

the foreign world would get the benefit of the cheaper products. The idea is a good one, which might be vastly improved by enlarging the boundaries of the "free ports" so as to include within them the whole country. If American manufacturers can pay American wages for the manufacturing of American products to be sold abroad in competition with the "pauper labor" of Europe, they can pay American wages for products to be sold at home. The advantage of the "free ports" would be not low wages, but free materials. This is another recognition of the truth that cheap goods do not come from low wages. High wages usually mean low cost of production. It is high taxes and not high wages that make high prices.

+ + +

## THE PROTECTION PRINCIPLE AND TARIFF REDUCTIONS.

It is with much interest and added respect for the American Protective Tariff League that we read its reply to the inquiries of the National Association of Manufacturers regarding tariff modifications. The League stands for protection as a principle, just as we stand for free trade as principle, and it plumply refuses to be drawn into any compromising relations with manufacturers who want tariff reductions on the products of others but not on their own. These manufacturers remind the League of Josh Billings's remark "that the best place to have a boil is on the other fellow."

+

"Reciprocity," in the technical sense, is rightly regarded by the League as "a breeder of hoggishness" that "would take the blue ribbon at any county fair." And "of all forms of tariff revision or tariff reduction," it argues, "reciprocity is the most outrageous and abominable, because it begins by discriminating against one group of domestic industries and in favor of other industries, and ends by discriminating in favor of some foreign countries and against other countries." The League sees in such reciprocity, what we also see, that "it would carry with it the downfall of protection." For the same reason, therefore, we look with favor on what the League opposes.

+

The League stands for protection unmitigated and undisturbed. That is where it ought to stand, if it stands for protection at all. For protection is either a fundamental principle of general benefit, as protectionists say, or else it is a method of creating special favors. If it is a principle for

the general good, then the more completely and rigidly it is applied the better will it be for the whole country. But if it is a method of creating special favors, then it cannot be torn up by the roots too soon. That the League believes it to be for the general good is evident from its stand on proposals to modify. If tariff revision is to come, the League prefers that it come at once, so that we may the sooner "find out the folly of it." The League opposes a permanent "non-partisan" tariff commission for the purpose of taking the tariff question out of politics, and for this opposition it gives the best of reasons. It truly says that there is no such thing as non-partisanship on the tariff question except among fools. It thinks that if a bi-partisan commission were appointed it would be constantly at loggerheads and command no one's respect, and that a commission wholly of protectionists would be derided by free traders. And it doubts the willingness and denies the right of the proper Congressional committees to surrender their functions to a commission. All this is perfectly sound and genuine. It points to a consistent protection policy, with all the faith of men who believe in it for patriotic and not for financial reasons. It raises the one and only issue that can be candidly raised, namely, protection or free trade. There is no middle ground. Protection with free trade features or free trade with protection features, would be special privilege in disguise. If protection is good, let us have plenty of it; if it is bad, let's get wholly rid of it.

+ + +

## THAT CAVE OF ADULLAM.

Patience is important in moments of perplexity when public interests are in the balance, but I am often impatient and indignant when I see from time to time the abominable methods that are pursued by the Plunderbund of Chicago to continue their hold upon public property. Not content with having already robbed the people of millions of dollars, they not only insist on their right to continue their iniquitous course but their newspaper allies revile those who are heroically waging war upon them and trying to see justice done.

Recently one of the Chicago dailies which pretends to great fairness in treating all controverted subjects had this to say regarding leaders in the efforts to prevent a traction settlement by the pending ordinances and without a referendum:

The cause of the opposition is the cause of a motley band of Adullamites. Tone, Haley, Grossberg, Blakely and Doty are the preachers of discontent, and their names give a pretty clear idea of the