

THE PASSING OF "PROTECTION."

Evidently, Havemeyer—our robber baron of our sugar Rhine—in his pointing to protection—that McKinley hobbyhorse—as the "Mother of the Trusts" has induced something like administration heart failure. The following symptoms of a protective tariff collapse are noted: Smith, of McKinley's cabinet, and presumed to mirror the president, says—as in the nature of that maneuver of politics known as crawfishing—that "The tariff is not an issue of the same importance as in the past. The policy of protection aimed to build up our industries to a point where they could stand independent on their own feet. This object has been accomplished. Protection has established the complete industrial independence of this country. More than that: it may fairly be said that it has substantially established our industrial supremacy. This truth has been demonstrated within the past two years, as we are now beating the products of the Old World on their own grounds." This is flubdub and the balderdash of corruption satiated. If an industry "needs protection" when it's small, it "needs" it to the same proportionate extent, and for precisely the same reason, when it's big. "Protection" was a taking without license of right from one and giving to another, for that the latter chose to go into a certain business. For example, protection took constantly from the farmer and gave to the iron-mongers like Carnegie. As one fruit of this leech system, note the difference between the farmer and Carnegie. Smith, in his effort to cover McKinley's retreat of protection pipes exultantly to the effect that within two years we have "been beating the products of the Old World on their own ground." One is to infer that this latter feat having had happy accomplishment, we can now take down our protective tariff fence. If that were all, then protection should have been abated twenty years ago. There should have been no swindle of a McKinley bill in 1890. As far away as the early 80's we were "beating the products of the Old World on their own ground." We were—for a handful of samples—selling Singer sewing machines in London at \$15, that cost—because of protection—the American purchaser \$30, in Jersey City, where they were made. Clark's spool cotton—and the Clarks, all Scotch and never naturalized, are the subjects of "Er Gracious Majesty the Queen" today—was three cents in London and five cents where made. Syracuse salt was cheaper in Toronto than in Syracuse. An Oakes Ames shovel cost less in Mexico than in Massachusetts, and the Santa Fe road took advantage of it as far away as 1881 to buy shovels in El Paso Del Norte, they being \$1.75 cheaper per dozen there than at their own Bay state manufactory. And

they'd paid freight 3,000 miles. An endless list of this kind can be made. Here's why the McKinley gang of protective loot and plunder seem to be taking the back track. There's danger in the word "protection;" always was. The more, since Havemeyer of Sugar pointed to it as the well-head of the trust crime. And they're about to abandon the word. "Protection was the name for that excess of tariff collected beyond the needs of government. To a tariff for revenue was added a giant per cent beyond what the government must have to meet its bills; and that last was called "protection," It was the favoring arm of Uncle Sam thrown around such folk as Havemeyer, and Cramp, and Carnegie, and Elkins, and Armour, and Clark, and Whitney, and Payne, and the whole brood of republican harpies. It was reserving the home market for their wares. It was a license to loot in favor of manufacturers. They didn't need it. They never needed it. It would have been a robbery and extortion even if they had needed it. But a time of politics has come when protection may be put aside. Why? A swindling republicanism, feeding fraud on every hand, has elevated our "expenses" to a point that makes protection unnecessary. What was "protection" is now a "tariff for revenue." When we've imposed a duty to meet our "expenses," as the fraud and corruption of our Hanna government have cut and corded them, that duty will be 50 per cent higher all along the line than the atrocious McKinley bill. Here we have the Dingley bill towering a story or two above the McKinley bill of eight years ago; and still the first of July displayed a deficit for the year of \$114,000,000. You say the war fed on the nation's money? The money that carried on the war was borrowed; we've sold over half a billion dollars' worth of bonds in the past six years. This, in addition to the tariff. Where has that borrowed money gone? Where have the revenues departed to? They have been swallowed by the maws of republican waste, and fraud, and swindle, and digested as "appropriations." Would you know how "appropriations" have grown? In 1819, with 9,000,000 of population, the appropriations for government's current expenses were \$8,500,000. In Jackson's day, with 13,000,000 of folk on our books, appropriations were a dollar a head, or \$13,000,000. As lately as the 60's our year's bills came no higher than \$60,000,000. Today, aside from a Philippine outrage costing \$100,000,000, they run up to \$800,000,000 a year. And that's why "protection" is no longer called for. With public expense piled mountains high by fraud, the Carnegies and the Cramps and the rest of aforetime protection bloodsuckers can get all the blood they want—a bellyful of blood,

in sooth!—with a "tariff for revenue only." What's the remedy? Income tax and cut tariff to the roots.—New York Verdict.

PERSONAL.

The pope has sent a full-length portrait of himself with a dedication and signature to Dr. Mazzoni, who attended him in his recent illness. He also appointed Dr. Mazzoni his consulting surgeon.

The Holy See having expressed disapproval of the further distribution of Professor Zahm's new work "Evolution and Dogma," he has requested that it be withdrawn from sale, and has written to his translators to the same purpose.

Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer, superintendent of public instruction in Pennsylvania, is to return to his former position at the head of the Keystone State Normal School at Kutztown. Not being in political harmony with Governor Stone he did not expect reappointment.

Field Marshal Lord Roberts of the British Army mourns the loss of his famous Arab charger Vonodel. He had ridden her in India and at home for twenty-two years, and Vonodel was a favorite with both the British and the native troops. She attracted great attention in the Jubilee procession of 1897, when she was decorated, by permission of the queen, with the Kabul medal, with four clasps, and the Kandahar star.

E. N. Dingley, of Kalamazoo, Mich., who is preparing a biography of his father, the late Representative Dingley, reports that President McKinley, in a recent conversation with him, said: "When you come to write of my relations to Congressman Dingley say in the strongest and most emphatic terms that I offered him the position of secretary of the treasury, and that he declined on the ground that he could help me more in the house than in the treasury."

The most contemptible beast is the pseudo conservative. A slave to tradition he seeks to enslave others. He is not a man, neither is he fish, flesh nor fowl. He is a nondescript. Barnum once exhibited him as the "What is it?" He is an anthropomorphic with a skull clogged with the mouldy wool of traditionalism instead of brains.

Commenting on Postmaster-General Smith's speech at Omaha, the Portland (Me.) Press (Rep.) says: "It is useless and worse than useless now to undertake to fix the responsibility of the war. It leads simply to unprofitable crimination and recrimination. It is the end and not the beginning of the war that people are now concerned about."