

air is burdened with an odor of stale milk.

Gives a Sample of Uncleanliness.

"Here is a sample of the conditions met with on our tour of inspection. It is a report on a large creamery near Freeport and reads as follows:

"The output of the plant last year was 74,880 pounds of butter, all of which was shipped to Chicago. The creamery handled 1,872,000 pounds of milk. The creamery is located in a two-story frame structure and the owner and his family live upstairs. The boards in the floor are loose and dirty water spurts between the cracks every time a person walks across the floor.

"Escaping steam fills the room and this, together with the smell of stale milk, makes the atmosphere almost unbearable. The weigh can cover was covered with a black grease due to the accumulations of months. Directly over the receiving vat was a window covered with dust and soot and cobwebs. The appearance of the entire place was slimy and dirty.

"We found the outside of the separator covered with a black grease half an inch thick.

"The woodwork of the cream vat was moldy and foul smelling. The churn was filthy and the valve through which the cream flowed was partially clogged with a black grease. The escaping steam in the place kept the ceiling wet all the time and dirty water dripped into the vats.

"The skimmed milk and butter tanks are located directly over a coal pile and every time fuel is removed the dust rises and settles in the tanks. In an adjoining room we saw them working and packing butter amid filthy surroundings."

Solicitude for Sanitation.

And from such environments comes the importunate petition for the Grout bill. Amidst the reeking filth, thus officially portrayed by Food Inspector Patterson, arises the tender and irrepressible anxiety for the public health which finds philanthropic incarnation in the Grout bill. From these Pharisees of the butter trade, in the old-fashioned thank-God-I-am-not-as-other-men-are style, comes the prayer to Congress that publicans and sinners of the oleomargarine brand be punished and regenerated by the torture of extreme taxation.

Domesticated Tariffs.

But having so long endeavored under the name of protection to exclude exchanges between ourselves and foreigners by the imposition of prohibitive tariff taxes, it is not strange that avaricious and cunning citizens should now ask to be protected from competition by their neighbors and rivals in business. As trade which is unprofitable between

individuals or nations, always stops itself and only exchanges, which are mutually advantageous continue, a protective tariff only impedes the latter. And an excise tax for the extinction of an industry—like the tax proposed for oleomargarine by the Grout bill—is therefore laid upon something in manufacture and commerce for which there is much demand and in which there are many and constantly increasing exchanges. That is to say, such an excise tax could never be asked for upon a commodity not constantly and actively in the market of exchanges. Butterine, oleomargarine or any substitute for cow-butter which is popularly demanded, must have proved itself mutually advantageous and satisfactory to sellers and to buyers, to producers and consumers.

There should be no bill passed to cripple and destroy the manufacture of butter substitutes under the false pretence of raising revenue. Such legislation is a menace to all competitive innovations in all lines of production, and an invitation to avarice and greed to secure a large trade by enactment, which in a free market it shrinks from attempting. There has been too much class legislation already. The American people have had too much faith in the mere "be-it enacted" potency of legislation. Goods honestly, wholesomely made and sold at reasonably profitable figures will build up successful industrial plants.

Personal and corporate endeavor, aided only by integrity and persistent adherence to fair-dealing, will always succeed without legislative aid. To petition Congress for an enactment clearly inimical to a rival in business is a confession of the merit and worth of that rival, an admission of fear of his competition, and an acknowledgment of inferiority and weakness by the petitioner.

ONE READER SAYS "HOW?"

To The Conservative:

Your office has very properly referred to me for reply, a postal inquiry by one who signs himself "Reader" and whose communication is post-marked "Elgin, Ill., Nov. 20th, 1901," and upon the reverse of which is pasted an extract from an article contributed by me on the subject of the tariff, and which appeared in a recent number of your journal. I here quote the extract from that communication, and also give copy of the inquiry *verbatim*. The extract is as follows:

"As a means of raising revenue for the necessary expense of government, taxes may be legitimately levied and collected, but this should be so done as to make the burthen equal upon all, etc., etc." And then follows the request of your "Reader" for information as follows:

"How? That is one of our most ur-

gent and most perplexing problems. 'Make the burthen equal upon all?' All men? Or all men and women? Or all persons? Or all property? In either case how? That is what we want to know. Please ask Ballou, and let us know. (Signed) READER."

If I be not able at the moment to give full and detailed reply to this complicated inquiry, and one which is admittedly a "most perplexing problem" the fact of my inability in no wise militates against the position taken in the article from which his extract is made. Neither the wisdom nor justice of a measure depends upon the ability or ignorance of its advocates or opponents. Otherwise the Golden Rule would be God's word in one community and the devil's edict in another. A tariff measure is either just or unjust without reference to your "Reader's" approval or my condemnation, and regardless of anybody's ability to devise a better or inflict a worse.

The endeavor of my article was to criticise and defeat a certain and well defined measure known as a protective tariff, designed professedly to aid in the development of our infant industries, and not to propose measures for the maintenance and support of the government. I acted upon the theory that others than the proprietor of a South African mine might be able to point out a flaw in a diamond, and that a man might condemn the architecture of a particular structure without being called upon to build a city after his own plans.

The inquiry of your "Reader," if legitimate and sincere, should have been directed to congress, or to the chairman of the ways and means committee of the house, whose office and duty it is to provide the revenues of government, and, incidentally, to formulate measures for that purpose. When the writer of this shall have been elected to congress and made chairman of that committee, he will have pleasure in submitting his views and proposed measures to his fellows, and through them to the people at large. But until then it would be as impertinent for him to propose plans and measures, as it is for your "Reader" to demand and command it.

At the same time it may not be wholly amiss to suggest to this real or pretended seeker after knowledge, that one way of making the burthen of taxation equal is to oppose measures which tend to make them unequal. As Secretary Sherman once said, "the way to resume is to resume," and so, the way to make taxation equal is to prevent inequality. And when a measure like a protective tariff, which is confessedly and avowedly partial and discriminating, is proposed, your "Reader" may find an answer to one of his "Hows" by opposing and defeating it.

BALLOU.

Omaha, Neb., Nov. 25, 1901.