

cate, there are times when I feel like exclaiming with poor Richard II:

"Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs;
Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
Write 'Sorrow' on the bosom of the earth."

For it seems to me that this great heritage given to us to make a home where Liberty could dwell in peace and prosperity with her votaries has been so misused that in justice it must be taken from us; and that, by our own misdeeds, it will, sooner or later, be made the grave of Liberty. C. H. REEVE.

P. S.—Since signing the foregoing article, this morning comes news of the appointment of Capt. Clark of the Oregon and Whitelaw Reid as coronation representatives. Well, Clark is a reputable man for the place, but what Whitelaw Reid has ever done for the country that he should be pushed to the front, puzzles me. However, I am so thankful that "fighting" Bob Evans and the "impossible" Potts were not selected—which would have been more in keeping with the treatment of Miles and Schley—that I can "put camphor in my ink" like Douglas Jerold, while, like Jeremiah, I write Lamentations. The old Polytheists declared: "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." Surely, the gods must contemplate the destruction of our new and "strenuous" President. C. H. R.

Plymouth, Ind., Jan. 15th, 1902.

FREE RAW MATERIALS.

[By J. B. SARGENT, of J. B. Sargent & Co., hardware manufacturers, New Haven, Conn.]

It is of great importance that iron, steel, lead, wool, hides, and other articles which are the basis of manufacturing industry shall be free from any tax or duty whatever:—

First, that manufacturers of countless articles shall be able to put their industries upon a sound basis.

Second, in order that their products shall be cheaper, so that they may supply more of them to our people, and therefore give more employment to our labor.

Third, in order that the extra cost of materials shall not handicap the products of American labor in their competition with foreign manufactures in any country in the world.

The protective tariff upon some of the materials named has aided those who produce them in this country to extort such a price that the manufactured articles into which they enter largely cannot be sold abroad. In some lines the tariff burden upon the cost of materials is lightened for the exporter by the rebate which is allowed on exported goods made of imported materials; but in others exportation is checked, because it not possible to present the proofs which are required, and the rebate cannot be obtained.

In spite of all, however, we do export both crude and manufactured articles to

every part of the world. It is as clear as day that we could export more of them, and employ more American labor in making them, if it were not for the protective taxes which increase the cost of the materials, implements, and machinery used in producing and marketing them. The protective duties are thus taxes upon all American labor, but fall with especial severity upon the labor engaged in producing articles which must find a foreign market. These articles are increasing in quantity and variety. Those engaged in producing them now outnumber those who could possibly be exposed to the injurious competition of imported products, if every protective duty were to be abolished. We must now seek a market abroad for our surplus production, not only of cotton, corn, wheat flour, and provisions, but also of finished manufactured goods, such as cotton fabrics, machinery, hardware, and metallic products of every kind.

"But," it has been asked, "are not pig iron and steel bars and billets produced so cheaply here that this country exports millions of dollars' worth? How, then, could we get these materials cheaper, even if there were no duty upon them?"

The answer is that, while iron and steel are produced cheaply in this country, they are not sold cheaply here. They are sold for export at lower prices than those we have to pay, and foreign manufacturers who use them get the benefit. In other words, the bearing of the protective duties is the same that it was ten years ago, although the conditions have changed. Then foreign hardware manufacturers were able to buy cheap foreign iron and steel, which we couldn't get on account of the protective tariff duties; while now foreign manufacturers can buy cheap American iron and steel, which we cannot buy so low because of those protective duties.

The protective duties give to the great steel combinations their power to extort high prices from Americans, while selling for foreign export at a reduction. This is true in other lines besides hardware, as in the steel plates used in shipbuilding, for example; and the only just and effective remedy is the removal of the protective duties.

It is true now, as it was ten years ago, that the foreign hardware or machinery manufacturer's advantage lies in his ability to obtain cheaper materials, and not in cheaper labor. Our labor is really the cheapest in the world, because now, as then, it is paid more; but it produces more, so that the labor cost of production is less here than in foreign countries. Indeed, the articles which we most excel in producing are those in which the proportion of labor is comparatively large and material small, like machinery and shelf hardware; while we find it harder to compete with

articles requiring less labor and more material, like anvils.

It would be a great mistake, however, to rest the demand for free raw materials solely upon the benefit to those producing goods for export. It would free them from grievous burdens. It would stimulate their industries and increase the employment they would give to their labor. But in a still greater degree it would free the whole American people from grievous burdens, from gross injustice, from dangerous monopolies, from oppressive extortion; and it would give still more employment to American labor, now deprived of a part of its fair share by the protective duties which restrict production.

Free raw materials should be demanded, not for our export business alone, but to benefit the whole American people; not as an end, but as a first step in a steady, consistent progress toward the only just and permanent condition for a free country,—free trade.

HISTORICAL SUGGESTIONS.

The Conservative has received a communication from Dr. Frederick Albert Hatch, of Omaha, a gentleman who lectures on matters connected with western history, in which he makes two suggestions which seem to us very reasonable. We quote with pleasure from Dr. Hatch's letter as follows:

"My object in writing is two-fold. Why can you not advocate the postponement of the Exposition in St. Louis until 1904, for this reason; that while the legal transfer of the Purchase took place in December 1803, the formal transfer of Upper Louisiana did not take place until about the middle of March 1804. At that ceremony, Lewis and Clark, with their detachment of U. S. soldiers, were present and took part. An account from the memory of an old colored woman, was published in a St. Louis paper along in the '30's, I think, which gave a fairly graphic picture of that event. There would be nothing in the sentiment governing the time of opening the Exposition, inconsistent with making it to occur in 1904.

My other reason is to suggest that it would be helpful in more than one way, if in our own Public School System, a place was made for a day when all over the state the pupils of sufficiently high grade should be expected to write or bring in compositions on some event in the early history of the state, which they may learn from old settlers, or from reading. Many an occurrence might be rescued from oblivion in this way. It would be fine if a small fund divided into suitable prizes could be given for the best compositions on this subject. It seems to me that this would be a good thing for the State Historical Society to take up.

Perhaps these points have occurred to you, but it will do no harm for you to know that others think of them."