EQUALIZING PROTECTION.

Address of David Lubin Before the National Grange.

The Patrons of Husbandry Recommend Mr. Lubin's Proposition to Congress—An Interesting Document.

Address delivered before the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, at its annual meeting held in Worcester, Mass., on November 14, 1895, by David Lubin of Sacramento, Cal.:

Worthy Master and Fellow-Patrons: By resolution of California State Grange at its last session, a committee of three was appointed to appear before the National Grange and advocate the adoption of resolutions indorsing the proposition for equalizing protection. Several other State Granges have likewise appointed committees for the same purpose. As one of the committeemen from California State Grange, it becomes my duty to aid in presentation of resolutions indorsing this proposition for your consideration and action.

In doing so I respectfully ask, as a matter of fairness and of established parliamentary usage, that I be permitted to make the closing argument before the final vote is taken. I desire to emphasize the above request, because at the last annual meeting a similar request by Past Master Johnston of California was denied, and as a result certain statements highly prejudicial to the indorsement of the proposition, which could have been replied to in a satisfactory manner, were left unanswered.

This, in my judgment, was the principal reason why this proposition did not receive the unanimous indorsement of the National Grange last year. Wherever the proposition was presented for indorsement, whether before subordinate or State Granges, before Alliances or labor unions, or in mass meetings or before commercial bodies, my request for the closing argument was uniformly granted, not alone as a matter of courtesy, but as a right accorded, as was said before, by parliamentary usage.

So essential is this point to the proper presentation of this matter, that I would prefer to stop right here rather than again jeopardize action on this proposition by a refusal to permit a defense against objections which can perhaps be readily overcome to the entire satifaction of the objector. With the understanding that I shall have the right of making the closing argument before the vote is taken on the resolutions, I shall proceed.

Before closing this introductory, it is deemed proper to state that the general interest justifies the belief that reports of proceedings before this organization on this proposition and copies of this address will be in general demand. And unless the National Grange gives contrary instructions, there will be 50,000 copies of same printed and circulated.

In addition to this, a large portion of the matter will be printed in some of the journals of the country. One of the leading daily journals of California has appointed me special correspondent for that purpose.

Whatever differences of opinions may exist in the minds of the delegates present there can be no disagreement as to this, that this proposition is now generally known throughout the United States. We can safely assert, for instance, that there can be but few producers of agricultural staples in our country who have not heard of it. Nor are these the only people whose interest has been awakened thereby, the shipping people, manufacturers, commercial bodies, labor unions, politicians, the lawmakers of our country, all these have given this matter more or less thought.

In addition to public presentation of this proposition at meetings, there was an eager demand for literature, which took over 1,000,000 pieces of printed matter to supply. These scrapbooks now on the desk, and from which quotations may be made in the progress of this presentation, form a portion of several similar volumes containing clippings of editorial criticisms and comments on this subject, from among the principal journals of this and of foreign countries.

From all this we may conclude that general information and interchange of thought has tended largely to correct former erroneous ideas prevailing on the subject. To such a degree is this manifest that even some prominent journalists no longer employ the arguments against this proposition that they did a year ago, as can be seen from the clippings in these books. At the start of this agitation many honestly believed that a tariff on imports could protect the home market of a product produced in surplus quantity for export. They now understand that the foreign buyer will pay us no more for our surplus than they can obtain the same from the cheapest land and labor countries of the world. They also understand that because the surplus and the greater quantity for home use is sold in the open market in public salesrooms, like at auctions, where buyers for export and for home use buy at the same time and place, therefore both buy at the same price the world's free trade price in direct competition with the cheapest land and labor countries of the world.

All this is now generally understood, therefore the former claim that a tariff on imports can protect the home market of a product produced in surplus quantities, sold at the world's auction free trade prices, is no longer of any value, except it be to confuse the most stupid. In the past many others were under the impression that, while a tariff on imports could not directly protect the home market of agricultural staples by reason of the export of its surplus, that these products were nevertheless indirectly protected, by reason of the protected wage rate, paid as a result of protection to other industries, which high wage rate they claimed caused greater consumption; hence steadier demand and higher prices. There are yet quite a number who make this claim. There is, however, no ground for this belief at all, for, as the export price and the price for home use is the same, it must follow that before we can enhance the price for home use we must first enhance the export or world's price.

As soon as we do it is not the producers of agricultural staples in our country who are benefited, but the producers of India, Russia, Argentine, in fact, the producers of every country but our own.

Any increase in price as the indirect result of our tariff system would be clear gain to the producers in foreign countries.

But, to the producers of agricultural staples of our own country any such increase must, when balanced against the cost of our present one-sided protection system, be a grievous loss to them. It is like compelling these producers to pay a half-dollar for direct protection, in order that they may have a chance to exchange it for a possible half-dime through indirect protection.

Even this once possible chance for indirect protection is now gone. Increased production by the cheap land and labor countries is now a sufficient factor to offset any increased consumption as the result of our protective tariff on imports.

The producers of agricultural staples in our country not alone gain nothing by indirect protection, but, on the contrary, they are very heavy losers by it. This loss is so grossly unjust, so inequitable, so oppressive, and of such great magnitude as to be without parallel in the economic history among civilized or uncivilized nations. It may be supposed that as soon as the truth of this injustice has been made clear, that there would be a prompt general effort on the part of our political leaders at rectification; but the contrary is true.

Among those who understand the truth are to be found political leaders, who prefer to cater to the wish of a majority rather than to strive unselfishly for the good of the country. There is, there can be but one term for such leaders, they are traitors to the republic. And yet, under guise of patriotism, these men shout loudly for protection, "for protection of American industries against the competition of the pauper labor of the world." Under guise of this patriotism they help perpetuate the most stupendous robbery in the world. They help the majority to sacrifice the minority, to literally eat the flesh and drink the blood of the producers of agricultural staples. Here we have a spectacle of a greedy, selfish, unjust, unpatriotic portion of the people of this republic devouring the other half, and that the better half, too.

"But," says editor Grosvenor of the New York Tribune, "But you forget to take into consideration that this very system has been in operation in the United States for the past thirty years, and that these have been the most prosperous in its history." Admitted, what then? This, that for thirty years the producers of agricultural staples have suffered under unjust laws, but in spite of this, and by reasons of certain world advantages, they prospered.

Chief among these advantages was the almost exclusive use of agricultural machinery, cheap and fertile lands and better transportation, all of which almost gave the American producer of agricultural staples a monopoly price and profit on his investment and labor. These advantages are his no more, nor is it likely that they will ever be his again. Agricultural machinery is now in the hands of the cheapest labor in the world, on lands cheaper, newer and more fertile, with transportation facilities and natural advantages, in many respects superior to ours. This is the new world condition, it has come to stay, and this condition we must now meet. The condition which permitted prosperity in spite of injustice is gone, and the time has now come when other and better and more just methods must prevail.

Those who make light of this statement, or those who insist in maintaining the present one-sided and unjust protective system, because it operated to their satisfaction for the past thirty years, must prove clearly, first, how a tariff on imports can protect an export. Second, how the home market of such products can be indirectly protected, as long as there is a surplus for export, which is sold in the open market at free trade prices. Third, they must prove that we are still the exclusive users of agricultural machinery, and that we do not annually export about $5,000,000 worth of these for use in the cheapest land and labor countries of the world. Fourth, they must prove that there are no plants for the manufacture and export of agricultural machinery, to the cheap land and labor countries in England, France, Germany, Austria and Belgium. Fifth, they must prove that there is no great subsidized trunk railway lines in India and in other British possessions, for the purpose of cheap carriage of agricultural staples to seaboard. Sixth they must prove that the Suez Canal has not shortened distance in carriage of agricultural staples to England. Seventh, that Argentine did not import flour and grain a few years ago; that she did not send to England in direct competition against us 6,470,045 bushels of wheat in 1892, 14,645,095 in 1893, and 24,774,685 in 1894.

That the same country did not send to Germany in direct competition against us 66,169.7 metric tons of wheat, to our 630,213.0 metric tons in 1892; that she did not increase the 66,169.7 metric tons to 346,224.5, against our 323,497.5 in 1894. And in periods of five years, 1836 to 1840, 1851 to 1855, 1876 to 1880 and 1891 to 1893, that India did not increase her cotton crop from 56,500,000 to 134,800,000, then to 407,400,000, then to 491,600,000. And that Egypt did not in the same period increase her cotton crop from 30,100,000 to 60,000,000, then to 268,700,000, then to 449,300,000. Seventh, they must prove that agricultural machinery is not being introduced and that rapid developments are not taking place in European and Asiatic Russia, or that Russia or Argentine have reached their limits in the placing of available land under cultivation, or that all these things have no material effect on the world's price; that if the world's price as soon as we produce a surplus for export is not also our home market price. Can these things be refuted? No, not one. Finding themselves beaten, inch by inch on their own ground, these would-be conservative leaders take a cross-cut out of the difficulty by brazenly claiming that protection does not enhance the price of manufactures at all, that the "fellow on the other side" pays the duty, and that our manufactures are cheaper than those of other countries. When confronted with the fact that we only export of mining, fisheries, manufactures, forestry and miscellaneous about 25 per cent., and of staple agriculture 75 per cent., that if our manufactures were cheaper there would be no need of a tariff, that we would export them in place of fearing competition by imports, that in spite of our high tariff the foreign manufacturer can, and does still undersell us to the extent of about $200,000,000 protective duties, annually paid into the treasury, which, with profits of middlemen added thereto, is paid by the consumers of the country, to be ultimately repaid in total with additions by the producers of agricultural staples.

They alone, be it remembered, are the only great class in our country who pay for protection and are themselves unprotected. But the enormity of this unjust burden, resting on the producers of agricultural staples, is much greater than is seen on the surface. Not alone is the duty added on imports, but the usual profits of merchants are likewise added on the duty as well as on the goods proper. This, together, becomes the measure of possible enhancement, or protection of home manufactures. To illustrate, if the duty is $50 on a case of goods, and if the profits of importer, jobber and retailer be respectively 15 per cent., 20 per cent., 25 per cent. (which is a general average, and, excluding staples, is conservative), the real duty will swell about as follows: Duty, $50; importer's profits, 15 per cent., increases the duty to $57 50, to which add 20 per cent. jobber's profits, increase the duty to $69, to which add 25 per cent. retailer's profits, making a total of $50; nominal enhancement for duty, $86 25.

The Home Market Bulletin of Boston, the official organ of the Home Market Club, the principal New England adjunct to the American Protective Tariff League, in its October issue, criticises this enhancement in the following words: "Outside the madhouse of the New York World we have seen no recent contention so untenable as Mr. Lubin's computation of the profits made by middlemen upon the duties which he insists are added to the prices." The most charitable view to take of this unjust and harsh criticism by the Home Market Bulletin is to say that the editor knew no better, as the following evidence will show: "Office of Teft, Weller & Co., 326, 328 and 330 Broadway, New York, October 31, 1895. D. Lubin, Esq.—Dear Sir: In response to request, we write you with reference to the question as to whether in figuring the percentage upon imported goods we do so before or after adding duties. We have no hesitancy in saying that we figure the cost of the goods as landed in our store. We think you will find this to be the general custom. Signed: Teft, Weller & Co." So then, not alone is the usual profit on the duty added to the price of the imported goods, but in addition there is also the profits on cost of buying in Europe, cost of transportation, of Custom-house brokerage, insurance and cartage. A nominal $50 duty, therefore, means more than a real duty of $86 25.

If more evidence is wanted to the same effect, we have it here in the following: "New York, Oct. 31, 1895. Profits on imports are not alone charged on merchandise cost, but a like per cent. of profit is also charged on the duty paid. Signed, "Garrison, Wright & Co., Bernhard, Ulmann & Co., George R. Gibson, Friend, Foise & Co., A. Steinhardt & Bro., Koch, Sons & Co." Were it deemed necessary, enough names of merchants of the highest standing throughout the United States could be obtained to verify the above which would make a book of thousands of pages. How many names of reputable merchants could the Home Market Bulletin obtain to prove that no profit is added to the duty? Not one.

Being driven from this ground, the opposition reluctantly admits that so long as we have a surplus of agricultural staples they can neither be protected in the home market, directly or indirectly, by a tariff on imports. "But," say they, "let us continue protection by a tariff on imports, and thereby so stimulate manufactures as to make it possible for us to consume our surplus of agricultural staples at home, for, as soon as we no longer have a surplus of agricultural staples for export, we can then protect them by tariff on imports." True, but will the foreign nations be any more willing to accept in payment for our imports our protected manufactures in the future than they have in the past? Certainly not.

To attempt the payment of imports with exports of highly protected manufactures is as if a dog were whirling around in a circle in an endeavor to catch his tail when the aforesaid dog had no tail to catch.

We must pay for our imports in bullion or in commodities. If in commodities, they must be at free trade prices. The items of manufactures which are produced under protection which can be profitably sold at free trade prices are few indeed. We must therefore continue to export agricultural staples to the extent of 75 per cent. of our exports in order to pay for our imports.

Some radical though foolish one-sided protectionists suggest that we overcome the difficulty by the prohibition of commercial intercourse with foreign nations. Others of these one-sided protectionists advise the producers to curtail the production of agricultural staples and to diversify their products. Strange to say quite a number of agricultural journals repeat this advice. On the surface it looks reasonable and sound, but in practice it is disastrous, not alone to the producers of non-stable agricultural products, but, like a boomerang, the mischief caused thereby rebounds and injures the producers of staples as well.

When cotton, corn, wheat and tobacco were profitable crops, the growers of these could afford to buy their root crops, poultry, hay, fruits and dairy products, thus the production of non-staples, as well as the staples of agriculture were profitable industries.

As soon, however, as the staples became unprofitable, and the producers started into raise root crops, poultry, hay, fruits and dairy products, a result followed which might have been expected. The non-staple agricultural products also fell below the profit point. None know this better than the Patrons assembled here, and none present can refute it.

The most demagogic cry of all, and the one of least value and most harm to the agricultural interest, is the cry for that equal protection for agriculture, which may be had by a tariff on imports. Can a tariff on imports protect the home market of agricultural staples as long as they are produced in surplus quantities for export? No, not directly or indirectly. If they never knew this before, they surely know it now. Of what benefit, then, is their cry for equal protection of agriculture by a tariff on imports? Of no value whatever. "But," say they, "if the tariff cannot protect wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco and hops, can it not protect wool?" Yes, it can protect wool, but at the expense of the producers of such agricultural staples as we must continue to produce a surplus of.

Additional protection by a tariff on imports as long as the great staples are themselves unprotected must always be at the expense of the staples unprotected, and would tighten the cinch the tighter and aggravate the injustice. There are but two methods for the removal of the unjust and tyrannical burdens which agriculture is laboring under. One is by the absolute abolition of the protective system, and the other is by protecting the home market of agricultural staples by an export bounty. Under ordinary conditions of international competition the adoption of free trade would not be a very serious affair. But the condition confronting us is not an ordinary one. In manufactures, we are confronted not alone with European competition, but with Asiatic as well. We all know that Japan is looming up as the most formidable competitor in manufactures in the world. As long as these people employed no manufacturing machinery they were unable to compete with Caucasian labor. Now, however, with manufacturing machinery they can as readily, under free trade, fix the rate of wages in this country as the peon, ryot fellah, coolies and the moujik now fix the world's and our home market price for agricultural staples.

Only the day before I left San Francisco, I saw Japanese matches sold in that city at a lower price than those produced in our country, in spite of the tariff. Remove the tariff and in a very short time our operatives would be obliged to accept the Japanese wage rate or no matches would be made in our country. So with other manufactures. The question is asked, why does not Japanese competition hurt free trade England? But it does, and so does India competition; thousands of idle workingmen in England are beginning to clamor for protection.

This new and destructive competition, the cheapest labor countries of the world employing labor-saving manufacturing machinery, is not a theory, it is a condition confronting us, and which is here to stay. To ignore this would be folly. Indeed, we cannot, dare not ignore it. What would happen to our workingmen under free trade with Japanese competition has already happened to the producers of agricultural staples. They must compete direct with like means of production, with the disadvantage of dearer transportation and less fertile lands against the cheapest land and labor countries of the world. Against this they must be protected, if they are not to be driven off from their lands. To protect them by a tariff on imports is but mockery and injustice. To fully comprehend the enormity of this injustice we need but illustrate the case by citing from the "Special Consular Reports," 1891, pages 556 and 557, from Consul-General Williams' report on the economic injustice of Spain toward Cuba. The Consul-General informs us that the unjust protective laws of Spain compel Cuba to buy "her flour, provisions, groceries, shoes, dry goods and all other articles of consumption in Spain," and that Cuba may only buy these things from other countries by the payment of heavy duties.

Cuba is an exporting country of agricultural staples. The development of the beet sugar industry in Germany, France, Austria and Russia has curtailed the demand for her sugar and molasses, resulting in a material lowering of the world's price for these products. The maintenance of the protective restrictions by Spain, and the decline of the world's price of her products, both operating at the same time, have so diminished the purchasing powers of the Cubans as to drive them into bankruptcy and revolution. Every right-minded man, knowing these facts, must sympathize with Cuba in her brave struggle for independence from this injustice and tyranny. The cause of the Cuban patriots is in every way as just as the cause of the War of the Revolution—the cause is the same.

Now, let us mentally separate in this country the producers of agricultural staples and their farms from the rest of the population by an imaginary intervening body of water, and we can the better realize the startling facts that by our present faulty protective system we treat as unjustly a great and important body of our fellow-citizens in our midst as Spain does Cuba, as England did the Colonists before the War of the Revolution. That what has been set forth above is true, no well-informed and fair-minded man will deny. Those knowing it to be true, but who for partisan reasons deny it, may justly be termed traitors to their country.

Having already indicated the objection to free trade, and further on pointed out the injustice and inequalities of our present protective system, we may now turn our attention to the proposition of equalizing protection by the payment of an export bounty on agricultural staples.

Inasmuch as the export and home buyers buy at the same time, place and price on the same calculation; therefore, the export bounty would not alone enhance the price of the quantity exported equal to the bounty paid, but would also enhance the price to the same degree of the much greater quantity for home use. This would do for the staples of agriculture so long as they are produced in surplus quantities for export, what a protective tariff on imports cannot do. It would protect the home market of this American industry against the destructive competition of the cheapest land and labor countries of the world.

To demonstrate that it would do this is not a difficult task. We need only bear in mind the several factors which go to make the world's price which the producers in our country receive for their product, whether exported or for home consumption, and add to it the export bounty to be paid and we have the sum of the protection of the home market granted.

That many objections have been offered against this proposition is true; that any of them are valid is not true. Space will only permit a review of the more important:

First—"That an export duty is unconstitutional."

So it is, but this proposition does not call for an export "duty," it calls for an export "bounty," which is quite a different matter.

Second—"That farm products are already protected by the tariff on imports."

So they are, but only such as we do not produce a surplus of, leaving the great and important body of producers of agricultural staples unprotected.

Third—"That speculators would combine and 'gobble' up the export bounty."

So they would, if they could; but as the world's price is known throughout the world, and the world's speculators bid against each other the export bounty would go to the producer, unless there were a combination among the world's speculators, and if they can do this when the export bounty will be in operation, they can do as much now without the export bounty.

Fourth—"That foreign buyers will not agree to pay us a higher price because of the export bounty."

No, but it is not intended that they should, for the export bounty will neither raise nor lower the foreign price; it will only raise the home price in our country.

Fifth—"That consumers will object to pay for the protection of agricultural staples."

By what right, then, may the producers of agricultural staples be taxed for the protection of those consumers?

Sixth—"That there is no money in the treasury for the payment of the export bounty."

This is not true. The United States Government collects annually about $500,000,000 through the operation of the protective system. The producers of agricultural staples pay for the protection of other industries and receive none in return, hence the protective money in the treasury has been indirectly contributed by them. Are they not therefore entitled to a share of their own contribution in order that it may do for them in the form of an export bounty what its collection as a tariff on imports does for the protected interests?

Seventh—"That a system which will protect all will protect none."

This is false. A system which protects A at the expense of B is unjust, but to protect A and B in our country against A and B in a foreign country is equitable. The gain under an equitable system of protection is in the maintenance of a more just ratio of compensation for labor than is possible under free trade, especially if in other countries like products are produced by the same means of production, and by an abundant supply of efficient, yet yielding, non-aggressive labor.

Eighth—"That if the sugar bounty is unconstitutional, this export bounty would be also."

The sugar bounty in its scope and operation is radically different. The sugar bounty is one of production, and is for the creation of a new enterprise; but the export bounty on agricultural staples is on the surplus for export only, and is demanded as a measure of justice and equity so long as the protective system is in operation.

Ninth—"That it would prove as disastrous to this country as the export bounty on sugar did to the European countries."

These objectors lack broad and correct information, and have perhaps read a one-sided view on this important matter. The export bounty on sugar has done more for Germany than the hundreds of millions of dollars which she received as war indemnity from France. Nor should it be overlooked that an export bounty, paid to the sugar manufacturer in the form of rebate on taxes, as in Germany, is one thing; to pay direct export bounty on agricultural staples is another. Beets must be turned over to the manufacturer, who has the power to fix the price and conditions of sale; wheat, cotton, hops, tobacco or corn are finished products, ready for the world's acceptance at its price.

Tenth—"That the agricultural staples are protected indirectly because the enhanced wage rate through protection causes greater consumption, a steadier demand—hence higher prices."

There is more sophistry than truth in this. Before increased consumption can raise the price in our country it must first enhance the world's price.

Eleventh—"That we show diversity."

To diversify is not always practicable, and is, beside, no remedy for low prices as a whole. Where certain sections make a specialty of raising non-staples, like sweet or Irish potatoes, poultry, tomatoes, fruits or dairy products, they can, as a rule, do so at a profit. When, however, many tracts of land formerly devoted to staples are put to use on the diversification plan, it generally follows that this renders the entire production in all sections unprofitable.

Twelfth—"To reduce the area under cultivation until there is no surplus for export; this being done, the tariff on imports will then protect these staples."

True, but impracticable, for it would leave much more than half the land uncultivated. Beside, the exports of agricultural staples now furnish about 75 per cent. of the payment for our imports, and only 25 per cent. is furnished by mining, forestry, fisheries, manufacture and miscellaneous. With what, then, would we pay for our imports so long as foreign countries refuse to buy our protected manufactures? In order to do away with our agricultural staples for export, we must first have free trade so that we could export manufactures enough to pay for our imports.

Thirteenth—"That such protective countries as France, Germany, Italy, etc., have protection by a tariff on imports but do not have an export bounty on agricultural staples."

No, nor do they need any, for, having no surplus of these staples for export, they protect them by a tariff on imports.

Fourteenth—"That this proposition would be costly to carry out."

Not at all. It can be carried out by the custom-house authorities at very little, if any, extra expense.

Fifteenth—"That this proposition may be theoretically right and just, but can it be shown from experience that it would work practically?"

Yes, it was in successful operation in England for a period of seventy-six years.

Sixteenth—"That if a bounty is allowed on the exports of agricultural staples, it should be granted also to the exports of manufacturers."

Not at all. The home market price of manufacturers is already enhanced by a tariff on imports, and the home market price of agricultural staple can also be enhanced by a bounty on exports. There is no intention to extend protection in the foreign market.

The agitation of this question has brought to the front the representatives of the shipping interests, who justly claim that the American merchant marine in the foreign trade can no more be protected by a tariff on imports than can agricultural staples exported, and for the same reason both come into direct competition with free trade and cheap labor countries. The shipping representatives proposed that this movement unite the two interests in the demand for equity in protection so long as the protective system be in operation. This was submitted to joint meetings of farmers, and the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, Seattle, Washington, the Board of Trade of Bath, Maine, and to the representatives of the Atlantic Coast shipping interests, and in every instance the proposition met with enthusiastic and almost unanimous indorsement.

In this, the concluding portion of the address, I may with propriety offer the following reasons to the Worthy Master and to the Delegate Patron why this honorable body should cast a unanimous vote in favor of the resolutions submitted indorsing this proposition:

First—It must be clear that what has been said is free from partisan bias, being so, it may properly be acted upon. Warrant for this is had by referring to page 10, report twenty-eighth session, National Grange, in the address by the Worthy Master.

Second—There is not a claim made in the argument submitted which conflicts with or is not substantiated by the Worthy Master, and by the Executive Committee of the National Grange, in their respective reports of 1894.

Third—There is nothing contrary to grange doctrine in this proposition, for one of the strongest claims by the grange is this: "Protection for all, or protection for none." No true patron can, therefore, honestly be a protectionist unless he indorse this proposition.

Fourth—Your action on this matter is calculated to influence largely that great body, the producers of agricultural staples, more directly, perhaps, than any other act by this organization. Their hope is centered in your vote on this proposition.

Fifth—The adoption of this proposition is as much to the advantage of Eastern agricultural interests as for Western and Southern, for it will tend to maintain agriculture at a profit in all sections.

Sixth—The adoption of this proposition is not asked as a special privilege or favor for the producers of agricultural staples. It is demanded as a just right so long as other interests are protected.

And finally, may our Heavenly Worthy Master direct your conclusion on this matter, to the end that your final action may accord with His will, and that it may terminate to the best interests of our noble republic.

(Other addresses were delivered by Llewellyn of Seattle and Craig of San Francisco. A resolution recommending to Congress Lubin's proposition for the protection of American agriculture and shipping was adopted.)

WHEN THE POET CAME.

I.

The ferny places gleam at morn,
The dew drips off the leaves of corn;
Along the brook a mist of white
Fades as a kiss on lips of light;
For, lo! the poet with his pipe
Finds all these melodies are ripe!

II.

Far up within the cadenced June
Floats, silver-winged, a living tune
That winds within the morning's chime
And sets the earth and sky to rhyme;
For, lo! the poet, absent long,
Breathes the first raptures of his song!

III.

Across the clover blossoms, wet,
With dainty clumps of violet,
And wild red roses in her hair,
There comes a little maiden fair.
I cannot more of June rehearse—
She is the ending of my verse!

IV.

Ah, nay! For through perpetual days
Of summer gold and filmy haze,
When autumn dies in winter's sleet,
I yet will see those dew-washed feet
And o'er the tracks of Life and Time
They make the cadence for my rhyme.

—Eugene Field.

Dr. Siegert's Angostura Bitters, a pure vegetable tonic, makes health and health makes bright, rosy cheeks and happiness.

3-Day Malaria Cure
CURES IN THREE DAYS.
MUNYON'S REMEDIES—A Full Line at
OTT'S PHARMACY,
200 K street, southeast corner Second and K.

SEND THE WEEKLY UNION TO YOUR friends in the East.

BEST MADE IN THE WORLD.
1845 1895
PRESTON & MERRILL'S
FIFTY YEARS ⇐ ⇒ THE STANDARD
BAKING POWDER
ALL OTHERS ARE IMITATIONS.

BEST KNOWN OF AMERICA'S WRITERS.

M. Quad, the Detroit Free Press Man, Made Well by Paine's Celery Compound.

Charles B. Lewis is more familiarly known to the thousands whose life he has cheered as M. Quad. It must be more than a score of years since the country was laughing over the sayings of his honor and Bijah, chronicled by Mr. Lewis to the Detroit Free Press. From that time until now M. Quad has delighted the public with unnumbered quaint sketches of character, overflowing with a humor that appealed to readers all the more strongly because they recognized the fidelity to life under the fun.

Among Mr. Lewis' recent creations the Bowsers, Brother Gardiner, Mrs. Gallup's Tribulations, Possum Sketches and the Arizona Kicker are destined to long life. Mr. Lewis' admirers will be surprised to learn that, like Walter Scott, Mark Twain and other highly gifted authors, he has produced work of rare quality while tormented by pain.

Mr. Lewis suffered intensely from rheumatism. "It made my days and nights miserable," he says, "and, of course, the agony was greater in bad weather. At the same time my nerves were weak, and I was in worse shape than I hope ever to be again. Yes, I took advice by the yard and medicine by the quart with no success. I was broken in spirit and bent almost double in the body, when somebody suggested Paine's Celery Compound for the nervousness. That remedy made short work of the nervousness, and of the rheumatism, too. A few doses made me feel much better, and to-day I am well; a happy change that I attribute to the use of Paine's Celery Compound. It gives me sincere pleasure to bear witness on the merits of the compound. I know at least a dozen authors and journalists who have found it a remedy for the same complaints."

Rheumatism attacks the body when it is tired out, and when its functions begin to act sluggishly. Disordered nerves, faulty digestion, and a slow, incomplete nutrition of the body invite rheumatism, just as they do neuralgia and nervous debility. There is no surer starting point for rheumatism than a "run-down," nerveless condition.

Paine's Celery Compound increases the appetite by giving a healthy tone to the stomach; it makes sure that the entire nervous system gets completely nourished. It regulates the bowels and the kidneys and encourages them to get rid of harmful and poisonous matter that the sluggish system has allowed to lodge in the blood, thus causing rheumatism and kindred disorders.

You cannot cure rheumatism by outward applications. The disease is due to internal disorder and must be constitutionally attacked and got rid of. Paine's Celery Compound has done for thousands of other people exactly what it did for Mr. Lewis. They were sufferers as he was, and the compound has made them well.

The warmest praises of Paine's Celery Compound are from men and women of high character and keen intelligence. They know they are doing a work of humanity and mercy in commending to all persons out of health this certain and speedy means of getting strong and well.

CIRCULARS AND TESTIMONIALS FREE

WASTING DISEASES WEAKEN WONDERfully because they weaken you slowly, gradually. Do not allow this waste of body to make you a poor, flabby, immature man. Health, strength and vigor is for you whether you be rich or poor. The Great Hudyan is to be had only from the Hudson Medical Institute. This wonderful discovery was made by the specialists of the old famous Hudson Medical Institute. It is the strongest and most powerful vitalizer made. It is so powerful that it is simply wonderful how harmless it is. You can get it from nowhere but from the Hudson Medical Institute. Write for circulars and testimonials.

This extraordinary Rejuvenator is the most wonderful discovery of the age. It has been endorsed by the leading scientific men of Europe and America.

HUDYAN is purely vegetable.

HUDYAN stops prematureness of the discharge in twenty days. Cures **LOST MANHOOD**, constipation, dizziness, falling sensations, nervous twitching of the eyes and other parts.

Strengthens, invigorates and tones the entire system. It is as cheap as any other remedy.

HUDYAN cures debility, nervousness, emissions, and develops and restores weak organs. Pains in the back, losses by day or night stopped quickly. Over 2,000 private indorsements.

Prematureness means impotency in the first stage. It is a symptom of seminal weakness and barrenness. It can be stopped in twenty days by the use of Hudyan. Hudyan costs no more than any other remedy.

Send for circulars and testimonials.

TAINTED BLOOD—Impure blood due to serious private disorders carries myriads of sore-producing germs. Then comes sore throat, pimples, copper colored spots, ulcers in mouth, old sores and falling hair. You can save a trip to Hot Springs by writing for 'Blood Book' to the old physicians of the

HUDSON MEDICAL INSTITUTE,
Stockton, Market and Ellis Sts.,
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

MEN of all AGES

Quickly, Thoroughly, Forever Cured.

Four out of five who suffer nervousness, mental worry, attacks of "the blues," are but paying the penalty of early excesses. Victims, reclaim your manhood, regain your vigor. Don't despair. Send for book with explanation and proofs. Mailed (sealed) free.

ERIE MEDICAL CO., Buffalo, N. Y.

PRINTING D. JOHNSTON & CO. 410 J STREET.
ORDERS FROM THE COUNTRY PROMPTLY FILLED