

tection for wool. He says that Protection on wool doesn't protect Michigan farmers, for wool raising is one of the smallest industries of the farm; that the amount which the people of Michigan expend for wearing apparel is 50 times greater than Michigan farmers get for their entire wool product; and that the unprotected dairy products of Lenawee County alone, exceed in value all the wool grown in Michigan. As Mr. Frensdorf is the Democratic candidate for Congressman-at-Large from Michigan, his election would add another vote in the House to those against continuing the Protection fraud.



Wagnon's Candidacy in Portland.

The Singletax candidate for tax assessor in Multnomah County, Oregon—the Portland county—is H. D. Wagnon, an old time and weariless Singletaxer of that part of the world. He was the principal promoter of the Singletax amendment which almost carried in Multnomah County four years ago, though pretty heavily defeated in the total vote of the State,* and he is the father of the graduated Singletax amendment on which the State-wide vote is to be taken next month. The opportunities for such good work as a man like Wagnon could do in Portland as assessor, are numerous enough, as they are almost anywhere else—as they were in Houston, Texas, when Pastoriza came into municipal office, and as they were in Whatcom County, Washington, when Kaufman was elected assessor. News of H. D. Wagnon's election would make good reading from Oregon two weeks hence.



Death of Edward B. Foote.

In the death on the 12th of Dr. Edward B. Foote of New York, progressive movements have lost one of their most loyal supporters. His devotion began with his youth; it never slackened until his death. With some of his activities The Public was not in sympathy, but Dr. Foote's truly democratic spirit which inspired them all, and was as a steady light in a dark place, could not fail to command universal respect. He served not only causes that were popular, but also and with even more intensity many that were yet in their swaddling clothes and their mangers, or in process of crucifixion. The popularity or the contempt they provoked made no difference to him. His simple test for the worthiness of a cause was its righteousness at the bar of his own judgment and conscience. Nor was he intolerant. With true charity

he accorded, in good faith to others of good faith, the rights of judgment he cherished for himself.



THE HOME MARKET.

Among the catch phrases used by the Protectionist to enlist the sympathy of the unthinking voter, perhaps the most seductive is that of the "home market." To buy at home, to patronize home industry, to protect the home market, is to favor one's countryman rather than a stranger. Nay, it is to serve one's friend, rather than an enemy.

Yet, what is this but an attempt to transmute the love of kindred into terms of gain; and to bind trade with personal ties?



Trade is as impersonal as the law of gravity; it serves all men alike; regardless of race, nationality or kindred.

By trade, man avails himself of the other means of wealth creation. If he could not trade he would derive no benefit from any of the vast multitude of labor-saving devices and inventions. Without exchange he would forego all the advantages of the diverse soils, climates, and human talents. As a man who would deny himself the use of steam would to that extent limit his power and enjoyment over the wealth of the world, so does the man who would bar out the products of another race or clime, sacrifice to that extent his power over nature.



The idea that trade within the country is more profitable, and therefore better for the country, than trade across the frontier is one of those strange beliefs inherited from the past, when simple minds groped for excuses to believe what they wanted to believe.

"Stranger" was synonymous with "enemy"; and one should not, argued the simple-minded, confer a benefit upon one's enemy.

That the same trade benefited oneself was not to be considered, since such benefit could be had by trading with one's own countrymen.

The idea is well illustrated by the homely example so often given: "If I buy a coat in Canada, I have the coat, but Canada has the money. If I buy the coat in this country, we have the coat and the money too. Or, as put by Adam Smith, a trade at home gives two profits within the country; whereas a trade abroad gives one profit at home, and one in the other country.

*See Public, vol. xi, pp. 250, 275, 320, 322, 358, 390, 420.