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My dear Miss Tarbell,

I am greatly interested in your current articles on the tariff. To me the one on the chemical test of woolens showing all cotton sold as wool is one of the most enlightening and persuasive statements I have ever seen on the subject.

I beg to suggest that you give some space to the consideration of wages as related to the tariff.

I enclose what I call my trust table as enlightning in that direction. One of the columns gives the percent of wages to sales price, and shows an astonishing disparity between the wages and the tariff rate. On anything so simple as glucose the prior wages of raising the corn is almost inconsiderable. Glucose is made of corn, the principal factories being in Peoria in the very center of the corn belt, and we find 55% protection to this Standard Oil Trust with only 7% going to the wage earner. We find they need substantially no protection because they ship $2,000,000 abroad and none comes in, and they make an enormous profit on the $24,000,000 of output, for surely they would not be treating their stockholders right unless they did add a great part of the legally provided tariff gratuity to the sales price.

It may be of interest to you to know that either two-fifths or three-fifths of all the glucose used in this country goes in to high grade candies like Huyler's. The New York Times a few months ago had an article wherein the President of the Glucose Trust, a Standard Oil director, said they contemplated making their own candy, and retailing it after the fashion of the United Cigar Stores. This would have been a tremendous blow to the candy interest. How the candy men, by negotiation or otherwise avoided this
consequence I do not know. Pardon this digression.

So on lead and linseed oil and on the semi-crude materials, but when it comes to railroad cars of course the percent of wage is very far from the total wage of making not only the car as such, but of its component materials.

One of the best authorities in this country tells me that twenty English spinners came over to New England sometime ago and after a fair trial returned home "because they could not stand the American wage scale."

The wage disclosures at Bethlehem last summer were very illuminating, showing the overprotected steel trust fights equally for high tariff and low wages. The figures at the bottom of the tariff report on Rhode Island, the worst of the overprotected states, are astounding as showing that the worst of all our over-protected industries pay wages that would not be acceptable the country over to the most inferior and unskilled labor. You will remember several splendid statements recently made by Col. Roosevelt that the Tariff Board, or other authority should disclose to the people the extent to which the tariff is passed on to the wage earner.

In Chemicals I know from one of the best authorities in this country that the wage cost runs from 2% to 10%, and almost never more than the latter sum, and yet chemicals are tremendously protected.

An interview with Albert Plaut of Lehn & Fink of New York City, manufacturing chemists, you might find very illuminating.

I enclose a tissue manuscript. A few of the pages I carefully digested and put in readable shape. You will notice in many other places, however, the expression is crude and it would have to be "boiled down" greatly to be of real use. I am thinking, however, that you may find it suggestive in some places. The final pages bear directly upon the situation today and immediate action. These statements mean much more than may seem because they touch upon the policy of the Administration, and if ever used will influence Congress and may foretell what I have reason to believe are the covert purposes of overprotected interests.

I have no thought of finishing this up and publish-
ing it. I do believe, however, the concluding warnings and suggestions are of value to the public.

Pardon me for also enclosing my little pamphlet on the Tariff Commission. The analysis of membership of tariff-making Ways & Means Committee has always interested readers.
Miss Tarbell -#3.

That pamphlet brought me the bitter enmity of many of the great Trusts who have sought to ruin me in a business way. While they have cost me a fortune they have not succeeded, and I think will not. This last, of course, confidentially, as well as personal.

I started the ball rolling by taking the minds of the people from the proposition of Protection vs. Free Trade, and fixing it upon the other proposition—Protection, honest or dishonest.

Your articles are indeed a blessing to the people.

Yours very truly,

N. E. Miles
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Miss Ida Tarbell,
New York City, N. Y.