

Now, the primary idea which lies at the foundation of all property is industry ; and if a man takes away any portion of another man's property, it may be considered as so much of his industry. Thus if he wishes to sell any article to him and purchase gold with it, if he can by any means whatever force him to pay a higher price for it than he otherwise would ; it is simply despoiling him of part of his industry, and appropriating it to himself.

Let us put this in a familiar way. Suppose Richard Stubble lives in the country and is a corn grower, and his friend John Smith carries on his business in town, and has accumulated money by his frugality and industry. Having some corn to sell, Richard proposes to have a transaction with his friend John. The free marketable value of the corn is \$100 per 100 bushels ; but suppose that Richard has about one hundred times as much influence over the legislature that John has, and he gets them to make a law by which he can compel John to pay him \$120 for what he could get elsewhere for \$100. That is, he takes away \$20, representing so much of John's industry, from him against his will, for which he gives him no equivalent and takes it to himself. In the mediæval ages great lords and barons used to keep armed retainers, whom they employed to plunder any unfortunate travellers who came within their power. In the 19th century great lords and gentlemen passed a law by which they forced traders to surrender to them a considerable portion of their property against their will. Where is the moral difference between the two cases ? When one man forcibly and unjustly deprives another of his property, the precise method he may adopt for attaining his purpose does not affect the moral aspect of the thing.

It is no argument whatever to say that the protective system was till lately established in England, and is still in force in foreign countries, nor that it was supported and adopted by men of unblemished character and integrity. It is absolutely necessary that we should not suffer our estimation of the moral character of men to influence our judgment as to the soundness of their opinions. There scarcely ever

pro
por
len
cer
the
goo
are
days
hens
disc
than
taini
most
been
which
ago t
of em
men
count
opinio
put it
consid
decla
in it a
not at
tection
same o
for the
themse
by the
system
greatest
taken p
tuary p
that wh
man in
not less
great re
century
in the in