FARMERS FOR PROTECTION.

They Made the First Tariff for Their Own Special Benefit.

Farmers' Votes Have Ever Since Sustained the Protective System—How They Have Benefitted by it—Great Improvement in Agricultural Property Under Protection—Striking Facts About Agricultural Conditions in the "Good Old Times."

Protection was adopted by the founders of the Government for the special purpose of benefitting farmers. The members of the first Congress were nearly all farmers themselves or represented farming constituencies. Agriculture was practically the only industry of the people, and they saw their produce rot on their hands year after year for want of a market for it. To create a market for this produce was the prime object of the early legislators. There was not a rubber baron among them. Their policy was a farmer's policy pure and simple. Later statesmen down to Blaine and McKinley based their advocacy of Protection on their belief that it benefitted the farmer most of all. We shall quote from two only, Jackson and Calhoun, both Democrats. Said the former, in advocacy of the Tariff of 1824:

"I will ask what is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus produce? Take from agriculture in the United States 600,000 men, women and children, and you will at once give a market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us."

He evidently understood how Protection benefited the farmer. The certain results of Protection, Calhoun said, would be:

"The farmer will find a ready market for his surplus produce, and, what is almost of equal consequence, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants."

He was no less sure that Protection benefited the farmer, because he, like Jackson, had experienced the miseries of a lack of domestic markets for farm produce.

Notwithstanding the teachings of all the great statesmen of early times, our country has on several occasions experimented with low tariffs. In every instance the effects on agriculture were most disastrous. Senator Ewing, of Ohio, speaking of the low tariff period immediately preceding the Tariff of 1828, said:

"In short, every portion of the world was searched by our intelligent merchants, and all combined did not furnish a market adequate to our surplus productions.

"Every farmer in Ohio long knew and felt the pressure consequent on this state of things. Year after year their stacks of wheat stood unthreshed, scarcely worth the manual labor of separating the grain from the straw. So low was it reduced in comparison with manufactured articles that I have known forty bushels of wheat given for a pair of boots."

Colton's "Life of Henry Clay" thus describes the wretched condition of agriculture under another experiment with low tariff, before the Protective act of 1842 came to the farmer's rescue:

"In some parts of Pennsylvania the people were obliged to divide bank notes into halves, quarters, eights, and so on, and agree from necessity to use them as money. In Ohio, with all her abundance, it was hard to get money to pay taxes. The sheriff of Muskingum County, as stated by the Guernsey *Times*, in the summer of 1842, sold at auction one four-horse wagon at $5.50; ten hogs at 6¾ cents each; two horses (said to be worth $50 to $75 each) at $2 each; two cows at $1 each; a barrel of sugar at $1.50, and a store of goods at that rate. In Pike County, Mo., as stated by the Hannibal *Journal*, the sheriff sold three horses at $1.50 each; one large ox at 12½ cents; five cows, two steers and one calf, the lot at $3.25; twenty sheep at 13½ cents each; twenty-four hogs, the lot at 25 cents; one eight-day clock at $2.50; lot of tobacco, seven or eight hogsheads, at $5; three stacks of hay, each at 25 cents, and one stack of fodder at 25 cents."

So much for our own experience with low or revenue tariffs. England's example is no less instructive. Before her adoption of Free Trade her agriculture was the main source of her strength and wealth. It was armies drawn from English farms that won her victories, made her conquests and placed her in the proud place she has occupied for centuries among the nations of the earth.

To-day, eleven million acres of the best farm land in the world is lying waste in England, 200,000 persons annually leave the agricultural districts and the condition of British agriculture is simply deplorable. Free Trade has all but ruined the English farmer. So it has ruined the Irish farmer. So it has dealt with agriculture in India. In fact, our own experience and that of the whole world is that a revenue tariff means death to the farmer's prosperity.

On the other hand, see how constantly and greatly the condition of American farmers has improved. Never before could they get so great a quantity of the things they consume with so small a quantity of the things they produce. The following comparison between former and present agricultural conditions shows how superior those of the present are, and vindicates the wisdom of our early statesmen, who, at a time when the farmer citizens of the young Republic had to exchange a wagon load of farm produce for a pair of boots, so directed the course of legislation as to realize at the close of the nineteenth century the conditions here pictured:

PRICE OF THINGS FARMERS SELL.

	1816.	1890.	Increase. Amount.	Increase. per ct.
Wheat, per bushel	$0.44	$1.05	$0.61	140
Oats, per bushel	0.15	0.44	0.29	193
Corn, per bushel	0.20	0.52	0.32	160
Butter, per pound	0.12	0.24	0.12	100
Cows, per head	15.00	40.00	25.00	166
Hay, per ton	5.00	10.00	5.00	100
Farm labor, per m'h	8.00	20.00	12.00	150
Average increase				144

PRICES OF THINGS FARMERS BUY.

	1816.	1890.	—Decrease— Amt.	Per cent.
Nails, per 100 pounds	$12.00	$2.00	$10.00	83
Broadcloth, per yard	16.00	3.75	12.25	76
Woolen blankets, pr. pr.	15.00	4.00	11.00	73
Cotton cloth, per yard	0.30	0.06	0.24	80
Calico	0.25	0.05½	0.19½	74
Salt, per barrel	6.00	0.50	5.50	91
Average decrease				79½

PURCHASING POWER OF FARM PRODUCTS.

	1816.	1890.
100 bushels wheat would buy pound of nails	350	5,250
100 bushels corn would buy yards broadcloth	1¼	14
100 pounds butter would buy pairs woolen blankets	4-5	6
1 cow would buy yards cotton cloth	50	666
1 ton hay would buy yards calico	20	182
1 month farm labor would buy barrels salt	1½	40

For some years back American agriculture was depressed, though in less degree than agriculture in foreign countries, because of overproduction. The free trade demagogue took advantage of the situation to urge his pet theories upon farmers, who more steadfastly than any other class of citizens have turned a deaf ear to the free trade siren and formed the main bulwark of American protection from the time of Washington down. The demagogue assures them that the remedy for their ills is to be sought in foreign markets for their produce. It is exactly the argument used to persuade them to consent to a revenue tariff in 1846. But when that tariff had been voted they discovered how they had been fooled. Said President Fillmore in his annual message in December, 1851, five years after the low tariff had been inaugurated:

"The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low Tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,000,000 in 1847 to $21,000,000 in 1851, with almost a certainty of a still further reduction in 1852. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country, by increasing the demand and raising the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show, incontestably, that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy."

And no such result would follow a repetition of the experiment now. Our misfortune is that we have to send too much of our agricultural produce for sale in foreign countries. But we are rapidly getting over that difficulty.

We are approaching very close to the line where, under normal conditions, our own people will consume all our farmers produce. There are no more such vast tracts of uncultivated wheat lands as were brought under cultivation during the last twenty years, and the diversification of industry resulting from consistent Protection for a few years more will place our farmers in a position where prices of their produce will be regulated independently of Liverpool, Russia and India. When that time comes, and it is close at hand, farmers will be more than ever interested in Protection. These are the teachings of common sense and experience. The only evidence that can be produced against them is the insincere, partisan ravings of the Free Trade demagogue.

Which Side Do You Choose?

JEFF DAVIS AND CLEVELAND.

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties and excises for revenue only, necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.—*Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the permanent Constitution of the Confederate States, adopted when in rebellion on March 11, 1861.*

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the federal government has no constitutional power to enforce and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only.—*From Platform of Democratic Party Adopted June 22, 1892.*

WASHINGTON AND THE TARIFF.

Whereas, it is necessary for the support of the government for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid upon goods, &c.—*Preamble to First Tariff Law Signed by George Washington July 4, 1789.*

Congress has repeatedly and not without success directed its attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of its efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.—*From George Washington's Speech to Congress, Dated December 7, 1796.*

We believe that all articles which cannot be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.—*From Platform of Republican Party, Adopted June 10, 1892.*

Philosophy of Buying at Home.

I am a believer in the rights of my own home; first my own town, then my own county, then my own State, then my own country, and when I am looking around for some country to boycott I always select some foreign country. (Laughter and applause.) The prevailing public spirit of the West is illustrated by this clipping from an independent Iowa newspaper:

"Let Cedar Rapids people stand by Cedar Rapids people and Cedar Rapids industries; when your baby in a Cedar Rapids carriage, pump your water with a Cedar Rapids pump, hitch your horse with Cedar Rapids harness; build with Cedar Rapids brick; employ Cedar Rapids contractors and builders; use Cedar Rapids engines; milk in Cedar Rapids pails, and strain away the milk in a Cedar Rapids cooler; sit on a Cedar Rapids cushion; eat Cedar Rapids pork, beef and crackers; use Cedar Rapids flour and oatmeal; marry a Cedar Rapids girl, and when you die have a Cedar Rapids monument erected to commemorate your loyalty to your home city."

[Applause and great laughter.]

I have no doubt that this is also the prevailing business creed of every wide-awake community of Nebraska. Not long ago we had a splendid stock farmer running for Governor of Iowa, and the Democrats started a story to the effect that he bought everything in Chicago instead of in the village near which he resided, and we had to fill the newspapers with affidavits denying the charge, so universal is the popular contempt for the man who goes back on the neighborhood in which he lives. And that feeling is well founded, for while one man or one set of men might possibly make a little something if they went away from home with their trade, yet, if everybody did so, the whole community would be involved in a common bankruptcy, and the beautiful and thriving little cities of Iowa and Nebraska would return to the open prairie from which they came.—*Congressman Dolliver.*

Watch the Tin-Plate Market.

The Welsh manufacturer who is selling his tin-plates at present low prices could tell the American Free Trade "reformer" a thing or two about who pays the duty. The *American Manufacturer* furnishes the following comparison of prices:

Prices of Bessemer Steel Coke Finish I. C. Tin Plate, f. o. b., Liverpool.

		1892. s.	d.	1891. s.	d.	1890. s.	d.
Jan.	1st week	12	6	17	6	16	3
"	2d "	13	0	17	9	16	6
"	3d "	.....		18	0	16	6
"	4th "	12	9	18	0	16	6
"	5th "	12	9	18	0	16	6
Feb.	1st "	12	6	18	0	16	3
"	2d "	12	6	18	0	16	3
"	3d "	12	6	18	0	16	3
"	4th "	12	6	18	0	16	3
March.	1st "	12	6	18	0	15	0
"	2d "	12	6	17	9	15	0
"	3d "	12	6	17	9	15	0
"	4th "	12	6	17	9	15	6
"	5th "	12	6	.....		.....	
April.	1st "	12	6	17	6	15	6
"	2d "	12	3	17	6	15	6
"	3d "	12	0	17	3	14	9
"	4th "	12	0	17	3	14	9
May.	1st "	12	0	17	0	13	9
"	2d "	12	0	16	3	13	9
"	3d "	12	0	16	3	13	9

Now, the McKinley increase in duty was $1.30 a box, and we find the plates selling $1 to $1.25 less than a year ago. The foreigner pays that much of the Tariff by lowering prices to make allowances for it to the American buyer. When a few more American tin mills get under way, he will pay it all.

SHODDY AND WOOL.

More and Better All Wool Goods Made Than Ever Before.

It is in Free Trade England where Shoddy Goods Abound—No Truth in the Assertion that Our Tariff Compels the Poor to Wear them—Beauty, Variety, Quality and Cheapness of Domestic Goods Never Before Equalled.

A criticism upon the domestic manufactures, reiterated during the debate in the House of Representatives, is that the wool tariff had driven them into a lamentable use of shoddy and other substitutes for wool, that the character of domestic fabrics had rapidly deteriorated, and that the American people can no longer obtain all-wool goods, but are defrauded and deceived by the adulterated fabrics forced upon them.

This charge is wholly false. It originates in ignorance of the conditions and the advance of wool manufacture in all countries.

CENSUS STATISTICS.

The census shows that there were manufactured in the United States in 1890, [illegible] square yards of all wool and worsted goods, of the mill value of $[illegible] of mixed goods—that is, of goods into the warp of filling of which shoddy of cotton was charted with wool—[illegible] square yards, of the mill value of $[illegible]; and of goods woven upon cotton warps, [illegible] square yards, of the mill value of $[illegible].

There was never a time when the proportion of all-wool goods made and worn in this country was larger in comparison with the mixed and cotton goods worn than at present.

This is extraordinary in view of the fact that the use of shoddy or reclaimed wool has reached a very high development within recent years, particularly in England.

USE OF SHODDY ABROAD.

Shoddy is utilized abroad to an extent undreamed of and unapproached by our own manufacturers. The quantity of shoddy consumed by the British manufacturers is vastly in excess of the quantity used by our own, while both use nearly the same amount of wool. They have attained a skill in concealing its presence, in utilizing wastes we still throw away, and in combining them with fresh material that no mills in this country can equal.

THE ENGLISH SHODDY MANUFACTURE.

There were in Great Britain in 1889 (see official returns under the "Factories and Workshops act"), 125 shoddy mills, employing 4,503 persons, as compared with the 1,266 persons employed in our 33 shoddy mills in 1890. No official return is made of the product of these mills, but from other data accessible it is estimated to exceed by four times the total consumption of shoddy in all the woolen mills of the United States.

While 3,586,280 spindles in the United States consumed over 400,000,000 pounds of wool in 1890, over 8,000,000 spindles in the woolen and worsted mills of Great Britain consumed but 430,000,000 pounds of wool. A considerable proportion of this great discrepancy may be explained by the larger production of fine counts of yarn in that country, but it is evident that to keep these 8,000,000 spindles supplied there must have been enormous quantities of shoddy and cotton passing over them.

LESS SHODDY USED IN THE UNITED STATES.

These statistics prove that the duty on wool has nothing to do with the comparative quantities of wool and substitutes for wool used in the industry, here or elsewhere. From every point of view the same conclusion is irresistibly forced upon us. The American people, with taxed wool, use every year two pounds per capita more wool than the people of Great Britain, enjoying the advantage of free wool, and our per capita consumption of shoddy is much smaller than that of the English people.

CHEAP GOODS DEMANDED.

The manufacture of adulterated goods is not primarily the work of the manufacturer himself. These goods, like others, are made upon orders; they are made and sold because there is a demand for them. There is a demand for them because the people who use them find that when well made they are slightly and serviceable, and well worth the money they cost. If wool was free, this demand for a fabric cheaper than all-wool would continue, and would be met in the same manner as now.

THE UTILIZATION OF WASTES.

This cry against wool substitutes is mainly founded on ignorance. The utilization of wastes is as legitimate in this industry as in any other. In every other it is commended by the very economists who insist that in this particular it is an evidence of degradation and deterioration. The discovery that animal and vegetable fibers can be combined in a warm, durable and handsome fabric has been a boon to mankind and womankind, not equaled, perhaps, by any that has occurred since the invention of automatic textile machinery.

The utilization of wood pulp in the manufacture of paper has enormously extended its use and increased the educating power of the printing press. Just so the use of substitutes for wool has added to the comfort of humanity. There could not be paper enough made without the use of wood pulp to supply the demand, and there is not wool enough grown in the world to properly clothe the people inhabiting rigorous climates.—*From the Memorial addressed to the Senate by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers opposed to the Free Wool bill.*

Who Are the Free Traders?

But who are our free traders? They are not found much among our industrial classes, certainly not among our workingmen and producers. They are composed of pro-slavery theorists, who can never forget what they learned before the war; doctrinaires and dreamers, who have a supreme contempt for facts and practical results; foreign importers, who can see nothing beyond their own personal gains; newspapers which are the subsidized attorneys of foreign manufacturers and merchants; the Cobden Club, representing British interests and caring nothing for the welfare of our people or the honor and glory of our country, and the pro-British Democracy.

The toilers and producers of our land, they whose intelligent labor makes the wealth and greatness of our country and the prosperity of our people, are not among them.—*Congressman Milliken.*

The Tariff Not a Tax.

SALT.

THE DUTY ON A BARREL OF SALT IS 33⅓ CENTS IT IS ADDED TO THE PRICE AS A TARIFF TAX THE FREE-TRADER SAYS BUT—

FARMERS IN NEW YORK STATE ARE BUYING IT FOR 28 CENTS A BARREL EXCLUSIVE OF THE COST OF PACKAGE. WHERE DOES THE TAX COME IN.

There was a time when the farmer had to pay the price of two or three tons of hay for a barrel of salt. That was in our Revenue Tariff period and little of the precious stuff could he afford to give his stock. Now it is so cheap under the McKinley Tariff that he can afford to buy it and dump it, a barrel at a time, in his sheep pasture. And the Tariff has enabled him to do it.—From AMERICAN ECONOMIST.

Farmers Benefited by the New Tariff.

It Has Enlarged Their Market Exactly as it Was Intended to do.

No schedule in the whole McKinley bill was framed with greater care or with more discrimination than the schedule of duties on agricultural products and provisions. Not only did farmers and agricultural societies without number have hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, but the members of that committee themselves spent no little time and labor in the construction of a schedule that would give the American farmer more thorough Protection and a better hold on the home market. That their efforts did not result in failure is shown by the following table giving the imports of various competing farm products (or finished products of which the raw material competes) in the years 1890 and 1892—the years immediately preceding and following the enactment of the McKinley bill—together with changes in rates of duty made by the new law:

PROTECTION FOR OUR FARMERS IN THE McKINLEY BILL.

Articles.	Late duty.	McKinley duty.	Imports, 1890.	Imports, 1892.
Horses	20 per cent.	$30 per head	$4,003,116	$1,073,079
Cattle	20 per cent.	$10 per head	206,970	149,[illegible]
Barley	10c. per bush.	30c. per bush.	6,206,097	1,081,[illegible]
Oats	10c. per bush.	15c. per bush.	7,116	7,[illegible]
Oatmeal	1c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	30,[illegible]	26,[illegible]
Eggs	5c. per doz.	5c. per doz.	2,071,614	855,[illegible]
Hay	$2 per ton	$4 per ton	1,158,[illegible]	411,[illegible]
Hops	8c. per lb.	15c. per lb.	1,160,601	1,085,[illegible]
Flaxseed and linseed	30c. per bush.	56c. per bush.	4,136,786	865,409
Leaf tobacco	35c. per lb. — $1 per lb.	35c. per lb. — $1.85 per lb.	13,773,710	8,296,619
Cigars, cigarettes and cheroots	35c. per lb. — $2.50 per lb.	50c. per lb. — $3.50 per lb. and 25 p. c.	3,917,034	2,742,865
Totals			$54,465,057	$18,784,935 — $18,054,222
Larger market for American farmers				

Although the articles given in this table are but a few of the many that compete with the products of American farms, they are enough to show that the effect of the McKinley Tariff has been to greatly decrease agricultural imports, and, by the amount of that decrease, to put money into the pockets of our farmers. We also see that agricultural producers have taken the advice so often given them by the Protectionists, to diversify their crops by raising the things for which the new Tariff law guarantees them a splendid market, instead of those of which there is a superabundant supply. Let the farmer continue his good work in this direction and it will be but a short time before foreign markets and foreign dependency will be a thing of the past. Prosperity for American farmers will be the watch-word in the coming campaign, and the only way to secure it is to vote for Protection's candidates next November.

Great Fortunes Not Made in Protected Industries.

No argument is more constantly dinned into the ears of our people by Free Trade demagogues, and none appeals more strongly to ignorant and prejudiced minds, than the assertion that Protection is responsible for great accumulations of wealth and its concentration into the hands of a few men. Yet no argument has less basis in fact. The following is a list of the ten wealthiest men in the United States, together with the business or industry in which their wealth has been acquired:

William Waldorf Astor, real estate; Jay Gould, railroads, telegraphs, and speculation; John D. Rockefeller, oil; Cornelius Vanderbilt, railroads; William K. Vanderbilt, railroads; Henry M. Flagler, oil; John J. Blair, railroads and banking; Russell Sage, railroads and speculation; Collis P. Huntington, railroads; William Rockefeller, oil.

Without an exception, these fortunes have been amassed by men engaged in occupations not in any way protected—occupations that have no more connection with the Tariff than with the spots on the sun. The rapid multiplication of wealth is the natural result of the development of our country's resources, in which development of railroads and telegraphs have played a prominent part, and the effect of which has been to greatly augment the value of real estate. It is nothing but pure demagogy which would make Protection responsible.

How Freight Rates Have Fallen Under Protection.

The results of improvements in lake transportation in reducing prices are strikingly shown in the report of Chief Brock of the Bureau of Statistics by a comparison of the fall in freight rates during a series of years. In 1890 the average rate of lake freight on a bushel of corn between Chicago and Buffalo was 1.9 cents; in 1871 the same service cost 7½ cents a bushel; in 1869 it cost 15¾ cents a bushel. The average season rate on coal from Buffalo to Duluth and Superior in 1890 was 39.4 cents per ton, and in 1891 31.8 cent per ton. From November 10, 1891, to the close of navigation, coal was carried from Buffalo to Duluth, a distance of a thousand miles, for 19 cents per ton. In 1891 the rate on coal by lake from Buffalo to Chicago during the entire season was from forty to sixty cents per ton, and the average season rate was 56 cents per ton. In 1887 the average rate was $1.05 per ton. In 1867 it cost an average of $4.25 per ton to carry iron ore from Escanaba to Lake Erie. In 1870 the same service cost $2.50; in 1880, $1.13, and in 1891, 82 cents. During the season of 1891 the rate from Escanaba to Lake Erie was at times as low as 55 cents per ton.

Where is the World's Workshop Now?

Talk about England being the workshop of the world! In Connecticut is a quite large community who live from the ivory manufacturing business. And where do you suppose they get their ivory for manufacture?

From London.

And where do you think it is sold after being fashioned by the deft Connecticut Yankees?

In London.

Yes; the finished product is actually shipped back to the place whence the raw material came, and sold there.

According to Cobden, we were the people who were to devote ourselves to furnish England with raw material and buying back the finished product.

But there was much in this protective system of ours which the philosophy of Cobden did not take into account.

Two Free Traders Differ.

THE DEMAGOGUE.

At any rate, the consumer has found life harder since this reform [i. e., the McKinley Tariff] than before, and if there is a workingman anywhere who has had his wages increased by virtue of its operation, he has not yet made himself known.—*Grover Cleveland, in a speech at Providence, R. I., April 2.*

THE INVESTIGATOR.

There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is to-day, nor a period when the workman, in the strict sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a steadily and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product.—*Edward Atkinson, in the May Forum.*

Englishmen and Democrats Pull Together.

There is a somewhat general idea in this country that the McKinley Tariff bill will be repealed before long, or at all events be so much modified that the sting will be taken out of those clauses most objectionable to British manufacturers; and it is for this reason that the hopes of the Democrats for the approaching Presidential election are so largely shared in this country.—*London Engineering, April 8.*

Tariff Nu[illegible]

The leader of Mr. Cleve[illegible] cago, and the one above all [illegible] for his nomination, is a [illegible] millionaire, the practical [illegible] free trade system and [illegible] the monstrous standard [illegible] Mr. Cleveland will pose as the [illegible] common people, who is raging [illegible] on trusts.

Imports free of duty, [illegible] imports dutiable, 48 per cent [illegible] is the story of the twelve mon[illegible] trade ending May 31.

Domestic exports were [illegible] McKinley Tariff during the [illegible] they only reached $1,[illegible] be added $11,[illegible] of foreign [illegible] $1,022,961,528. We can [illegible] kind of strangulation, [illegible]

The number of depositors [illegible] the United States is [illegible] posits, $1,[illegible] and the [illegible] positor $[illegible]. The number [illegible] savings banks in Great Brit[illegible] amount of deposits $[illegible] to each depositor, $[illegible].

According to the report of [illegible] the United States Treasury [illegible] tigate the tin plate industry [illegible] the three months from [illegible] 1892, 3,004,987 pounds of [illegible] figures show that there [illegible] making a specialty of [illegible] while various others [illegible] product.

Wire nails have been sold [illegible] $1.50 per keg of one hundred [illegible] quite a difference between [illegible] $10 a keg at which they [illegible] joyed the blessed privilege [illegible] Trade in order of saving [illegible] buy the cheapest.

The tax which is placed [illegible] ish Free-Trade Tariff is [illegible] There is not a family [illegible] though it be the poorest [illegible] man's—that does not [illegible] ment of this tax. The [illegible] Trade Tariffs always [illegible] least able to bear it. [illegible] has just declared in [illegible] the only kind of tariff which [illegible] tional. Do the American [illegible] coffee, taxed tea and taxed [illegible] will elect the Democratic [illegible]

The free trader is very [illegible] fall in wages in the English [illegible] cording to the *Iron Trade* [illegible] of January 16, puddlers [illegible] the North of England [illegible] July, 1890, from $[illegible] to $1.95; in May, 1891, [illegible] last to $1.[illegible]. The lowest [illegible] this country is [illegible]

The average annual decrease [illegible] debt of the United States [illegible] ceeded $100,000,000; the [illegible] combined national, State [illegible] the same period was from [illegible] other statistics show that [illegible] assessed for taxation increased [illegible] $17,000,000,000 to $[illegible] indicating a reduction of [illegible] increase of wealth for [illegible] cedented at least in modern [illegible] *port.*

Protection Breeds [illegible]

It has been truly said that [illegible] Garden swing inward. No [illegible] is struggling up the hill of life [illegible] and comfort every [illegible] out. None desire to leave the [illegible] tion and plenty for the poor [illegible] ness, the happiness and [illegible] which they fled in the Free Trade [illegible] birth.—*Congressman Milliken.*

There has been during the reve[illegible] since 1865, except in temporary [illegible] fluctuations, a steady advance [illegible] wages, a steady reduction in the [illegible] per unit of product, and a corresponding [illegible] tion in the price of goods of all [illegible] to the consumer.—*Edward Atkinson, in the May Forum.*

The American laboring man [illegible] paid, better fed, better clothed [illegible] and happier than those of [illegible] rope. It is almost discouraging [illegible] back to my country and read [illegible] report which shows such a condition of things in America [illegible] —*Paul Dudley, Special Commissioner Chamber of Deputies to investigate workingmen's wide United States.*

In no event can the growth [illegible] be laid to the charge of [illegible] Protection has proved a [illegible] sum of money, not an aggregate [illegible] in the hands of a few. The [illegible] ings banks and building [illegible] peated to in support of the [illegible] benefit of Protection goes to [illegible] men who earn their bread in the [illegible] faces.—*James G. Blaine.*

How Protection Lo[illegible]

Woolen goods are lower [illegible] the McKinley Tariff act [illegible] such goods as are made [illegible] used by the masses; and [illegible] every woolen mill in the [illegible] of wool manufacturing [illegible] running, whereas a quarter [illegible] in less.

Now, what is the explanation [illegible] cannot be denied! Desiring [illegible] tion, I went to a leading [illegible] knew, had a quarter of [illegible] down in 1890, while in [illegible] spindle. I said to him [illegible] for your goods now? [illegible] asked: "How does that compare [illegible] of 1890?" He answered: [illegible] less, according to grade. [illegible] profit in 1890?" "No, I [illegible] make anything in 1890." "[illegible] profit." "How could you [illegible] received it to be some less [illegible] in 1890, when, as you state, [illegible] "Why," said he, "every [illegible] knows the reason. When [illegible] fourths of my machinery [illegible] goods as cheaply as I [illegible] it. When my market [illegible] strain every particle of [illegible] encouraged to put new [illegible] to b ing into use new [illegible] besides, a large part of [illegible] nearly the same whether [illegible] my machinery or the [illegible] make goods at a new [illegible] quick market and a large [illegible] me to increase my [illegible] the market is dull. [illegible] —*Congressman Dingley.*

ARE YOU A F[illegible]
TO THE CAU[illegible]
PROTEC[illegible]
TO
American
Are you willing to [illegible] tection in placing [illegible] hands of your acquaintances? If you are, you should [illegible]
AMERICAN PROTE[illegible]
135 W. 23d St.

AFTER YOU HAVE [illegible] YOUR LOCAL PAPER [illegible]
THE AMERICAN [illegible]
the reliable exponent of [illegible] Every person who wishes to [illegible] p m the Tariff should have [illegible] larly. Price, $2.00 a year.
SPECIAL CANVA[illegible]
In clubs of five subscribers [illegible] NINT will be sent to [illegible] day for 10 cents each. [illegible] Send postal card request [illegible] AMERICAN [illegible] dress