

# HARASSED WOOL MEN

## HOW THE DEMOCRATS HAVE CHEATED THEM.

A Short Chapter on the Condition Which Confronts the Wool Growers—How Can They Vote the Democratic Ticket?

Magnificent as has been the showing of the wool industry in the United States in the past twenty-five years, yet it has during that time encountered a constant friction. Whenever the Democratic party has been in power, which, unfortunately for the wool interest, has been much too often, it has brought in a free-wool bill, and we think it is no nearer fruition now than in Fernando Wood's time or Morrison's time or Mills's time. And yet the Democrats put the fat in the fire always, not only their own fat, but, unfortunately, the fat which the wool industry should have. As it is now it is rather lean after twenty to thirty years of Democratic agitation of free wool. What is the most puzzling in it all is that a man engaged in any way in wool growing or wool manufacturing should ever vote the Democratic ticket, and it would seem as though only by hypnotism or witchcraft could any sane man be induced to vote for a party which has done nothing but harass the wool industry. It has been all loss and no gain, for not a step has been gained by them, and only for the selfish desire of a party cry do they talk free wool.

We are quite sure that the common sense of the people will again bury the Democratic party for a time, but, unfortunately, there is always a resurrection like that of 1890, and then comes again free wool. We must have patience and down the devil whenever he turns up. Our sympathy goes out to those in the wool industry, for the many shipwrecks of fortune of the past thirty years are almost wholly due to free wool agitation of the Democrats. And what have they gained by it? It has occasioned not only loss to wool men, but, likewise, loss to the Democrats, as Grover Cleveland may remember. Now in 1892 the Democratic party again throws down the Cleveland gauntlet. Will not the answer of 1892 be the same as in

intelligent enough to enable us to manufacture at home everything that we are not precluded, by climate or other natural causes, from producing. It is an American policy, broadly, consistently American, and as such its most appropriate emblem is the American flag.—American Economist.

### OVER PRODUCTION.

A Lesson Intended for the American Farmers to Read.

The trouble with the American farmer for the past ten years or so has been overproduction. He raised more than there was a market for at paying prices. Yet this overproduction has existed only in particular lines, as wheat and corn, for example. All the time we have been importing immense quantities of other kinds of farm produce which he might just as well have supplied us with. There, for instance, are the items of beans and peas, of which our small exports have been decreasing while our imports have progressed in the opposite direction, as will be seen below:

	Imports.	Exports.	Net Imports.
1891	\$1,656,708	\$251,063	\$1,405,705
1890	1,350,297	291,212	1,059,075
1889	705,483	294,456	411,027
1888	1,942,861	253,170	1,689,691
1887	648,388	387,222	261,166

Now, beans and peas are profitable crops, and there is no good reason why we should have to import a bushel of the ordinary kinds. That is the view the framers of the McKinley tariff took of the situation. So they raised the duty on beans from 10 per cent to 40 cents a bushel, and the duty on peas from 10 per cent to 20 cents a bushel. With this additional protection our farmers can now go on and turn some of their wheat lands into beans and peas and be sure of a fair price for their product, regardless of Canadian competition, while at the same time reducing the pressure on the wheat market.—American Economist.

### SOME TARIFF SERMONS.

How America Prospered During the Free Trade Periods.

Free trade has had five periods of relative prevalence in the history of the United States—i. e., there have been five distinctly marked periods when foreign competing imports have been freer than at any others to enter our ports, to the subversion and overthrow

thing to do is to put the article on the free list at once.—Boston Evening Record.

Paragraph 536 of the McKinley tariff law speaks for itself. The coal controlled by the combine is on the free list. It occurs to us, in thinking of the blissful ignorance of the Record's tariff editor, that there is at least one home industry which seems to flourish, although it receives absolutely no protection. However, we shall refrain from invidious remarks.—American Economist.

### A Prediction That Will Come True.

[From Bourke Cockran's Speech in Chicago.] I believe it was the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts—Gen. Collins—who declared there were no Democrats in this Union who would vote against that ticket; but there are behind him two heroes whose deeds have not escaped the attention of history—two heroes who have led the Union armies to victory, and who have never made faces at the vanquished foe; and they will tell you here that the soldier vote of the State of New York, of whom they are 25,000 at least Democratic, will not support the nomination of Mr. Cleveland, and did not support it in 1888. [Gen. Sickles rose in his place, among the New York delegation and said: "No, no, never." There were three cheers and hisses heard about the hall and in the galleries.]

### A Tariff Picture.

In May, 1890, we paid foreigners \$229,422 for imported cutlery. Last May we paid only \$53,168

for foreign cutlery. We used just as much cutlery as before, but we bought of American makers instead of European makers.

### Hill and Dana.

A new substance has been discovered that has nine times the power of extinguishing fire than water has. Some of this stuff ought to be made up into a cocktail for David B. Hill. It might also aid Dana's digestion of the over-indulgence in crow which he is just now giving way to.—Ex.

### The Postoffice Department.

The postoffice department has been a model for the conduct of public business under this administration. Not-

### BROKEN PROMISES.

Sham Pretensions of Economy and Reform—The Record of a Reform Legislature.

Two years ago the populists, seeking election to the legislature, were loud in denouncing republican extravagance and in their promises of economy if elected. Every voter in the state who reads these lines will recall vividly the campaign then, and remember how the charges of republican extravagance were boldly made in every school house, and at every picnic all over the state. And how Dick Dodson and Shrader and Poynter and Eider, and all the other independent candidates dived with telling effect on the question of republican extravagance, in general appropriations of public money, and in a useless array of clerks or hangers on at the legislature. And when these charges were made at each gathering of the Alliance people, the farmers cheered to the echo the battle cry of the independent, "Turn the rascals out, and put in honest and economical men." Well, the people turned the republicans out, and put the populists in power in both branches of the legislature. Did they redeem their oft-repeated promises of economy and reform? The record of that alliance legislature shows that it was the most flagrantly extravagant body that ever convened in the state. That legislature spent more than half a million dollars in excess of any previous session. Deducing the \$250,000 appropriated to the drouth sufferers and the Columbian Exposition, which was laudible and proper, there remains over a quarter of a million, which they appropriated in excess of any former session, and which no independent member, now seeking re-election, can explain, as in the line of the economy and reform which they promised. Where are now the transparencies, and the banners they carried, whereon was inscribed "Down with big appropriations!" "Down with republican extravagance and up with alliance economy and reform." What has Dick Dodson, and Marsh Eider, and Shrader and Gunnett and Stevens and Poynter done with these transparencies and why don't they bring them out again and use them in this campaign? McKelnoids and Shrader and Poynter and Gunnett were members of that "economic" session, and each of these have been promoted by his party to a candidacy for higher position. On what ground were these promotions made? Was it on the ground that these men had kept their promise of economy? Or is it not true that the leaders of the farm movement have boldly thrown off all obligation as to the pledges they made two years ago, and are now using the movement in a bold and desperate scramble for office for the sake of the offices alone? It cost the taxpayers of Nebraska \$250,000 to ascertain that Poynter and Shrader and McKelnoids and Gunnett deliberately duped their followers when they promised economy. It cost \$8,335 per day in that session, more than for any former session; \$8,335 per day, or \$1,390 per hour. In the senate, where there were only thirty-three members, these reformers had 118 employees, or four to each member. Bring the old transparencies that the independents carried in Poynter's campaign of two years ago, and ask the reform senator to explain the four men he had to wait on him in the senate; for a junketing trip to Texas, \$450; paid to a coterie of jack-leg lawyers as contest fees, 10,900. Pyrtie, the reform secretary of the senate, got in 150 days in a sixty day session, and was paid therefor \$600. But that was not enough for Pyrtie, the reformer. He filched \$1,500 from the people for compiling the journal of the senate, a job for which Wait Seeley had only gall enough to charge \$900. Reform comes high. In fact it is quite a luxury and only prosperous and growing states can afford it. Erick Johnson drew pay for 150 days out of a possible 60, and was paid \$600 therefor. In addition to that he filched \$1,500 for compiling the house journal, making \$2,100 in all, which this innocent reformer drew from the people's money during a sixty day session of their reform legislature. The sum of \$36,000 was paid to the gang of hangers on, who had brought up the country precincts in the great reform campaign; \$36,000 to employees alone in that one session of sixty days; \$36,000 scattered among the strikers in the county precincts would amount to \$400 in each county. But as these members came largely from the forty western counties, the amount distributed amounted to nearly \$800 per county in the western part of the state. No wonder these members had shouters in each precinct, who secured first their nomination, and then their election. For postage \$2,360. That means that each of these innocent reformers wrote 900 letters during the sixty days he was in the session.

There were custodians of cloak rooms, custodians of the halls, custodians of committee rooms, custodians of brooms and brushes, of hats caps and overcoats of cuspidors and inkstands, custodians literally swarmed about the building in every conceivable place, all drawing as hard as they could at the public teat, but there was no custodian of the public fund. The chaplain of the senate, who prayed for reform and agonized at a throne of grace in behalf of the tax-ridden people, charged the state with eighty-nine prayers, twenty-nine more than he ever delivered.

At Beatrice in the first joint discussion between Judge Crouse and Van Wyck, Judge Crouse said: "I am not here to say anything against the Farmers' alliance. For that organization I have the profoundest respect and am with them in their great motto Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." I do not come here with my record pinned to my

arm, but simply refer to my record as a judge, a legislator and as a member of congress to determine my fealty to the cause of the people of Nebraska. When in congress I put through two bills to tax those railroad lands Mr. Van Wyck's congress left untaxed. I respect honest John Powers and the men like him and their principles. When they had made a political organization possible, then we find Ignatius Donnelly, Van Wyck and Paul Vandervoort trying to ride into power on their backs, and honest John Powers is sidetracked. I have the profoundest respect for the principles of the alliance, but the profoundest contempt for the political mountebanks who seek to ride into political distinction on the backs of the founders of that alliance.

"The reference of Mr. Van Wyck to Mr. Carnegie is unfair and dishonest. He has no right to inveigh against such a man as Mr. Carnegie because he is rich and because he has founded and endowed so many institutions for the benefit and education of his less fortunate fellowmen. Before he inveighs against Mr. Carnegie let my friend point to one single institution that bears the name of Van Wyck. I propose to show that my friend Van Wyck is worth \$500,000, and know that he owns one of the grandest and most palatial residences in Washington, which now shelters the chief justice of the United States as a tenant. He has other valuable property here, too. I am glad that he is rich and that he is the only one of the Nebraskans in congress that has ever been able to build a mansion in Washington."

The speaker then came gallantly to the defense of the administration as against the insinuations and charges implied in the preamble and platform of the independent party.

### How Nebraska Was Defamed.

For a year or more he had to act as an apologist for the state of Nebraska, to answer and refute the charges of calamity made by the independents; most of the mortgage indebtedness charged to the state of Nebraska was by those who are now absent from the state; young adventurers who took up claims and upon proving up on them, mortgaged the land for all it was worth, then left the state with no intention of returning or ever redeeming the mortgage. He then proceeded to show that the republican congresses had always been friendly to the farmers and cited that the best efforts at legislation had been for them. The homestead law was cited as the great measure that had given homes to over 1,000,000 people, the agricultural laws, the meat inspection law and scores of others. The introduction of corn into Europe as a food product was a republican measure that will soon open out a new and great market for American corn. The Union Pacific bill, he claimed, had done more to insure the development of the new west than all other causes combined.

Continuing, he said: "It was built under certain conditions where the government agreed to take a second mortgage, and we should not at this distance say that all that legislation was dishonest, and we have no right to assail men who are not here to defend themselves against the charge of dishonesty."

### As to Railroad Legislation.

"I refer to this matter because some of Mr. Van Wyck's friends in the audience have asked what about the Union Pacific railroad, and will call attention to a bill introduced by Mr. Van Wyck in 1886 authorizing the Union Pacific to take out of the sinking fund, deposited with the government under the act by the road to meet its mortgage indebtedness, money to build other roads. A second bill was introduced to permit the Union Pacific to use its credit to build other roads, and as these bills were introduced during the latter part of Mr. Van Wyck's term as senator, I can but think that his motive was to curry favor with the railroads in securing re-election."

The speaker then paid a glowing tribute to the men who came to Nebraska in its early days penniless and had risen to affluence by their energy and industry. He was glad Mr. Van Wyck was worth \$500,000. He wished it were \$1,000,000 if he had accumulated it honestly and without the aid of a preemption law that permitted him to bring an army of preemptors here from which he later reaped a magnificent speculative benefit. If that law was wrong Mr. Van Wyck should have had it repealed when he was in the senate.

He paid a high compliment to Hon. J. Sterling Morton, whom he (Judge Crouse) had often met at the state fairs and horticultural and historical societies. He had yet to meet Mr. Van Wyck at any of these. If Van Wyck did attend the fairs he evidently found more enjoyment about the whirligigs and horse races than among the farm products and live stock pens.

### A Dose of Calamity that Would Suit the Most Fastidious.

Put Van Wyck into the United States senate for six years and let him bob up once a week with a bluff resolution to frighten capital, and intimidate men who are about to invest in western enterprises. Then put Shrader into the governor's chair, and damn the state constitution, the supreme court, and send forth from time to time his edicts and interviews, denouncing the state as paupers' roost. Then put McKeighan and Kem and Poynter and Bill Deen into the national congress, and let them wait out their tale of woe into the ears of the whole nation. Then put Joe Edgerton ("Our Joe") on the supreme bench, and Marsh Eider ("Our Marsh") back in the speaker's chair, and Pyrtie ("Our Pyrtie") as clerk of the senate; and Erick Johnson ("Our Erick") as clerk of the house, and then put Dick Dodson ("Our Dick") and John Stevens ("Our John") and "Our Modie" and "Our Newberry," and all the rest of "our" calamity pets, and

let them rave like howling Dervishes in the state house for three months and then pull down the bridge across the Missouri river and put up a sign that every home seeker in Iowa, Illinois and Wisconsin looking westward might read: "This state is on the verge of political, moral and financial ruin. Keep out!" And we would then have a condition of real calamity that would suit the most fastidious.

Of what does the principal property of Nebraska consist?

Land. Has this land increased or diminished in value in the last two years? Increased. How much?

The whole amount of land occupied as farms has increased in the last two years about \$125,000,000, or \$100 per capita for the whole population of the state, or \$800 per 160 acres.

Why is farm land advancing so rapidly in value in Nebraska? Because farming is a profitable business. If farming were unprofitable, farm land would decline instead of advance in value.

Has town property also advanced in value?

No; you can buy town and city property, the stone, brick blocks and the stock for less money today than you could two years ago.

Why is this decline in bank stock? Bank stock has declined because rates of interest on bank loans has declined, and the banking business is less profitable in Nebraska than it was two years ago.

If then, farming is profitable to a greater extent than any other business, why does the farmer complain? The real farmer does not complain. It is the "farmers' friend" who complains.

The six republicans now running congress, if elected and sent to national capital, would represent a carry with them the idea of prosperity and progress. The six prophets of evil who oppose them, if elected, would carry with them the idea of pauperism and financial ruin which they prophesy. Where the six republicans would go, it would be said: "There goes six Nebraskans who believe in their own state, and are proud of its achievements." Of the other six it would be said: "There goes a calamity howler from Nebraska."

The following taken from the report of the secretary of agriculture for the year 1890, shows the average price of corn in Iowa and Nebraska. In Iowa, for the years of '87, '88, '89 and '90, the average price of corn was 24, 19 and 41 cents. The average price of corn in Nebraska, for the same years, was 30, 22, 17 and 15 cents. The total average for the four years in Iowa was 27 1/2 cents, while the total average for the same four years in Nebraska was 27 1/2 cents, or one-fourth of one per cent lower in Nebraska than in Iowa.

Ask the leader of the People's party, and he will tell you that the farmers of Nebraska are growing poorer every day. Ask the individual farmer as to his own condition and he will say pride in stating how much his circumstances have improved in the last two years, and how much his land has increased in value. The actual condition of the farmers themselves is a standing contradiction of the calamity theory.

Let Judge Field and Haines and Prof. Andrews and Whitehead and Mikeljohn and Dave Mercer walk into the next congress, and the nation would cheer and say "Hurrah for Nebraska!" They've had a rain! But McKelnoids and Kem and Poynter and Bryan and Bill Deen walk into the congress, and the people would say "Poor old Nebraska! She's had another back set. There comes the Calamity Howlers!"

"I don't believe in taking money out of one man's pocket and putting it into the pocket of another," said Bryan at Nebraska City. "And I don't believe," retorted Judge Field, "in taking money out of an American's pocket and putting it into the pocket of a foreigner."

"Show me," says Judge Crouse to Beatrice, "a prosperous community and I will show you plenty of currency. Currency does not make prosperity, but prosperity makes plenty of currency."

### Why He Did Not Have His Hair Cut.

Karl Brown entered the barber's, threw himself into a chair and called for a shave. After he got his shave the barber, as usual, began to badger the customer about "hair-restorers, shampoos, and other knick-knack that go to a man's discomfort and barbers' profits. The old chap withstood the siege bravely. Then the barber tried him for a hair cut in the usual strain.

"Hair's a little ragged, sir."

"Yes; like that way."

"Longer than you usually wear it, ain't it, sir?"

"Think not."

"Looks as if it hadn't been cut for an age, sir."

"It hasn't."

At this point the old man rose and very politely drew off a wig, disclosing a pate underneath as bald as a paving stone.

### Poor References.

Office Boy—"You want to see the boss 'bout that advertisement for book-keeper, don't ye?"

Applicant—"Yes."

"Got any references?"

"I am ready to produce them when requested."

"Where did ye work?"

"I was two years with Cash & Co."

"Huh! That's th' firm that discharged me. They don't know a smart feller from a idjet."



IN A SORRY FLIGHT—The Status of the Democratic Canvas Is Appropriately Illustrated in the Above Picture.

1888? We think so, or the wool growers and wool manufacturers have forgotten their cunning. "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad," but this recurrent madness makes it worth our while to put the entire Democratic party into bedlam or we go to ruin ourselves.—American Economist.

### THE ENGLISH POST.

"How It is Trying to Sneak Out of an Uncomfortable Position."

In the campaign of 1888, who can recall without shame the impudent appropriation of the National flag as an exclusive symbol by the Protection party, and the relegation of its opponents to the British flag, thus proclaiming a moral disfranchisement, demoralization and deportation of one-half the citizens of the United States.—The New York Evening Post.

Without attempting to answer the Post's broad question, we simply desire to call its attention to the following editorial utterance of another great Mugwump free-trade newspaper, the Boston Herald:

"The American flag is simply a number of pieces of textile fabric, of three different colors, sewn together for the purpose of making a predetermined combination."

When free-traders are found sneering at patriotism and ridiculing all feelings of veneration for the American flag, when they advocate a policy that would break down our industries and hand over our markets to foreigners, they surely cannot blame protectionists for classing them as adherents of Great Britain rather than of the United States. Whatever else may be said of our protective policy, it must at least be admitted that that policy—the American system, as it was named by its great expounder, Henry Clay—is one which is designed to stimulate a sound and healthy American sentiment. It emphasizes the importance of American industries, American markets and American workmen. Its fundamental doctrine is that American skill is great enough, American talents are varied enough, and American laborers

of domestic competing industries. These were:

1. The colonial period, ending with throwing over the tea in Boston harbor and the battle of Lexington in 1775. The British parliament forbade us to manufacture in order that they might monopolize our market. This chiefly impelled us toward the war for independence.

2. The "peace under confederation" period from 1783 to 1789, when no national duties on imports existed. This chiefly impelled us to adopt the Federal constitution.

3. The period of the so-called reciprocity treaty with England in 1816 to 1824, culminating in the financial crisis of 1817-19.

4. The compromise tariff period of 1833 to 1842, including the unparalleled crisis of 1836-39.

5. The Walker Tariff period of 1846 to '57, intensified by the further reduction in '57 and thus prolonged to March 3, 1861. This period was marked by a general poverty or "hard times" crisis, setting in in the summer of 1854, continuing into a bankruptcy and non-payment crisis in 1855, which caused a mercantile bankruptcy crisis in England in 1856, and this reacting produced the bank crisis in America in 1857, after which the country struggled on in a pauperized condition until 1861.

Without a single exception, our every approach to free-trade brought disaster, particularly to farmers and working people.

Do we want any more of it?—American Economist.

### Another Trust!

Coming from Boston, the city of culture, the home of the Mugwumps, this is refreshing:

So the coal trust is going to put up the price of that commodity by 25 cents a ton. Well, there is but one answer to that scheme, provided the anti-trust law will not break it, and that is to allow New England to buy her coal wherever she can get it the cheapest. We believe fully in the protective tariff, but when it is used by these trusts to bleed the people, then the best

ing in the way of suggestion from any service in the world has been neglected. The postoffice service is fully abreast of the requirements of the age, and is being improved every month.

### Oh, Ye Gods!

The Louisville Courier-Journal thinks that the majority report of the committee on resolutions to the Democratic convention showed that there were "representatives of the painted harlot of protection on the committee." But the result shows conclusively that the protectionists were not in it.

### The Law of the Land.

Gov. McKinley remarked recently that all the principles of the first Republican national platform are now incorporated in the laws of the land. And no party dares come forward and demand the repeal of any of them.—Bulletin.

### Don't Mistake Them.

There is the old whimper from the South that the People's party will not support the Democratic ticket. But they will. Western farmers should have learned enough wisdom to know that by this time.—Bulletin.

### Tammany.

The Tammany braves To save their lives, Are sharpening up Their campaign knives.

### An Interesting Incident.

One of the interesting features of the revival of "Richelieu" by Henry Irving at the Lyceum theater in London recently was the presence in the stalls of the veteran actor, Henry Halls, who "created" the part of Francois in the play when it was first put on the stage. That was in 1839, when Macready acted the title role, and Mr. Halls was then a young man of 29. He is now a hale and handsome octogenarian.

### Solitude.

Tramp—Say, sonny, ask y'r mother if she kin spare me some old clothes. Little Boy—All right, I will; but (with some concern) I'm 'fraid you'll trip up in 'em.—Good News.