

There are many white soaps, each represented to be "just as good as the Ivory." They are not, but like all counterfeits, they lack the peculiar and remarkable qualities of the genuine. Ask for Ivory Soap and insist upon having it. 'Tis sold everywhere.

The Plattsmouth Weekly Herald

KNOTTS BROS., PUBLISHERS.

Published every Thursday, and daily every evening except Sunday. Registered at the Plattsmouth, Neb. post-office for transmission through the U. S. mails at second class rates.

TERMS FOR WEEKLY. One copy, one year, in advance \$1.50. One copy, one year, not in advance 2.00. One copy, six months, in advance 1.00. One copy, three months, in advance .50.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1890

REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET.

- For Governor, L. D. RICHARDS, of Dodge. For Lieutenant Governor, T. J. MAJORS, of Nemaha. For Secretary of State, J. G. ALLEN, of Red Cloud. For Auditor, THOS. H. BENTON, of Lancaster. For Treasurer, J. E. HILL, of Gage. For Attorney General, GEORGE H. HASTINGS, of Saline. For Commissioner of Public Lands and Buildings, GEORGE R. HUMPHREY, of Custer. For Superintendent of Public Instruction, A. K. GOUDY, of Webster.

REPUBLICAN COUNTY TICKET.

- For State Senator, S. L. THOMAS. For Representatives, E. A. STOPHER, P. S. BARNES. For Joint Representative, JOHN C. WATSON. For County Commissioner of the Second Commissioner's District, AMSDELL SHELDON. For County Attorney, JOHN A. DAVIES.

Republican Central Committee meeting.

There will be a meeting of the Cass County Republican Central Committee at the City Hall in Weeping Water on Saturday Sept. 13th, 1890 at 2 p. m. A full attendance is desired, also the candidates are requested to be present, G. W. NORRIS, Secretary.

CHAIRMAN ROOT says, that between Connell and Bryan he favors Connell.—World Herald.

THERE is one conundrum which the Journal did not put to us (last evening) on the tariff; it is, why is an elephant like a brickbat? The answer is, because it can't climb a tree.

FOR the Journal Why did the honest farmers of Maine double and almost quadruple the republican majority in that state last Monday? Ans: because the tariff is not a tax.

MR. ROSEWATER'S guns, which he spoke of the other day, seem to lack priming. If they ever go off in the direction of Mr. James E. Boyd they must be primed with something quicker than Peter Iler's anti-amendment ammunition.

BOSS GORMAN of Baltimore the most corrupt and one of the shrewdest politicians in the country was leading and managing the democratic fight in Maine. The result shows that money would not win or Gorman with his boodle would have been on top.

MR. BRYAN ought to extend his educational campaign down into Maine, the dark untutored mind of the Maine farmer is unable to discern the truth at the hands of Tom Reed, he needs the silver tones of our young Mr. Bryan to lead him out of this bondage that is so much worse than slavery.

VERMONT'S population fell off to the extent of eighty-one in the ten years just ended. This is a much more serious thing for the State than the recent reduction in its republican majority. The latter undoubtedly will be made up in the next election, but the loss in inhabitants can not be so easily recovered.

The Platform.

The committee on resolutions reported at 2 a. m. with the following platform: The republicans of Nebraska reiterate and cordially endorse the fundamental principles of the republican party, as enunciated by a succession of national republican conventions from 1856 to 1888, and we believe the republican party capable of dealing with every vital issue that concerns the American people, whenever the rank and file of the republican party are intrusted in the exercise of their political rights.

We heartily endorse the wise and conservative administration of President Harrison. We also fully approve the wise action of the republican members of both houses of congress in fulfilling the pledges of the party in legislation upon the coinage of silver and other measures of national importance, and congratulate the country upon the continued reduction of the national debt.

We most heartily endorse the action of the republican congress in passing the disability pension bill and the republican president who approved the same, and regard it as an act of justice too long delayed, because of the opposition to all just pension legislation by a democratic president and a democratic congress; yet we do not regard it as the full recognition of the great debt of obligation which the government and the people owe to those heroic men by reason of whose sacrifices and devotion to the union was saved and the government restored.

We hold an honest, popular ballot and a just and equal representation of all the people to be the foundation of our republican government and demand effective legislation to secure integrity and purity of elections, which are the foundations of all public authority. We favor the revision of the election laws of the state so as to guarantee to every voter the greatest possible secrecy in the casting of the ballot, and secure the punishment of any person who may attempt the corruption or intimidation of voters; and we favor the Australian ballot system for all incorporated towns and cities, applicable both to primary and regular elections, so far as it conforms to our organic law.

We oppose land monopoly in every form, demand the forfeiture of unearned land grants and the reservation of the public domain for homesteaders only. We are in favor of laws compelling railroads and manufacturers to use appliances which secure safety for the protection of lives and property. We demand the enactment of a law defining the liability of employers for injuries sustained by employees in such cases as they are not covered by laws now in force in occupations dangerous to life, limb or health. Railroads and other public corporations should be subject to control through the legislative power that created them. Their rate of increase of stock or capital should be prohibited by stringent laws. We demand of the state that it protect the property of individuals; that the provisions of our constitution requiring the assessment of franchises shall be enforced by suitable legislation.

We do not repeat our declaration in favor of a just and fair service pension, graded according to length of service, for every soldier and sailor who fought in behalf of the Union, and by reason of whose services, sacrifices and devotion the government now exists. We demand the reduction of freight and passenger rates on railroads to correspond with rates now prevailing in the adjacent states. We demand that we further demand that the legislature shall abolish all passes and franchises on railroads excepting for the conveyance of mail, freight and passengers. We demand the establishment of a system of postal telegraphy, and request our members to vote for government control of the telegraph.

Owners of public elevators should be declared public warehouses, and compelled under penalty to receive, store, ship and handle the grain of all persons alike, without discrimination, the state regulating charges for storage and inspection. All railroad companies should be required to switch, haul, handle, receive and ship the grain of all persons, without discrimination. We favor the enactment of more stringent usury laws and their severe enforcement under severe penalties. The republican party has given the American people a stable and elastic currency of gold, silver and paper, and the highest credit of the nation to one of the best of any country of the world, and their credit is on a perfect equality with any money, fully with gold.

We favor the modification of the statutes of the state in such a manner as shall prevent the staying of judgments secured for work and labor and the enactment of such laws as is consistent with a protection of American industries. We endorse the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in ordering a reduction of the rates between the Missouri river and lake ports. We denounce all organizations of capitalists to limit production, control supplies of the necessities of life, and the advance of prices detrimental to the best interests of society and an unjustifiable interference with the natural laws of competition and trade, and ask their prompt suppression by law.

SUPPRESS the great city of Omaha casts 30,000 votes at the coming election, to obtain 10,090 majority over his competitor, Capt. Hill, our Mr. Cushing would have to scratch around and find some 20,000 voters who prefer him to the captain. This would be two votes to Captain Hill's one. If that city casts 25,000 votes, which is a large estimate, then Mr. Cushing would need 16,666 votes while the captain would get but 8,333. It is well to keep these figures before the Omaha republicans.

TEN thousand majority for our Mr. Cushing in Douglas county is spreading it on pretty thick isn't it? Of course this is not impossible in that county where political ties rest so lightly, but for the appearance of the thing, if for no other reason, we would advise the republicans of that county to keep enough of votes, in the shape of a nest egg, to start on in the next campaign. Also, while we are on this subject, we should like to see the central committees hereafter, both state and congressional, apportion the representation of Douglas county on the head of the state ticket and not on the vote of some Omaha man who happens to carry a large home vote. Mr. Richard's vote for instance will do to apportion on two years from this time.

WITH the usual democratic truthfulness the Journal announces that the republican majorities in Maine are reduced. That paper never stops to reflect that the democrats of this locality read THE HERALD as well as the other Journals which give the news: Tom Reed counted a great big quorum in the pine tree state on Monday in spite of democratic obstruction and opposition and is returned to congress with a majority which surprises friend and foe alike. It is an endorsement of his course in the reform instituted in congress in the dispatch of business and the people endorse him in it.

AFTER weeks of incubation the Journal attempted Tuesday evening to break the force of our wool correspondents' attack by asserting that the wool tariff is a heavy (accent on the heavy) tax on the people, and that the favorite doctrine of the protectionist is that tariff duties cheapen the product of protected articles.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

"SHERMANICUS" SHORN. We are sorry for the Journal man but he is off of his base in the article referred to in last evening's issue as bad as he is off on the economic question. Judge Chapman did not write the article which stirred the gall of our contemporary to its bitter depths, nor does he furnish this paper its editorials in whole or in part. As to the conundrums proposed by the Journal we may be excused in the outset, in noticing them, when we say they put us in mind of the old saying and homely truth, viz, it takes a fool to ask questions but a wise man to answer them; however, replying to the anxious and evidently weighty inquiries of our neighbor we may say first, the McKinley bill does not take sugar off the protected list because it is a tax on the consumer. If our friend would inform himself he would discover that the repeal of the duty on sugar is only conditional and that unless the countries producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea and hides, receive our agricultural products free of duty the protective tariff is to remain on sugar, and sugar is only placed upon the free list as an offer for reciprocal exchange with those countries. It is a progressive feature of republicanism that an ordinary democratic editor is not supposed to grasp all at once and to some extent is an experiment. As for the bounty placed on domestic sugar it was a democratic as well as a republican dodge to encourage the manufacture of beet sugar which is also an experiment. The removal of the duty upon quinine did not cheapen that drug but the fall in price was caused by entirely different causes: Woolen goods are today purchased almost as cheap in this country as they are in Great Britain and the only goods which we manufacture that cannot be purchased in this market as low as in foreign markets; also this paper has called attention to the falsehood that our contemporary has been circulating, that the American manufacturer sells his goods to foreign purchasers cheaper than to purchasers at home, although, if that was true, it would establish nothing more than the fact that our manufacturers were a lot of fools to sell to foreigners cheaper than to home buyers whose money and custom is always as good, if not better, than their neighbors abroad. This, charge so far as we have seen has been fully refuted by the principal manufacturers of the country, the proof of which we published the other day. As for coffee and tea the Journal is more than unfortunate in citing those commodities and the facts bear us out in asserting that the duty is not a tax, and is not borne by the consumer, for when coffee was placed upon the free list the price came up instead of going down and has always continued to stay up, the moment the foreign shipper found the duty gone he elevated the price.

The Journal ought to know this but evidently does not. No better protected article, from which a duty has been removed, could be selected to prove the fact that it is the importer who pays the duty and not the consumer. If our democratic friends will watch the single article of lumber, or any portion of that product from which the duty is removed or the sugar market they will soon discover that the removal of the duty will not reduce the price, because the market is under the control of the importer and that individual will as in times past, maintain the price and consequently gain, himself, any benefit desired from the reduction or destruction of the tariff duty. In the face of the fact of article after article on the protected list when the prices are less than the duty itself it strikes us that it requires credulity unbounded for the citizen to swallow the free trade nonsense that the average free trade newspapers inflict upon their readers.

We don't know why the manufacturer watches the National Legislature unless it is to protect himself and his vast investments from the British lobbyist and his collaborator the home free trader who, both, aim at exactly the same object and use the same argument. Finally it seems presumptuous for us to have to answer the inquiry of our neighbor, as to what the true definition of a protective tariff is? We may truthfully say however, that its purpose and effect is to build up home markets, build up and maintain home wages, keep down transportation expense by furnishing markets close to the consumer, to furnish a diversity of occupations and industries at home, stimulate competition among manufacturers and thereby regulate and furnish cheap goods for the people. These are a part of the blessings which we have demonstrated in this country through a long series of years that we owe to our system of a protective tariff. Finally, we desire to say to our amiable neighbor that he will find the Editors of the HERALD at our office every day ready and willing, in our weak way, to defend the policy of the republican party and that it doesn't worry us one particle who writes for the Journal just so we have an opportunity to refute its false teachings.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature of the economic question which disturbs the free trader. The fact is, a tariff which protects does promote manufacturing enterprises, this is freely admitted by prominent and reliable free traders all over the country. The building up of manufactures in any locality does help such locality every free trader admits this proposition also, and the only objection the free trader urges, which has any force to it, is that it raises the price of goods in certain cases to the consumer. The consumer is the only person the trader sees when he gets on the tariff question, while the protectionist sees all classes. The moment manufacturers are placed on a firm footing, competition between them increases the supply of goods to that point where the cost to the consumer is reduced as low and even lower, in some cases, than would be reached under free trade; again, and chiefest, the protectionist claims and knows that, protection maintains wages and is in the interest of the wage earning classes of the country. The laborer of this country knows this and appreciates it. Finally the protectionist knows that a tariff protects one man as much as another and that any kind of manufacturing found to be profitable is open to all who choose to engage in it. The difference, between the protectionist and the free trader is that the former take into consideration all classes while the latter look solely at the consumer. One is a broad gauge, the other a narrow gauge economist. One other proposition we might here advance for the benefit of the farmer who is reading the cut and dried, ready made, material furnished the democratic press of this country by the Cobden club agents and that is, that the average annual income of farmers in those states where manufacturers are prosperous is much greater than those states where there is little or no manufacturing done.

Both of which assertions are untrue. The Journal like the Ostrich when hard pushed buries its head and fails to see but one feature