

IRISH INDUSTRIES.

How Great Britain Succeeded in Destroying Them.

Prohibitory Duties Were Levied on Irish Goods Sent to England, While English Goods Were Admitted into Ireland Free or at a Very Low Rate.

For a time before the act of union between Great Britain and Ireland, in 1800, the latter country enjoyed the advantages of a protective tariff, and Irish industry expanded and flourished accordingly.

Table with 2 columns: Irish goods to England, English goods to Ireland. Lists items like Beer, Bricks, Candles, etc. with prices.

In 1783 Lord Clive said of the condition of Ireland: "There is not a civilized nation on the face of the habitable globe which had advanced in cultivating its agriculture and manufactures with the same rapidity in the same period as had Ireland."

The late Mr. Parnell, whose far-seeing statesmanship and political sagacity brought his country from utter hopelessness to the very verge of the liberty it had sought so long and vainly.

"The question of the protection of the industries of Ireland is one of vital importance for the nation. We have to consider the interests of the artisans of the towns and of the laborers in the country, and, as I have already stated, it is my firm belief that it will be impossible for us to keep this great portion of the laboring class at home as in comfort without protection to Irish industries.

"The life of Ireland is dependent upon the preservation of her boys and girls. Our population has diminished at the rate of a million a decade during the past forty years; it is true that that should be put a stop to, and that it should be possible for the laborers, the artisans and mechanics of Ireland to live, thrive and prosper at home."

The one great unanswered and unanswered question in American politics is: Why are Irish-Americans found for the most part in the ranks of the Free Trade party, which is fighting England's battle to-day as readily as Irishmen have done for centuries in the British army?

FARM LABOR INTERESTED.

Higher Wages For Agricultural Labor in Manufacturing Sections.

A report just issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, relative to compensation of laborers on farms in different sections of the United States, draws an interesting comparison between the wages of such laborers in sections exclusively devoted to agriculture, and those in which manufacturing industries have also been established.

Table: Average Monthly Wages of Farm Labor. Columns: Sections, Wages. Rows: Eastern States, Middle States, Western States, Southern States.

We have eliminated the Pacific States from this comparison because of abnormal conditions, such as the extreme scarcity of labor, existing in those commonwealths. Considering the sections given in this table, we find that wages are highest in the Eastern States, which are essentially manufacturing commonwealths.

Continuing through the Middle and Western States, wages gradually fall, being lowest in the South, the section most distinctly agricultural. The same result is shown in the comparison between wages in individual States.

Table: Wages in Individual States. Columns: States, Wages. Rows: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Iowa, Michigan, South Carolina.

From the figures given we readily perceive that wages of farm laborers are higher or lower, according as the section of the country in question is more or less a manufacturing section. This is a natural consequence of placing the farm and the factory together, for the products of the former not only results in the higher prices for those products, but also, and through these higher prices, in higher wages for the workmen producing them. Thus we have another demonstration of the beneficial effect on agriculture of our Protective policy.

Do Farmers Want Direct Taxation?

In discussing the Tariff it should be remembered that we have to consider only duties upon imports. We levy no duties on exports. Whatever our people produce to sell abroad goes out to our foreign customers free of any export tax. But why should we levy import duties? Well, it cost during the last fiscal year \$365,000,000 to carry on our Government. We raised \$145,000,000 by our internal revenue laws upon alcoholic liquors and tobacco, \$60,000,000 by the sale of public lands, and \$22,000,000 from miscellaneous sources. These sums left \$133,000,000 to be raised in some other way.

How should this be done? By direct taxation on property? Have our farmers, who are more heavily taxed than any other class of the community, considered what would be the burden upon them? What would be the condition of that great industry which produces the prime necessities of life, and is more than any other the source of our comfort and wealth, if obliged to pay in addition to the present large share in sustaining State, county and municipal government, the portion of \$133,000,000 for national expenses? What, then, would be the value of farm lands, and where would the farm mortgages, so much talked about and had about by our political opponents, be paid?—Congressman Hill.

NULLIFICATION IN 1892.

Crushed by Jackson in 1833, It Bears Its Ugly Head Again.

Sixty years ago next November a general convention was in session in South Carolina. Its members represented the sentiments of that arrogant slaveholding oligarchy whose influence a few years later induced the Southern States to attempt the dissolution of this Republic by armed force. They were by birth, training and interest opposed to the elevation of workingmen and women, and viewed with alarm the growth of the army of intelligent free labor in the Northern States under the shelter of the Protective system. So they hated Protection with an all-consuming hate, and had called this convention for the purpose of formally serving notice on the President and Congress that the Protective Tariff of 1828 must be repealed, so far as South Carolina was concerned, or South Carolina would secede from the Union. The resolution passed an "ordinance" of nullification, of which the gist is contained in the following extracts:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States, by various acts, purporting to be acts laying duties and imposts on foreign imports, but in reality intended for the protection of domestic manufacturers, etc., hath exceeded its just powers under the Constitution, and we therefore, the people of the State of South Carolina, in convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained, that the several acts and parts of acts of the Congress of the United States, purporting to be laws for the imposing of duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities, etc., are unauthorized and violate the Constitution of the United States, and violate the true meaning and intent thereof, and are null, void, and no law—Ordinance of Nullification passed by South Carolina, through Delegates assembled in General Convention, Nov. 27, 1862.

The answer of that great Democrat, Andrew Jackson, who was then President, was to order South Carolina to submit to the Tariff, and to dispatch troops and gunboats to see that his orders were complied with. Congress, however, saw fit to modify the Tariff slightly to appease the South Carolina nullifiers; they receded from their position and bloodshed was postponed till twenty-eight years later, when the pretensions of South Carolina were stamped upon by the American people for good and all at a cost of half a million precious lives and untold suffering. They hoped that they had heard the last of Nullification and the absurd Tariff views of Calhoun and his fellow-nullifiers. But they were mistaken. Just about twenty-eight years after the closing scenes of the tremendous struggle, in which it was believed the principles of the nullifiers were buried for ever, another convention was held, not in South Carolina this time, but in the native State of Abraham Lincoln, which has reasserted the teachings of Calhoun. Here is the pronouncement:

We denounce Republican Protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect Tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.—New Democratic Platform of 1892.

For the first time since the Civil War a political party has dared to incorporate into its platform the utterance of the ordinance of Nullification, and to declare that the Tariff laws supported and advocated by Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Madison, Clay, Webster, Jackson and Lincoln were unconstitutional and were legislative robbery of the people.

There is no mistaking the meaning of the Democratic Tariff plank, and we are glad of it.

THE TARIFF NOT A TAX.

HANDSAW FILES.



75 Cts. A Dozen. Selling Price, 48 Cts. A Dozen.

It is very evident that the farmer, the carpenter and people generally who use hand-saws are not "tariff taxed," 75 cents a dozen (the duty on imported files) on the files they buy to keep their tools in order. Good American 1/2-inch files, made by American workmen at American rates of wages, are advertised in the trade papers for 27 cents a dozen less than Grever Cleveland's alleged tax on them.

This Barber Believed in Protection.

Not long ago I was in the city of Plainfield, N. J., a city of 10,000 inhabitants and rapidly becoming a fashionable suburb of New York. I strolled into a barber shop. I always like to talk with the barber. He knows everything, and has a cheerful way of letting go of it. [Laughter.] So I asked him how things were coming in Plainfield. He said things were doing so much better. I asked him what was the matter with Plainfield. "Well," said he, "these New York roosters don't help a town much." I asked him what he meant. "Why," said he, "I mean these fellows doing business in the City of New York. They buy what they need and get shaved before they start home, and just root in Plain-

field." [Laughter.] And as I crawled out of that Democratic barber's chair I made up my mind to do everything I could by vote and by speech to prevent the Democratic party from covering the people of the United States with English roosters, doing business in London and merely sleeping in the United States.—Congressman Jackson.

Purchasing Power of Farm Produce.

To tell a farmer that his products have gone up or down in price does not mean much to him till he knows whether the things he has to buy have gone up or down in the meantime. He is most interested in how much the things he needs, his produce, or, what is the same thing, the money he receives for it, will buy. Below is a table showing how much more of the standard necessities a given quantity of what he raises will exchange for at current market prices in 1892, after thirty years of protection, than the same quantity would purchase under a free trade tariff in 1860:

Table: Purchasing Power of Farm Produce. Columns: Item, 1860, 1892, 1892-1860. Rows: Wheat, Butter, Eggs, etc.

It is just possible that our farmers do not appreciate the blessings Protection has showered down and is continuing to shower down upon them, and that they want to return to the system under which they had to almost give their stuff away for want of a home market for it—but we don't believe that they are so stupid.

A McKinley Democrat.

About a week ago Governor McKinley, of Ohio, received by express a big pocket-knife, the first made by the Cutarragus Cutlery Company, whose factory at Little Falls, N. Y., was opened as a result of the increased protection to the cutlery industry afforded by the McKinley law. With the knife came the following letter:

"I voted the Democratic ticket for nearly thirty years, but a drive through New England in the year 1890, past wild cutlery factories in Bridgeport, Naugatuck, Union City and Torrington, together with the nearly paralyzed industries of Lakeville, Northfield, Thomaston and Shelburne Falls, convinced me of the error of my ways.

"I found old friends, who were good mechanics in our line, driven by the cheap Dutch knives, which were on sale in every city and hamlet through which I passed, out of profitable employment, and seeking work as common laborers, ditch diggers and coal heavers. Grass grew around many of the doors of the factories.

"Passing through the towns I heard Bill McKinley and the McKinley bill talked of on every side. I was first convicted, then converted, and, like Saul of Tarsus, the scales fell from my eyes and I saw the parties contending over American industries in their true light.

"Thanks to your efforts, the McKinley law was enacted, and hard times in our line of industry are past. Trade is good, wages are good, our little town has nearly doubled its population in two years, and we believe it will double again in two years more.

"Hoping in the near future to address you at the Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., instead of Columbus, O., we remain, yours sincerely, J. B. F. CHAMPLIN, For Cutarragus Cutlery Co."

Ask the Free Trader These Questions.

If a nation must buy in order to sell, why was the balance of trade in our favor more than \$292,500,000 in the past year? If strikes are due to the tariff, why are there two strikes in Free Trade England to every one in the United States?

If Protection is unconstitutional, why were the framers of the Constitution Protectionists? If Free Traders are really the friends of the farmers, why did they abolish the duty on the farmer's wool?

If free raw materials would give us the "markets of the world," why are our imports of cotton goods far in excess of the exports? If the protected United States is not prosperous, why are we the only nation in the world that has no emigrants?

If the tariff is a "tax," why can you buy numerous articles for less than the very duty which is imposed on them? If Protection is opposed on the ground that our industries are no longer "infants," why don't the Cobdenites support the tariff-duty?

If our higher wages are due to the greater efficiency of American workmen, why do foreigners who come here receive two and three times as much as was paid for the same work in their own country?

If the House of Representatives was not laboring in the interests of the British Orange Trust, why did they pass the Free Binding-Twine bill?

If a revenue Tariff does not cause pauperism, why were there more paupers in New York during the revenue Tariff of '46 than ever before or ever after?

If Free Trade is patriotic, why do Free Traders always sneer at everything American?

Domestic Goods Better Than Ever Before.

In domestic production there never before were employed as much skill and as great amount of brain power as during the past season. The result is shown in the goods on the market, which, in many instances are quite equal to the best of their grade produced from foreign looms. In every line the best assortments are shown, and in nothing is any of them wanting, except in the matter of design in certain lines of fancy goods, which, in consequence of the higher artistic skill of the foreign manufacturer, do not in all cases present neatness and newness of design and pattern so characteristic in foreign goods. Even in these there is seen a marked advance on those of last season, and taken altogether domestic dress goods are a great credit to American production.—The Dry Goods Economist, Tariff "Reform," May 29, 1892.

REAL MCKINLEY PRICES.

Cost of Living Has Fallen—Wages Have Risen Under the McKinley Tariff.

Of course you remember the great campaign of lying in 1890, when the Democratic hirelings from one end of the land to the other proclaimed (beginning before the ink of the President's signature to the new Tariff was yet dry) that prices of manufactures were "mounting skyward" because of the new measure. They enlisted the services of unscrupulous tradesmen, who, for the sake of temporary gain no less than for political office, exacted from their customers the excessive prices made possible by the Democratic "McKinley prices" nullification. And peddlers were even hired to go about offering tinware and other household wares at fabulous prices, with instructions to say that such prices were made necessary by the "McKinley bill." The nation, however, was not so easily deceived, and the result was the great triumph of the Tariff and the election of the present Free Trade majority to the lower House of Congress.

When, after election, the people began to learn that prices, instead of being higher, were actually lower, as a rule, than before the new Tariff, the Free Traders dropped the price question and took another tack. They started in asserting that wages were falling, and have kept up their assertions to the effect of incessantly down to the present writing. They considered themselves safe from conviction here, because of the known difficulty of gathering wage statistics for the whole country. But this lie, also, has now been run to earth.

The Senate Committee, appointed soon after the passage of the McKinley measure, to investigate its effects on prices and wages, have just reported the following results:

During the twenty-eight months from June 1, 1890, to Sept. 1, 1891 (the act took effect Oct. 6, 1890), the average retail prices of twenty-one articles of common consumption among the people declined 3.64 per cent; wholesale prices of agricultural products advanced 18.51 per cent, and prices advanced on the average 7.5 per cent.

This is the result obtained and unanimously accepted by Senators Aldrich, Allison, Hisscock and Jones, for the Republicans; Senators Harris and Carlisle, for the Democrats. The details of the investigation were conducted by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of the Department of Labor at Washington, D. C.; Gen. Francis A. Walker, Professor Henry C. Adams, Edward Atkinson, Professor Edmund J. James, and William Grosvenor. Of the Assistants, the first is independent on the Tariff question; the next three are Free Traders; and the last two are Protectionists. All are men of unquestioned probity and of world-wide reputation as economists and statisticians.

With their seal upon this latest condemnation of the McKinley prices and wage lie, he ought not to show his head again in this generation.

A Deadly Parallel from History.

The Tariff of 1890 was by no means the first in our history to prove the utter unprofitability of Free Trade conditions of evils to come upon the country under its operation. Here, for instance, is a quotation from our old Free Trade friend, the New York Evening Post, of July, 1834, relative to the famous Protective Tariff act of that year: "We place beside it the simple statement of the facts recorded by eight years' actual experience under that Tariff, as made by Henry Clay in a speech in the Senate, 1832:

Pass the Tariff as reported by the committee, and you pay the nation. Pass it, and where will you any longer find occupants for your costly piles of stores and dwelling houses? Pass it, and who will be exempt from the grinding operation? The poorer classes, especially, must feel its effect in paying an additional price for every article of clothing they and their families wear, and every mouthful they eat or drink, and to that will they ere long be reduced.—New York Evening Post, July, 1834.

This ought to be a warning to everybody to piapo no reliance on Free Trade prophesies.

Farms Increasing in Value.

Within the last eight months I have traveled extensively through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, in conversation with hundreds of farmers and business men in each one of these States, I have ascertained that the verdict is nearly unanimous that land has been increasing in value steadily for nearly two years past.

In Kansas I visited twenty counties. The people I met have assured me that land will no longer bring \$5 to \$8 more per acre than it would two years ago. The statements made in Nebraska have been to the same effect. In Iowa the improvement in price is still higher. In the vicinity of Atlantic City I was assured by trustworthy men that farming lands are July \$15 an acre higher than they were in 1890, and that sales are much more readily made, at those advanced prices, than they were two years ago at the very low prices of that date.

In Wisconsin the rise is just as pronounced, but the increase is not so great per acre. In Michigan the advance is marked, but not so large as in Illinois. In Ohio, after visiting thirty of her counties, I am able to state that farming lands in that State have risen in value between \$5 and \$15 per acre within two years. The loss of the Ohio farmers has entirely changed with that short period. They have ceased to be despondent and are now full of courage and hope.

In New York and Pennsylvania the improvement is not so great as in the West, yet there is a decided change for the better in these two States also. From my personal observation, I am able to state that times are more promising, and that there is property in store for men who till the soil.—K. G. Burt.

Cobden as a Prophet.

What was Predicted. I speak my unfeigned convictions when I say I believe there is no country in the world which will receive so much benefit from the repeal of the Corn Laws as the farm lands interest in this country.—Richard Cobden, 1844.

On the next occasion on which I spoke on this subject, I was surprised by the English gentlemen, the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Woodhouse, who accused the Free-Traders of wanting to throw poor land into cultivation, and of causing the other land out of things like manure. I knew the Anti-Slavery Law League will not again be reproached by any such language.—Richard Cobden, 1844.

What Cobden Foretold. The depreciation in land values has in the last 14 years almost been, says the President of the Surveyor's Institution: In 25 county divisions of England, over 50 per cent. in 14 years of value; in 15, over 25 per cent.; in 10, over 50 per cent.; in 5, over 75 per cent.; and in 2, over 90 per cent. While these statistics will not in many instances include farms recently sold, and the agricultural returns show that in 25 years two million acres of land, three-fourths of which were unproductive, have been reclaimed, and have become the property of 2,000,000 men, mostly heads of large families, thereby depriving of rural employ-ment, and of the labor competition in the towns.

ENGLAND IS DEMO

British Manufacturers Pray the Democratic Home-

Whatever their own country about it, the Free Trade the satisfaction of knowing the course of action that they elected in England. How, in the British paper, except the GOOD NEWS FOR BRITISH MANUFACTURERS.

Information now at hand shows that there were at least 40,000 more in the American Home of 1890 than in the year 1880. There was considerable improvement, however, in the year 1890, of Georgia, which produced cotton-wool, and consequently a large harvest. The opponents of the act of 1890, declaring that it put into the hands of the people of this country a large number of jobs, and that it was a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, said the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.

The act of 1890, which was passed on the 6th of October, 1890, has been checked in its progress, and the cotton-wool of the country in 1891 was not so large as in 1890. The act of 1890, however, was not a step towards the establishment of the iron and steel industry in the United States, as the McKinley bill would make only about two per cent. of the cotton-wool of the country; the importation of 30,000 tons in 1890.



THE EFFECT OF FREE FOREIGN WOOL UPON THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURER.