

SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

ONE OF THE DRAWBACKS OF EXCEPTIONAL PROSPERITY.

The famine in structural steel and iron is an illustration of the phenomenal conditions attending the restoration of a protective tariff.

The famine in structural steel and iron is perhaps the most striking among the phenomena attendant upon McKinley prosperity. Nothing like it was ever before known in this country, and certainly not in any other country. Here we have every iron and steel producing plant in the United States working to its utmost capacity, and yet there is a big shortage in the supply, so great is the demand in many lines of construction. Because of the inability of the mills to fill orders, or even to meet the time requirements of contracts already entered into, we are told by the New York Herald that in New York the structural work upon many big office buildings is at a standstill, and public schools that were to have been opened for the fall term will remain uncompleted; in Philadelphia work upon warships for foreign powers is at a halt; in the West the agricultural implement makers are at their wits' ends for material and are renewing their demands for steel for next year's delivery, and from every section contractors and builders are calling for impossible thirty and sixty day deliveries of mill products.

The shortage in structural material, says the Herald, is so serious that contractors are vainly offering bonuses to the manufacturers to push their work. It is but a short time since structural iron and steel were advanced \$5 a ton, and it is predicted that there will be another increase within a few days. According to the experts, the railroads are the most seriously affected by this remarkable state of the iron and steel market, and already American agents are at work in the English market obtaining options upon Scotch steel. The demand for mill products is increasing daily, and those who are responsible for the supply frankly admit that they are unable to cope with the abnormal situation. Contractors and builders are growing desperate and are daily begging those who hold them in bond to release them from obligations the fulfillment of which has been made impossible by conditions for which they are not responsible.

From Chicago it is reported that railroad tonnage is on a scale never before equaled, and is still mounting higher. As for the iron and steel trade, the exports for June actually fell off owing to the great home demand. The domestic requirement was so enormous that material could not be spared for foreign shipment.

The demand has caused the resur-rection of mills believed to be dead. Old plants that have been idle for years, chiefly from competitive causes, have been reopened and put in operation.

If a manufacturer wants material three months hence he must buy now and pay the prices that are current. The clamor for materials is in no way relieved. There have been large sales of pig iron for delivery in 1900. Iron bars cannot be bought under four months' delivery from the mill.

Vessel owners of Chicago having suitable bottoms for the transportation of iron and steel cannot fill orders. Two years ago prices were forty-five to fifty cents a ton for the haul from Lake Superior to Lake Erie. Now the rate for ore from Duluth to Lake Erie is \$1.30 a ton, and will go higher.

In Philadelphia the big shipyards, notwithstanding the boom in their industry, have been compelled to lay off hundreds of men because of delay in the arrival of material. Extensive building operations have been halted and others abandoned. Charles McCaul said: "To my knowledge certain big building concerns within the last few days have tried to contract with local companies for structural steel, to be delivered a year from now at prevailing prices. The proposals were refused."

The Phoenix Bridge Company is liable to a penalty of \$50 per day for failure to complete the big bridge over the Schuylkill river at Gray's Ferry. The delay is due to the steel famine. The director of public works has decided not to enforce the penalty.

Pittsburg manufacturers of iron and steel say they see no relief for New York contractors. The demand is so far ahead of the output that it will take many months for the trade to catch up. The Carnegie Steel Company, it is said, will not take orders for structural steel for delivery under twelve months. Last week \$38 a ton was paid for billets. Two years ago the price was \$14. The pig iron manufacturers will not quote prices for delivery this year.

The iron and steel industry, it will be remembered, is protection's biggest and healthiest child. It is an industry which free traders twenty-five or thirty years ago declared could not be built up by a protective tariff. Yet today the United States leads the world in the production of iron and steel. Big as the industry has become, it is not able to supply the requirements of the great home market in these times of McKinley prosperity. As an index of the general conditions that have grown out of the restoration of the American policy the iron and steel situation is interesting and instructive.

So the Wheel Goes Round.

dustry in that vicinity that there is said to be more work to be done than there are laborers to do it, and the indications are that this condition of things will continue for some time. With such a demand for labor, wages are necessarily high. The high wages mean liberal purchases on the part of the laboring men and their families, and the retailers profit by it. They in their turn make large sales for the wholesalers and the increased demand on the wholesalers make more business for the manufacturers, and so the wheel of prosperity goes around. The description of the state of affairs in Duluth reveals only a few links in the "endless chain" by which the protective tariff brings prosperity to the whole American people.

A Convert to Protection.
The latest and most prominent convert to the doctrine of a protective tariff is Hon. William R. Grace, former mayor of New York and a leading Democrat of national reputation. Mr. Grace was for years one of the strongest free traders, standing in close sympathy with Cleveland and Wilson. Mr. Grace says:

"I am not ashamed now to say that in the light of recent events I have completely changed those views and now see, as I believe, clearly that the amazing growth in all that makes for permanently prosperous conditions and in all influences that have so recently established the United States as a first power among the nations of the world, not only politically, but financially and commercially, is due in great measure to the policy of protection."

Mr. Grace says "facts are stronger than theories;" and the facts of the past two years under the Dingley law, as compared with those under the Wilson law, are enough to overturn any theory and convince Mr. Grace or any other free trade Democrat.—Tacoma (Wash.) Ledger.

No Cause for Grumbling.



First Farmer—Help was never so scarce before nor wages so high. If that's the result of "McKinley prosperity," I don't want any more of it.

Second Farmer—Oh, I don't know. Everybody 'round here has paid off his farm mortgages, and I noticed you got a new piano over at your house last week. Don't seem to me you've got any kick comin'.

The Cotton Mills and Protection.

A year or two ago there were many complaints of the declining cotton manufacturing industry of New England, but we are glad to learn from the Springfield Republican that there is now a complete change for the better; that the mills everywhere are actively employed; that prices are firm; that the export demand is good; that the home market is strong, and that the business is generally profitable. Mills which had suspended dividends are resuming a distribution of profits, and many others are increasing dividends. The Amoskeag's current semi-annual dividend is 5 per cent, against 4 per cent paid six months ago and 2 per cent in the first half of 1898.

The Republican does not tell us that this recovery of prosperity on the part of the New England cotton mills is due to Republican protection, as that would be too frank an admission for a Cleveland mugwump to make; but as the cotton mill prosperity has come along with all the other industrial prosperity since the triumph of Republicanism in 1896 and the enactment of the Dingley law in 1897, it is a fair inference that the adoption of the protective policy by the nation has something to do with it.—Minneapolis Tribune.

Economic, Not Political.

The assumption that prominent members of the Republican party are more identified with trusts than the leaders of the Democratic party is contrary to fact. The corporate interests of Messrs. Croker and W. C. Whitney have no parallel in the Republican ranks. Senator Hanna, who is the butt of all Democratic shafts against capital, is a mere dabbler in speculation compared to Messrs. Whitney and Croker, who, many hold, will dictate the next Democratic nominee for the presidency. When the public grows familiar with the subject it will learn that trusts are entirely an economic and not in the least a political issue. They can fatten on free trade as well as protection. They need only the rich soil of good times.—Cincinnati Times-Star.

Nothing to Lose.

The originality and boldness of the Iowa Democratic convention are shown in the anti-trust plank. The remedy for trusts is the "repeal of the protective tariff"—of the whole tariff, not merely of the duties on trust-controlled goods. This alone indicates with what deliberation and thoughtfulness the platform was framed. Is there a Democrat who really believes that Iowa will vote against a protective tariff and the pacification of the Philippines? The platform was drawn and adopted by men who know that (even had nothing to lose.—Chicago Evening Post.

Merit Will Be Recognized.

The imitation of the most famous of foreign brands in many lines of manufacture by American producers is conducted on as large or larger a scale today than ever before. There are, however, some notable exceptions to this rule. For example, it is a fact now generally recognized that the best cut glass in the world is the American; but in some other lines of manufacture the sentiment of the Euro-maniacs is still very strong.

To illustrate: In many lines of silks and woolsens made by American manufacturers foreign brands are still used very largely. A representative of the American Economist met one of our largest manufacturers a few days since, who was about to introduce a new line of dress goods, and said that it would be necessary to introduce this as a foreign manufacture to begin with. "Why?" was asked. "Because if I attempted to introduce this dress goods as American the people who are seeking foreign goods constantly would claim that my product should be sold at 20 per cent less than I can sell these same goods to a foreign importing house. Consequently I will introduce these goods through an importing house, and afterward I will bring out the trademark or design."

In time the American people will be educated up to the fact of the distinctive merit of the products of their own country—the silks, the woolsens, the dress goods, the wines, cigars, mineral waters, etc.—and it will no longer be necessary to sell such products under foreign brands or labels.

Look to Results.

When a policy has been in operation so long as that of the protective tariff it is only rational to look to results already achieved rather than to the original theories in estimating its economic values. That is what ex-Mayor Grace has done. He has glanced about him in commercial ranks and he has everywhere observed substantial evidence of healthy growth. He has seen the exports from the American factories, for which the tariff tonic was designed, more than doubled during the period of which he speaks. He has found every commercial gauge registering high-water mark, and he has come to the natural conclusion that it was because of the tariff and not in spite of it that the country has prospered. That is the logical conclusion and it is not at all improbable that other Democrats have reached it, but lack the moral courage to go on record to that effect, as Mr. Grace has done. If they haven't yet read the lesson, they have been given eyes with which to see and brains with which to think in vain. Either their intelligence or their courage to express conviction will have to be discounted.—Sioux City (Iowa) Journal.

A Significant Increase.

Uncle Sam continues to reap a double profit from the Dingley law—a direct profit through the increased customs receipts and an indirect profit through the prosperity of the people in general. The receipts for the fifty largest post-offices for the month of July, 1899, show an increase over the receipts for July, 1898, of \$177,969, this increase being equal to 6.1 per cent. This means that more letters have been written. People write oftener to friends and relatives when they have a prosperous, cheerful tale to tell. It means more money orders and registered letters sent, both for the purchase of goods and as gifts to those dear to the sender. It means that more birthday and anniversary remembrances have been sent to the absent. In short, the increased postal receipts tell to the thinking mind a story of prosperity, generosity and contentment, a story made possible by the restoration of the industry creating, work giving, wage raising policy of protection.

New Industries.

The newspapers have been pretty busy recording the number of instances of the increase of wages and of the reopening of factories since the passage of the Dingley law. They have had a hard task to keep track of them all, but there is a harder task before them. They will be obliged now, and in a constantly increasing number of cases in the future, to turn their attention to another phase of the prosperous times which have come to the country—viz., the building of new mills and the establishment of new industries. One commercial paper published in a single issue recently, in addition to its numerous reports of increased prosperity in different cases of industries already established, the announcement of a new pulp mill of mammoth size in Wisconsin, a new wall paper plant in Massachusetts and a new fertilizer factory in Georgia.

What Might Be Done.

Another vindication of a high protective tariff has been found by a Pennsylvania professor. As is well known, we maintain a tariff on sardines for the benefit of the New England herrings, out of which our "sardines" are made, and now this professor announces that good asphalt can be made out of herrings. With the maintenance of that tariff a few years longer it would not be surprising if we could make attar of roses and cross-cut saws out of herrings.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

We can still do better than that. We can make traps out of our mechanics and laboring men by a return to the good old days of the Wilson-Gorman tariff measure. We can do still more. We can issue gold bonds to carry on the government and bring idleness and want and hunger into almost every home in the land. Shall we do it?—Feoria (Ill.) Journal?

TALMAGE'S SERMON.

EASY DIVORCES, LAST SUNDAY'S SUBJECT.

What Therefore God Hath Joined Together Let Not Man Put Asunder? Matt. 19: 6—Skeletons All Over the House as Well as in the Closet.

That there are hundreds and thousands of infelicitous homes in America no one will doubt. If there were only one skeleton in the closet, that might be locked up and abandoned; but in many a home there is a skeleton in the hallway and a skeleton in all the apartments. "Unhappily married" are two words descriptive of many a home-stead. It needs no orthodox minister to prove to a badly mated pair that there is a hell; they are there now. Sometimes a grand and gracious woman will be thus incarcerated, and her life will be a crucifixion, as was the case with Mrs. Sigourney, the great poetess and the great soul. Sometimes a consecrated man will be united to a fury, as was John Wesley, or united to a vixen, as was John Milton. Sometimes, and generally, both parties are to blame, and Thomas Carlyle is an intolerable grumbler, and his wife has a pungent retort always ready, and Froude, the historian, pledged to tell the plain truth, has to pull aside the curtain from the lifelong squabble at Craigenputtock and 5 Cheyne row.

Some say that for the alleviation of all these domestic disorders of which we hear, easy divorce is a good prescription. God sometimes authorizes divorce as certainly as he authorizes marriage. I have just as much regard for one lawfully divorced as I have for one lawfully married. But you know and I know that wholesale divorce is one of our national scourges. I am not surprised at this when I think of the influences which have been abroad militating against the marriage relation. For many years the platforms of the country rang with talk about a free-love millennium. There were meetings of this kind held in the Academy of Music, Brooklyn; Cooper Institute, New York; Tremont temple, Boston, and all over the land. Some of the women who were most prominent in that movement have since been distinguished for great promiscuity of affection. Popular themes for such occasions were the tyranny of man, the oppression of the marriage relation, women's rights, and the affinities. Prominent speakers were women with short curls and short dress and very long tongue, everlastingly at war with God because they were created women; while on the platform sat meek men with soft accent and cowed demeanor, apologetic for masculinity, and holding the parasols while the ter-magant orators went on preaching the gospel of free love. That campaign of about twenty years set more devils into the marriage relation than will be exercised in the next fifty. Men and women went home from such meetings so permanently confused as to who were their wives and husbands that they never got out of the perplexity, and the criminal and the civil courts tried to disentangle the tangle of woes, and this one got alimony, and that one got a limited divorce, and this mother kept the children on condition that the father could sometimes come and look at them, and these went into poorhouses, and those went into insane asylums, and those went into dissolute public life, and all went to destruction. The marriage relation was made against the marriage institution was that free-love campaign, sometimes under one name and sometimes under another.

Another influence that has warped upon the marriage relation has been polygamy in Utah. That is a stereotyped caricature of the marriage relation, and has poisoned the whole land. You might as well think that you can have an arm in a state of mortification and yet the whole body not be sickened, as to have any territories or states polygamized and yet the body of the nation not feel the putrefaction. Hear it, good men and women of America, that so long ago as 1862 a law was passed by congress forbidding polygamy in the territories and in all the places where they had jurisdiction. Thirty-seven years have passed along and nine administrations. Yet not until the passage of the Edmunds law in 1882 was any active policy of polygamie suppression adopted. Armed with all the power of government, and having an army at their disposal, the first brick had not till then been knocked from that fortress of libertinism. Every new president in his inaugural tickled that monster with the straw of condemnation, and every congress stultified itself in proposing some plan that would not work. Polygamy stood in Utah and in other of the territories, more entrenched, more brazen, more pudent, more bragart and more intemperate than at any time in its history. James Buchanan, a much-abused man of his day, did more for the extirpation of this villainy than all the subsequent administrations dared to do up to 1882. Mr. Buchanan sent out an army, and although it was halted in its work, still he accomplished more than the subsequent administrations, which did nothing but talk, talk, talk. Even at this late day, and with the Edmunds act in force, the evil has not been wholly extirpated. Polygamy in Utah, though outlawed, is still practiced in secret. It has warped against the marriage relation throughout the land. It is impossible to have such an awful sewer of iniquity sending up its miasma, which is wafted by the winds north, south, east, and west, without the whole land being affected by it.

Another influence that has warped against the marriage relation in this country has been a pestilous literature, with its millions of sheets every week choked with stories of domestic wrongs, and infidelities, and massacres, and outrages, until it is a wonder to me that there are any decencies or any common sense left on the subject of marriage. One-half of the news stands of our great cities reek with the filth. "Now," say some, "we admit all these evils, and the only way to clear them out or to correct them is by easy divorce." Well, before we yield to that cry, let us find out how easy it is now. I have looked over the laws of all the states, and I find that while in some states it is easier than in others, in every state it is easy. The state of Illinois, through its legislature, recites a long list of proper causes for divorce, and then closes up by giving to the courts the right to make a decree of divorce in any case where they deem it expedient. After that you are not surprised at the announcement that in one county of the state of Illinois, in one year, there were 833 divorces. If you want to know how easy it is, you have only to look over the records of the states. In Massachusetts, 600 divorces in one year; in Maine, 478 in one year; in Connecticut, 401 divorces in one year; in the city of San Francisco, 333 divorces in one year; in New England, in one year, 2,113 divorces, and in twenty years in New England, 20,000. Is that not easy enough? If the same ratio continue, the ratio of multiplied divorce and multiplied causes of divorce, we are not far from the time when our courts will have to set apart whole days for application, and all you will have to prove against a man will be that he left his slippers in the middle of the floor, and all you will have to prove against a woman will be that her husband's overcoat was buttonless. Causes of divorce doubled in a few years, doubled in France, doubled in England, and doubled in the United States. To show how very easy it is, I have to tell you that in Western Reserve, Ohio, the proportion of divorces to marriages celebrated was in one year one to eleven; in Rhode Island, one to thirteen; in Vermont, one to fourteen. Is not that easy enough?

I want you to notice that frequency of divorce always goes along with the dissolution of society. Rome for 500 years had not one case of divorce. Those were her days of glory and virtue. Then the reign of vice began, and divorce became epidemic. If you want to know how rapidly the empire went down, ask Gibbon. Do you know how the Reign of Terror was introduced in France? By 20,000 cases of divorce in one year in Paris. What we want in this country, and in all lands, is that divorce be made more and more difficult. Then people before they enter that relation will be persuaded that there will probably be no escape from it, except through the door of the sepulchre. Then they will pause on the verge of that relation, until they are fully satisfied that it is best, and that it is right, and that it is happiest. Then we shall have no more marriages in fun. Then men and women will not enter the relation with the idea it is only a trial trip, and if they do not like it they can get out at the first landing. Then this whole question will be taken out of the frivolous into the tremendous, and there will be no more joking about the blossoms in a bride's hair than about the cypress on a coffin.

What we want, is that the congress of the United States move for the changing the national constitution so that a law can be passed which shall be uniform all over the country, and what shall be right in one state shall be right in all the states, and what is wrong in one state will be wrong in all the states. How is it now? If a party in the marriage relation gets dissatisfied, it is only necessary to move to another state to achieve liberation from the domestic tie, and divorce is effected so easily that the first one party knows of it is by seeing it in the newspaper that Rev. Dr. Somebody a few days or weeks afterward introduced into a new marriage relation a member of the household who went off on a pleasure excursion to Newport or a business excursion to Chicago. Married at the bride's house. No cards. There are states of the union which practically put a premium upon the disintegration of the marriage relation, while there are other states, like the state of New York, which has the pre-eminent idocy of making marriage lawful at 12 and 14 years of age.

The congress of the United States needs to move for a change of the national constitution, and then to appoint a committee—not made up of single gentlemen, but of men of families, and their families in Washington—who shall prepare a good, honest, righteous, comprehensive uniform law that will control everything from Sandy Hook to Golden Gate. That will put an end to brokerages in marriage. That will send divorce lawyers into a decent business. That will set people agitated for many years on the question of how they shall get away from each other to planning how they can adjust themselves to the more or less unfavorable circumstances.

More difficult divorce will put an stop to a great extent upon marriage as a financial speculation. There are men who go into the relation just as they go into Wall street to purchase shares. The female to be invited into the partnership of wedlock is utterly unattractive, and in disposition a suppressed Vesuvius. Everybody knows it, but this masculine candidate for matrimonial orders, through the commercial agency or through the country records, finds out how much estate is to be inherited, and he calculates it. He thinks out how long it will be before the old man will die, and whether he can stand the refractory temper until he does die, and then he enters the relation; for he says, "If I cannot stand it, then through the divorce law I will back out." That process is going on all the time, and men enter into the relation without any moral principle, without any affection, and it is as much a matter of stock speculation as anything that was transacted yesterday in Union Pacific, Wabash, and Delaware and Lackawanna. Now, sup-

pose a man understood, as he ought to understand, that if he goes into that relation there is no possibility of his getting out, or no probability, he would be more slow to put his neck in the yoke. He should say to himself, "Rather than a Caribbean whirlwind with a whole fleet of shipping in its arms, give me a zephyr off fields of sunshine and gardens of peace."

Rigorous divorce law will also hinder women from the fatal mistake of marrying men to reform them. If a young man, by 25 years of age or 30 years of age, have the habit of strong drink fixed on him, he is as certainly bound for a drunkard's grave as that a train starting out from Grand Central depot at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning is bound for Albany. The train may not reach Albany, for it may be thrown from the track. The young man may not reach a drunkard's grave, for something may throw him off the iron track of evil habit, but the probability is that the train that starts tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock for Albany will get there, and the probability is that the young man who has the habit of strong drink fixed on him before 25 or 30 years of age will arrive at a drunkard's grave. She knows he drinks, although he tries to hide it by chewing cloves. Everybody knows he drinks. Parents warn, neighbors and friends warn. She will marry him; she will reform him. If she is unsuccessful in the experiment, why then the divorce law will emancipate her, because habitual drunkenness is a cause for divorce in Indiana, Kentucky, Florida, Connecticut and nearly all the states. So the poor thing goes to the altar of sacrifice. If you will show me the poverty-struck streets in any city, I will show you the homes of the women who married men to reform them. In one case out of ten thousand it may be a successful experiment. I never saw the successful experiment. But have a rigorous divorce law and that woman will say: "If I am affianced to that man it is for life, and if now in the ardor of his young love, and I the prize to be won, he will not give up his cups, when he has won the prize surely he will not give up his cups." And so that woman will say to the man: "No, sir, you are already married to the club, and you are married to that evil habit, and so you are married twice, and you are a bigamist. Go!"

UNIQUE SCHEME.

By Which a Clever Man Made a Living by Eating Oysters.

New Orleans Times-Democrat: "I used to know a young man here who made a living by eating oysters," said one of a little group about the counter of the Grunewald. "Ate them on a wager, eh?" asked an Englishman in the party. "No," replied the first speaker, "he had a much better scheme than that. He would stroll into an oyster bar—you know how many there are in New Orleans—and order a dozen on the deep shell, always selecting a time when several customers were present. After swallowing two or three he—" "Two or three customers?" interrupted the Englishman. "Now!" said the story-teller, frowning, "two or three oysters. After he put them away he would stop all of a sudden and feel in his mouth. 'Look here!' he would sing out to the bartender, 'what kind of things do you keep in your oysters, anyhow? I've nearly broken a tooth!' With that he would take a beautiful big pearl from between his lips. Of course, there was no questioning the genuineness of a gem in that way, and everybody in the crowd would look envious. Some one was morally certain to make a guess as to its value. 'Oh, well,' the oyster-eater would say, 'I don't know anything about pearls, and I'd be glad to sell this one for \$5.' I don't think he ever failed to make a trade on the spot, and as soon as he got the five in his lapid pocket he would saunter out and work another bar. He used to find about four pearls a week, and as long as he kept it down to that game was perfectly safe. But he grew avaricious at last, and found so many that folks got suspicious and he considered it healthy to leave for another fishery. He bought the pearls by the gross from a house in New Jersey. They were very pretty pearls, and cost him about 6 1/2 cents apiece net. I have one in a scarf-pin now."

How They Rewarded Madame Sterling.

Madame Antonette Sterling, the contralto singer and evangelist, had an experience in the Bombay presidency, India, which is as quaint as any of Kipling's tales of the hills. She was campaigning with Pandita Ramabal, and through her magnificent voice was drawing thousands of natives to her meetings. They had never seen that kind of a missionary before, and had never heard a voice like hers. They were so pleased with her work that they said to themselves: "This is a foreign woman guru, and for fear of giving offense to us she has omitted to put her begging-bowl outside of her door for us to put in the customary contributions." In India, every guru or holy person carries a brass, wood or clay begging-bowl into which the devout put some small sum of money. Madame Sterling walked out upon the veranda of her bungalow one morning, and there, to her amazement, found two begging-bowls. One, a little one, with a few annas in it intended for the Pandita, and one, an enormous affair, containing a handsome sum of annas and rupees for herself. The only explanation she could ever extract from the servant was this: "Little bowl—little money for the little Pandita with little voice. Big bowl—big money for big Missahib with big voice." Madame Sterling was one of the principal speakers among the American women at the International Council recently held in London.

The shiftless man accuses fortune of being blind.