M'KINLEY ON WOOL

Free Wool Means Ruin to the Great Industry.

The Wilson Bill and What It Has Done—The Remedy.

Major McKinley spoke to the farmers and wool growers of Ohio on September 14th, as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen, My Fellow Citizens: I count it a very special honor to receive this visit from my fellow citizens, composed for the most part of the farmers of Harrison county. I would have been glad to have had with you that venerable citizen and statesman John A. Bingham, whose message of cheer and congratulation and good will you have brought me. (Great applause.) I beg that you will carry back to him my best wishes and my earnest prayer that his life may be long spared to enjoy the respect and honor given to him by his admiring countrymen everywhere. (Cheers.) I know of no man in public life to whom greater opportunity was given and who more admirably improved those opportunities than your distinguished fellow citzen in the mightiest crisis of our country's history, and I needed no assurance from him that he stands now as he has always stood in the past, for his country and his countrymen, for his country's honor and for the prosperity of the people. (Great applause.)

It is especially gratifying to me to receive a visit from so many of the farmers and wool growers of Harrison county. There is scarcely a county in the state which is so essentially agricultural as yours. You have no large towns. You have but few factories, and your occupations are almost exclusively rural. Your county has long been noted as one of the great agricultural sections of the state, and especially devoted to that branch of agriculture known as sheep raising and wool growing. There is probably no portion of the country of the same area that has supported so many sheep as yours, and for many years at least this was the most profitable industry of your farmers.

His Prediction in 1890 Borne Out.

It is not so good, I believe, now as formerly. (Laughter and applause, and cries of "I guess not.") The last three years have been years of great trial, not only to the wool growers of your county, but to the entire country. You have seen your flocks disappear and your fleeces diminish in value to an extent that prior to 1892 you would not have believed was possible. I remember in 1891 to have delivered an address in Cadiz to the assembled farmers of Harrison county, in which I undertook to predict what would happen if we had free wool in the United States. There were few men in that great audience who believed my prediction then. What do you think of it now, farmers of Harrison county? (Cries of "We think it is right.")

In 1891 you had, according to your banners displayed here to-day, 153,563 sheep of an average value of $5 per head. In 1896 you have but 92,000 sheep, worth only $1.50 per head. In 1891 you received from thirty to thirty-two cents per pound for your wool; in 1896, for the same grade of wool, from fourteen to sixteen cents per pound. This enormous loss to a great industry is truly astonishing, and calls for serious consideration and prompt remedy, if one can be found, and the only remedy we have in the United States is by the ballot, and if it is protection you want, you know what party carries the banner of protection. (Enthusiastic cheering.)

Prior to the enactment of the Wilson tariff law you had enjoyed, almost without interruption, from the beginning of the government a tariff on your product to protect you from the competition of the cheaper lands and the cheaper labor of other countries. By that act your product was made free and opened up to the unrestricted competition of all the wool of the world. What makes that act more indefensible is, first, that it was wholly unnecessary, and, second, that it was singling out one of the greatest industries of the country for immediate sacrifice, leaving other industries having no greater claim upon the consideration of the government practically unharmed. (Cries of "That's right.")

Bill Denounced by Mr. Cleveland.

No class of our citizens have suffered so much from the tariff as the wool growers of the United States, and none were more deserving the generous treatment than they. So inexcusable was this act that the president, who favored a reduction of the tariff all along the line and believed in free raw material, was unwilling to sign the bill, and used these characteristic words against it: "It may well excite our wonder that Democrats are willing to depart from this (free raw material doctrine), the most democratic of all tariff principles, and that the inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmers be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists." But this did not avert the fatal blow. Less organized than other industries in the country, you were unable to secure the recognition to which you were justly entitled and your product was made the victim of free trade. (Cries of "That's right.")

In all the years in which the Republican party was in power, you know that it gave protection to wool, and in the act of 1890 gave to this industry increased protection. That law, the law of 1890, gave to every agricultural product of this country, every farmer's product of this country, the best protection ever had. Every protection that could be given to them against outside competition and to preserve the home market was always cheerfully and generously accorded by the Republican party. (Great applause and cries of "That's right.")

The platform of the National Republican party, on which we stand this year, much to my gratification, singles out the wool industry and makes of it special mention as entitled to full protection under our revenue laws. (Loud applause and cries of "Good, good.") This is the language of the national platform: "To all our products—to those of the mine and field, as well as those of the shop and factory—to hemp, to wool, the product of the great industry of sheep husbandry, as well as to the finished woolens of the mill, we promise the most ample protection." (Applause.) And what the Republican party promises it is in the habit of performing. (Cries of "That's right.") It does not make promises to be broken. It says what it means and means what it says. (Great cheering.) If clothed with power in all branches of the government it will give to this industry fair and just protection with all other industries of the country.

But, my fellow citizens, what we want, whether we produce wool or any other agricultural product—what we want is to preserve the splendid home market to our own American producers. (Great applause.) It is the best market in the world. There is no other market like it, and upon every principle of justice and fair play it belongs to us and nobody else before us. (Applause and cries of "That's right.") Protection to the farmer has been recognized from the beginning of the government until now.

Wool Industry's Importance.

As showing the importance of your industry, it is only necessary to say that in 1892 there were 700,000 wool growers in the United States—700,000 people whose chief occupation was that of wool growing. There were probably one-fourth as many more who were owners of small flocks of sheep in the United States. This industry employed besides those who owned the flocks, it is estimated, at least 500,000 laborers, representing with those who were dependent upon them, nearly 2,500,000 people. There were 700,000 farms, averaging 160 acres each, devoted to this industry, and the mountainous regions and the vast plains of the great West, which are not adapted to other kinds of farming, have been utilized in this great industry and made valuable. Every one of these farms, comprising 160 acres of land—112,000,000 acres in all—have been seriously injured by placing wool upon the free list.

In one of the agricultural papers of the West I have seen the statement that in Oregon, Utah, Washington, Idaho and Western Montana, there were 6,710,746 sheep, which were worth in 1892 $13,421,000, and which in 1896 were worth only $6,710,000. In 1892 we had 47,273,553 sheep in the United States valued at $125,000,000. In 1895 we had 38,298,000 valued at $65,000,000. The total imports of woolen goods in 1862, under the Republican protective tariff law, were a little above $37,000,000, and in 1895, under the Wilson tariff law, the imports amounted to more than $60,000,000. (Cries of "Hurrah for McKinley and the Republican party.")

His Words in 1888 Recalled.

On April 2, 1888, in presenting the minority report in opposition to the Mills tariff bill in the National House of Representatives, I said: "Wool on the free list is a deadly assault upon a great agricultural interest, and will fall with terrible severity upon a million people, the households and dependencies. It will destroy invested capital, unsettle established values, wrest from flock masters their lifetime earnings, bankrupt thousands of our best and most industrious farmers and drive them into other branches of agriculture already overcrowded. (Cries of "That's what it has done.") It is a vicious and indefensible blow at the entire agricultural interests of the country." (Cries of "You are right.")

Alexander Hamilton, in his report upon manufacures, made to Congress 104 years ago, said: "This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first importance. It is, of all things, that which most effectually conduces to a flourishing state of agriculture."

Thomas Jefferson said: "Experience has taught me that manufacturers are as necessary to our independence as to our comfort. The duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made at home, secure us against a relapse into foreign dependency. My own idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption." (Applause.)

Home Market Always the Best.

I have said that the home market is the best market. You known that from experience, and the home market is made better by increasing our factories and giving employment to idle workingmen. (Great cheering.) Put every idle man in the country to work and your consumers will be increased—(applause and cries of "That's right")—and when your consumers are increased, then your market is improved and the better the price you receive for your product. (Cries of "Good, good.")

You remember that in 1892 it was repeatedly stated that free wool would increase the price of wool to the American wool grower—in voice, "That's the biggest lie that was ever told" and great laughter)—but then you heard them tell it. (Renewed laughter and cries of "Yes, we did.") There may have been some farmers who thought that was true. (A voice, "Well, they know better now," and great laughter.) There are none who think so now. (Renewed laughter and applause.) It was said that if we opened up this country to the free use of the wool of the world, the farmers would be benefited. It was done, and with what benefit you know better than I can tell you.

Now they tell you that free silver—(laughter)—is the panacea for all your ills—(renewed laughter)—and you have that same money in circulation now that you had four years ago, but the wool growers haven't got as much of it as they had then. (Cries of "That's right.") As free wool degraded your industry, so free silver will degrade your money. (Applause and cries of "That's right.") You have already been fleeced by loss of your flocks, and you don't propose to be fleeced further by loss on your money. (Great cheering.)

Must Protect American Labor.

We have opened up our mills to the wool of the world, and both the wool and the woolen mill have suffered. The American farmer has seen his wool displaced by the foreign clip. The American woolen manufacturer has seen his goods disappear from the American market to give place to the foreign market. The American farmer has thus lost directly in the price of his wool and almost as severely by the blow dealt to the home market for a good product, through the diminished consumers resulting from idle mills. The American farmer will not tamely submit to this injustice and wrong. (A voice: "We don't intend to in Harrison county.") The American workingman in the woolen mills will indignantly repel that legislation whose effect is to degrade his labor. (Applause and cries of "He will on the 3rd of November.")

My fellow citizens, I am glad to receive you and welcome you here at my home, and it will afford me sincere pleasure to shake hands with each one of you personally if you desire me to do so. (Great applause.)

"BRYAN—"SMOTHER THE KID! IT WILL DRIVE EVERYBODY OUT OF THE CAMP."

—From Cincinnati Times-Star.

THE MECHANIC AND THE TARIFF

What Three Years of "Reform" Have Done For Him.

From 1880 to 1892 the five million or more persons engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits in the United States were busy and prosperous. During those twelve years the cities of the United States pushed ahead at a marvelous rate. The building trades were especially prosperous. Carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, stone masons and painters were well employed at good wages. Magnificent buildings went up in all the large cities, and millions of surplus funds were put into permanent structures of all sorts. Skilled labor was in great demand. There was no lack of currency with which to prosecute these enterprises. The wages paid were the highest known, and they were paid in gold, or in money as good as gold.

The same may be said of manufacturing. While general observation and the figures easily obtainable in individual cities show the prosperity of the building trades, we have the official census return of manufactures. Here are the figures:

	1880.	1890.
Capital.	$2,780,726,895	$6,139,397,785
No. employed. . .	2,700,732	4,476,884
Total wages. . . .	939,462,252	2,171,730,181
Val. of products	5,349,191,458	9,056,764,996

In spite of an alleged appreciating currency, over 64 per cent. more capital was invested in mills and factories and workshops in 1890 than in 1880. Nearly 66 per cent. more persons were given employment. For each hundred persons employed in 1880 we find an additional 66 persons in 1890; and for each hundred dollars thus invested in 1880 we find an additional seventy dollars in 1890, or an increase of seventy per cent.

There was no lack of money with which to do this enormously increased volume of business.

How about wages?

Wages increased not only actually, with the increase of the number employed, but at a still greater rate relatively. While the number employed did not double, the wages paid more than doubled, the increase being 131 per cent. In short, every man, woman and child thus engaged went home each Saturday night with more actual money (good sound money) in his pay envelope, in 1890 than in 1880, and what was true in 1890 was likewise true down to the year 1892.

We therefore had money enough, work enough, and a rising wage.

Defeated on all sides by the tremendous array of facts on this point, the free silver advocates are now trying to change their battle ground. They declare that the workingman is getting less and less of the profit of labor and capital in combination as his share, and that the manufacturer is getting more and more. This assertion is absolutely false. The reverse is true. The average annual wage per hand paid in 1880 was about $100 more than the average paid in 1870, while the average in 1890 was $83 more than in 1880.

Including mechanics, there were added to this class of bread-winners 2,500,000 between 1880 and 1890, or 250,000 for each year. In manufacturing alone over $3,000,000,000 of new capital was invested, or $300,000,000 annually. And yet the claim is advanced that the country was suffering from a contraction of the currency. This is not true, but if it were, it would merely prove that confidence and hope are *after* all of more value as aids to progress than currency.

Then people were ready to invest; now they hold back. Then wage-earners were receiving full money for their work, and their consuming power was almost double what it is now. It is claimed by those who are capable of making estimates, that in 1892 the value of our manufacturing product had reached $10,000,000,000. Had the McKinley law remained in force, and had there been no financial disturbance, the close of the present year, 1896, should have seen this amount $12,000,000,000*. Instead of that, careful estimates by reliable authorities bring out the startling fact that the products of our factories did not exceed $5,000,000,000 in 1895—a falling off of nearly one-half. Since nearly 90 per cent. of this amount represents the earnings of labor, it will be seen how seriously the masses of our people have been affected by three years of "reform."

Every free trade prediction and promise failed of fulfillment. The markets of the world, which were to be ours, have taken two or three hundred millions less of our products than they did in 1892. There is simply nothing in this free trade experiment but trouble for our producers and for our workingmen. It has been truly said that every blow at any product of labor, whether it be coal, which gives employment to the miner, or steel rails, which keep puddlers at work, or wool, which adds to the income of the farmer, or cloth, which gives work to the tailor, is a direct blow to labor and the laborer.

Look to-day over the whole broad field of American industry, and what do we find? A diminished production, falling prices, increased foreign importations, and, as a result, labor in distress, out of work and starving. Look where you may, it is the same. The textile industries of New England, the iron and steel districts of the Middle States, the mines of the Northwest, and the lumber camps along the Canadian border — all give evidence of great distress. The cry is iterated and reiterated: Open the mills and the factories, start the furnaces, cut the lumber, dig the ore! Give us employment! It is work and wages, not the intricacies of the money question, which interest these victims of three years of "reform."

*—Had the same rate of increase in the number employed kept up, we should now be giving work to a million or more additional hands, instead of having that number out of a job.

BRYAN FOR FREE RIOT.

Attorney General Harmon is right. The issue of superlative importance in this campaign is that of social order, the maintenance of constitutional law, the protection of society against mob violence. All other issues are of minor consequence so long as this one remains undecided. The tariff question and the coinage question are merely incidental. Our government can survive the disasters of a mistaken financial policy, of a mistaken tariff policy. But it could not long survive a wrong interpretation of the constitution and the law as regards the preservation of peace and the protection of society against mobocracy.

The issue is clearly drawn. Mr. Bryan stands upon a platform which in effect denounces the action of President Cleveland in using the federal power to suppress the insurrection of 1894. In his letter of acceptance Mr. Bryan particularly emphasizes his indorsement of the anarchist plank of the Chicago platform. It is of small consequence that Mr. Bryan veils his real sentiments in smooth phrases favoring "the enforcement of law and the preservation of the public peace." The monstrous theory which he attempts to defend, if carried to its logical sequences, would rob the federal government of the power to enforce its own laws; and this would be tantamount to destroying the federal government.

Stated in a few words, the question directly in issue is this: Has the national government a right, when rioting is in progress in any part of the United States, and where both state and United States are being violated and private and state property, as well as federal property, is being destroyed, to use its power and authority to restore order, unless called upon to do so by the authorities of the state in which such rioting is in progress? Must the national government remain passive, unless invited by the state government, through its representatives, to aid in the restoration of order?

The Chicago platform evades or seeks to evade this issue by denouncing "arbitrary interference by federal authorities in local affairs." Mr. Bryan also fails to meet the issue squarely when in his letter of acceptance he declares that the United States "is not authorized to interfere in the domestic affairs of any state except upon the application of the executive when the legislature cannot be convened." He plainly indicates, however, in the context of his letter, that if he was president, and an emergency should arise like that of July, 1894, he would refuse to use the federal power to quell the insurrection and restore tranquility. The whole tenor of the Chicago platform and of Mr. Bryan's letter leads irresistibly to the conclusion that in case the conditions of July, 1894, were repeated, if he were president, he would regard the disturbance as a purely local affair and would, therefore, refuse to intervene.

The fundamental error of Mr. Bryan's position is in regarding such an insurrection as that of 1894 as a "local" affair. In no sense was it such. It was part of a vast conspiracy, which extended over a dozen or more states.

The disturbance was merely centralized at Chicago and some other points. It was a conspiracy, not against state authority, but against the authority of the United States. The mob violence which ensued was in violation of both state and United States laws; but it was more directly in violation of the latter, because its larger results were the detention of United States mails and the stoppage of interstate commerce. The violation of these laws of the United States was the cause that brought the federal authority into action, and backed that authority up by federal bayonets.

The contention of Mr. Bryan and of the unstable platform upon which he stands is untenable, illogical and absurd. It is also in the last degree dangerous. If that be the correct interpretation of the constitution, our federal authority is but a myth and our national government is but an empty name. Of what use is it to pass United States laws if the executive officers of the United States are not clothed with power to enforce those laws?

The action of President Cleveland in the grave crisis of 1894 established and defined a principle which will endure—which must endure, if this government is to stand and constitutional liberty is to be maintained. It establishes the principle that every foot of the soil of the United States is subject to the authority of the government of the United States; that no portion of the national territory is too sacred for the exercise of federal power to enforce the national laws; that the enactment of United States laws necessarily implies the possession of authority and power by the national government to compel obedience to those laws, to use force if necessary for that purpose, and to punish violations of those laws.

Propositions so plain as these should hardly seem to require the emphasis of an object lesson. They appear to be axiomatic. The fact that a considerable number of persons—Mr. Bryan among them—deny the truth of these propositions makes the danger and menace of the situation.

There was no "arbitrary interference," nor any interference whatever with local affairs by President Cleveland in 1894. In no sense was the federal authority brought into conflict with state authority. The sovereignty of the state of Illinois was in no manner violated nor even menaced by the president's action in sending troops to Chicago. Troops were sent there because United States laws were violated, United States property was being destroyed, and the authority of the United States courts was set at defiance. National sovereignty and state sovereignty can coexist, each within its sphere. The sphere of the one does not necessarily clash with that of the other. The same territory is subject to both federal and state authority, and each sovereignty is clothed with power to compel obedience to its laws.

This question, as Major McKinley has said in one of his speeches, is of the first importance. Social order and the supremacy of law must be assured; all else can wait.

This matter gains additional importance from the practical certainty that the election of Bryan would precipitate labor disturbances in all sections of the country. The misguided men who will vote for free coinage under the mistaken idea that their condition would be improved by the adoption of that policy would speedily find out their error if Bryan were elected. Finding their wages reduced, instead of increased, they would inaugurate strikes on every hand in the vain hope that they might thus save themselves from the consequences of their own folly. Thus we would be speedily confronted with a crisis similar to that of 1894, but much more serious. With Mr. Bryan in the presidential chair, pledged to a policy of non-interference with mob law, what would be the harvest but revolution?

This nation could withstand free trade and free coinage, but not free riot.—Los Angeles Times.

WHY WE ARE HAPPY.

The Republicans were desirous of fighting this present campaign out upon the tariff issue. They believed that upon that single issue alone they could carry the country with ease.

It was in fear of that unanswerable issue that the Democracy swung so unanimously in some sections for the money issue. The attempt to crowd the tariff discussion to one side by the leaders in the Chicago convention and the ready compliance with that desire on the part of a majority of that convention was not brought about by any conviction that unlimited silver was the country's panacea but by a desire to force to the front of the battle a new issue. The tariff issue must be strangled to death. There was hope only in the chance of diverting public opinion from the shortcomings of the present administration.

What has been the result? The Republican party has refused to give up its faith in protection. It talks protection today as faithfully as it ever did. On the other hand, the Democratic convention has driven more Democratic votes away from the party by its stand on the financial issue than it has attracted by burying the tariff issue. The Republican party has done just what the Democratic party forced it to do. It has met the money issue squarely and it has answered it to the consternation of the Democracy. Leading Democrats all over the nation have deserted to the Republican columns. Disintegration has set in in New York state. Mortification is the complaint in Illinois, and gangrene seems to have affected the party in Ohio and putrefaction is the result in Indiana. In short, a surgical operation to cut away the abscess of anarchy and repudiation is absolutely necessary, and even that seems now to be too late to be of any benefit.

The Republican party has not been frightened into deserting the tariff policy that has made it so successful nationally. The credit is due to Major McKinley more than to any other single person. In addition, it has met the financial issue very squarely and discomfited the enemy.—Brooklyn Times.

DOLLAR WHEAT AND WHEN WE HAD IT.

In this country the prosperity of the farmer depends upon the prosperity of the other industrial elements of our population. When our industrial classes are employed at American wages their consumption of farm products is on a liberal scale and they are both able and willing to pay good prices for all the necessities and many of the luxuries of life. Under such conditions there is a good market for everything the farmer has for sale.

When the reverse is true, and the workingmen are idle or on short time and cut wages, they are forced to practice economy and the farmer necessarily loses part of his market and in the keener competition for the balance must lower his prices. There is no partisanship in saying that during the past twenty years the periods of commercial activity and general prosperity have been coincident with Republican administration of the government. The general policies of the Democracy have always been considered by business interests as inimical to the commercial welfare of the country, and whether that feeling is correct or not, the periods of Democratic ascendency have been marked by keen business depression. A large part of this feeling is no doubt due to the hostility to the protective tariff principles of the Republicans which always dominates the opposition. But in addition, there is always apprehension of radical legislation hostile to established business interests.

This fear of Democracy has always restricted our manufacturing enterprises whenever that party was in power, and in that way has grievously affected our farming interests. It is a matter of record that farm prices rule lower under Democratic administrations, and this fact is due to the disturbance of general business whenever that party wins.

If any one has not noted these facts, or is inclined to dispute their accuracy, let him examine the following table of farm prices of wheat. The figures are from the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture and show the average farm price of wheat as reported by farmers themselves on December 1st of each year, arranged into four-year periods, beginning with the election of General Grant in 1872. The currency prices from 1872 to 1879 have been reduced to the gold basis:

	Price of Wheat.
1872-75.	$0.961
1876-79.	.861
1880-83.	.984
1884-87.	.696
1888-91.	.825
1892-95.	.541

Notice that under Grant, Hayes and Arthur the farm price of wheat averaged very nearly $1.00. Then follows four years of Democracy, with the famous Cleveland free trade message, the Mills bill and commercial distress of the future and the average price of wheat for the period dropped nearly 30 cents a bushel. The Harrison administration, which followed, brought forth the McKinley tariff law, opened old mills and built new ones, and of the prosperity which followed the farmer had his share, the average farm price of wheat advancing to 82.5 cents. The past four years need no introduction. The situation of the country speaks for itself. The Wilson law and the business stagnation which followed it, the repeal of the reciprocity treaties and the distrust of the future which the silver agitation has aroused have smitten the farmer with a heavy hand. The price of wheat has again declined nearly 30 cents and all other products have kept it company.

The Democratic platform this year is more radical, more reactionary than ever and its threats alone have been enough to paralyze all interests, the farmer suffering as much as any one else.

The panic which would certainly follow Mr. Bryan's election would involve all interests and those financially weakest would suffer the most. Instead of dollar wheat, or even 50-cent wheat, the only market for a time would be the market under the sheriff's hammer.

The deficit for August is so large that it startles. However, the time will come after McKinley's election, when each month will show surplus. This will occur when the Republicans revise the tariff protection lines.

It is well that Mr. Bryan is such a talker. The more thoughtful people hear of him, the more gladly they will vote for McKinley.