THE DAILY JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1894.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—515 Fourteenth St.

Telephone Calls.

Business Office.....238 | Editorial Rooms.....242

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.

Daily only, one month	$ .70
Daily only, three months	2.00
Daily only, one year	8.00
Daily, including Sunday, one year	10.00
Sunday only, one year	2.00

WHEN FURNISHED BY AGENTS.

Daily, per week, by carrier	15 cts
Sunday, single copy	5 cts
Daily and Sunday, per week, by carrier	20 cts

WEEKLY.

Per Year	$1.00

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscriptions to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp; on a twelve or sixteen-page paper a TWO-CENT postage stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

PARIS—American Exchange in Paris, 36 Boulevard de Capucines.

NEW YORK—Gilsey House and Windsor Hotel.

PHILADELPHIA—A. P. Kemble, 3735 Lancaster avenue.

CHICAGO—Palmer House.

CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House and Ebbitt House.

When will the public hear of the gerrymander cases?

To have abundant labor in May kill the Wilson bill in January.

And remember every day that this cramping and distress are unnecessary.

The business disturbance is an expression of the opinion the business men of this country entertain of tariff reform.

When Solomon said, "When the wicked beareth rule the people mourn," he must have had the present Democratic Congress in mind.

If American manufacturers succeed in holding the home market under the Wilson bill it will only be by making a large reduction in the rate of wages.

It is not trusts that are hurting the country so much as distrust. Distrust of the people in the Democratic party and distrust of the Democratic party in itself has killed business.

Years ago Horatio Seymour declared that a short crop would be followed by a Democratic victory. The country knows that disaster has followed an all-round Democratic triumph.

Secretary Hoke Smith is said to wear a perpetual smile on his broad face. If he smiles every time a Union veteran is deprived of his pension the continuousness of the grin is explained.

It should not be forgotten that Mr. Cleveland, in his annual message, referred to the great panic which is now paralyzing the business of the country as "the recent financial perturbation."

A manufacturer would be exceedingly foolish to enlarge his stock with a prospect of losing money by having to sell cheaper after a reduction of the tariff. That accounts for the idle factories.

Manufacturers generally are of the opinion that a large proportion of the work on the Wilson tariff bill savors much of an inexperienced workman. The professor is a doctrinaire who consults maxims, not markets.

The organ of the liquor trade in New York turns against Tammany with the charge that in 1891, when Governor Flower was elected, it blackmailed the traffic out of $500,000. The wonder is that Tammany was so lenient.

A Detroit preacher announces that signs portend the speedy coming of the end of the world. He is not a true interpreter. What he sees are signs of the approaching dissolution of the Democratic party. The world will live on.

If the granite and marble manufacturers got after the authors of the Wilson bill Monday with a sharp stick the wool growers spitted them and suspended them close over the coals yesterday. And some of them voted for Cleveland.

"America for Americans" should be the keynote to the economic policy of the United States. American wages for American workmen, American markets for American manufacturers, and American products for American consumers.

The McKinley law imposes a duty of 25 cents a bushel on apples and $1.50 per thousand on oranges. The Wilson bill repeals the duty on apples and leaves the duty on oranges unchanged. Apples are produced in the North and oranges in the South.

It is unfortunate that a reversal of a verdict of guilty should come in a murder case on the heels of another murder. Swift justice and a legal hanging or two would have a tendency to check the weekly succession of homicides in this city.

It seems remarkable that with more people out of employment than ever before in the history of the city, with a Board of Public Works professedly anxious to furnish them employment, and with two committees at work collecting and disbursing relief funds, not a shovel full of dirt has been thrown nor so much as a single square of street pavement swept.

It is amusing to see all the Democratic papers in New York metaphorically holding up their hands in holy horror at the wickedness of Tammany, when everybody who knows anything about politics knows that the Democratic party has not had a ghost of a chance in a presidential election since the war without the cordial support and the frauds of that conspiracy of extravagance, fraud and ballot-box crime.

T. G. Pownall, of Romney, W. Va., says in regard to the proposition to defeat the tariff bill by sending protests to Chairman Wilson: "It is no use to write to Wilson. I live in his district and know him. He and Cleveland will run the bill through in spite of 'high water and Brown's mules.'" He adds: "Nothing but a period of starvation will bring a West Virginia Democrat to his senses." They seem to be built that way pretty generally.

NOT FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

If the President should confirm the report by withdrawing the nomination of Mr. Hornblower for the Supreme Court and substitute that of Attorney-general Olney, the leading public objection to the former would be intensified in regard to the latter. Mr. Olney is connected with an extensive railroad corporation in New England, and it is further intimated that his relations with one of the rivals of the Union Pacific have not been dissolved. But the point which can be raised against Mr. Olney is that he has gone out of his way to assail the Sherman anti-trust law. Indeed, he has practically nullified that law. So long as Mr. Cleveland is President or Mr. Olney is Attorney-general the act could not be of less force if it were repealed. One of the federal judges appointed in the South when Mr. Cleveland was President before made a decision which would have attracted no attention if Attorney-general Olney had not rescued it from oblivion and given it his indorsement as "the best exposition thus far made of the scope and bearing of the statute," referring to the Sherman anti-trust act. Having thus bestowed his praise, the Attorney-general makes the following summary of the decision:

1. That Congress cannot limit the right of State corporations or of citizens in the acquisition, accumulation and control of property. 2. That Congress cannot prescribe the prices at which such property shall be sold by the owner, whether a corporation or an individual. 3. That Congress cannot make criminal the intents and purposes of persons in the acquisition and control of property which the States of their residence or creation sanction. 4. That monopoly, as prohibited by the statute, means an exclusive right in one party, coupled with a legal restriction or restraint upon some other party, which prevents the latter from exercising or enjoying the same right. 5. And that contracts in restraint of trade and commerce as prohibited are contracts in general restraint thereof, and such as would be void at common law independently of any statute.

Since the decision at Appomattox, when it was assumed that the heresies of ultra Calhounism surrendered with Lee there has not been a more unqualified affirmation of State supremacy. The man who holds such views as the foregoing, and declares that the anti-trust law cannot be applied to interstate railways doing business under a State charter, will not do for an associate justice of the Supreme Court.

MR. BYNUM'S EXIT.

It is very evident that Representative Bynum is not intending to stand for the suffrages of the people of this district next November. It has been stated before, but when he stood up in committee, a few days since, and, in tones of exultation, said to the representatives of the pottery interest, "The duties of the Wilson bill will put the wages of the United States and Great Britain on a level, enabling you to compete in the markets of the world," he defiantly declared to the thousands of wage earners who have voted for him time after time, "I defy you because I want nothing more of you." He declares, in effect, that he is supporting a bill which will lower the wages of Indiana workingmen in the pottery, glass, iron and other interests and raise the wages of Europeans in similar trades until they are the same in both countries. Mr. Bynum dared not say this when he was asking the votes of the Seventh district wage earners in 1892. Instead, he satisfied a portion of them that a reduction of the duties would not reduce wages, for the reason that the American workman is more facile than his competitors. This silly device of free-trade theorists Mr. Bynum now throws to the winds and declares for a tariff which will put the American wage earner upon the same wages for the same work that the European receives. The difference between the highest in Great Britain and the average in the same employments here is 75 per cent. Your Representative, wage earners of the Seventh district, declares it to be his determination to cut your wages down 40 or 50 per cent. in order that those of your competitors in Great Britain may be raised 35 or 25 per cent. Bynum has, like Benedict Arnold, deserted the cause of his own people to promote the fortunes of Great Britain.

THE PARKER-M'AFEE CASE.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the Parker-McAfee case will be disappointing to the general public, which is apt to form its opinions in criminal cases without much regard for legal technicalities. In this case the public knew that an unprovoked and brutal murder had been committed, it knew that Parker and McAfee were bad on general principles, and it knew there was strong reason for believing that they committed the murder. Knowing this much, it warmly approved the verdict of the jury which found them guilty, and it will regret to hear that the case has been reversed. But, bad as the defendants undoubtedly are, and guilty as they probably are, they were entitled to be tried according to law, and the Supreme Court says they were not. It finds that the judge of the trial court made several distinct errors in his rulings and instructions, and, without touching the merits of the case, it is reversed because of these legal errors. It is unfortunate for the cause of justice and the interests of society that so many criminal cases are reversed by courts of appeal on such grounds. The errors of law committed by trial courts cost the State a great deal of money, and are one of the factors which criminals take into account in estimating their chances of escape. The present decision will tend to confirm the growing feeling that criminals in this country have too many chances of escape and that our system of criminal jurisprudence needs reforming.

At the close of this Congress the Hon. William D. Bynum will retire from the higher levels of statesmanship to become a claim agent in Washington. If five thousand men who voted for him in November, 1892, could revise their work he would go now, and not wait upon his going.

The Chicago Tribune says that since the close of the holiday trade nearly 6,000 persons previously employed as clerks in retail stores in that city have been discharged. At a public meeting held to discuss the situation resolutions were adopted asking the employers to reconsider their action and to adopt the policy of more clerks and shorter hours of work.

On the 30th of October last, in an editorial on "Relief for the Unemployed," the Journal, after referring to the situation as it then existed, said:

The city ought to do all in its power to furnish employment by prosecuting public works, such as sewers, street paving, etc. There is a great deal of this kind of work to be done, and it should be undertaken as soon as possible. These works should not be postponed till better times or better weather. They should be begun at once and prosecuted during the entire winter so far as weather will permit. The old adage that he gives twice who gives quickly applies here. Employment now would be far more grateful to those needing it than if it is postponed six months. The Board of Public Works should make a special and extraordinary effort in this direction, and, besides giving all the work they can during the winter, they should perfect plans to extend operations at the earliest approach of spring.

More than two months have passed since this was written. They have been, for the most part, months of good weather. The season has been an unusually open one. Even now there is no frost in the ground. Yet the Board of Public Works has done absolutely nothing in the way of furnishing work for the unemployed. It has talked fairly, but done nothing. Nothing is cheaper than talk, but it does not prosecute public works nor give employment to those who need it. What is the Board of Public Works doing, anyhow?

Queer errors creep into newspapers, despite the watchfulness of editors and proof readers. One in the Journal yesterday was quite funny. In speaking of the drinks served at New Year's receptions the Washington correspondent intended to say, regarding a punch, that it warmed the cockles of the stomach in great haste. As printed the word "cockles" appears "cockleburs." The Journal has heard of topers who were supposed to have cast-iron or copper-lined stomachs, but the cocklebur-lined drinker belongs to a new class. It is possible he is a Populist and comes from a prohibition State, where stomach irritants are sometimes scarce.

And so sporting authorities have decided that football must be purified. But will purification make the game any safer?

STATE AND LOCAL POLITICS.

Capt. John Worrell, of Hendricks county, was in the city yesterday looking up his prospects for nomination as State Statistician. Captain Worrell was appointed State Statistician by Governor Hovey to test the constitutional right of the General Assembly to elect certain State officers, and it was by his efforts that the election of Statistician and other State officers was denied by the Supreme Court to the Legislature and made elective by the people, thereby securing to them a constitutional right which had been withheld from them. The suit cost Captain Worrell heavily in loss of time and expense, and was but of little benefit to him personally. He is an excellent speaker, and if nominated will be a valuable man in the campaign. During the last campaign, without seeking the nomination, but in compliance with the wishes of the Fifth district Republicans, he made a vigorous and telling canvass against George W. Cooper for Congress, winning esteem everywhere he spoke for his ability and fairness as a political speaker.

Marcus Sulzer, Republican candidate for Secretary of State, and W. S. Richey, of Muncie, who is seeking the nomination of State Auditor, are at the Denison.

The Fourth ward meeting Saturday night will be held at 304 Blake street.

BUBBLES IN THE AIR.

Prediction Fulfilled.

Mrs. Jason—Lord 'a' mercy! That there Jimpson boy has gone and blowed hisself up with a dynamite catridge!

Mr. Jason—I allers said that boy would spread hisself some of these days.

Matrimonial Matters.

Mrs. Watts—If you were not so lazy, you might have been a great man by now.

Mr. Watts—I am mighty glad that I ain't. Just think of the horror it would be to me to have that face of yours pictured in the daily papers.

The Misery of It.

"I always hate to hear of a rich man writing poetry."

"Oh, you think he ought to be at work making more money, do you?"

"No, that isn't it; but when a rich man takes a notion to write verse, there is nothing to prevent his publishing it."

Satisfying Him.

"I have called," said the captious critic, "to find out what reason you can give for representing the new year as a nude small boy."

"That is done," responded the art editor, "because the year does not get its close till the 31st of December."

Then the captious critic went out and broke his nice new pledge.

BYNUM'S FRANK ADMISSION.

The Wilson Bill Is Meant to Increase English and Lower American Wages.

Trenton (N. J.) Special in New York Tribune.

The Democratic party loves to pose as the friend of the workingman. Publicly it is announced that the Wilson bill is for the benefit of the laborer and wage-worker. This little story shows how hollow the pretense is, and what the private opinion of leading Democrats is on the subject.

A committee of manufacturing potters recently went to Washington to induce the ways and means committee to restore some of the disastrous reduction in the proposed tariff on crockery. The delegation was turned over to Congressman Bynum, one of the prominent members of the ways and means committee. Mr. Bynum was told how the pottery industry would suffer if the tariff was cut as intended. "The only way in which we can continue in business," said the spokesman for the delegation, "is reducing the wages of our workingmen to a pitiful point, in order to compete with foreign manufacturers. The trade is already anticipating what will happen. Foreign producers, we can well suppose, will even increase the paltry wages of their employes in order to get out the ware to supply the tremendous business that will come to them. Don't you see how it will affect the workingman in this country?"

Bynum's face lightened up with a smile, and he replied: "Well, you fellows will be just as well off. The increase in wages on the other side will be offset by the decrease in wages in your establishments. You can then compete all right and make money."

Quick as a flash one of the delegation turned to the Congressman, and said: "Do you mean to say, Mr. Bynum, that the object of the Wilson bill is to increase wages in Great Britain and other countries and reduce wages in the United States?"

"That's it," answered Mr. Bynum.

The next minute he understood what a fatal admission he had made. He bit his lip, and then said he trusted the delegation would consider his remarks as strictly confidential.

The above story came directly from the lips of a leading potter of this city.

A New Year's Message in a Bottle.

Washington Special in New York Sun.

This morning an empty bottle floated ashore just below Alexandria. In the neck was a fragment of writing paper upon which was inscribed in a small, cramped hand the following resolutions, or parts of resolutions:

"3. I will never play poker again with Gresham in the game.

"4. I will give one thousand dollars to Paramount Blount's senatorial campaign fund, in accordance with the Fitzhugh Lee precedent; but I will not—

"5. I will run my administration this year without any reference to Congress. It doesn't seem to get on to my curves—

"6. I will solemnly reconsecrate—"

The rest is torn off with the exception of a few words which are absolutely illegible.

THEY ARE UP IN ARMS

Wool Growers Unanimous in Condemnation of the Wilson Bill.

Hon. James A. Mount's Clear Exposition of the Withering Effects of Free Wool Upon the Industry.

HULL'S CAUSTIC CRITICISM

Lonesome Defender of the Theory of Free Trade.

He Asked a Couple of Questions, and Was Answered Quickly and Completely.

There was a man of the Democratic persuasion at the wool growers' congress, in the Statehouse, yesterday, and the way those aroused flock-keepers went after that misguided individual will long be a warning to him to hold his peace when he finds himself again in an assemblage with nobody on his side to help him fight. He was an upright, clean-handed and, apparently, perfectly sane citizen from Fairview stock farm, Rolling Prairie, Ind., by the name of N. W. Garvin. Senator J. A. Mount had just finished a well compilated paper on "The Signs of the Times and Whither Is the Sheep Industry Tending," which, in plain English, turned out to be an emasculation of the Wilson bill for the blow it proposes to strike at the wool-growing industry. Mr. Garvin, with his eyes flashing behind a pair of convex spectacles and with all the unwise temerity of the charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava, desired to ask Mr. Mount two innocent questions. He wanted to know "What has been the effect of the McKinley law on wool and sheep?" and he also sought to know "Do you believe the removal of the duty on wool would reduce the price of wool an equal amount to that of the duty removed?" adding that he did not agree with Mr. Mount's position.

The farmer from Montgomery county was on his feet in an instant. In reply to the first question he said: "The last report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows an increase of nearly 3,000,000 sheep in 1892 and an increase since the passage of the McKinley bill of over 5,000,000 sheep. Furthermore, since its passage, wool in Europe has declined in value from 7 cents to 10 cents a pound, while in this country the decline was only 2 cents a pound until the present impending danger threatened in the Wilson bill."

For answer to the second question Mr. Mount took the Rolling Prairie man's breath away with this: "A man of much greater wisdom than I claim, President Cleveland, in his message to Congress in 1887 said it would (reduce the price of wool equally with the shaving of duty.)"

At this the wool growers present stood up and yelled. The man from Rolling Prairie buttoned his coat tighter about his bosom, shook the icicles from his beard and strode out of the chilling atmosphere of the hall in search of a steam heater in the Statehouse corridor.

Before the association got down to business proper there were several desultory talks on the all-important subject of threatened tariff legislation. It was the general sentiment, as ex-Senator Mount outlined in his interesting paper that appears below, that wool growers were as deserving of protection as are manufacturers, and to get the subject before all the industrial bodies now in session at the Statehouse the following resolution was adopted:

"Reosived, That we extend an invitation to all those attending the industrial associations of Indiana to meet together tomorrow, at 10:50 a. m., in Room 12, State Board of Agriculture, Statehouse, to discuss the effect the proposed traiff legislation would have on our industries."

The eighth annual convention of wool growers was an interesting session, as the above incident will attest. There was a good representation form all sections of the State, and the comparisons of notes showed that the past had been a hard year for the industry, and all agreed the ensuing years will be much harder unless the wild dreamers of free trade at Washington can be induced to maintain a suitable protection for American sheep raisers. President J. F. Tomlinson, of Fairland, was barely able to occupy the chair, having just recovered from a serious illness, and his brother read the brief but pointed address of the president. In this the president hit the nail on the head in his opening sentence with the query:

"Shall we continue to raise sheep? This is the question in the minds of sheep farmers at the present time." As a reminder of the condition of the wool-growing industry, the president further said: "Perhaps the prices of sheep and lambs have declined in the principal markets 33 per cent. in the last two years, and 25 per cent. in the last year. The price of wool has also declined, especially on fine wool grades. Many sheep raisers have fallen into a panic. Many have reduced their herds, and my opinion is that one-half the farmers in Indiana have sold their flocks. There is a stagnation of the wool industry. From 1882 to 1892 the Australian wool product increased from 993,000 bales to 1,750,000 bales, while the price fell from $80 to $60.50 per bale, with the prospect of a still further decrease. The recent drought and other embarrassments have caused an unloading of the farmers on the market. The receipts of sheep at Chicago in eleven months have been 2,804,747 head, but in 1893 this number, it is thought, will reach 3,050,000. In 1893 about 1,000,000 more sheep were handled at Chicago than in 1892."

The president's address closed with a promise that the sheep industry is bound to be protected and that farmers should not abandon the raising of sheep, as the enormous increase in the consumption of mutton alone showed the industry was becoming more profitable each year.

The paper on "Wool Handling," by C. E. Carroll, of Hartford City, was not heard, as Mr. Carroll was absent. J. W. Hull, of Indianapolis, had a carefully written communication on "Changing Phases of Sheep Husbandry." He touched up the attempts to cripple the industry with the following:

"There is an infinite variety of opinion surrounding the changes now taking place in sheep industry as a result of the present import duty regulation, which is somewhat overwhelming to those directly interested in sheep. The manner in which it came about and the course it is pursuing in defiance of all civil measures by the people to prevent a criminal loss is intimidating to a humiliating degree. Violently forcing stagnation upon the industry that has been king of human comfort since the world began, without which we, as a nation, depend upon our enemies to clothe us in time of war as well as peace.

"As an industry we must painfully admit it is like Peter's wife's mother—lay sick with the fever; like a ship that has lost her rudder—at the mercy of the atmosphere, we have cried aloud to the wind to blow our way and land us where we used to be, but we hear the echo from the whirlwinds—we have friends across the sea.

"An imposition upon ten million farmers to force a favor that is not a favor upon a class of people who are disgusted with the folly, and who never asked for cheaper clothing. Strangling with the stench that comes with every breath from a decaying industry that is sacred to all people and adds wealth to State and Nation. A change of this description is a violation to principles of liberty and prosperity as prescribed by statesmen who were giants in political economy.

"Well, the yoke is on our necks, but we are yoked together doomed to bite the dust of Australasia."

There were two interesting papers on "Improvement of Flocks by Selection" and "Breeding and Feeding for Mutton," by C. A. Phelps, of New Castle, and J. C. McGaughey, respectively. The discussion brought out by these papers was listened to with great interest. Next came the paper by Hon. J. A. Mount, of Shannondale, on "The Signs of the Times and Whither Is the Sheep Industry Tending." In this Mr. Mount gave a clear exposition of the relative merits of the industry in America and in the rest of the world, showing that the Australian wool growers are the greatest competitors United States growers have. The paper is reproduced in full, as follows:

"The topic you ask me to discuss is one of vital moment. The signs of the times forebode evil to wool growers, and indicate serious damage, if not partial destruction, to their great industry. This conclusion is forced upon us by pending legislation unfriendly to our interests. There is another and more hopeful aspect of this subject, found in the increased demand for wool and mutton, and the necessity for a diversified and more intense system of farming. The latter makes a forcible appeal for the multiplying of our flocks to meet this rapidly growing demand. Our impoverished soil appeals to the farmer for more 'golden-hoofed sheep', that our land may be richer and our farms cleaner.

"Mr. President, I shall address myself, first, to the threatened danger now pending. I shall be forced, from an economic standpoint, to consider the effect of pending legislation upon the wool interests. In my wide experience in farm institute work, I have scrupulously avoided any reference to any economic policy, about which there was any political difference. In the discussion of 'Profits of Sheep Husbandry,' I have avoided any mention of tariff, and refused to be interrogated on that subject. These are held under provision of the statute and any question of party legislation should be avoided. This, gentlemen, is a meeting of wool growers to discuss, in all its bearings, any legislation, for or against us; whether protection from foreign wools, or home-grown dogs; or for better quarantine regulation looking to the suppression of infectious or contagious diseases.

"In the national Congress measures are now pending, upon the decision of which, in a large degree, depends the future profit of wool growing in this country. The Wilson bill now pending proposes to open our markets to the free importation of foreign wools. This seems to be the fixed policy of the dominant party. It was urged in President Cleveland's message in 1887. Its enactment was sought in the 'Mills bill,' renewed in the 'Springer bill.' In both the foregoing instances its enactment into law was prevented by the opposite party in the Senate. There now seems to be no legislative power to prevent the passage of a law that unjustly discriminates against the wool growers of this country.

FREE WOOL AND THE RESULTS.

"President Cleveland in his message in 1887 frankly admitted that free wool would reduce the price from 10 to 12 cents per pound. He said: 'If the liberal estimate of six pounds be allowed for each fleece, the duty thereon would be 60 or 72 cents, and this may be taken as the utmost enhancement of the price to the farmer by reason of this duty. Eighteen dollars would thus represent the increased price of the wool from twenty-five sheep, and $36 that from the wool of fifty sheep.'

"Following the above, Mr. Cleveland argued that the farmers not engaged in wool growing had no interest in sheep husbandry.

"This argument (and it is the one in stock) is an illusive theory, disapproved by every principle of economic reasoning. Take from this industry the 1,020,000 flock masters; take the $400,000,000 invested in flocks, grazing lands, barns, etc., turn the attention of these flock masters, and utilize this capital in growing more grain, cattle, horses, etc., and to the already low prices you will add increased stagnation. The supply of these products is now in excess of the demand in all the markets of the world. Hence every farmer in the land will feel the ruinous effect of any law that cripples or destroys sheep husbandry.

"But the question is often asked, what have the farmers of the United States to fear from foreign wool growers?

"We answer emphatically, nothing, if conditions were equal. Give to our wool growers what Great Britain gives to the Australian wool growers, and we will ask no greater favor. Give us free land and exemption from taxation and we will become exporters of wool. This country cannot give us free land; it cannot exempt our flocks from taxation. It can, however, and every consideration of economic wisdom and justice demands that the present system of protection should be maintained.

"To bring before this body some of the favors bestowed by the British government to the Australian wool growers, allow me to quote from page 30 of the 'special consular reports on Australian sheep and wool:' 'Executive orders and legislative enactments were made to foster this industry in every possible manner.' 'In addition to sales at low prices, long leases at nominal rents, and grants of lands upon most favorable terms, appropriations and loans of money from the public treasury were made for the carrying out and enforcement of regulations and laws, which were enacted for the destruction of vermin, the extirpation of the scab, foot-rot, etc.' Here the fostering care of Great Britain is set forth, and is of greater value than all the protection accorded our wool growers. Page 96 of the same report reads as follows: 'A certain amount of diversity of opinion seems to exist among the political economists of the colony as to the soundness of the prevailing custom of allowing large tracts of land to be occupied for sheep breeding purposes.' 'One party leads a crusade against a state of industrial interests which countenances the existence of a class occupying vast territories almost for wool growing purposes alone, and clamors for small holdings and the introduction of enterprises in other directions.' 'They look upon the great strides taken by the wool interest with aversion, prophesying that the day of retribution must come when those who have given over state property (i. e. land) to sheep cormorants will be guilty of treason to the country.' 'On the other hand, we have the supporters of this enormous interest content to refer the malcontents to facts, figures and results, and maintaining that an immense continent like Australia, carrying a population of less than two to the square mile, and possessing but narrowly developed resources, could not possibly be worked to greater advantage than in the lines which, by their devotion to the production of wool, have proven both remunerative to individual interests and a source of great revenue to the government.'

"I have quoted at length to show how governmental aid is given to foster, encourage, stimulate, develop and build up this enormous interest in Australia, and to further show to any reasonable, candid, honest mind that our conditions as wool growers and those of this vast colony bear no comparison. In the face of the foregoing array of facts, will any true friend of sheep husbandry in this country say that our farmers, on high-priced lands, heavily taxed, can compete with wool growers on free land and untaxed flocks, and 6 cents a day labor? Free wool means turning over our markets to the fostered 'sheep cormorants' of Australia, to augment their 'individual interests,' and prove a source of great revenue to the commonwealth.

"The results attending the fostering care of sheep husbandry in this colony have been marvelous. In 1860 but 13,000,000 sheep increased to 119,924,062 in 1891. (See page 103, Consular Report.) The increase of the last eleven years equals the aggregate of our flocks at this time. Those who argue that wool was higher in price prior to 1860 than in recent years will find the reason in the wonderful increase in the world's number of sheep and product of wool. The world's production of wool in 1890 was 950,000,000 pounds, increased, in 1891, to 2,456,773,600 pounds.

"While examining the New South Wales exhibit of wool at the World's Columbian Exposition, I was much interested in the enthusiasm manifested by the exhibitors. They painted in glowing colors the advantages they possessed for the growing of sheep and wool, representing that wool could be profitably grown and prepared for market at 10 cents per pound.

"South American wool growers are afforded conditions for cheap production of wool far superior to that offered our farmers in this country, and with flocks aggregating nearly double our own, and exporting near 400,000,000 pounds of wool annually, is another factor potent for evil if wool is admitted free.

"The law of 1883 but slightly reduced the duty on classes 1 and 2 of imported wools, while class 3 (carpet wool) was reduced to 2½ cents per pound. By an unfair construction of the law, clothing wools, which should have paid 11 and 12 cents per pound duty, were admitted as carpet wool, thereby defrauding the government and damaging the wool growers. This law, and its unjust construction, caused a rapid decrease in the number of sheep and the production of wool. In 1884 the number of sheep in this country was 50,626,626; in 1889 the number had declined to 42,509,079, a decrease in five years of 8,027,547, with a decline in value of $29,000,000. (See report of Secretary of Agriculture for 1889, page 244.)

"The Secretary of Agriculture, in his last annual report, on pages 245-248 inclusive, discussed at length the evil effects of the construction of the law of 1883, and shows that in the six preceding years more than three-fourths of all our importations of wool were admitted as 'third' class.

"If a slight reduction of the duty on wool, together with its unfair application, has caused such havoc, how much more imminent the danger, how much more certain the ruin, that must attend the passage of the law now pending?

BENEFITS OF PROTECTION TO WOOL.

"The increase in the number of sheep from 1850 to 1860, a period of low tariff, was from 21,700,000 to 22,000,000, or less than one-fifth of 1 per cent. per annum. The increase during ten years of high tariff, from 1870 to 1880, was from 28,500,000 to 42,400,000, an increase of 45 per cent., or 4½ per cent. annually. The increase in the clip of wool for the same period was even more marked, being from 163,000,000 pounds to 264,000,000 pounds. (See report of tariff commission 1882, page 252.)

"Under the tariff law of 1890 sheep husbandry has taken a new impetus, and 1892 showed a gain of 2,355,188 sheep. (See report of Secretary of Agriculture for 1892, page 437.)

"In 1860 there were 1,263 woolen mills in the United States, with a capacity of $30,922,654, consuming 83,608,468 pounds of wool, paying in wages to 43,735 employes $10,153,998, and yielding a product of $65,596,364. In 1880 factories had increased to 2,689, with a capital of $153,021,869, paying in wages to 161,575 employes $47,389,087, with an annual product of $267,252,913. Factories more than doubled; capital increased more than fivefold, giving employment to four times as many hands, with an annual product increased more than $200,000,000.

"In 1870 flour and grist mills stood first in their annual production; second, slaughter and packing; third, iron and steel manufactories; fourth, sawmills; fifth, foundries and machine shops; sixth, cotton manufactories; seventh, woolen factories. In ten years, 1880, woolen factories had passed cotton factories, foundries and machine shops, and sawmills, and stood fourth in importance. From 22,000,000 sheep in 1860 yielding 60,000,000 pounds of wool, to 50,000,000 sheep in 1884, yielding 308,000,000 pounds of wool, marks an era of growth to sheep husbandry in this country that could only be attained under protection.

"So long as one article remains on the protected list, that article should be the farmers' wool. Industries claim protection that they may be able to compete with the underpaid labor of the old world. The wool not only has to compete with the lowest paid wages, but with wool growers fostered and aided as no other interest or industry is encouraged in the world.

"Who opposes protection to American wool? Not the manufacturers as a class. It was a joint committee of national manufacturers and wool growers that submitted to the Revenue Commission in 1886 a report declaring with the utmost emphasis that [illegible] tion, the prosperity of the manufacturer, and that it was necessary to give sufficient protection to the wool grower.' This joint committee formulated the wool schedule of the high protection of 1867. A joint committee from the same national organizations, sixteen years later, before the Tariff Commission of 1882, reiterated the same doctrine.

"William Whiteman, representing the national woolen manufacturers, was asked by this commission 'why the woolen manufacturers upon the whole consented to the wool tariff of 1867, and became reconciled to it.' He answered: 'For the reason that they believed the duty imposed would increase the growth of wool here, and establish a national industry, and in time furnish wool enough for our factories.' The president of the Tennessee manufacturers repeated in substance the same sound logic.

"The above statements are a consensus of the arguments of the leading wool manufacturers of this country.

"Some unscrupulous demagogues, presuming upon the credulity of the wool growers, have represented to them that foreign wools were necessary to 'mix' with home grown, in order to produce a line of goods in large demand; therefore, free wool would augment the mixing process and increase the demand and price of the domestic. The stupidity of the argument is only equaled by the dishonest purpose that prompted it. The late Secretary of Agriculture, General Rusk, than whom no truer friend or abler advocate of the farmers' interests ever held position in our government, said in one of his reports: 'Possessing, as we do, a varied climate and conditions of the soil, we can successfully grow any of the breeds of sheep, or quality of wool, grown in any other land or climate.' He who argues for the 'mix,' is either ignorant of the geography of his country, its adaptability and its possibilities, or he deems the American farmer less skilled and intelligent than the Australian. This argument is akin to that made a few years ago by a gatherer of crop and stock statistics. He sent to his correspondents a petition to sign, praying Congress to defeat the 'pure lard bill.' He argued because the compound lard manufacturers consumed 175,000,000 pounds of the farmers' lard annually in the 'mix' with cotton seed oil, therefore, they being large purchasers, were the farmers' friends. Many farmers were duped into signing his petition, which prayed Congress not to disturb the cotton seed oil trust, but to allow them to continue to supplant the farmers' lard in the market, hence lower the prices by excessive supply and augment the profits of the trust. The 'mix of foreign wool' will supplant the home grower to his hurt and damage, and to the gain of the foreigner. It may be philanthropic, it may be neighborly, for the American lamb to 'mix' with the British lion, but it is not business, as the mix will only add greed to the lion and the loss of the lamb.

"Mr. Whiteman, president of the National Woolen Manufacturers, said: 'There are no wools in the world that can compare with the great bulk of American wools.' The American consul at Sidney, New South Wales, G. W. Griffin, in his report to the Department of State, March 23, 1891, said: 'The samples of American wools sent to the international exposition at Melbourne were admitted, by experts, to be superior to anything of the kind ever grown in the colonies.' Charles Fletcher, of the Providence worsted mills, in a letter to the Boston Home Market Club, dated Feb. 18, 1891, said: 'The talk of mixing Australian wools to make a line of goods required by this market is all nonsense, as Australian wools are only largely used because they are cheaper.'

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

"Why place the farmers' wool in the same class as ore in the mountains, coal in the mines, or timber in the forest? Wool is a finished product of the farm, manufactured from crops costing labor in their production; and requiring skill, intelligence and attention in the manufacturing.

"The present policy is not akin to that which prompted General Jackson when he wrote, under date of April 26, 1824, to Dr. Coleman, of North Carolina, in which he used these memorable words: 'Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which have been extended to us we deserve not the continuance of His blessing. He has filled our mountains and plains with minerals, with lead, iron and copper, and gives us climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the greatest materials in our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection.'

"Following the passage of the law of March 3, 1883, the Democratic party of the State of Ohio, through the State executive committee arraigning the Republican Congress and Republican President for amending the law of 1867, and reducing the duty on wool, said: 'The wool producing interest of the United States government has a perfect right to demand first, that it shall receive as much consideration and encouragement as is shown to any other interests whatever; second, that as protection by means of taxing importations of raw wool has thus far proven highly beneficial to the farmers of Ohio, as evinced by the continuous increase in number and value of their flocks, this protection shall not be pursued by the United States; third, that if any discrimination be made in favor of particular industries as against others, this discrimination shall not be made against the wool industry. What will be the results? Plainly, it cannot fail to be disastrous.' Upon these solemn promises to the 100,000 wool growers of Ohio, the Democrats elected the Governor and Legislature. This Legislature passed resolutions instructing their Congressman to vote to restore the wool tariff of 1867. The same party in their State convention, June 25, 1884, passed as the third resolution of their platform the following: 'That the just demands of the wool growers of Ohio and the country for an equal readjustment of the duties on wool (unjustly reduced by a Republican Congress) so that this industry shall be fully and equally favored with other industries, ought to be complied with.'

"How changed in ten years! What a significant lesson has been taught! The party leading in the championship of the wool interest then was victorious. The same party in 1893 having abandoned the wool-growers' interest, and threatened its destruction, merited and received the rebuke of the 100,000 wool growers of that State in the last election. The policy that is threatened, and by its impending danger is now sending sheep to the slaughter, and has reduced the price of wool, merits and will receive the condemnation of the 1,000,000 flock masters in this country.

"I have dealt at length with the economic side of this subject. I have endeavored to present the environments at home and the conditions abroad that have to do with the wool interests of our country. It is not necessary to acquaint the intelligent sheep husbandman with these facts and the trend of the sheep interest. Prices of wool, the sacrifice of flocks, sounds the note of alarm. The pendulum is now swinging to the reverse side of this industry. The momentum that will be acquired in the extreme reverse sweep will rebound in its favor. I predict in less than five years prosperity will again return to the flock masters. The farmer who sells his flock at ruinous prices will be in the market as purchaser when the pendulum has vibrated to the other extreme. The American people possess too much wisdom and patriotism to see the destruction of this great agricultural industry. The intelligent farmer realizes that to secure the best results in farming sheep husbandry is indispensable.

"The consumption of wool in the United States in 1840 was but 76,796,130 pounds, or four and one-half pounds per capita. In 1890, 548,398,374 pounds, or nine pounds per capita. The consumption of mutton per capita has increased at a far greater ratio. We now consume over 12,000,000 sheep annually. It would require near 100,000,000 sheep to supply the demands of our market for woolen wares, etc. We should have on our Indiana farms 4,000,000 sheep instead of less than one-third that number. Our farms, as a result, would be richer, more inviting in appearance, and the profits would be increased. I shall continue to grow sheep, combining wool and mutton. If legislation is adverse I shall endeavor to meet the adversity with more intense determination to succeed, inspired with the belief that no policy adverse to this great industry can long survive in this country."

One of the papers that resulted in much discussion on the subject of taking care of sheep was that on "Scab in Sheep," by Mortimer Levering, of Lafayette. Mr. Levering in ten minutes gave the wool growers