

New Ulm Review.



VOLUME XV. NO 40.

NEW ULM, BROWN COUNTY, MINN., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1892.

WHOLE NUMBER 770

NUGGETS FROM HARRISON.

Protection and American Homes Defended by the Nation's President.

One fact is enough for me. The gates of Castle Garden swing inward. They do not swing outward to any American laborer seeking a better country than this. These men who have toiled at wages in other lands that barely sustained life, and opened no avenue of promise to them or their children, know the good land of hope as well as the swallow knows the land of summer.

Buys more and has more to buy with.—It is known to you all that our 65,000,000 people furnish per capita a larger market than any other like number of people. This grows out of the fact that our capacity for purchasing is larger than is found in those countries where poverty holds a larger sway. The workingman buys more, has more to buy with in America than in any other land in the world.

The wages of skilled labor bears on all.—The attempt is often made to create the impression that only particular classes of workmen are benefited by protective tariff. There can be nothing more untrue. The wages of all labor—labor upon the farm, labor upon our streets—has a direct and essential relation to the scale of wages that is paid to skilled labor. One might as well say that you could bring down the price of a higher grade of cotton cloth without affecting the price of lower grades as to say that you can degrade the price of skilled labor without dragging down the wages of unskilled labor.

Tin plate and commercial independence.—I cannot quite understand how an American can doubt that we have the mechanical skill and business sagacity to establish successfully here the manufacture of tin plate. No other country certainly surpasses us in the inventive genius of its citizens or in the business sagacity of its capitalists. It is surprising to me that any patriotic American should approach this question with a desire to see this great and interesting experiment fail, or with an unwillingness to accept the evidences of its success. It will be a great step in the direction of commercial independence when we produce our own tin plate.

Free trade must mean less work and lower wages.—Less work and lower wages must be accepted as the inevitable result of the increased offering of foreign goods in our market. By way of recompense for this reduction in his wages, and the loss of the American market, it is suggested that the diminished wages of the workingman will have an undiminished power, and that he will be able to make up for the loss of the home market by an enlarged foreign market. Our workingmen have the settlement of the question in their own hands.

Axioms of political economy.—Certainly you do not need to be told that that shop or mill that has the smallest pay-roll in proportion to its production will take the market. Certainly you do not need to be told that the wages now enjoyed by our American workmen are greatly larger and the comforts they enjoy greatly more than those enjoyed by the working people of any other land. Certainly you do not need to be told that if the American Government, instead of patronizing home industries, buys its blankets for the public service in England there is just that much less work for American workmen to do.

Our disinterested foreign critics.—The criticisms of the bill that have come to us from foreign sources may well be rejected for repugnancy. If these critics really believe that the adoption by us of a free trade policy, or tariff rates having reference solely to revenue, would diminish the participation of their own countries in the commerce of the world, their advocacy and promotion by speech and other forms of organized effort of this movement among our people is a rare exhibition of unselfishness in trade. And on the other hand, if they sincerely believe that the adoption of a protective tariff policy by this country inures to their profit and our hurt, it is noticeably strange that they should lead the outcry against the authors of a policy so helpful to their countrymen, and crown with their favor those who would snatch from them a substantial share of a trade with other lands already inadequate to their necessities.

The American wage-system must be upheld.—As the great German chancellor, that student of human government and affairs, turning his thoughtful study

toward the history of our country since the war, has declared that in his judgment our protective tariff system was the source of our strength, that by reason of it we were able to deal with a war debt that seemed to be appalling and insurmountable, I do not doubt that you, too, men who believe in work and in thrift, and so many of whom are everywhere sheltered under a roof of their own, will unite with us in this struggle to preserve our American market for our own workmen, and to maintain here a living standard of wages.

If any is robbery, all is.—Our Democratic friends say a protective tariff is robbery. You see this written at the head of campaign tracts circulated by their committees. You hear it said in the public speeches of their leaders. You have not once, I think, in the campaign heard any Democratic speaker admit that even a low protective tariff was desirable. Those who, like Mr. Randall, have in former campaigns been used to allay the apprehension of our working people by talking protection have been silenced. On the other hand, the Republican party declares by its platform and by its speakers that a protective tariff is wise and necessary. There is the issue. Make your own choice. If you approve by your votes the doctrine that a protective tariff is public robbery, you will expect your representatives to stop this public robbery, and if they are faithful they will do it; not seven per cent. of it, but all of it.

A National and common policy.—It seems to me that when this fuller development of our manufacturing interests, this building up of a home market for the products of our farms, which is sure to produce here that which has been so obvious elsewhere—a great increase in the value of farms and farm products—is opening to us the pleasant prospect of a rapid growth in wealth, we should be slow to abandon that system of protective duties which looks to the promotion and development of American industry and to the preservation of the highest possible scale of wages for the American workman. The development of our country must be on those lines that benefit all our people. Any development that does not reach and beneficially affect all our people is not to be desired, and cannot be progressive or permanent.

Students of Maxims not Markets: We cannot doubt, without impugning their integrity, that if free to act upon their convictions they would so revise our laws as to lay the burden of the customs revenue upon articles that are not produced in this country, and to place upon the free list all competing foreign products. I do not stop to refute this theory as to the effect of our tariff duties. Those who advance it are students of maxims and not of the markets. They may be safely allowed to call their projects "Tariff Reform" if the people understand that in the end the argument compels free trade in all competing products.

The essential difference.—The Republican party proposes that our tariff duty shall be of an intelligent purpose, be levied chiefly upon competing articles. That our American workmen shall have the benefit of discriminating duties upon the products of their labor. The Democratic policy increases importation, and, by so much, diminishes the work to be done in America. It transfers work from the shops of South Chicago to Birmingham.

Cheap products from abroad as bad as cheap labor at home.—Closely connected with the subject of the tariff is that of the importation of foreign laborers under contracts of service to be performed here. The law now in force prohibiting such contracts received my cordial support in the Senate, and such amendments as may be found necessary effectively to deliver our working men and women from this most inequitable form of competition will have my sincere advocacy. Legislation prohibiting the incorporation of laborers under contract to serve here will, however, afford very inadequate relief to our working people if the system of protective duties is broken down. If the products of American shops must compete in the American market, without favoring duties, with the products of cheap foreign labor the effect will be different, if at all, only in degree, whether the cheap labor is across the street or over the sea. Such competition will soon reduce wages here to the level of those abroad, and when that condition is reached we will not need any laws forbidding the importation of laborers under contract—they will have no inducement to come, and the employer no inducement to send for them.

DOLLIVER'S ELOQUENCE.

Extract From one of the most Brilliant Tariff Speeches Ever Delivered.

Perhaps there is no other political orator in the west, whom the people so much love to hear as the young and brilliant Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa. Polished, witty and eloquent, his speeches go straight to the sympathies of the people who hear and read them and are making for him a national reputation as well as doing effective work for the Republican cause. One of the best that he ever delivered was made in the lower house of congress in March and one of the most eloquent portions goes as follows:

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Boston Herald of February 16, which I cut out the other day—an inadvertent editorial admission called out by the exigencies of the silver question, which says that the undeniable tendency of the times is "toward a steady decrease in the value of the products of labor with a steady advance in the value of labor itself."

That is the most conspicuous fact in our industrial situation, and constitutes the miracle of our national progress, which in thirty years has repaired the waste of civil war, restored the losses of a disordered currency, and so multiplied the national wealth that the luxuries of yesterday are the necessities of today, and the comforts of life are brought within easy reach of a greater number of people than ever before enjoyed them in the history of the human race.

But what chance does a great fact like that stand with my friend from Tennessee who opened this debate, or with my friend from Indiana, who cherishes with apparent affection a newspaper paragraph predicting an exceptional and easily explainable strike in the iron regions? Absolutely none. Coming into this House, it is kicked and stripped and beaten and left for dead, to the apparent satisfaction and glee of the entire Democratic party. Or what chance does a fact like that stand with my young friend from Nebraska, who the other day took one of his young farmer constituents down from the cannibal tree long enough to use him for the purpose of pointing the moral and adorning that tale of the "plundered homestead" or "the adventures of a young married couple." You remember that he represents a young man in the act of selecting "a young woman who is willing to trust her future to his strong right arm," and beginning to build a home, which is the unit of society.

The picture represents that he is robbed by the tariff on lumber, on paint, on furniture, on carpets, on tablecloths, on knives, forks, and dishes, on spoons, on everything that enters into the construction and operation of that home. And to make the picture all the more pathetic and absolutely hopeless, the artist gives the unhappy couple no sign of defense except the lung capacity of the Democratic party yelling at the top of its voice, "Hands off!" (Great laughter.)

Now, without stopping to point out that the actual price of every article that enters into the "construction and operation of that home" has been reduced in price by the Republican policy of making them in the United States instead of buying them in Europe, I want to ask my friend, or any other man in this House, to name to me a country in the Old World where a young man without money can slip his strong right arm around a girl without means and take her into a home of their own or give her even the prospect of a home, which is the unit of society? (Applause on the Republican side.)

I have talked to hundreds of people from Ireland, from Scotland, from Denmark, from Germany, from the mountains of Norway and Sweden, and they all tell me that a day's work in the United States goes further than anywhere else in the world towards putting a roof over the head of a family, paint on a cottage, music in the parlor, newspapers on the stand, carpets on the floor, dishes on the table, something to eat in the dishes, and the divine light of love and joy in the sweet faces of wife and children.

They have come into my office again and again, husband and wife together, speaking in broken English the language of the thriftiest countries in Europe, to ask my help and advice in mailing a little American money to the Old World for father or mother or sister or sweetheart, living in lands where the labor of

a lifetime is not enough, after paying daily expenses, to pay their passage upon an ocean steamer. I have seen their tears falling upon the paper as they wrote out their message of hope and courage from the only country on earth where human life is lifted above the level of hopeless drudgery for the poor.

I have often stood in Castle Garden, at the gateway of the Republic, watching that restless throng out of every kindred tongue and tribe of people. I have seen young men standing there holding in their hands a suit of taxed American clothes for a brother arriving on these shores out of the very countries where clothes are the cheapest. I have seen young women timidly hiding under a taxed American cloak the bright colors of a new hat for a sister who had just come from a land where everything is so cheap that nobody can buy anything.

Nor could I keep out of my heart words of welcome to those who have loved our flag even afar off, and have come hither to better their condition and open the pathway of fortune to themselves and to their children. And the day is coming, is nearer than the Democratic leaders of to-day may think, when these fugitives from the hard conditions of the Old World, and their children after them, will stand as a unit with the Republican party to keep the shield of American law before the cottages of American labor.

I have not as much interest as some in the current agitation that seeks to shut the doors of the great Republic in the face of mankind. I do not feel that we have been here long enough ourselves to begin to complain about the arrival of other people. I believe that men and women who know by experience the burdens of other countries are likely to serve the commonwealth as well as those persons born among us who go about complaining that American life is not worth living; that our pockets are picked, and that our houses are entered by duly authorized burglars, and our household goods so nearly all stolen that it is hardly worth while to interrupt the larceny. (Laughter.) They say that anarchy is abroad in the land.

May be it is, but the most complete statement of the popular creed of the anarchist was not by John Most, the German, but by the son of an American clergyman who teaches that "a man is no more responsible for his character than for his height, for his conduct than for his dreams." And the only time we have ever seen anarchy on exhibition in the West was the day when Knute Mattson, a Norwegian sheriff, managed the hanging of a native Virginian for the murder of Michael Degan, an Irish policeman of Chicago. But if it is thought necessary to stop immigration, especially of the degraded and the illiterate, there is an easier way than by legislation.

Let the societies interested translate into the languages of Europe a few specimen Democratic speeches; those masterpieces of rhetoric which reflect sentiments like those which wrung the heart of the Hebrew poet when he cried out, "Woe is me, that I sojourn in Mesech; that I dwell in the tents of Kedar." Let them take my friend's picture of the young married couple and hang it up at the steamboat landings of Europe. It will sift and assort immigration in the most approved fashion, for it will frighten away the unintelligent mob, and after such a warning only those will go down into the ships who have sense enough to see that the gentleman from Nebraska does not know what he is talking about. (Laughter on the Republican side.)

We should not forget that we have workingwomen in America. None more than they are interested in this policy of protection which we advocate. If want and hard conditions come into the home the women bear a full share.

Even if we were to experience a complete revolution in prices we do not believe that the Democratic party would cease to pray for tariff reform. Even to-day the cost of the great majority of the necessities of life has been reduced, the balance of trade in favor of the United States in 1892 was 38 millions of dollars in excess of the previous year, and the increase in our commerce relations over the annual average prior to 1890 was \$400,000,000 and still Dan Lawler comes around this year with the same old story that we are burdened with the cost of living, that our government isn't doing business in the market of the world and our people are oppressed. Such nonsense!

RAPIDLY PROGRESSING.

A Republican Rejoinder to a Democratic Criticism.

An Iowa Farmer Rebukes the Comments of a Democratic Paper on the Current Political Issues.

Sometime ago there appeared in the Winona Herald a criticism of the Republican platform adopted by the convention which nominated Senator Tawney for congress. J. H. A. Lacher, an Iowa farmer, thereupon penned a reply to the ideas of the Herald, which contains as concise and accurate a summary of the effects of McKinleyism as we have seen. Here it is:

Before the enactment of the McKinley bill we imported from Canada about 11,000,000 bushels of barley and malt annually, upwards of 8,000,000 bushels of potatoes, about 2,000,000 bushels of beans and peas, 100,000 tons of hay, 7,000,000 pounds of hops, 1,583,000 bushels of flax seed, 16,000,000 dozen of eggs, besides buckwheat and vegetables aggregating a large sum. We also imported about 72,000 head of cattle, 60,000 horses and large quantities of leaf tobacco. The McKinley tariff raised the duties on the above articles materially, the increase in barley alone being from 10 to 30 cents per bushel. The imposition of these higher duties may not have given the "impetus to agriculture," yet I recollect very vividly that when an effort was made last winter by the maltsters of New York to secure a reduction of the duty on barley, the Democratic maltsters of Wisconsin and the Democratic barley king of Minnesota circulated petitions by the hundred, which when signed by farmers and merchants, irrespective of party, were forwarded to Democratic congressmen at Washington to influence their views on tariff reform. Evidently there must have been some virtue in that duty.

Though you may not know it, the farmers of this district know that the McKinley bill effectually checked the importation of the articles enumerated above and hence gave an "impetus to agriculture." The farmers of this district know that the McKinley bill gave them free sugar and cheaper binding twine, recollecting right well that Mills taxed sugar about 68 per cent, and that the present Democratic governor of New York when in congress opposed the reduction of the duty on the latter article. The farmers know that the reciprocity feature of the McKinley bill removed the Canadian export duty on logs, they know that it opened the gates of France and Germany to American pork, that it reduced the Cuban duty of \$5.08 per barrel on American flour to 90 cents, giving the United States control of her flour market, that under the reciprocity treaty with Brazil duties were reduced 25 per cent and in some industries entirely abolished and that as a consequence our exports with these countries have increased enormously. The McKinley bill was not framed, as you declare, for the purpose of checking our commerce, but for the purpose of firmly establishing industries which from their nature can flourish here, once established, and for the purpose of increasing our foreign commerce by making conditions and concessions regarding certain non-competing products. Democratic free trade would not open foreign ports to our goods, but our ports to foreign goods.

In his last annual report Gen. Rusk stated that notwithstanding the abundant yield of crops in 1891, values were well sustained, and he estimated that the increase in the value of agricultural products over the previous year could not be less than \$700,000,000. According to the unanimous report of the Senate committee appointed to investigate the effect of the new tariff law upon the consumer and producer "the average price of all the agricultural products except flax seed, when put at their proper relative importance, was 18.87 per cent. higher in September, 1891, than in June, 1889."

Although the information has been accessible in every metropolitan and trade paper, the data concerning the enormous foreign commerce and enormous free imports, seem to have escaped your attention, for you flippantly speak of "dried blood, acorns, dragon's blood, fossils, hoofs," etc., but it does seem strange when you rummaged around for those articles you should have failed to find the item sugar, because with religious care you avoid all mention of any of the 190 articles on which the duties were reduced by the McKinley bill, the absence of binding twine being especially noteworthy.

During the fiscal year 1892 the total value of our imports and exports reached the unprecedented total of \$1,857,726,910. Our exports were valued at \$1,030,335,626 against \$884,480,810 during the fiscal year 1891, and our imports were valued at \$827,391,284. The balance of trade in our favor was \$202,944,324. Free imports amounted to \$458,001,145, or \$91,759,793 more goods were imported free of duty than during the preceding year. In the face of this enormous sum of free imports, of this vast increase in free imports, in spite of the fact that upwards of 55 per cent, of our importations came into the country without paying any duty whatever, you have the temerity to speak sarcastically of "acorns, dried blood, etc.," for the purpose of discrediting the McKinley bill. It is an insult to intelligent readers and in keeping with the Democracy cry that the McKinley bill is a Chinese wall that shuts out trade. I sincerely hope that the eminent political economist of the Herald has not persuaded his Democratic readers that we imported \$458,000,000 of "acorns, ashes, stuffed birds and such other articles as he enumerates, in the fiscal year of 1892.

By "the Republican gamblers in workingmen's blood," do you mean that the Democrat Frick has turned Republican, or do you mean Calvin S. Brice of New York, Ohio and Briceville, Tenn., whom your party has exalted to a seat in the U. S. Senate, who is one of the great leaders of your party, and whose employment of convicts in place of honest labor precipitated bloody riots, which a Democratic governor quelled by calling out the militia? Yet, if you will, you may blame Carnegie for paying "the highest wages I have ever heard of," as the Democratic Congressman Oates characterized them. I am, however, ashamed of myself for making use of expressions as demagogical as yours. The Republican party is not any more responsible for the strikes in this country, than is free trade for the strikes in England. Strikes will occur wherever labor has the liberty to organize. There may have been strikes in Russia and Turkey, but I have never heard of them.

Apologies, allow me to quote from a recent article of the free trader, Edward Atkinson: "There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is now, or the price of goods relatively to the wages as low as they are to-day, nor a period when the workman, in the strictest sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a strictly and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product."

One, and One's Won.

On Wednesday evening of last week in the brilliantly lighted home of Mr. and Mrs. John Hauenstein there occurred the happy wedding of their daughter, Emily, to Mr. Fred Seiter, son of Mrs. Helen Seiter of this city. A large number of intimate friends and relatives were present as guests and the preparations that had been made to render the scene attractive and the event memorable were beautiful in every particular. At seven o'clock the ceremony was performed and as the soft sweet strains of the wedding march floated through the building the bridal procession entered the room and formed in the foreground of an arched window that was tastefully adorned with lovely flowers. At that moment it was a pretty scene. Three little girls, the very picture of sweetness, lead the group and carried baskets of roses. Then came the bride and groom attended by the Misses Frida Hauenstein and Emma and Ella Seiter and Mr. Oscar Seiter of St. Paul, Mr. F. W. Johnson and Mr. Henry Furst of Chicago. The bride was dressed in soft white silk, trimmed with rich lace and myrtle, and carried a bouquet of white roses. The bridesmaids were also dressed in white and wore roses.

Judge Brandt performed the marriage ceremony and at its close congratulations were tendered the young couple with a genuine feeling of good wishes. A tempting feast was then served to the guests and from that time until early in the morning the minutes winged their way pleasantly. Dancing occupied the time of both young and old and music by the Concordia Band, Pfander's Orchestra and the festive "charivari" added cheer to the joy of the occasion.

To the young couple who are now to be known as Mr. and Mrs. Seiter the Review extends congratulations, burdened with wishes for their mutual happiness. They are among the most popular young members of New Ulm society and deservedly so, for the pleasant disposition and kindly nature of each entitles them to friendship of the enduring kind. They will continue to make their residence in New Ulm and their acquaintances here will be pleased to know it.