

## IN SPITE OF CLARKSON.

MR. LEONARD BROWN, OF IOWA, IS OBDRATE.

Specious Casuistry Wasted by the Post office Mogul on a Dissent from the Infamous Legislative Enactments Proposed by the Republicans.

[Des Moines Cor. Chicago Herald.]

Some interesting correspondence showing the trend of public sentiment away from the Republican party in Iowa has just been published here. The first letter is from First Assistant Postmaster General James S. Clarkson, written to Leonard Brown, of this city, remonstrating with the latter gentleman because he had denounced the Harrison administration for its autocratic tendencies, and the Republicans in Congress for defeating the free coinage of silver and for urging the passage of the Lodge force bill. Mr. Brown is a prominent figure in Iowa among the industrial classes. He is a writer of force upon industrial questions, and an orator of rare power and genius. Clarkson recognized his strength when he took him East in the Presidential campaign and kept him on the stump continuously all the time in the doubtful States. Fully aware of what effect his defection will have on the Republican party, Mr. Clarkson has written him a letter full of flattering allusions and praise of that organization. He begs Mr. Brown, when he raises his hand to voice to strike at President Harrison, "to remember that he had a boyhood of poverty; that the best blood of America came down to him through men who proved their patriotism in every time of the country's need; that he went to the war for the Union and offered his life; that he has remained poor despite his large legal practice and his public office—he is not worth \$10,000 to-day."

But Leonard Brown is obdurate and fails to be convinced by Mr. Clarkson's pathetic appeal. He quotes from Mr. Clarkson's own paper a serious indictment of the reigning powers at Washington, wherein it is charged that the creditor class control legislation and that the executive officers of the administration are in line with this policy, interpreting the statutes to the extreme limit in that direction. He then contends that the free coinage of silver was demanded by the platforms of all the political parties, and was defeated in Congress by the threat of a Presidential veto. With regard to the poor people of the South and the Lodge election bill, Mr. Brown says:

We are treading on dangerous ground when we would take the ballot box out of the hands of the people. Capital menaces labor today. The capitalist has a complete monopoly, nothing but the right of labor. He cares nothing for the rights of the poor man. He cares nothing for American liberty. That is the rule, to which, to the honor of human nature, there have been and are glorious exceptions. But the love of money is still the "root of all evil." It is true that the "less than a quarter of a million of persons" who practically "own the American Republic" own the courts, own Congress and the President. Our government to-day obeys implicitly the commands of the rich men, and is deaf to the voice of the people. The petitions of the toiling millions, white and black, go unregarded. Under the pretext of "protecting industry," it enriches a few. Under the pretext of "protecting the public debt," it pillages the Treasury, buying in its obligations at 127 per cent, thus making a present of hundreds of millions of dollars to millionaire bond owners, until, after twenty years, the amount of our national debt—though 60 per cent of it has already been paid—measured by the number of days' work, bushels of wheat, bales of cotton and barrels of pork that would be required to pay it, is as much now as it was in 1868.

This accursed policy has resulted in piling upon the farms of the Mississippi Valley mortgages amounting, according to General Butler, to \$4,500,000,000, and reducing prices of farm products below the cost of production. Under the pretext of "protecting the currency" it stops the coinage of silver, creates a money "as good as gold" to the usurers, but that will not pay a mortgage debt when otherwise especially stipulated, in the mortgage, which is already being done by the loan and trust companies, and opens the way for indefinite currency contraction by "booming" the price of silver to where it was prior to 1860, above par with gold. Under the pretext of "preserving and protecting the freedom of the ballot" it aims at the destruction of popular liberty by taking the ballot-box from under the control and supervision of the people and placing it under the control and placing it under the control and supervision of irresponsible agents of an irresponsible party, elected by Federal President and representatives, placing the nation above the States, as England is above Ireland, centering the powers of government in a junta of dictators for life and destroying the power of the people.

The Lodge bill is a bad law. It is the culmination of a series of bad laws. It is the dagger plunged into the heart of the American republic—not accidentally but designately—the result of a conspiracy of plutocracy to destroy democratic liberty. It is the winding up of American liberty and the inauguration of an autocratic and plutocratic despotism. Before I will set the ballot-box wrenched from the hands of the trusted elect by the power of hands and make it the ballot-box of the "quarantine" of United States marshals, appointed by a life-appointed "supervisor," appointed by a life-appointed judge, appointed by a President elected at a "supervised" election, I will give up willingly my life upon the scaffold, as Sir Henry Vane did his, as Sir Walter Raleigh did his, as Robert Emmet did his. I love my country as intensely as did Warren, so I believe. I love the flag of my country with as deep a fervor as did Jasper, so I fondly think; but "loyalty to the Government and the flag" will cease in my heart the moment the ballot-box has been wrenched by Federal usurpation from the hands of the people.

The Western farmer, who is being urged to demand the privilege of paying an enhanced price for his tinware in order to sell more grain in Pittsburgh, should take this little lesson to heart.

### Foreign and Home Prices.

Much has been said about the fact that the price of farm machinery has steadily decreased under the protective tariff. While nobody denies the fact that the price has decreased, some have maintained that it was owing to other causes than the tariff, and claimed that the tariff has prevented the price of these machines from going still lower. To prove this they have claimed that our manufacturers have really sold and are now selling their wares abroad cheaper than they sell them at home. This claim has been denied, but now it appears that tangible proof of its correctness has been found. The Ann Arbor (Mich.) Agricultural Machinery Co. advertises by publishing cuts of its implements, with the price annexed. These cuts have been published in both foreign and home papers. Cuts which are identically the same are published in a Spanish paper and in an American paper. The following table gives the result of the comparison:

Spanish American  
Price. Price.  
Advance plow... \$5.00 \$18  
Adv. ice plow... 4.00 8  
Hayrader... 32.00 65  
Harrow... 4.00 6  
Horse rake... 17.0 23  
Cunning feed cutter, No. 3... 60.0 19  
Ann Arbor cutter, No. 2... 25.0 10  
Ann Arbor cutter, No. 1... 16.0 8  
Clip cutter... 1.0 18  
Cultivator... 4.25 30  
Level cutter... 22.0 30  
Sweep... 60.0 90  
Or an aggregate difference of \$155.20.

We do not publish these figures to prove any preconceived idea. They are facts, and are submitted as such. — *Northwestern Mail.*

### A Urgent Question.

"If reciprocity," said Mr. Plumb, "is in the mind of any one, why not make that reciprocity wide enough to take in all nations with which the United States could establish trade in products of which there is bound to be an excessive supply beyond the home demand?" That is a very urgent question, and no man on

the Republican side in the Senate, or in the House, who supports the McKinley bill, dares to give a truthful answer to it. The real answer is that reciprocity would expose to fair competition wealthy men who depend on tariff favors for their great profits, and who are ready to pay for these favors. There is absolutely no other reason. The thousands of manufacturers whose skill, enterprise, pluck, and business capacity would enable them to compete with all the world in a fair field are ready for such mutual trade; but the favorites of the tariff know that the moment this is undertaken their exactions must cease, and they will fight it to the last. The people of the United States, however, are coming day by day to see the facts as they are, and the time is not far distant when the power of these monopolists to block the progress of the country will be taken away. — *New York Times.*

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

If the tin-plate cannot be manufactured in this country with a tax of 34½ per cent on consumers, it should not be manufactured at all.

It is an attractive theory, and it is not to be wondered at that the farmer has been attracted by it. The wonder is that he has not learned long since that it is only a theory, and that the facts do not support it. One would think he would have learned this, when, after nearly thirty years of experience with the workings of the home market theory, he finds himself still dependent on foreign countries for a market for his surplus products and for the price in his home market. Perhaps he has learned it—at all events there are some indications this year that he is no longer following the home market theorists as blindly as he once did. But if he has not learned it, the indications are that the forthcoming census will open his eyes completely.

Among the instructive facts which the census will show are the workings of the "home market" theory in Connecticut. This State, as every farmer knows, has been one of the chief beneficiaries of the protective tariff by reason of the number and importance of its manufacturing establishments. Here, if anywhere, the beauties of the protective system and the resultant fruit of the "home market" should show themselves. But, alas! for the "home market theory." From the figures already received by the *New York Evening Post* has constructed a table showing that the theory in Connecticut has proven a lamentable failure. In this table each of the twelve cities of the State has been selected as the center of the group of farm towns lying nearest it—the towns which should profit by the establishment of a "home market." "In a large number of cases," says the *Post*, "the farm towns selected adjoin the city, which is their natural market, and in no case are they more than a few miles away. The population by the last two censuses of these twelve 'farm groups,' consisting of the three rural towns nearest each of the cities—except in the case of Hartford, the State capital, where four towns are taken—is approximately as follows:

Group.	Population	Population
New Haven	2,491	2,801
Bridgeport	6,500	5,120
Stamford	2,211	1,923
Waterbury	2,911	2,179
Meriden	3,767	3,317
New Britain	3,215	3,028
Wethersfield	2,677	3,408
Danbury	5,631	5,035
New London	2,680	2,210
Middletown	3,75	3,384
Rockville	4,437	4,030
Total	48,815	48,567

On this table the *Post* comments thus: "The decrease, subject to very slight revision in the final returns, during the ten years in these twelve groups is 4,748, or about 10 per cent. In the thirty-seven 'farm towns nearest cities' which make up the whole twelve groups, two or three towns have been used twice over, in cases where they adjoin two cities—a point to which the ardent protectionist cannot object, as in that case the farm town is supposed to receive 'protective' benefits from both its urban neighbors. It will be observed also that in only a single group of towns there has been a gain of population during the ten years, and in that but the merest trifle. The figures, however, derive their chief value from the fact that they test and vitiate the 'truck-farm' and 'proximate-farm-town' theory on the choicest protection ground—in a New England State, in towns close to bustling and prosperous cities, where the farmer may be supposed to encounter no problems of transportation, and where the competition—in 'garden sass' at least, with other regions of the country is reduced to its lowest terms."

The Western farmer, who is being urged to demand the privilege of paying an enhanced price for his tinware in order to sell more grain in Pittsburgh, should take this little lesson to heart.

### Foreign and Home Prices.

Much has been said about the fact that the price of farm machinery has steadily decreased under the protective tariff. While nobody denies the fact that the price has decreased, some have maintained that it was owing to other causes than the tariff, and claimed that the tariff has prevented the price of these machines from going still lower. To prove this they have claimed that our manufacturers have really sold and are now selling their wares abroad cheaper than they sell them at home. This claim has been denied, but now it appears that tangible proof of its correctness has been found. The Ann Arbor (Mich.) Agricultural Machinery Co. advertises by publishing cuts of its implements, with the price annexed. These cuts have been published in both foreign and home papers. Cuts which are identically the same are published in a Spanish paper and in an American paper. The following table gives the result of the comparison:

Spanish American	Price.	Price.
Advance plow	\$5.00	\$18
Adv. ice plow	4.00	8
Hayrader	32.00	65
Harrow	4.00	6
Horse rake	17.0	23
Cunning feed cutter, No. 3	60.0	19
Ann Arbor cutter, No. 2	25.0	10
Ann Arbor cutter, No. 1	16.0	8
Clip cutter	1.0	18
Cultivator	4.25	30
Level cutter	22.0	30
Sweep	60.0	90

Or an aggregate difference of \$155.20. We do not publish these figures to prove any preconceived idea. They are facts, and are submitted as such. — *Northwestern Mail.*

the Republican side in the Senate, or in the House, who supports the McKinley bill, dares to give a truthful answer to it. The real answer is that reciprocity would expose to fair competition wealthy men who depend on tariff favors for their great profits, and who are ready to pay for these favors. There is absolutely no other reason. The thousands of manufacturers whose skill, enterprise, pluck, and business capacity would enable them to compete with all the world in a fair field are ready for such mutual trade; but the favorites of the tariff know that the moment this is undertaken their exactions must cease, and they will fight it to the last. The people of the United States, however, are coming day by day to see the facts as they are, and the time is not far distant when the power of these monopolists to block the progress of the country will be taken away. — *New York Times.*

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.

### Tin Plate.

Tin plate was always admitted free until 1842, when it was taxed 2½ per cent, and that increased to 15 per cent in 1846 to increase revenue. In 1857 it was reduced to 8 per cent, and it was increased to 10 per cent in 1861, and again increased in 1862 to 25 per cent as a war measure, and reduced to 15 per cent in 1872. In 1875 the duty was made specific at 1.1 cents per pound. In 1882 the tin plate combine was formed that is now demanding the monstrous tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum on the people for the benefit of a few monopolists, and it then appealed to Congress to increase the duty to 2½ cents per pound. There was such a popular revulsion against it that Congress was compelled not only to refuse the demand of the extortionate combine but to reduce the tax to one cent per pound, and it has remained at that figure until now.