

## THE TIN PLATE CIRCUS.

### SOME ORIGINAL TRICKS OF CLOWN M'KINLEY.

Statistician Peels the Question of Wages  
—Senator Daves Is Rattled—Rebates Favor Foreigners—Our "Happy Farmers"—Crockery Duties and Prices.

Performed at Philadelphia.

We doubt if there ever has been in any previous campaign anything comparable to the silliness of the "American tin" performances which Mr. McKinley and his associates have been guilty of. When McKinley spoke in Philadelphia Sept. 23, the following solemn buffoonery was gone through with in the Academy of Music, according to the Philadelphia Press:

"While he was telling of the new industries that had been built up in this country, a banner made of tin and bearing the inscription, 'American tin, 1892, made at Norristown,' was carried down the platform. The applause which greeted the appearance of the banner interrupted the Governor, and he turned and looked at the banner. 'Another trophy to a protective tariff' was his comment, and then cheers were given for American tin."

Col. McClure exposed the humbug of performance completely a few nights later, but the manager of the "American Tin Works at Norristown" has since added the final touch. He says the works have been shut down, and their sixty workmen thrown out of employment because of the delay in the arrival of material from Wales. There are, he says, 250 tons of plates on the way, all of which have been rolled in Wales, and that when the plates arrive, they will be shipped to the works in As for the sources of his tin supply, he says: "I purchase it from the importers in New York. It comes from various parts of the world, and I am frank in saying that although I have looked high and low for the American article, I have never seen it." He goes on to "give away" the entire business by adding:

"I am willing to tell the truth about this matter, and nothing but the truth, and therefore I mean exactly what I say—that the sheets, pig-tin, and palm oil are imported. Therefore, if at any time there should be a delay in the arrival of these materials, we would be compelled to shut down, as we have done this week. We have ten men at work this week, and they are all men who were employed in the factory at Wales."

That is the plain truth about the tin banner which McKinley pointed to with pride as the symbol of a new American industry. It was made entirely of foreign material, by foreign workmen imported for the purpose, and there was nothing American about it save the glamour of humbug which McKinley threw over it. His antics with it were only a little more intense than were those of the Republican candidate for the Vice-Presidency and Warner Miller at the Cooper Institute meeting here last week when they passed around among the audience "samples" of American tin made in a similar manner. The distribution of small plates among the school children of this city is another variation of the entertainment. What is to be said of the intellectual and moral caliber of a great party whose leading minds conceive that the people can be induced by such exhibitions as these to bear patiently a tax of \$25,000,000? The manager of the Norristown works says he has not been able to discover any American tin, and his testimony is confirmed by that of every other man who has tried to buy any. The entire product is absorbed in samples for mass meetings and Republican newspaper of fact windows, and much of it, like the Philadelphia banner, is made of foreign material. Temesal the mines, where the product was so much in dispute for a considerable period have been shut down because of failure of the ore, and the Tribune of to-day has tractored from Congressman Bowers the valuable opinion that they are full of tin, but that they have been shut down by their English owners in order to "freeze out" some of the stockholders. Mr. Bowers is convinced of this because he visited the mines and was not allowed to look into them!—New York Evening Post.

### Senator Daves Rattled.

The Question Clubs of Massachusetts have been putting some queries to Senator Daves in regard to the McKinley tax on wool, reminding him that he was in favor of free wool in 1860, and asking him if it was true, as reported in the Boston Journal, that he believed that "whatever raw material entering into manufacture here cannot be produced here in sufficient quantities, and at such cost as to make its use in manufacturing here profitable, it should be admitted free of duty." The Senator answered that he had been correctly quoted, and that "by that test the clause alluded to on the increasing the duty on carpet wools from 25 to 32 per cent" must be admitted free of duty. But he does not think the McKinley will "be best judged by placebos, any more than a house can be best judged by testing here and there a brick in it." That is to say, the Senator would be in favor of knocking out the wool brick and many others, in accordance with the demands of his constituents, but thinks the ridded McKinley edifice would still be fair to look upon. At any rate, he is unusually bold and frank for a Republican in a Presidential year, though we fear it must be charged to the fact that he is not seeking re-election. It is impossible to conceive of the Hon. Henry G. Lodge at this interesting political juncture, with Mr. Daves, that the "McKinley law is not perfect."—New York Evening Post.

### Jekyl-Hyde-Medill.

The following extract from an address delivered by Hon. Joseph Medill, editor of the Chicago Tribune, before the American Agricultural Association of the West, appeared in yesterday's Republic, but it is worth reproducing: "Understand the truth when I say that the farmers of the West and the planters of the South are charged \$500,000,000 a year for the taxes, and for the profit of protected Eastern manufacturers, more than is fair and necessary on the principle of live and let live."

This is Mr. Medill's real opinion, to which he gives utterance during three years and nine months out of every four years. During the remaining three months, just preceding a Presidential election, he advises the farmers of the West and the planters of the South to vote for a party that imposed and keeps up these unfair and unnecessary taxes.—St. Louis Republic.

### No Secrecy Asked by Labor.

Labor Commissioner Peck, of New York, who ought to be designated rather Commissioner for Capital Peck, states in his reply to the court at Albany that every time he sent out circulars asking for information he "Invariably gave pledges of secrecy."

It is a curious fact in the transactions carried on by Commissioner Peck that it was only protected monopolists who desired this pledge at his hands. Labor has asked no secrecy from Peck. If there be a workman from end to end of this country whose wages have been increased by the McKinley tariff, he will excuse Peck from keeping the secret. If the McKinley bill had raised the wages of any rank, or any division of workingmen, they would be eager to

proclaim the fact. Where are these men? Who are they? In what industry are they occupied? No workingman wants to rob a tariff law or any other law of the credit due for raising his wages. Labor asks no secrecy about its fortune under the McKinley law.—Chicago Herald.

### How Peck Is Supported.

In its attempt to bolster up the foolish and fraudulent figures put forth by Labor Commissioner Peck, the Johnstown Republican thus refers to the report of Commissioner Wadlin of Massachusetts:

"Labor Commissioner Horace G. Wadlin of Massachusetts has reported that wages have been increased in the Old Bay State, during the first year of the McKinley tariff."

We are greatly obliged to our contemporary for citing Commissioner Wadlin. Here is the testimony submitted by that very accurate and upright official.

1. Average annual increase of wages for the six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$12,16 Annual increase of wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .897

Decrease under McKinley tariff. .8919

2. Average annual increase in total wages for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$14,900,000 Annual increase in total wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .9,774,595

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$2,25,404

3. Average annual increase in manufactured product for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$23,700,000 Annual increase in manufactured product for 1892 under McKinley tariff. .8,078,903

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$16,631,947

The Massachusetts report shows that the McKinley tariff has stimulated the State's industrial growth, checking the increase for six years previous in the average wages, the total wages, the materials used, and the manufactured product. It has impaired the efficiency and reward of labor and deprived industry of the advance which six years had entitled it to expect. This is the result of McKinleyism in Massachusetts, dear Republican, and we have no doubt the result in the State of New York is substantially the same, the statements of the discredited and disgraced Peck to the contrary, notwithstanding.—Glover-Ville Standard.

### Wages in Building Trades.

That statistical evader of justice, Mr. Peck, has produced some more figures in which the protectionists seem to find great comfort. They purport to show that wages in the building trades increased from 1890 to 1891. As a matter of fact, wages in the building trades have been going up for many years, and, on the other hand, a headlong, thoughtless, open-mouthed follower of protection has now even supposed that carpenters, masons and people engaged in kindred pursuits owe their prosperity to the taxes which the Government levies on them.

There is no law on the statute book, and even Mr. McKinley would not undertake to invent one, that taxes houses imported from Europe, or roofs, or stairs or paved streets or ceilings. The art of driving a nail or carrying a hod is not taxed. And, as we all know, there is no duty on carpenters or engineers or lathers or stonecutters.

The wages in building trades have had a tendency to advance for at least half a century, and the great reason for their going up is because the men are more their own masters than are the hands employed in the trust of a single protected capitalist.

The mind that supposes that a bricklayer or a stair-builder can be protected by a tariff which increases the cost of his living, itself needs a protection that is far beyond the power of any statute to grant.

Perhaps such a mind may take its first step in intelligence by grappling with this problem. A correspondent of the world, who has the courage to sign his name, A. Marcroft, writes as follows:

"In this city carpenters are getting \$3.50 a day of eight hours; in Brooklyn they get \$3.25 per day of eight hours; in New York City \$3 per day of nine hours; in Hoboken they get \$2.75 per day of nine hours, and in Westchester County \$2.50 per day of ten hours."

How can the tariff account for these differences? It is an easy problem if tackled cautiously, and if no protection professor is consulted.—N. Y. World.

### Republican Romance Spoiled.

Lately the Republican papers outside of Indiana have been referring to an alleged report made by State Statistician Peels, showing an advance in wages since the enactment of the McKinley tariff. The Republican papers of this State are not referring to it, because no such report has ever been made in order to disprove this Republican falsehood. Statistician Peels makes the following statement for the record:

"I have made no report since the report for 1890 was issued. The report for 1891 will not be issued until the next Legislature convenes next January, when it will be submitted to them.

"That is to say, the Senator would be in favor of knocking out the wool brick and many others, in accordance with the demands of his constituents, but thinks the ridded McKinley edifice would still be fair to look upon. At any rate, he is unusually bold and frank for a Republican in a Presidential year, though we fear it must be charged to the fact that he is not seeking re-election. It is impossible to conceive of the Hon. Henry G. Lodge at this interesting political juncture, with Mr. Daves, that the "McKinley law is not perfect."—New York Evening Post.

It is a curious fact in the transactions carried on by Commissioner Peck that it was only protected monopolists who desired this pledge at his hands. Labor has asked no secrecy from Peck. If there be a workman from end to end of this country whose wages have been increased by the McKinley tariff, he will excuse Peck from keeping the secret. If the McKinley bill had raised the wages of any rank, or any division of workingmen, they would be eager to

proclaim the fact. Where are these men? Who are they? In what industry are they occupied? No workingman wants to rob a tariff law or any other law of the credit due for raising his wages. Labor asks no secrecy about its fortune under the McKinley law.—Chicago Herald.

### How Peck Is Supported.

In its attempt to bolster up the foolish and fraudulent figures put forth by Labor Commissioner Peck, the Johnstown Republican thus refers to the report of Commissioner Wadlin of Massachusetts:

"Labor Commissioner Horace G. Wadlin of Massachusetts has reported that wages have been increased in the Old Bay State, during the first year of the McKinley tariff."

We are greatly obliged to our contemporary for citing Commissioner Wadlin. Here is the testimony submitted by that very accurate and upright official.

1. Average annual increase of wages for the six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$12,16 Annual increase of wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .897

Decrease under McKinley tariff. .8919

2. Average annual increase in total wages for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$14,900,000 Annual increase in total wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .9,774,595

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$2,25,404

3. Average annual increase in manufactured product for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$23,700,000 Annual increase in manufactured product for 1892 under McKinley tariff. .8,078,903

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$16,631,947

The Massachusetts report shows that the McKinley tariff has stimulated the State's industrial growth, checking the increase for six years previous in the average wages, the total wages, the materials used, and the manufactured product. It has impaired the efficiency and reward of labor and deprived industry of the advance which six years had entitled it to expect. This is the result of McKinleyism in Massachusetts, dear Republican, and we have no doubt the result in the State of New York is substantially the same, the statements of the discredited and disgraced Peck to the contrary, notwithstanding.—Glover-Ville Standard.

That statistical evader of justice, Mr. Peck, has produced some more figures in which the protectionists seem to find great comfort. They purport to show that wages in the building trades increased from 1890 to 1891. As a matter of fact, wages in the building trades have been going up for many years, and, on the other hand, a headlong, thoughtless, open-mouthed follower of protection has now even supposed that carpenters, masons and people engaged in kindred pursuits owe their prosperity to the taxes which the Government levies on them.

There is no law on the statute book, and even Mr. McKinley would not undertake to invent one, that taxes houses imported from Europe, or roofs, or stairs or paved streets or ceilings. The art of driving a nail or carrying a hod is not taxed. And, as we all know, there is no duty on carpenters or engineers or lathers or stonecutters.

The mind that supposes that a bricklayer or a stair-builder can be protected by a tariff which increases the cost of his living, itself needs a protection that is far beyond the power of any statute to grant.

Perhaps such a mind may take its first step in intelligence by grappling with this problem. A correspondent of the world, who has the courage to sign his name, A. Marcroft, writes as follows:

"In this city carpenters are getting \$3.50 a day of eight hours; in Brooklyn they get \$3.25 per day of eight hours; in New York City \$3 per day of nine hours; in Hoboken they get \$2.75 per day of nine hours, and in Westchester County \$2.50 per day of ten hours."

How can the tariff account for these differences? It is an easy problem if tackled cautiously, and if no protection professor is consulted.—N. Y. World.

Republican Romance Spoiled.

Lately the Republican papers outside of Indiana have been referring to an alleged report made by State Statistician Peels, showing an advance in wages since the enactment of the McKinley tariff. The Republican papers of this State are not referring to it, because no such report has ever been made in order to disprove this Republican falsehood. Statistician Peels makes the following statement for the record:

"I have made no report since the report for 1890 was issued. The report for 1891 will not be issued until the next Legislature convenes next January, when it will be submitted to them.

"That is to say, the Senator would be in favor of knocking out the wool brick and many others, in accordance with the demands of his constituents, but thinks the ridded McKinley edifice would still be fair to look upon. At any rate, he is unusually bold and frank for a Republican in a Presidential year, though we fear it must be charged to the fact that he is not seeking re-election. It is impossible to conceive of the Hon. Henry G. Lodge at this interesting political juncture, with Mr. Daves, that the "McKinley law is not perfect."—New York Evening Post.

It is a curious fact in the transactions carried on by Commissioner Peck that it was only protected monopolists who desired this pledge at his hands. Labor has asked no secrecy from Peck. If there be a workman from end to end of this country whose wages have been increased by the McKinley tariff, he will excuse Peck from keeping the secret. If the McKinley bill had raised the wages of any rank, or any division of workingmen, they would be eager to

proclaim the fact. Where are these men? Who are they? In what industry are they occupied? No workingman wants to rob a tariff law or any other law of the credit due for raising his wages. Labor asks no secrecy about its fortune under the McKinley law.—Chicago Herald.

### How Peck Is Supported.

In its attempt to bolster up the foolish and fraudulent figures put forth by Labor Commissioner Peck, the Johnstown Republican thus refers to the report of Commissioner Wadlin of Massachusetts:

"Labor Commissioner Horace G. Wadlin of Massachusetts has reported that wages have been increased in the Old Bay State, during the first year of the McKinley tariff."

We are greatly obliged to our contemporary for citing Commissioner Wadlin. Here is the testimony submitted by that very accurate and upright official.

1. Average annual increase of wages for the six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$12,16 Annual increase of wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .897

Decrease under McKinley tariff. .8919

2. Average annual increase in total wages for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$14,900,000 Annual increase in total wages for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .9,774,595

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$2,25,404

3. Average annual increase in manufactured product for six years previous to the enactment of the McKinley tariff. \$23,700,000 Annual increase in manufactured product for 1892 under the McKinley tariff. .8,078,903

Decrease under McKinley tariff. \$16,631,947

The Massachusetts report shows that the McKinley tariff has stimulated the State's industrial growth, checking the increase for six years previous in the average wages, the total wages, the materials used, and the manufactured product. It has impaired the efficiency and reward of labor and deprived industry of the advance which six years had entitled it to expect. This is the result of McKinleyism in Massachusetts, dear Republican, and we have no doubt the result in the State of New York is substantially the same, the statements of the discredited and disgraced Peck to the contrary, notwithstanding.—Glover-Ville Standard.

That statistical evader of justice, Mr. Peck, has produced some more figures in which the protectionists seem to find great comfort. They purport to show that wages in the building trades increased from 1890 to 1891. As a matter of fact, wages in the building trades have been going up for many years, and, on the other hand, a headlong, thoughtless, open-mouthed follower of protection has now even supposed that carpenters, masons and people engaged in kindred pursuits owe their prosperity to the taxes which the Government levies on them.

The mind that supposes that a bricklayer or a stair-builder can be protected by a tariff which increases the cost of his living, itself needs a protection that is far beyond the power of any statute to grant.

Perhaps such a mind may take its first step in intelligence by grappling with this problem. A correspondent of the world, who has the courage to sign his name, A. Marcroft, writes as follows:

"In this city carpenters are getting \$3.50 a day of eight hours; in Brooklyn they get \$3.25 per day of eight hours; in New York City \$3 per day of nine hours; in Hoboken they get \$2.75 per day of nine hours, and in Westchester County \$2.50 per day of ten hours."

How can the tariff account for these differences? It is an easy problem if tackled cautiously, and if no protection professor is consulted.—N. Y. World.

### Republican Romance Spoiled.

Lately the Republican papers outside of Indiana have been referring to an alleged report made by State Statistician Peels, showing an advance in wages since the enactment of the McKinley tariff. The Republican papers of this State are