

not that alone. Nor that the priests are mercenary—corruption among the leaders is not the worst that can happen. But when the leaders are corrupt and the people know it and love to have it so; when the people themselves have been debauched—what hope is there for the community; what will ye do in the end thereof?

We are not discouraged by the indifference of people. They can be shaken out of that; ignorance can be overcome; prejudices can be broken. But what can be done when the moral fiber of the community has decayed? When courage is gone, and a city is cowed by its political bosses; when self-respect is done, and the people seem scarcely to realize their shame; when greed has well-nigh claimed all hearts, so that the scoundrel is not despised for his evil deeds, but honored for his success and envied for his spoils; when the universal guilt puts on a cynical laugh, and truth is answered by a silent shrug of the shoulders—that is hell.

It would be sad indeed to believe that anywhere in this country such a condition has actually been reached. Such a belief would paralyze every effort for human betterment. Pessimism is the doctrine of despair. We need preachers of hope. But optimism does not mean blindness. There are enough signs of moral decay in certain of our communities to suggest a terrible warning to those who love our free institutions; signs which should impel them to their utmost effort to stem the tide of evil which threatens to sweep away the foundations of the republic.

This decay of public morals is most in evidence in our cities.

Our magazines have been flooded with articles portraying what Jeremiah would have called an astonishing and horrible thing. Our cities have fallen into the hands of politicians who have made an alliance with our public corporations for purposes of public plunder.

The methods of these thieves are an open secret.

Those who keep unlawful resorts made to pay tribute to the bosses. The law, which was intended for the discouragement of vice is used for purposes of blackmail. These laws are not enforced, save as a penalty for those who wish to break the laws but refuse to pay the bosses for the privilege.

Contractors doing public work are compelled to include in their bids the commission which is demanded by the political machine. The arbitrary power which inspectors have of accepting or rejecting materials is sufficient to ruin any contractor who is foolhardy enough

to undertake public work without becoming a party to the conspiracy.

The public pay roll is padded, and wages are paid in the name of men who are dead, or of those who never lived, for work which is never done, but for which taxes are collected.

The great daily papers are bribed by contracts for public printing which the bosses give out at extravagant prices. For instance, the public printing in Cincinnati is divided between two Republican papers, each receiving \$18,000 a year. Recently a law was passed requiring public printing to be given to Democratic papers also, and the Cincinnati Enquirer, claiming to be a Democratic paper and the only one, gets all the printing, which amounts to about \$36,000 a year, minus the share which goes to the machine. This paper has not supported a Democratic ticket since 1896, except once, when its owner was a candidate. It is Democratic for purposes of public printing only.

Undoubtedly, the most prolific source of corruption is in the granting of franchises. It is the common belief that enormous bribes are given for those privileges, and political accidents, such as the nomination of Joseph W. Folk, occasionally give us a glimpse into the political depths.

In order to make it appear that these frauds are acquiesced in by the people, fictitious majorities are secured by padded registration lists, and professional "repeaters" are employed to go from precinct to precinct, voting under assumed names, under the direction of city officials, and with the protection of the police.

What shall we say of cities like Cincinnati and Philadelphia, where these conditions prevail year after year without provoking a storm of indignation?

Some say the people do not know. Then let us work patiently for their enlightenment.

Some say the people do know and do not care.

If this is true, it is an "astonishing and horrible thing."

WOOLEN INDUSTRY BLIGHTED BY HIGH TARIFF.

THE SHEEP AND THE GOATS.

No important industry better illustrates the blighting effects of tariff taxation than that of the manufacture of woollens. The high duties placed upon its chief raw material, wool, in 1867, have been but slightly changed since, except for the three years, 1895, 1896 and 1897. The duties on raw wool have averaged about 44 per cent. since 1867, while the duties on manufactured wools have averaged over 80 per cent. During the last three years the duties on raw wools

have averaged over 52 per cent., while the duties on manufactures of wools have averaged about 94 per cent., under the McKinley and Dingley bills. Surely the virtues of protection must show in this government-favored industry! What are the results?

The woollen industry has been declining rapidly as compared with other important, though less protected, industries and as compared with our increasing population. In the following table the increase in population is compared with the increase in the value of woollen manufactures, and with the increase in cotton manufactures—the other important textile industry and one whose chief raw material, cotton, is on the free list:

| Year. | PER CENT. OF INCREASE. | | |
|-------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Popu- lation. | Cotton. man'ct' res. | Woolen. man'ct' res. |
| 1890 | 21.85 | 23.58 | 9.88 |
| 1880 | 50.21 | 76.58 | 24.75 |
| 1870 | 97.59 | 91.1 | 49.06 |

Thus, while the value of cotton manufactures has more than kept pace with our growing population since 1880, and has almost kept pace since 1870, the value of our woollen manufactures has not half kept pace with our population since 1890 or 1880, and has barely half kept pace since 1870. This means that the per capita value of woollen goods produced in this country is declining from year to year, is less now than in 1890 or 1880, and is 25 per cent. less than in 1870, the decline being from \$5.17 per capita in 1870, to \$3.89 in 1900.

Could there be a more withering criticism of our protective system than is shown by the sad results of this industry? The attempt to compel the people to pay nearly twice the normal price for woollens has resulted: (1) in blighting the industry that was to be protected and built up, and (2) in preventing the people from wearing warm, substantial clothing, and (3) in forcing them to wear shoddy and cotton clothes.

The doctors and undertakers who treat or bury the victims of improper clothing, are the real beneficiaries of taxed wool and woollens.

Nor do we get better results if we consider the effects of "protection" upon the prices of wool or upon the wool growers. According to the census report, the average cost of scoured wool declined from 56.56 cents per pound in 1880, to 45.46 cents in 1890, and to 37.71 cents in 1900. This same report tells us that the per capita consumption of wool declined from 8.52 pounds in 1880, and 8.75 pounds in 1890, to 5.97 pounds in 1900. And this decline has occurred in spite of the fact that we imported more than three times as many pounds of raw wool in 1900 as in 1870. Practically, all of the reduction in consumption is due to the reduced production of domestic wools. And here, again, the reduction in the home supply of wool has occurred in spite of the great increase in the amount and proportion of coarse wools and of mohair (included with wool in the 1900 census), to the fine wools produced. As a matter of fact, the number of sheep east

of the Mississippi river and north of Mason and Dixon's line, which included the fine wool section when high protection was first applied, is now less than one-half what it was in 1867, and their value is probably only one-fourth what it was then.

The following extracts from the 1900 census, compiled by Republicans and protectionists, tell a part of the sad tale of this tariff demoralized industry:

The year 1900 was an unfortunate one for an official investigation of the wool manufacture. . . . The machinery in many mills was only in partial operation, or run on part time. . . . Like the preceding year, it was marked by unusual conditions, both as to the chief raw material and manufactured products. . . . The sudden changes in wool prices, and the strenuous competition for business, led to the failure of many large and until then prosperous concerns.

The quantity of wool consumed in woolen mills in 1900 was only nine-tenths of the quantity consumed in 1890 and was about 30,000,000 pounds less than was used in 1880.

The quantity of shoddy used in these mills was 66,856,106 pounds. The proportion of clean shoddy and clean wool used were respectively 31.5 and 43.1 per cent. of the raw material consumed in the card wool manufactures.

The use of shoddy has made possible a greater supply of warm clothing than could have been obtained without it, while the mixture of cotton and cotton yarn with wool has made possible the production of soft, light-weight fabrics, well adapted for use where lightness, moderate warmth and low cost are desired, and consequently the people are better clad than before these combinations were devised.

In discussing the hosiery and knit goods industry the census reports says:

The quantity of wool used has decreased 3,685,486 pounds. . . . The use of cotton and cotton yarns has increased greatly, and in consequence the whole character of the industry has altered. In 1890, 22,432,617 pounds of cotton and 33,248,849 pounds of cotton yarn were used in this industry. In 1900 the demand for cotton goods had so increased that 44,461,301 pounds of raw cotton and 131,620,068 pounds of cotton yarn were necessary, which would require approximately 160,000,000 pounds of cotton for its production, making the total quantity of cotton used in this manufacture 200,000,000 pounds, costing \$25,766,510, compared with 17,453,007 pounds of wool used, which cost \$5,292,135.

In our underwear we now have only two-thirds as much wool as in 1890, and the average underwear contains eight times as much cotton as wool.

The paragraph from the census extolling the virtues of shoddy (old rags ground up) displays the happy temperament and optimistic mind of the protectionist—when his party is in power; and his wonderful skill in transforming adversity to prosperity—on paper. He puts his protection glasses before the shivering, shoddy victim, and immediately the poor fellow begins to feel a "moderate warmth." He is then, supposedly, ready to give thanks to the Republican party which, having made it impossible for him to wear real woolen clothes, did not

compel him to go stark naked, but, kindly and humanely, permitted him to wear "soft, light-weight and low-cost" shoddy and cotton clothes. Well may we feel proud of our sanguine census makers for their ability, by inserting these side remarks, to give warmth and color to what would otherwise be cold and gloomy statistics of adversity. We can have nothing but prosperity while the party of protection and shoddy is on deck.

The greatest prosperity experienced by the woolen industry in many years was during the three years of free wool and low duties on wools, in 1895, 1896 and 1897. More wool was consumed, both domestic and foreign, and more yards of woolen goods produced, than before or since. During these three years the per capita consumption of wool averaged 9.59 pounds. During the five years since, it has averaged only 5.95 pounds. Thus, during the three Wilson bill years we consumed far more wool than in any four years since, and almost as much as during the whole five years since.

Deprived of wool by high tariff duties, the people have taken to wearing shoddy and cotton. Ours is the only important country that taxes raw wool. All other countries recognize that no one country produces all kinds of wool, and that many varieties of wool must be mixed to produce substantial, well-finished and marketable goods. As Mr. William Lloyd Garrison says:

To expect to make the United States supply all grades of wool by passing a Congressional edict, is as vain as to declare by statute that Massachusetts shall have the climate of Italy, or South Carolina that of Russia. It follows of necessity that our manufacturers must either import the wools not grown in this country, or limit the range and quality of their product.

Free wool, then, does not mean a lessened demand for home grown wools. Nor does it mean lower prices for them. In fact, it is difficult to detect any effect upon prices of domestic wools, of high or low duties on wool.

Protection having proven a flat failure, both as to the wool grower and the woolen manufacturer, the Republicans of the Agricultural department at Washington are now advising the farmers to try to raise Angora goats as a substitute for sheep. They are telling New England farmers that these goats are just the things to reclaim the many abandoned farms in their territory. The Republicans have already begun to call the hair of this goat (mohair) wool, and to include it with the genuine article in their statistics. But for this statistical fiction our wool figures would make a more sorry spectacle than they now do.

Will calling a goat a sheep make it one? Will the farmers bite at this goat bait? How much longer can the Republicans fool the farmers? These are vital questions.

BYRON W. HOLT.

A definition of the difference between "Old School" and "New School" has been given thus: "The children of

the Old School Presbyterians sin as soon as they are born, and the children of the New School Presbyterians as soon as they know how."—Woman's Journal.

DIRGE.

I'm sure they'd take my manuscripts
And spare me all these pangs,
If I were called Frank Harding Peck
Or Richard Dempster Bangs.
Oh, would I were Kate Seton Hobbes,
Or Robert Caldwell Higgins,
Or Josephine McEnery Vance,
Or Thomas Daskam Wiggins.
Each one of these sonorous names
Adds envy to my sins;
For all of them are triplets born,
While mine are only twins.
—The Whim.

"I dunno about it bein' altogether a good thing to hold these expositions," said Uncle Josh. "It gets them foreigners sendin' goods over here and if some of 'em are cheap and attractive it may be a temptation to our people to buy 'em, thus underminin' our infant industries which are strugglin' so hard to hold their own ag'in' the pauper labor of Europe."

"Yes; that's so," said Uncle Silas. "But, then, on the other hand, it helps us to get a line on them pauper-labor-made goods, and when we find out which of 'em is the cheapest and most attractive, and therefore the most dangerous to our prosperity, why, we can boost the tariff up on them particular goods higher than it is now!"

And Uncle Josh was forced to admit that, even from a protectionist point of view, international expositions might have their uses.—Puck.

Some days ago two little fellows of seven or eight years heard older people speaking of skeletons. The seven-year-old listened intently to the conversation, when the elder boy, with an air of superior knowledge, said abruptly:

"You don't know what a skeleton is; I do."

"So do I!" replied the younger. "I know. I know for certain, I do."

"Well, now, what is it?"

"It's bones with the people off!"—Lippincott's Magazine.

An American heiress was wooed by a foreign prince, who urgently besought her to become his wife. In order to test the sincerity of his love, she asked: "Will you marry me if I give away all my money for charity, and become as poor as yourself?"

The prince considered awhile, and then responded: "Yes, provided you will still marry me if I renounce my title