

INDUSTRIAL WORLD

AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST.

DEVOTED TO HOME INDUSTRIES, COMMERCE, FINANCE, INSURANCE, RAILROADS AND MINING

Vol. II.—No. 36.

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1881.

\$3 PER ANNUM.

Industrial World
 AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST
 Published weekly, by the INDUSTRIAL WORLD PUBLISHING COMPANY,
 100 FINE ARTS BUILDING, NEW YORK.
 OFFICES:
 BOSTON, CHICAGO, CINCINNATI, CLEVELAND, DETROIT, PITTSBURGH,
 PHILADELPHIA, RICHMOND, ST. LOUIS, ST. PAUL, WASHINGTON.
 All communications, and all letters, must be addressed to
 INDUSTRIAL WORLD PUBLISHING CO.,
 P. O. DRAWER 100, NEW YORK, N. Y.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS.

Free Trade in the States	Page 145
Official Report on Prof. Hurd's Charges	146 & 147
Commercial and Industrial Press	148
Current and Weekly Review	149
Practical—Mining	150
Insurance	151
Current and Weekly Review	152
Trade	153
Insurance	154
Money Market—Trade Directory	155
Trade	157
	158

TRADE IN THE STATES.

The activity of the Free Trade party in the States, the Chicago *Journal of Commerce* writes on the part of those who favor the free trade encouragement of home industries. It says: "At no other period of our history have the Free Traders been so active, so vigorous, so dangerous, nor, at any former period, has popular mind been so widely and so earnestly awakened to interest in the tariff question. The literature, with the publications of kindred kind in the United States, has been profusely all over the west, especially among the farmers, where the Free Trade and Protection has been the topic of conversation at ordinary gatherings, at public meetings, and of discussion in the school-room, debating clubs. We are in constant contact with letters asking for information, campaign answers to particular questions; and we are daily urged by mail to direct attention to the need of educating the public mind, in preparation for the Congressional elections next year. A member of a prominent law firm in Iowa writes as follows:—

"I am aware that this Free Trade question is forcing its way to the front, and is being discussed in all the schools of the country. It is very important that accurate information should be thoroughly and widely disseminated, so that they may not be misled by shallow and plausible arguments based upon perverted or distorted statistics."

A weekly paper in this State writes as follows: "The probability that the question of protection will form one of the issues of the next campaign, I suggest that Protection leaguers be throughout the State. I think the question will be better prepared the Protectionists will be the better prepared the chances of success." Communications of like tenor are being received from the Industrial League of America, the Free Trade Club of Chicago. In the laboring districts of this and other cities, the tariff comes up for discussion at almost every one of their regular meetings. The New York Free Trade Club is daily sending out pamphlets and circulars. The Colden Club has two special agents in the States—one placed at New York and Chicago. It also has in its employ a travelling emissary, whose duty it is to transmit information to the local agents, and forward it to the central office. A society of Free Traders has been formed in the city of New York, and distributes literature designed to enlighten the people against the policy of tariff protection. A Brooklyn organization has been formed with the Rev. HARRY WARD BEECHER as its pastor, which has for its object the total abolition of tariff protection, and the substitution of Free Trade and simple. The *Christian Union*—a weekly newspaper of wide circulation and high character, and the personal organ of Mr. Beecher

—has been made the medium of communicating these ultra views. And now as the list of these progressive movements, we have the one described in the following telegram to the Associated Press:—

"Washington, Feb. 25.—A dinner was given to-night to represent the Hurd, of Ohio, to a number of Democratic members of Congress, well known Free Trade practitioners. About thirty members were present, and initial steps were taken toward forming a congressional organization in the interest of Free Trade, and to commence an aggressive Free Trade campaign throughout the country. The following gentlemen, members-elect of the next Congress, were selected as officers of the association: S. S. Cox, of New York, President; W. R. Morrison, of Illinois, John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, R. Q. Mills, of Texas, J. Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, Vice-Presidents. Speeches were made by Messrs. Hurd, Cox, Springer, Lefevre, Knott, Morrison, Townsend and others. Nearly all declared themselves in favor of making Free Trade a prominent feature of the Democratic policy from this time forth, with a view to making it a leading national issue in 1881."

After referring to the results that would follow a radical change, the *Journal of Commerce* concludes: "Shall we defend our industrial interests, or shall we let them go in default? Unless the friends of American industry awaken to a full realization of the danger at hand, we shall certainly be beaten in the coming contest. There are plenty of evidences that, if the naked issue of 'a tariff for revenue' or 'a tariff for protection' should be put to the people, without an electioneering canvass sufficiently long and intense to educate the popular mind, the verdict of the ballot box would be in favor of a revenue measure. It is true that an illumination of sufficing would follow this unfortunate choice, and that a revulsion of views among the voting masses would be the result, yet incalculable losses, damage, and distress would be requisite to reach that end—processes which can be avoided by a thorough work of instruction before the shock of the struggle. A net work of tariff clubs, ramifying the whole country, is demanded by the circumstances of the time. Each of these clubs would be a missionary in its local field. Among them all would be an elbow-touch of sympathy. Combined, they would exert the strength, power, and momentum which belong to bodies of magnitude in a state of activity. The welfare of millions of laborers and of thousands of millions of dollars in property are involved in the contest. The defence of such prodigious interests should be commensurate with their vastness and their immense value." Whatever modifications may be made in the tariff, a complete departure from the policy that has done so much, and is still doing much, in developing and building up the manufacturing industries of the United States is not likely to take place at an early day.

NOVA SCOTIA COAL.

The Halifax *Evening Mail* says that for some time past the Pictou colliery managers have been complaining that they are unable to obtain a sufficient number of coal cars for shipments to Montreal and Toronto. A correspondent of that journal says:—"I understand that contracts have already been made in the Upper Province markets for over one hundred thousand tons Cape Breton coals alone, and that during the ensuing season the coals shipped to Montreal from Cape Breton will be more than double the quantity shipped last year, or nearly four times more than in 1878. I am also informed that, providing favorable freights are secured, and the outlook at present is encouraging, the colliery proprietors will realize larger returns than they have known since 1873. Of the quantity contracted for I understand that some 15,000 tons are for the Rodpath sugar refinery, and large quantities for the gas companies, Canada Central and other railways. Up to last year the Ottawa gas works always used American coal—they thought they could not make gas without using American coal. But now the Parliament Buildings and the whole city of Ottawa is illuminated by gas made entirely from Cape Breton coal—the quality of which is now too well known to need comment. I am also told that the Toronto Gas Company, which have hitherto manufactured what is known as water gas—from American anthracite coal and oil—are getting very much dissatisfied with the quality of the gas (its injury to health and excessive cost being two of the principal objections), consequently they will have to return to the use of bituminous coal, which will create a greatly increased demand for that article—the Toronto gas works alone requiring over 20,000 tons annually. From conversation with prominent brokers and shipping agents I learn that on the opening of our canal system, consequent on recent improvements, and the employment of steam colliers of suitable size, Nova Scotia will certainly secure the Toronto market, and that grain will be carried back to Sydney or Pictou as return cargoes, and

transhipped thence to Europe. Mr. D. J. KENNELLY, of the Halifax and Cape Breton Company, who was also recently in this city, has contracted for the sale of a large quantity of coal." This boom in the Nova Scotia coal trade is the direct result of the National Policy.

OFFICIAL REPORT ON PROFESSOR HURD'S CHARGES.

Returns have been laid before both Houses of Parliament consisting of letters and pamphlets by Prof. H. Y. Hurd, charging the late Government with having used official documents at the Halifax Commission, in 1877, which were deliberately "falsified." The papers are voluminous, evincing an amount of inventiveness on the part of Prof. Hurd worthy of an honest purpose and a useful end. They are accompanied by a memorandum addressed to the Prime Minister, at his request, by the Commissioner of Fisheries. This memorandum deals with the subject in a candid and effective manner, which Mr. Warrcusa's experience of the fisheries question and the proceedings at Halifax so well qualify him to do. The charges, he says, stripped of much verbiage, apply mainly to tables of exports and imports founded upon the trade and navigation returns. These exhibits were adduced in evidence and attested personally by a competent officer of the Customs Department. Mr. Warrcusa admits the possible existence of technical errors and anomalies, but points out their consistency with the general correctness and truthfulness of the returns, which are believed to be substantially accurate. He denies, and proves the impossibility of their having been altered for the purposes charged. The object of these statements was to show the extent and operation of the trade in fish between Canada and the United States during a series of years. They were compiled principally from American records and were verified by comparison with Canadian returns. Blatant statements were filed by the United States and proved by experts. Whatever discrepancies existed on either side were explained in the evidence. Mr. Warrcusa mentions, as an example, that in the year 1874—which was the year chosen by the United States as the most favorable to their view—the records of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington showed nearly eleven and a half millions of dollars less merchandise exported to Canada than was shown by the Canadian import returns, of which fish formed a proportion. Such difference would be advantageous to the United States; but the discrepancy was satisfactorily accounted for and adjusted. Professor Hurd has omitted to stigmatize that fact as a "fraud" or "forgery" on the part of the Americans. The counter claim of the United States for remitted duties being based on the quantities of dutiable fish imported from Canada, it was incumbent on them to establish the basis of computation from their own import returns, which were tested by comparison with the Canadian export returns. Mr. Warrcusa points out that:—

"There are only two methods by which the real state of the fish trade relations between the United States and Canada could have been altered for sinister purposes. The first is by decreasing the quantity of dutiable fish exported from Canada, so as at once to diminish the value of the American market to Canadian dealers and fishermen, and to reduce the amount of customs duties accruing thereon, the remission of which might be applicable as compensation in part for privileges conceded by the treaty. The second is by increasing the quantity of fish subject to duty imported from the United States into Canada, showing thereby the reciprocal advantage of the Canadian market, and a proportionate sum of duties remitted by Canada in reduction of the offset chargeable against her. As the United States import returns would correct the first, and their export returns would disprove the second, any deceptions of this nature were simply impracticable."

Professor Hurd's earlier charge related to statistics of the catch of fish, which he represented as being altered designedly. This allegation is disposed of very summarily by Mr. Warrcusa, who frankly acknowledges that errors occurred in the table compiled from the fishery reports, owing to inefficient aid in the Fisheries Office; but as they would have proved mostly unfavorable to Canada, and were producing in evidence corrected by virtually the original reports, no possible wrong to the United States nor injury to Canada could result. Prof. Hurd's motive is ascribed to the fact of his having been ill treated by the British Agent and Secretary. Their conduct towards him affords no excuse for the course he has pursued. We may add here that complaints prevail of the same regrettable provocations towards others. The following passage seems to be severe, but it is probably justified by the writer's knowledge of the falseness and personal animus of Professor Hurd's unpatriotic accusations, and perhaps some natural in-

dignation at reflections such as these studious charges have occasioned:—

"It is inconceivable that any man of Mr. Hurd's practical experience and literary and scientific ability could be led astray by personal motives so far as to outrage confidential relations, and regardless of either public or patriotic duty, to marvellously distort actual facts and recording divergencies into a tissue of 'fraud' and 'forgery.' Such faithless endeavors to create distrust in proceedings with which he was himself familiar, and in which his own country was especially interested, are alike morally reprehensible and indefensible."

Mr. Warrcusa's remarks make it quite clear that whatever errors existed on either side the evidence prepared and used throughout was employed in perfect good faith. We can well understand, therefore, the strong confidence felt by Sir Alexander Smith, who acted on behalf of the late Administration, in declaring to Parliament "that the charges and accusations made by Professor Hurd are absolutely and entirely baseless, and that the case on both sides was conducted in a manner becoming to the dignity and honor of both countries."

PIG IRON PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

The New York *Bulletin* contains the following interesting statistics relative to the production of pig iron in the United States last year. The production of pig iron in the United States in 1880 was 4,295,414 net tons, or 3,835,181 gross tons. The production in 1879 was 3,970,875 net tons, or 3,741,853 gross tons. The increase in 1880 over 1879 was, therefore, 1,224,539 net tons, or 1,093,328 gross tons, or 40 per cent. The production of 1879 was larger than that of any preceding year, but the production of 1880 was not only 10 per cent. larger than that of 1879, but it was 50 per cent. larger than that of the two preceding most active years, 1872 and 1873, and it was double that of the centennial year, 1876, when the production of pig iron during the panic years reached its lowest point. The following figures, in net tons, will make these extraordinary facts plain to the eye. Production:—

1872	2,854,558	1877	2,914,581
1873	2,898,278	1878	2,577,321
1874	2,889,413	1879	3,970,875
1875	2,366,581	1880	4,295,414
1876	2,593,231		

Of the total production of pig iron in 1880, 1,807,051 net tons were made with anthracite coal, 1,050,205 tons with bituminous coal and coke, and 537,558 tons with charcoal. The increased production of the year over the product of 1879 was very evenly divided among the different fuels. It is, however, worthy of notice that the production of charcoal pig iron has increased *pari passu* with that of anthracite and bituminous pig iron. In the four years preceding 1880 it had declined relatively as compared with its two rivals. The charcoal iron product of 1880 has only twice been excluded in our history—in 1873 and 1874, when the production was respectively 577,620 and 576,557 net tons. As has heretofore been the case, some of the anthracite furnaces used more or less coke in 1880 as a mixture, and a smaller number of bituminous furnaces used anthracite as a mixture. The exact quantity of pig iron produced in 1880 with this mixed fuel was 714,631 net tons. Twenty-three States made pig iron in 1880, one more than in 1879, Minnesota entering the list for the first time with her Duluth charcoal furnace—the pioneer we have no doubt of many iron enterprises within her borders. North Carolina has not made any pig iron since 1877. Oregon, with her Oswego charcoal furnace, doubled in 1880 her production of 1879. Another State, Colorado, has its first furnace at South Platte, ready to put in blast. California and Washington Territory are getting ready to make pig iron, a furnace in each being well under way. Utah Territory has made no pig iron since 1876, but the largest and best of its two furnaces, the one at Ogden, is likely to be blown in this year. Every State in the Union which made pig iron in 1879, except one, increased its production in 1880. The exception was West Virginia, which made 70,801 net tons in 1879, 70,338 tons in 1880. In 1879 Pennsylvania made 52 per cent. of the total production; in 1880 her production declined relatively to 48 per cent. Ohio made a very sharp advance in 1880 upon her record of 1879. In 1879, with a production of 447,751 net tons, her percentage of the total product of the country was 14.35; in 1880, with a product of 674,207 net tons, her percentage was 15.7-10. The States which ranked next to Pennsylvania and Ohio in production in 1880, and which produced over 100,000 tons each, were New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Illinois and Missouri, in the order named. There was a gratifying increase in 1880 in the production of spiegel-eisen. The product was