

Kenyon College

Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange

Mount Vernon Banner Historic Newspaper 1890

10-1890

Mount Vernon Democratic Banner Supplement October, 1890

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.kenyon.edu/banner1890>

Recommended Citation

"Mount Vernon Democratic Banner Supplement October, 1890" (1890). *Mount Vernon Banner Historic Newspaper 1890*. 25.
<https://digital.kenyon.edu/banner1890/25>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mount Vernon Banner Historic Newspaper 1890 by an authorized administrator of Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact noltj@kenyon.edu.

THE FEDERAL ELECTION BILL

And The Tariff!

Speech of Captain Alfred E. Lee,

An Independent Republican, at Columbus.

Any honest, just and beneficent measure to secure the independence of the voter and promote the purity of the ballot should have the cordial approval of every good citizen. But the measure against which we make our protest is not one of that kind. It is not conceived in any such motive. It will not produce any such result. It is the misbegotten offspring of selfishness and greed. It is a scheme to create outrage, and reawaken sectional contention. It is a scheme to convert a new army of office holders, dissipate the surplus, and perpetuate war taxes. It is a scheme to convert the national judiciary and the national army into partisan machines controlled by a partisan boss. It is a scheme to destroy the representative character of the lower house of Congress, and commit the choice of the people's representatives to a partisan board appointed for life. It is a scheme to enlarge the area of bribery and corruption in elections. It is a scheme to count in a prohibitory tariff majority in the next House of Representatives regardless of the popular verdict.

The demand for this measure is wholly a manufactured demand. The necessity for it is wholly a partisan necessity. The motives behind are neither generous nor humane. What those motives are a brief retrospect of political history will make perfectly clear.

At the time the war broke out in 1861, our national revenues were derived mainly from duties on imports so adjusted as to afford whatever protection was necessary for the industries of the people. Under that economic system the country had prospered for nearly a decade more than it ever had prospered before—more, relatively, than it is prospering now. But the war produced a necessity for extraordinary revenues, and every taxable subject that could be found was laid under tribute. To enable our manufacturers to pay these taxes and at the same time hold their ground against foreign competition, the tariff duties were enormously raised. This was a war expedient, restored to for war purposes. When the war closed our great armies were mustered out and dissolved into the mass of the people, our armored fleets were sold for scrap-iron, and our war legislation was mostly swept from the statute books. But the war tariff was permitted to stand. Our tremendous war debt seemed to make this necessary for the time being. But as the country increased in wealth and population, and the debt melted away, the financial necessity for this excessive taxation disappeared, and it existed by artificial necessity only. That necessity had no other foundation than the clamor and greed of great monopolies which demanded continuance of the high taxes by which they had been enriched at the expense of the people. The taxes were continued, but the clamor of their beneficiaries was not silenced. The more they got the more they wanted; the stronger they grew the more bounty they demanded from the Government.

In an evil hour the Republican party succumbed to this demand, and committed the greatest mistake in its history. Tempted by expectations if not professed of monopolistic bounty for so-called election purposes, the Republican leaders abandoned the traditional principles of their party, and adopted a tariff platform such as no other party in this country ever adopted before, or thought of adopting. That was done at the National Republican convention of 1888, which nominated General Harrison for President. It was a new departure such as the old Republican Guard never anticipated and never would have tolerated. It was the selfish and short-sighted purchase of temporary triumph at the price of future degradation and disaster. It was subjection to a soulless master, whose selfish exactions know no limit. Never did a great party more foolishly sell and bargain away its birthright of freedom.

For thirty years prior to that time the Republican party had uniformly adhered to the policy of levying duties primarily for revenue and secondarily and incidentally for protection. Such was the policy advocated by all the great leaders and statesmen of the party from Greeley, Wade and Sumner to Grant, Lincoln and Garfield. Such was the platform doctrine of the party, State and National, down to 1888. There was no thought of levying taxes on any one class of citizens, or on all classes, for the benefit of another or single class. Incidental protection was deemed sufficient protection, and it was sufficient. It preserved and stimulated our industries without producing monopolies to oppress the people. Fostered by it, our manufacturing interests prospered, our commerce, both foreign and domestic, was enormously developed, our home-built shipping visited the principal seaports of the world, and our farmers, as well as mechanics, found a profitable market for all they could produce.

The Republican National Convention of 1888 announced this beneficent policy and embraced that of a prohibitory tariff. It reversed the old-time doctrine—a tariff for revenue with incidental protection—and substituted that of a tariff for protection with incidental revenue. A quarter of a century after the war had closed it declared that the

war duties should be raised rather than reduced. With an enormous surplus in the treasury over and above all legitimate expenditure, it opposed any reduction of the burdens of the people, and favored additional and more oppressive restrictions on commerce. It declared that the Republican party would abolish the taxes on whisky and tobacco before it would remove them from victuals and clothes. It made these pledges under the false and fraudulent pretext of protecting American labor. It made them at the behest of tariff-begotten monopolies which care nothing at all for labor except for the money they can make out of it.

Once the Republican party was the champion of the poor, but by this act it became the champion of the rich and powerful against the poor. Once, in the language of its greatest statesman, it was for a government of, by the people, and for the people, but by this act it declared itself for a government of monopoly, by monopoly, and for monopoly. Once it was the enemy of slavery and the champion of freedom, but by this act it became the friend of despotism and the champion of industrial and commercial servitude. Once the Republican party was a party of high moral principle, but ever since it espoused this sordid policy, greed seems to have been its guiding star. Moses, descending from Sinai, found his people worshipping a golden calf, and that is what the Republican Moses, Abraham Lincoln, would find the priesthood of his party worshipping to-day could he descend from the heights of his immortality as a martyr to the cause of the poor and lowly. Think, if you can, of the plain and honest Lincoln taking part in such a performance.

Since the inauguration of President Harrison this prohibitory tariff policy, which so changed the character and destiny of the Republican party, has been the avowed policy of the government. To carry that policy into effect the House of Representatives has recently passed a bill known as the McKinley bill, which the farmers of Minnesota, in State Convention, have just denounced as "the crowning infamy of protection." This language is none too emphatic. It is not unjust. It fitly characterizes a measure which proposes to greatly increase the power of the monopolies known as trusts and combines, to crush competition and take absolute control of the American market.

Ever since the election of Harrison and the formal instalment of the prohibitory tariff policy, these monopolies have been constantly multiplying by scores and hundreds. They are still multiplying so rapidly that we can scarcely take up a newspaper without seeing new ones announced, while scores of others secretly organized and never announced are known only to the dealers who pay them tribute.

The rapacity of these trusts is insatiable and universally felt. Every family which uses sugar uses it for the benefit of a protected monopoly. Every workingman who builds a dwelling builds for the benefit of a score of protected monopolies. Every farmer who uses the most ordinary articles necessary to agriculture, uses them for the profit of a whole legion of protected monopolies. Every child which ciphers on a slate, ciphers for the benefit of a protected monopoly. None of us can use a lead pencil or an envelope without using it for the benefit of a protected monopoly. None of us can die and be put into a decent coffin without dying for the benefit of a protected monopoly. None of us when dead can have the melancholy distinction of a tombstone without having contributed to the profits of a protected monopoly. Fortunately this wolfish horde can not pursue us beyond the grave, but there is no escape from it on this side.

Many of these devouring infants which we have so generously protected, yet now demand still more protection, are already paying from 15 to 30 per cent. dividend on a watered stock capital amounting to four or five times their actual investment. Worse still, they are ungratefully requiting our bounty by selling their wares cheaper to foreigners than they sell them to our people. Such is the great American system we hear so much about—the system which furnishes cheap goods to foreigners and dear and shoddy goods to Americans. In a recent spasm of frankness Mr. Butterworth gave us a striking illustration of the beautiful results of this system when he told us that the protected copper ring had made in nineteen years a profit of \$60,000,000 on an invested capital of \$1,250,000.

Some time ago this same copper ring contracted to deliver its entire output to a French syndicate at 12 cents a pound, while the price demanded and paid on this side was 16 cents. As a consular officer I have myself signed invoices for large amounts of American ingot copper for return, at a high profit, to the United States. What do you think, citizens of America, of being compelled to get your Michigan copper by paying a profit on it to a foreign syndicate three thousand miles away!

Within the last few days incontestable proofs were presented in the discussions of the National Senate that agricultural implements manufactured in the United States are sold at from 20 to 70 per cent. cheaper in South America than they are to our own farmers. It is but a short time since American refined sugar could be, as it probably still can, be bought in London cheaper by \$2.25 per hundred pounds than it is sold for in our own country. The way for Americans to get trust-made goods cheap is to buy them on the other side of the ocean, in South America, or just across the border in Canada.

Another method by which these protected combinations display their ingratitude for the enormous advantages awarded them under the prohibitory system is that of crushing and destroying all home competition. They will tolerate no rivals. Under the operations of this system the weak industries exist by sufferance of the strong. The glorious bounties of nature which should be free to all are grasped and held by a few. The opportunities of this great

free land which should be placed equally within the reach of all, are put beyond the reach of any but the rich and powerful. Such is the new doctrine of American liberty. Rival establishments are undersold, or bought in, and closed down by the trusts, depriving thousands of workmen and women of employment, and this is called the protection of American labor!

Such are some of the economic results of prohibitory protection; let us look at some of its political results. It has given us an hereditary President. It has introduced the hereditary principle into the system of administrative appointments. It has converted the merit system of appointments into a hideous farce. It has put a London banker, chiefly notable for the amplitude of his check-book, into the Vice-President's chair. It has chosen as its second, an alleged statesman who declares that the Decalogue and the Golden Rule have no place in politics. It has converted the National Senate into a millionaires' club. It has given us the most profligate Congress this country has yet known. It has placed the House of Representatives at the mercy of a partisan autocrat who assumes that the minority has neither rights nor duties. It has put the Republican organization under the control of another autocrat against whom it has been repeatedly and repeatedly charged by his own partisans, and without denial, that he took \$200,000 from the Treasury of Pennsylvania, and squandered it in gambling. It has exalted the custom-house, with all its favoritism, intrigue and rottenness, as the chief temple of American liberty. It has put this same custom-house before the school house and college and proclaimed tariff prohibition as the great American fetish, before which every knee shall bow. It has undertaken to subject all party administration to Custom House usage, and the whole country to the sordid dogmas and practices of Custom House politics. It has exhausted the surplus of \$100,000,000, and confronted us with a probable deficit in the near future. It has exalted the love of gain as the chief American motive, and has glorified wealth as the only thing on earth worth striving for or thinking about, worse than all it has undertaken to corrupt our ballot with the contributions of trusts, and to buy with money the suffrages of American freemen.

Meanwhile, as Mr. Secretary Blaine has just declared, "our market for foreign breadstuffs grows narrower." Our trust-protecting duties have provoked, and still provoke, retaliatory measures on the part of foreign governments, excluding more and more the products of our farms from the markets of the world. As a necessary consequence of this, farming lands have greatly depreciated in value from one end of the country to the other. Within thirty miles of Columbus beautiful farms have been recently offered, without takers, at little over half what they cost in money ten years ago.

In a recent speech in the House of Representatives, Mr. Butterworth declared that he could count on his ten fingers men whose combined profits in the last decade have exceeded those of all the agriculturists of any State in the Union.

The remedies offered for this state of things are higher taxation and more monopoly. These are tendered us in the McKinley bill. But the farmers of the great West and Northwest are not satisfied with that measure. They are profoundly dissatisfied with it. Even Mr. Secretary Blaine is dissatisfied with it, and goes so far as to say, in substance, that a prohibitory tariff, after all, is chiefly useful as a diplomatic expedient. He wants to barter away such duties for equivalent free trade. He wants them put on merely that they may be taken off again by treaty. He declares that there is not a section or a line in the McKinley bill that will open a market for a bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork. And why should there be? Must not our trade be confined exclusively to the "home market"? Such is the prohibitory tariff flat. But the sturdy farmers of the country do not accept that flat. They are tired of selling the produce of their farms without a profit while the protected trusts are paying enormous profits on their inflated stocks. They are tired of paying these trusts higher prices for what they buy than the same articles are sold for to foreigners. In consequence of this, the farming element throughout the country is showing a disposition to repudiate the prohibitory tariff dogma, and the magnates of monopoly suddenly find themselves in danger of overthrow. Having chained down the safety-valve and thrown turpentine on the fire, these magnates now perceive that there is about to be an explosion.

The discovery of this danger has compelled the political champions of the trusts to resort to desperate measures. With fatuous haste they have rushed into the Union as States, six Territories, the combined voting population of which probably does not exceed that of Ohio. They have thus gained, as they think, twelve Senators and nineteen Presidential Electors, but still they are not happy. A political landslide is imminent in the great West, and something must be done to make good the decline of monopolistic power that will ensue if that landslide occurs. For that reason this Force Bill has been resorted to. It is a twin brother to the McKinley Bill. It is a prohibitory tariff expedient, and nothing else.

Some weeks ago, Mr. Speaker Reed, in a speech at Pittsburgh, gave some of the pretended reasons why such a measure as this should become the law of the land. As if to apologize for such an attempt to reinforce sectional and race hatred, he declared that for years he had not been of those who talked about the South. "For the last eight years," said he, "no man has heard me, in the House or in the campaign, discourse upon either our rages or wrongs, murders, shootings, or hangings." And then he added the significant confession that "at present the murders have mostly passed away, and the terrorizing and the midnight marauders." All of which is as much as to say that while the colored voters were

being outraged and murdered for eight long years, Mr. Reed maintained a determined silence. Only since the outrages have "mostly passed away" has he been moved to speak. And what has moved him? Is it sympathy for the colored voters, whom, as he says, he permitted to be outraged, murdered and hanged for a quarter of a century without protest? No doubt Mr. Speaker would like to have us think so, but he will not so impose on our credulity. He has much more plausible reasons than pretended pity for the colored people for his phenomenal outbreak.

"The Republican vote of the South," he declares, "the Republican party is entitled to under the Constitution, whether the vote be ignorant or sensible." If this means anything it means that for the benefit of the Republican party, not the country, is this legislation intended. Its object is to secure, not for the good of the country, but for the good of a party, what is called "the Republican vote of the South." That vote may be ignorant or it may be sensible—most likely it is ignorant—but nevertheless the prohibitory tariff magnates want it, and want it bad. The more ignorant it is, the more they want it, and the less able they are to do without it. "If ignorant," Mr. Reed continues, "we need it to offset the Democratic ignorance which votes in New York and other large cities." Of course we are to infer from this that whatever is opposed to trust despotism, and an unlimited tariff for its benefit is "Democratic ignorance," and it must be confessed that a great deal of that kind of ignorance prevails now-a-days, not in large cities only, but in small ones as well. Among the farmers of the Northwest it seems to be spreading over the country like a prairie fire.

To crown his argument for the Force bill, and bring it to an overwhelming climax, Mr. Reed defiantly inquires why they (the Democrats) "should poll their ignorance, and we not poll ours." Now, really, most of us had supposed that the prohibitory tariff faction had polled its ignorance and polled it to an extraordinary extent. There, for instance, is Mr. Murat Halstead—or rather ex-Senator Halstead, an illustrious member of the Cobden Club, now in retirement in Brooklyn—they have been polling him, and for dense and impenetrable ignorance, both as to the tariff and other public questions—except ballot-box contracts—he is without a rival.

Let it be understood, then, that the crowning argument for this Force Bill is the prohibitory tariff demand for ignorance. But Mr. Reed gives other arguments. He says "manhood and not riches—manhood and not learning is the basis of our government." May we not here respectfully suggest that this depends somewhat on the kind of manhood referred to? According to the prohibitory tariff idea, American manhood is American babyhood. The only sort of full-grown political manhood which seems to be evolved from prohibitory tariff politics is that which submits itself abjectly to the decree of a caucus, or the dictation of a partisan autocrat. Take, for example, the melancholy case of Mr. Butterworth. A few weeks ago he delivered in the House of Representatives a speech which no intelligent person can read without concluding that, in the opinion of the speaker, the McKinley bill is just what the Minnesota farmers call it—"the crowning infamy of protection." And yet, when his name was called, Mr. Butterworth voted for that very bill. He surrendered his convictions, his intelligence, his conscience to the decree of the caucus, as did many of his Republican colleagues who knew as well as he did that the bill was wrong. The only essential political difference between these gentlemen and some of the rest of us who are not in such good standing in the Republican party is, that while they believe one way and vote another, we vote as we believe. The surrender demanded of Mr. Butterworth is demanded of us, and of every conscientious Republican, and this is what is meant, in the prohibitory tariff sense, by making "manhood" the basis of our government.

Mr. Reed asserts, as a further argument for the passage of this Force Bill, that ballot-box stuffing and cheating in the count have taken the place of violence. Outrage and murder did not affect him at all, but he is very much touched by ballot-box stuffing and cheating. He evidently wants us to infer, that these evils are exclusive to the South.

But while it is a monstrous wrong to cheat ignorant voters, it is a still greater wrong to bribe and corrupt both the ignorant and the intelligent. The alleged suppression of the black vote in the South does not do the country a hundredth part the harm that is done here in the North by the corrupt use of money in elections. The corruption of the ballot by bribery is today our chief national danger. It is an evil which there are good reasons for believing exists in Mr. Reed's own congressional district as much as in any district of the South, or more. Yet there is not a line or a section in this bill which provides any new safeguard against this atrocious fraud. If, by virtue of this measure, the ignorant black vote of the South should fall under the control of Mr. Quay, and the influence of his corruption fund, such safeguard might be very inconvenient. Men have been known to be put in the penitentiary for the crime of bribery, albeit they are sometimes punished for embezzlement by being elected to the National Senate.

For the purity and fairness of her elections, Ohio needs an independent ballot more—a thousand times more—than she needs the ignorant vote of the South. To stuff the ballot-box with ignorance is a kind of ballot-box stuffing which ought to be condemned rather than commended, avoided rather than forced or encouraged. Far more important to us and to our children is it to keep the bribe-giver's and the bribe-taker's hand out of the ballot-box, than it is to force senseless and ignorant votes into it. The coercion or suppression of the ballot is bad enough, but its

corruption is infinitely worse. Better no vote at all than a bought vote.

Realizing these things, the workmen of most of the Northern States have demanded through their organizations the passage of State election laws which will make the voter absolutely independent, and guard the ballot against both coercion and corruption. Such a law was introduced in the last Legislature of Ohio, passed the House of Representatives, and would have passed the Senate had not the dictation of the caucus brought every Republican vote to bear against it. And now, no doubt, these same Senators who thus spurned the workmen's request in Ohio, and refused to accord to Ohio's freemen an independent ballot, are among the most clamorous for this Force bill for the South. They belong to that rather numerous class of reformers who delight in painting their neighbors black in order that their own assumed virtues may shine brighter by contrast.

But if such a law as this is good for one section why is it not good for another? Even Mr. Reed does not distinctly claim that it is a good thing for the South. He rather apologizes for its mischievous nature by saying that "if Mississippi be in danger of ignorant domination, the United States is not! But if ignorant domination is a good thing for Mississippi, why is it not a good thing for the United States? If good for the South, why not for the North? If good for Georgia, why not for Ohio? Moreover, if the partisan Republican election boards which this bill provides for are good for Democratic States, why are not partisan Democratic boards good for Republican States?"

The Force Bill, so it happens, itself answers this question. It provides that the supervisors who are to count in, or count out, the Representatives in Congress shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court. The judge for the Sixth Judicial District is Howell E. Jackson, of Tennessee, who is a Democrat and an ex-Confederate soldier. His district comprises Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio and Michigan. In case this bayonet bill becomes a law, our prohibitionist friends will probably demand the application of the bayonet policy in Ohio and Michigan, as well as in Tennessee and Kentucky. In that event the board of supervisors for Ohio will be appointed by Judge Jackson of Tennessee, a Democrat and an ex-Confederate, and we shall see how much better it is to have our Congressmen chosen for us by partisan Democratic boards than it is to choose them ourselves.

Now I wish to say, if there are any Democrats here—and probably there are a few, for they sometimes break into Republican meetings—if you Democrats protest against any such arrangement as this, you must either be very magnanimous partisans, or very foolish in a partisan sense.

Of course all of us who oppose this bill no matter what party we have adhered to, or acted with, will be excommunicated by the prohibitory tariff organs. Any one who does not meekly put his political conscience in the keeping of the caucus, fawn upon the reigning party boss whoever he happens to be, and believe in a duty of five hundred per cent. on every thing he eats, drinks, wears or breathes is not an orthodox Republican any more. But it so happens that fifteen years ago, when the reasons for were far more plausible than they are now, an attempt was made to enact a bayonet law very much the same in principle as the one now proposed. That attempt was resisted and defeated by such Republicans as Ellis H. Roberts, Eugene Hale, William Walter Phelps, Joseph R. Hawley, Henry L. Dawes, James A. Garfield and James G. Blaine. Now, if it was good Republicanism to oppose the Force Bill of 1875, why is it not good Republicanism to oppose that of 1890? If force was not good policy then, why is it good policy now?

The political conditions in the South, of which complaint is made, arise, as every one knows, from social conditions which do not exist in the North. These conditions no force can change and no law remedy. The attempt to regulate them by legislation will prove even more disastrous than the attempt to cripple, restrain and abolish by statute the natural laws of trade. Preach it forever, but you can no more make men virtuous and intelligent by act of Congress than you can make a nation rich by taxation. You can not remove in a year, or in twenty-five years, the bestiality and degradation produced by a century of servitude. To accomplish this must be the work of time and of moral rather than of political influence. To a very great extent it must be the work of the enfranchised people themselves. They must work out their own salvation, and must do it mainly, not by the agency of legislation or the bayonet, but by their self-improvement and self-help. Such is the true American principle; a fair field and no favors. Real American manhood, black or white, will always be able to take care of itself. It is no baby. It is no mendicant. It is no leech, or monopolist. It commands respect, not by physical prowess or military force, but by the forces of character and virtue—those resistless moral forces which have defied wrong and subdued tyranny in every clime and age. Let the colored voters of the South assert and prove their deserving, not by the ignorance which Mr. Reed covets, but by their intelligence, industry, and virtue, and their political rights will be nowhere disputed—will be everywhere freely accorded.

There is a better remedy than force, let it be tried. The Golden Rule, although repudiated by our Junior Vice-President, is a good rule. Let us do to our Southern neighbors just as we would have them under like circumstances do to us. The white people of the South are a spirited people and dislike to be driven or forced just as much as the Northern people dislike it. They were deeply touched when our heroic Grant told the surrendering Confederate soldiers to take their horses, go home and plow their fields, be good citizens, and they would not be disturbed. Nothing that has happened since the war has helped and inspired them to be good citizens like that magnanimous act. It has done a thousand times more to allay

turbulence and make this restore. Union a union both of hearts and of hands than all the bayonet legislation and all the bitter speeches.

This is no time to stir up hate and revengeful passion between different races, classes or sections of our people. No deserving interest has need of such passions. The country has no need of them. They are the devil's own. They are the enemies, not friends, of our national prosperity. The very fact that any interest appeals to such passions condemns it as unworthy. They are fit expedients of monopoly and oppression. They are the fit instruments of the soulless and bandit leagues which scramble for opportunities to enrich themselves by taxation of the people.

Instead of cultivating such passions let us rather act, as by word and example, the great-hearted Lincoln has enjoined us to act, "with malice toward none, with charity for all." As the heroic Grant admonished us, "let us have peace." As a greater than Grant has admonished us, let us "seek peace and ensue it." We have far more need of tranquility and reconciliation of races and sections than we have of the ignorant vote of the South, or any other part of the country. The best of all means for securing the rights and happiness of all, is to cultivate amity and good will. Persuasion and kindness will readily win where force will utterly fail.

When our illustrious military chieftain looked out from the summit of Mt. McGregor into the vast, mysterious eternity on the brink of which he sat, voice having failed him he wrote on a tablet these words which the muse of history will record in words of living light: "I have witnessed since my sickness just what I have wished to see ever since the war—harmony and good feeling between the sections."

This harmony and good feeling which Grant so longed for and the kindly-souled Lincoln so labored for, this force bill, if it becomes a law, will surely disrupt, and can not fail to destroy. Shall it be destroyed? Shall we encourage or tolerate any such enforced and unnecessary alienation? Shall the country be plunged into a ferment of contention in order that monopolistic despotism may profit by an ignorant vote? Shall we sacrifice our National peace on the altar of greed?

To do so is no better than a crime. It is a crime. It is an affront to every patriot who has given his effort or shed his blood to make this Nation one. It is a calamity and a wrong to the black race no less than to the white.

Let us, then, with all the might that is in us, protest against it. Let the freemen of Ohio rebuke and repel this monstrous selfishness which grasps after ignorance as the basis of its political power, and would provoke civil war, if necessary, to establish and perpetuate its despotic sway.

THE MCKINLEY TARIFF.

Comparison of the Old and New Rates—Showing Advance in Prices of Necessaries of Life.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Class 1—Coasting 13c.	25¢ lb. equal to 24¢ cent.	32¢ cent.
Class 2—Cost more 15c. lb. equal to 13c. per lb.	15¢ lb. equal to 13¢ cent.	50¢ cent.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Unbleached not exceeding 50 threads 30 in. per yard.	24¢.	30¢.
Bleached.....	24¢.	35¢.
Dyed or stained.....	44¢.	45¢.
Between 50 and 100 threads.	24¢.	24¢.
Bleached.....	34¢.	30¢.
Dyed or stained.....	44¢.	40¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Between 100 and 150 threads.	40¢.	44¢.
Bleached.....	40¢.	44¢.
Dyed or stained.....	40¢.	44¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Exceeding 200 threads.....	40¢.	44¢.
Bleached.....	40¢.	44¢.
Dyed or stained.....	40¢.	44¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Containing admixture of silk and not provided for.....	50 per cent.	100¢.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Unbleached not exceeding 50 threads 30 in. per yard.	24¢.	30¢.
Bleached.....	24¢.	35¢.
Dyed or stained.....	44¢.	45¢.
Between 50 and 100 threads.	24¢.	24¢.
Bleached.....	34¢.	30¢.
Dyed or stained.....	44¢.	40¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Between 100 and 150 threads.	40¢.	44¢.
Bleached.....	40¢.	44¢.
Dyed or stained.....	40¢.	44¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Exceeding 200 threads.....	40¢.	44¢.
Bleached.....	40¢.	44¢.
Dyed or stained.....	40¢.	44¢.
Ad valorem on same.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Containing admixture of silk and not provided for.....	50 per cent.	100¢.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Silk, corded or combed.....	\$0.50	\$0.50
Spun silk.....	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
Velvets, pile fabrics less than 75 per c. in weight silk.....	\$1.50	15 p.c.
75 per cent. or more.....	\$5.50	15 p.c.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Stockings, worth less than 60 cents per dozen.....	40 p.c.	\$2.00
From \$2 to \$4.....	40 p.c.	\$2.00
Over \$4.....	40 p.c.	\$4.00

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Amusson, Axminster.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Moquette and Chenille.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Saxony, Wilton.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Tournay Velvets.....	40 p.c.	40 p.c.
Brussels.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Tapestry Velvets.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Treble Ingrains.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Felt Carpeting.....	40 p.c.	40 p.c.
Tapestry Brussels.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Tin plates, per pound.....	10¢.	2 p.c.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Firebrick, not decorated.....	30 p.c.	\$1.25 ton.
Firebrick, decorated.....	30 p.c.	40 p.c.
Tiles, decorated.....	35 p.c.	45 p.c.
Glass bottles, per lb.....	10¢.	14¢.
Glassware, plain.....	40 p.c.	60 p.c.
Glassware, decorated.....	45 p.c.	60 p.c.
Blown glass.....	45 p.c.	60 p.c.
Porcelain.....	45 p.c.	60 p.c.
Window glass, 24x36 or larger, per lb.....	3¢.	3¢.
Cylinder glass, 24x36 or larger, per square foot.....	30¢.	40¢.

Quality.	Old rate.	New rate.
Leaf tobacco, suitable for cigar wrappers, if not stemmed, per lb.....	75¢.	\$2.00
Leaf tobacco, suitable for cigar wrappers, if stemmed, per lb.....	75¢.	\$2.75
Cigars, cigarettes and cheroots of all kinds, \$2.50 and over, per lb.....	35 p.c.	\$4.50 and 25 p.c.

\$1,000, must this year go without some articles that he and his family have enjoyed or else get into debt, for it will require about \$1,300 to buy what could have been purchased last year for \$1,000.