

VOORHEES ELOQUENCE

Our Daniel Lets Loose a Flood of Words at Terre Haute.

He Attempts to Cover Up Democracy's Shortcomings by Charging All Manner of Things Against Republicans.

LONG TALK ON THE TARIFF

In Which the Senator Says He Stands on Cleveland's Platform.

He Also Tells What Was Done for the Trusts and Southern Industries, but in an Indirect Way.

Special to the Indianapolis Journal.

TERRE HAUTE, Ind., Sept. 22.—Senator Voorhees delivered his long promised speech here to-night at the army, which was well filled. The local Jackson Club made an effort to have a street demonstration, but only 124 persons were in the ranks. Democracy craved to know the fact that every other man in the state is a public official—federal, state, county or city—who had been pressed into service. There was a notable absence of prominent local Democrats who ordinarily take part in these Voorhees demonstrations. The most significant feature of the meeting was the fact that Congressman Brookshire, of this district, who in past years has opposed Senator Voorhees on all the Democratic silver issues, as well as on federal appointments, was present after having been refused permission to make the opening Democratic speech in this district. The Gazette, the Democratic paper here, printed Brookshire's speech delivered in another part of the district and gave scant publicity to the Voorhees meeting.

Col. McLean, who was Deputy Commissioner of Pensions in Cleveland's first administration, was chairman of the meeting to-night and spoke briefly and in general terms of the issues. Senator Voorhees read his speech from printed slips and was unusually careful to "follow copy."

The Senator began by informing his hearers that the Democratic party "has never recognized any master, except themselves." They could not be intimidated by secret and reasonable outbursts. Here the speaker discreetly refrained from mentioning the "Knights of the Golden Circle" and the "Knights of the Ku Klux Klan," but he alluded to the Republican party, denouncing it as despisers of the people and as a party of fraud and robbery and a fraud-always shows its ravenous teeth at the mention of free trade and protection. He alluded to the death of every man who has been directly responsible for the mortgages on the farms of the country by enacting laws which have made it borrow money at high rates of interest.

THE SHERMAN SILVER LAW. The Senator next took up the so-called Sherman silver-purchase law and said: "I drew the bill which repealed it."

While on this subject the senator repeated the Democratic falsehood to the effect that the Cleveland administration had bankrupted the treasury. After recounting the work of Congress, and before taking up the tariff question, he said: "When I look out on the vast and difficult work to be done, the extensive reorganizations required before the government can again yield harvests of prosperity and happiness to the people, I am sometimes reminded of an old farm in which for many years has been in bad hands and has ceased to be productive of wholesome crops. Its fields will be found breeding brimstone, locusts, locusts, thistles, cockle burr, beggar lice, symphon weed, dog fennel, smart grass, skunk cabbage and yellow root, and the weeds and ugly stumps also cumber such fields and hinder the work of the plow and delay the planting of the seed. If a farmer in this condition has the good fortune to get a change of ownership and the new owner, instead of the old owner, is an honest farmer, you would hardly expect him to clean out all its noxious obstructions and put in a new crop of wheat, oats, hay and clover in a single season. You would grant him at least two or three months to do this. The same with which his farm were afflicted before he took possession. The benefit of this illustration, and the same which would extend to the farmer in his work of agricultural reform, are all I ask for the Democratic party. We have begun our work nobly and well; much has been done and yet much more remains to be done. In the political fields for more than thirty years past can be entirely extirpated."

The senator then took up the subject of his speech to the repeal of the McKinley law and enactment of the Bristow-Gorman bill, protecting measures. He repeated the McKinley act," he said, "when all the circumstances and conditions are calmly considered, will be found to be the most stupendous struggle against poor and consolidated capital ever made before in American history. Protection, in its most without limit rallied to the defense of that infamous act as troops rally at the call of the bugle. Never did the greatest battles in human events play for a bigger stake in actual money. The struggle was for money for future domination than the robber barons of protection and their henchmen, in their fierce, unyielding opposition to the repeal of that colossal engine of fraud prepared for the tolling masses by their enrichment and power, at the expense of every honest principle known to free government. The accused spirit of the law was aroused and alarmed as never before in American history. The love of riches, as an exclusive purpose of the human soul, and danger of loss has more of terror in it to greed avarice than an assassin in his life."

The whole doctrine of protection was at stake in the movement. I here proclaim that the backbone of the protective system is broken in this country. The McKinley act dragged itself along in a crippled and limping condition yet for a short time, but it is doomed to a speedy and total extinction. The passage of the McKinley act in 1890 was the culmination of that system by which taxes are levied on one class of people for the benefit of another class, and it was so shameful, arrogant and insolent in all its features that it was a disgrace and oppressive in its exactions on labor, and the fruits of labor, that it became at once a trumpet of war. It was a war of peace, and for the final overthrow of the hideous principle of legislative piracy on which it was based. No measure of such magnitude as a spontaneous flame against a measure so unrighteous, so subversive of the inherent rights of man. No measure in American history has ever been more odious to the American people than the McKinley law. The McKinley law was held in greater abhorrence and detestation throughout the North than any other measure of wickedness and extortion throughout the whole country. The provocation given by the McKinley law to the American people, and in attacking and destroying the measure itself they demand that the doctrine of its construction shall be wiped out and come back to trouble them no more.

OBJECT OF TARIFF REFORM.

"The great and primary object of tariff reform is the abolition of tariff duties on the wants and necessities of life, as far as can be done with safety to the revenues for the support of the government. It follows, therefore, that legislation which, from legitimate sources, supplies revenue and furnishes the treasury with funds for public use, without laying taxes on the wearing apparel of the plain people, or increasing the cost of the beds they sleep on, or of the knives and forks with which they eat, must be hailed as wise statesmanship, and the reformer who brings it about, as a universally conceded, I do not hesitate to declare that the bill which passed both houses of Congress and became a law on the 28th day of August, 1894, whatever its other merits or demerits may be, will do more in the aggregate to benefit the people than any other measure ever enacted into law by the American Congress. While repeal-

ing the McKinley act we provided that at least thirty millions a year should be collected from people who had failed to do good, net incomes, rather than from people who have nothing but their wants, and their wants which touch the lives of the poor to the ole and the olive. What is this but a transfer of taxation for the support of the government from the laboring poor to the ole and the olive? What is it but a relief from high protection and a direct and powerful blow to the whole protective system?"

"In all other classes of men and women in the United States can submit to the laws of the country on the subject of taxation there is no reason to my mind why the owner of a million dollar income should pay a higher rate of tax than the owner of a \$1,000 a year should fail to obey. A man with a large fortune has more need of protection by law than his poorer neighbor; he owes more to the support and enforcement of the law. It is pure capriciousness that he should be taxed on his realized wealth in return for the government care and protection against the ravages of the law. Why should such a system be stigmatized as unjust and oppressive? What is the Democratic system of government, or in the Democratic principles on which it is founded, that exalts the rich and humiliates the poor according to their means? Those in poverty have done this, why not those who have a net surplus of \$100,000 at the end of the year? Is justice un-American? Is equality before the law and in the enjoyment of natural rights un-American? The first income tax known to history was of a higher origin than that which we have enacted to earth, nor was it a weight enactment such as we now propose. For the support of his own government the Supreme Ruler of the universe taxed his whole people—taxed them one-tenth of their possessions nor did such a tax threaten it with criminal violation. From that high and ancient day to the present day the tax on incomes has been no more or more experiment in the history of government. Such a tax has always been regarded as the greatest interest of the ruling classes, while at the same time inflicting no injustice on those best able to pay it, and having the greatest interest in the stability of government and the supremacy of law."

THE GIFT TO DISTILLERS.

"But in the effort we made to break down tariff duties by supplying the government with revenue from other sources we did not stop with the income tax. The increased taxation of whisky from 90 cents to a dollar and ten cents per gallon was a favorite measure with all except protectionists, the Whisky Trust and other holders of whisky who wanted to be let alone. Protectionists have never failed, no matter to which party they belong, to antagonize the collection of money for government support by means of our internal revenue system. They do not want taxes paid on incomes, on whisky, on beer, on tobacco, on playing cards and the like. Their system is to raise all the revenue the government needs and to protect the masses of the people from the plundering of the people of ill-familiable millions, by blockading our ports against the trade of the world, by shutting out competition from abroad, which would cheapen everything to the people here—by turning over our markets to private, exclusive greed and by compelling consumers to pay, as the market shows, for all articles of value, a life amongst laboring people, from 25 to 50 per cent. more than they are worth. More than that they could be bought for if trade were free. Hence, the doctrine of protection for the rich and oppression for the poor—the Republican doctrine of protection which has been so justly denominated robbery and a fraud—always shows its ravenous teeth at the mention of free trade and protection to the death every man who has been directly responsible for the mortgages on the farms of the country by enacting laws which have made it borrow money at high rates of interest."

When it was discovered that the bill which has recently become a law, the Senate bill if you choose to call it so, made provision for a reduction of over seventy millions a year in duties on imported goods, a tax on incomes, and an increased tax on distilled spirits, which together will more than equal that amount, the clear-sighted protectionist from Maine to California knew his fatal meaning to his policy of rapine and injustice. The able and efficient Commissioner of Internal Revenue authorizes me to say that he will collect every dollar coming to the government under the increased whisky tax of \$1.10 a gallon as certainly and as readily as he has heretofore collected the tax of one dollar a gallon, and that it is a fair estimate, after the first year, that over one hundred and ten millions will be poured annually into the treasury from the new law, which touches not one of the necessities or natural wants of human existence. The enormous fact, impossible to overestimate, the income tax and the tax on distilled spirits have come to stay. They make life more burdensome and laboring people to secure in their farms, as it became a law, a reduction of taxes on all woolen clothing of all kinds from 40 to 100 per cent.; a reduction on iron ore, steel, iron plates, tin plates, tin cans, and on all the principal implements and utensils needed by farmers of from 40 to 100 per cent. The truth is, and it is a truth too often stated, nor made too plain, that the internal revenue system of taxation embracing incomes, whisky and distilled spirits, and other forms of rapine, tobacco in its various forms, playing cards and other like articles of wealth and luxury, will hereafter be added to the forerunner of the downfall of protection—the John the Baptist of the gospel of commerce.

"As to the defects and shortcomings of the new law, which repealed the McKinley law and has gone into operation, we will discuss their practical workings will discuss them with more wisdom for their future correction. The Republican bill they can discuss now in party heat and bad temper. It is well known that I would have gone to the Senate with some important amendments to the bill in the Senate, and that I struggled hard to do so. I stand with Grover Cleveland, and I stand with the most stupendous struggle against poor and consolidated capital ever made before in American history. Protection, in its most without limit rallied to the defense of that infamous act as troops rally at the call of the bugle. Never did the greatest battles in human events play for a bigger stake in actual money. The struggle was for money for future domination than the robber barons of protection and their henchmen, in their fierce, unyielding opposition to the repeal of that colossal engine of fraud prepared for the tolling masses by their enrichment and power, at the expense of every honest principle known to free government. The accused spirit of the law was aroused and alarmed as never before in American history. The love of riches, as an exclusive purpose of the human soul, and danger of loss has more of terror in it to greed avarice than an assassin in his life."

TARIFF REDUCTIONS.

"But let us see what has actually been done in the interest of taxpaying people. The average valorem rate of duty under the McKinley bill was 45.8; the average rate proposed by the Mills bill, indorsed by the national Democratic convention only six years ago at St. Louis, was 47.8; the average rate of the Morrison bill, another Democratic measure, was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley act, and what have Democrats to say when they see what the present Democratic Congress, in spite of its professed within, and incessant assault from without, has made a headlong rush to reduce in tariff duties than was ever before even proposed in American history? The average rate of duty under the Morrison bill was 41.65, while the average rate of duty under the new law, as it now stands, may be stated at 37 per cent. ad valorem. What have Republicans to say of this comparison with their odious McKinley