THRUSTS AT FREE TRADE

Mr. McKinley, at the Georgia Chautauqua, Speaks Eloquently for Protection.

The Great Evils of Free Trade Exposed in a Manner that Surprises the Southerners.

A System Under Which the Country Has Prospered Should Be Longer Continued.

We print below the main portions of the very able address of Hon. William McKinley, Jr., delivered at Atlanta, Ga., on the 21st of August, on the invitation of the Piedmont Society:

The Hon. J. Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, an eminent lawyer and experienced statesman, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives May 13, 1878, defined a revenue duty as follows: "Therefore, as no higher duty ought to be laid than is needed to raise the requisite revenue on any particular article, it follows that the true revenue duty is the lowest duty which will bring the required revenue."

This definition is a fair and frank one, and I accept it. A revenue tariff is, therefore, such a one as will produce the largest revenue from the lowest duty. The lowest rate of duty will encourage importations, diminish home production, and inevitably increase the revenue; it will of necessity check competition at home and send our merchants abroad to buy; it affords no protection, not even incidental, for the very instant you discover that such duty favors the home producer, that instant you discover that importations and revenue are checked, and that our own producers are able to control the home market or a part of it. Then at once the advocate of a revenue tariff reduces the duty, brings it down to the true revenue standard; for it must not be overlooked, according to that free-trade maxim, "where protection begins revenue ends," and the question of revenue is always controlling. A revenue tariff is inconsistent with protection; it is intended for a wholly different purposes. It loses its forces and character as a genuine revenue tariff when it becomes to any extent protective. It has but one object. It can have but one effect—that of opening up our markets to the foreign producer, impoverishing the home producer, and enriching his foreign rival.

England is more nearly a free trade country than any other, and her system of taxation furnishes an unmistakable example of the practice and principle of a revenue tariff. Her import duties are imposed almost exclusively upon articles which cannot be produced by her own people upon her own soil. Tobacco, snuff, cigars, chicory, cocoa, currants, figs, raisins, rum, brandy, wine, tea, and coffee—these are the articles from which her customs revenue is derived—articles, in the main, not produced in England, but which must be supplied from abroad; while practically all competing products of foreign make and production are admitted through her custom-houses free of duty. A brief statement of the dutiable imports of Great Britain will not be without interest. It will be observed that her duties are more largely imposed upon peculiarly American products than upon any others. The duty upon tobacco is, according to moisture, from 84 to 92 cents per pound for the raw or unmanufactured article, and if manufactured it pays a duty of from $1.04 to $1.16 per pound. The manufactured article is made dutiable at 20 cents a pound greater than the raw product, which, with all of England's boasted free trade, is intended as a protection to those engaged in the manipulation of tobacco. It is almost prohibitive to Americans who would export manufactured tobacco. The advalorem equivalent of the duty on tobacco is nearly 2,00 per cent. Cigars pay a duty of $1.32 per pound, and from tobacco and snuff over $48,000,000 of duties are collected annually. The duty on tea is 12 cents a pound. How would the American enjoy paying such a duty upon this article of every day use? The duty collected from this source is over $18,000,000 annually. Coffee pays a duty of 3 cents a pound, but if ground, prepared or in any way manufactured, it must pay a duty of 4 cents a pound—another sample of where England protects those engaged in manufacture. Cocoa pays a duty of 2 cents a pound, but if it is in any form subjected to manufacture it pays 4 cents a pound, the duty on the manufactured article being double that on the raw material. Besides the articles I have named, there are about ninety or a hundred others, chiefly of American production, patented and other medicines, which are dutiable at $3.36 per gallon. More than $90,000,000, or nearly one-fourth of the British revenues, are raised from customs duties.

You will note the character of taxation to which the revenue reformer invites the people of the United States. Both the breakfast table and the sick-room are made to bear a large part of the burden under the British system of taxation. It is not without significance that the nearer we approach this system the more generous the bestowal of British commendation. Every step we take in that direction, every enlargement of the free list of competing foreign products, every reduction of duty upon such products, is hailed as a vindication of Cobden and a beneficence to British interests. It is in vain for the British statesman to assure us that their system is best for us. We are not accustomed to look to our commercial rivals for disinterested favors. "It is folly," said Washington in his farewell address, "in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay, with a portion of its independence, for whatever it may accept under that character. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure and which a just pride ought to discard." We are not, Mr. President, insensible to the good opinion of mankind and the English-speaking race, but when it is to be had only at the expense of our industrial independence, at the sacrifice of the dignity and independence of labor and the destruction of national prosperity, we must regard it with supreme suspicion and turn from it as the eulogy or selfish interest and the commendation of interested greed.

The other theory of taxation, and the one which I believe to be essential to American development and national prosperity, is based upon an exactly opposite principle. It permits all articles of foreign production, whether of the field, the factory, or the mine, except luxuries only, which we can not produce in the United States, to enter our ports free and unburdened by custom house exactions. The duty is to be imposed upon the foreign competing product, that is, the product which, if brought into this country, would contend with the products of our own soil, our own labor, and our own factories, in our own markets. Under this system if the foreign producer would enter our market with a competing product he must contribute something for the privilege which he is to enjoy, and this something, in the form of duties, goes into the Treasury, furnishing revenue to the Government; and these duties operate to protect the joint product of labor and capital against a like foreign product. This mode of levying duties answers a double purpose. It produces revenue to the Government and at the same time fosters and encourages the occupations of our own people, promotes industrial development, opens up new mines, builds new factories, and sustains those already established, which in turn furnish employment to labor at fair and remunerative wages. A revenue tariff accomplishes but a single purpose—that of raising revenue; it has no other mission, while a protective tariff accomplishes this and more—it brings revenue to the American Treasury and discriminates in favor of the American citizen. A revenue tariff invites the product of foreign labor and foreign capital to occupy our markets free and unrestrained in competition with the product of our own labor and capital. A protective tariff invites the product of foreign labor and foreign capital which are necessary to the wants of our people (which we can not produce in the United States) to occupy our markets and go untaxed to the people, but insists that every foreign product which is produced at home, or can be successfully, in quantities capable of supplying the domestic consumption, shall, whenever necessary to maintain suitable rewards to our labor, bear a duty which shall not be so high as to prohibit importations, but at such a rate as will produce the necessary revenues and at the same time not destroy but encourage American production. It says to the world of producers: "If you want to share with the citizens of the United States their home market, you must pay for the privilege of doing it. Your product shall not enter in free and unrestrained competition with the product of our own people, but shall be discriminated against to such an extent as to fully protect and defend our own."

It is alleged as a serious objection to protective duties that the tax, whatever it may be, increases the cost of the foreign as well as the domestic product to the extent of such tax or duty, and that it is wholly paid by the consumer. This objection would be worthy of serious consideration if it were true, but, as has been demonstrated over and over again, it is without foundation in fact. Wherever the foreign product has successful competition at home the duty is rarely paid by the consumer. It is paid from the profits of the manufacturer, or divided between him and the merchant or the importer and diminishes their profits to that extent. Duty or no duty, without home competition the consumer would fare worse than he fares now. There is not in the long line of staple products consumed by the people a single one which has not been threatened by competition at home, made possible by protective duties. There is not an article that enters into the every day mess of the family which is produced in the United States that has not been made cheaper and more accessible as the result of home production and development, which was to be secured only by the steady maintenance of the protective system. While this is true of protective tariffs, exactly the opposite is true of revenue tariffs. They are always paid by the consumer. A duty put upon a foreign product, the like of which is not produced at home, and which enters our markets free from home competition, the cost to the American consumer is exactly the foreign cost with the duty added, whatever that may be, much or little. Supposing, for example, there was a tax upon tea and coffee. There being no production of these articles in the United States, and therefore no competition here, the cost to the American public would be the cost abroad and the duty added. We imported last year 526,189,000 pounds of coffee. A duty of 10 cents a pound would have produced to the Government over $52,000,000, which would have been paid by the 12,000,000 families of this country, consumers of the article. Eighty-seven million five hundred and eighty-four thousand pounds of tea were imported last year. At 10 cents a pound $8,000,000 and upward would have gone into the Treasury, every dollar of which would have been paid by our own people. Take sugar, as another example. We produced last year in this country about 8 per cent of what our people consumed. The duty collected from imported sugar amounted to $58,000,000. The domestic production was so inconsiderable as compared with the domestic consumption as to have had little, if any, appreciable effect upon the price to the consumer, and therefore this sum was almost wholly paid by our own citizens, and the cost of sugar, to the American consumer, because of the inadequate home supply, is practically the foreign price, duty added, the domestic production being so small contrasted with the domestic demand that it in no wise controlled or influenced the price. The price to us is fixed by the 92 per cent. which came from abroad, plus the amount of the duty collected at the custom-house. It would have been otherwise if the bulk of our consumption was produced at home. If you take any American production which is large enough to supply the domestic demand the effect is different. Then the foreign producer must undersell the home production in order to get a foothold in this market, and therefore the foreign producer is willing to surrender the whole duty, or a considerable part of it, consenting to less profits for the sake of extending his markets, with the hope of ultimately destroying home competition. The real question, therefore, is whether in raising money to supply the government needs we should have thoughtful concern of the industrial interests of the people we represent, or, discarding every other consideration shall adjust our duties upon the revenue principle to secure revenue, and revenue only. The money must be raised, and in raising it the protectionist is mindful of the interests of our own people. The tariff reformer is considerate of everybody else's interest but our own. I can not understand why so long as taxation must be resorted to and that will be the case so long as governments exist it should not be raised upon the foreign article which competes with the domestic article, and thus discriminate in favor of our own and against the foreign, rather than to admit to equality in our markets untaxed, and upon equal terms with our own producers, the products of our foreign rivals.

The protective system but invokes the highest law of nature—that of self-government. There is every reason, founded in justice, why the American producer should in every constitutional way be favored as against the foreign producer whose products compete with his. This is our natural market; we have made it. We have made it after a century of struggle. We have made it after a cost of capital and brain and muscle. We have preserved it against foreign wars and domestic conflicts, at a great sacrifice of money. The foreign producer has contributed nothing to the growth or development of the country. Whatever influence he has exerted has been against us and to our detriment. He has nothing in common with us. He is without the jurisdiction of our laws. He cannot be reached by the tax-gatherer. He is exempt from all civil obligations in every part of the republic. We can make no requisition upon him, either in peace or in war. Our mode of reaching him is through the product he would send to our markets. We can demand of him that his merchandise shall make contribution to our Treasury if he would enjoy the use of our markets. We can make him serve us in no other way. In the case of a revenue tariff, as I have pointed out, his product never bears the burden. Whatever we put upon it is borne by our own people, and in no wise shared by him. This principle of caring for our own is founded upon the highest authority, human and divine. It commences with the family, extends up through the community, to the State, and at last to the nation. There is no city in the country in any section that does not invoke this principle in the administration of municipal government for the protection and encouragement of its own citizens.

The itinerant vender is taxed in every city of the land. If he would expose his wares upon the streets of Atlanta at public auction I doubt not the city government compels him to pay a tax for the privilege of doing it, and that tax is added to the ordinary revenues of the city to assist in meeting its obligations. Now, why is this done? Upon exactly the same principle that we tax the foreign competing product under the system of protection. It is done to protect the resident merchants of your city, who are with you always, within your jurisdiction, subject to your laws, contributing to the wealth and progress of your city, paying taxes to adorn and beautify it, paying taxes to support your public schools and make public improvements. The itinerate vender has no such relation to your community. He is no part of your political organism. He comes and goes; he is not a tax-payer; he shares in none of the burdens of your people; he is a free-trader, who looks upon your market as much his and as open to him as to your own tradespeople. Your city government taxes him to diminish the burdens borne by your own citizens. This is protection, simple and pure, and is the exact character of that which we would apply to foreign nations seeking our markets. Our fathers recognized this principle. It was emphasized in the second act they passed

WM. MCKINLEY, JR.

by the Congress of the United States. The ringing words of that declaration for industrial independence I wish might find a lodgment in every American heart:

WHEREAS, It is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the nation, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be levied on imported goods, wares and merchandise.

A more positive declaration in favor of the protective system it would be difficult to find language to express. This was the first important legislative declaration under the Federal Constitution. The only other law that preceded it was that of fixing the oath of office of certain Federal officials. It was made even before Washington was inaugurated. It subsequently received his sanction, and it is a fact not without significance that his approval was given to it on a day memorable in American history, the 4th of July, 1789. It had the approval of James Madison, Rufus King, Roger Sherman, Trumbull, Lee, and a host of other leading men from all parts of the Union.

Additional tariff legislation was had in 1790. Some duties were increased. The journal of the House of Representatives discloses the fact that of the thirty-nine votes given in favor of the bill, twenty-one were from the Southern States. Of the thirteen votes against, nine were from the New England States, three from the Southern States, and one from the Middle States. It will thus be seen that we are largely indebted to the South for the inauguration and establishment of the protective system in the United States, which has for the most part governed our legislation since the formation of our government. For nearly sixty sixty years of our national life this principle in its fullness has been recognized in our laws, and whenever recognized it has been accompanied by commercial and industrial development, stimulating new enterprises, and securing prosperity to the masses without a parallel in the world's annals.

The revenue tariff periods in our history have been periods of greatest financial revulsions and industrial decadence, want and poverty among the people, private enterprises checked, and public works retarded. From 1833 to 1842, under the low tariff legislation then prevailing, business was at a standstill, and our merchants and traders were bankrupted, our industries were paralyzed, our labor remained idle, and our capital was unemployed. Foreign products crowded our markets, destroyed domestic competition, and, as invariably follows, the price of commodities to consumers was appreciably raised. It is an instructive fact that every panic this country has ever experienced has been preceded by enormous importations. From 1846 to 1861 a similar situation was presented under the low tariff of that period. Contrast this period with the period from 1861 to 1883, the former under a revenue tariff, the latter under a protective tariff. In 1860 we had 160,000,000 acres of improved land, while in 1880 we had 287,000,000, an increase of 75 per cent. In 1860 our farms were valued at $3,200,000,000. In 1880 the value had leaped to $10,197,000,000, an increase of over 300 per cent. In 1860 we raised 173,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1880, 498,000,000. In 1860 we raised 838,000,000 bushels of corn; in 1880, 1,717,000,000 bushels. In 1860 we produced 5,000,000 bales of cotton; in 1880, 7,000,000 bales, an increase of 40 per cent. In 1860 we manufactured cotton goods to the value of $115,681,774; in 1880 the value reached $211,000,000, an increase of upward of 80 per cent. In 1860 we manufactured of woolen goods $81,000,000; in 1880, $267,000,000, an increase of 330 per cent. In 1860 we produced 60,000,000 pounds of wool; in 1880, 240,000,000 pounds, an increase of nearly 300 per cent. In 1860 we mined 15,000,000 tons of coal; in 1880, 79,000,000 tons, an increase of over 400 per cent. In 1860 we made 987,000 tons of pig iron; in 1880, 3,835,000 tons. In 1860 we manufactured 253,000 tons of railroad iron, and in 1883, 1,208,000 tons. In 1860 our aggregate of national wealth was $16,159,000,000; in 1880 it was $43,000,000,000. From 1848 to 1860, during the low tariff period, there was but a single year in which we exported in excess of what we imported. The balance of trade during the twelve of the thirteen years was against us. Our people were drained of their money to pay that of leather for boots, shoes, etc., etc. In 1872 hides and skins were made free so that our manufacturers could import them without custom house burdens. They have had "free trade" in their raw material now for sixteen years. The industry has been an exceptionally successful one, and you can not avoid being surprised when I say to you that in these sixteen years we have been able to export but 2 per cent. of the leather production of the country.

But if free raw material be necessary to secure an export trade and the foreign markets, then I answer that our manufacturers to-day have substantial free trade in foreign raw materials which they make into the finished product in the United States, provided they export it. Sections 3,019, 3,020, 3,021, and 3,022 of the United States Statutes provide for the remission of duties on all foreign materials used in manufacturing for the export trade. The law is positive that all articles manufactured for export from imported materials, upon which duties have been paid, shall, when exported, be entitled to a drawback of 99 per cent. of the duties paid on such raw materials. Some use has been made of these laws. The remission of duties in 1884 paid upon imported material manufactured for foreign markets amounted to $2,253,668. On some articles the drawback is equal to the duty paid, but in no instance where articles are imported to be manufactured here and sent abroad is the duty to exceed 10 per cent. And yet we are gravely told by the tariff reformers that we cannot reach foreign markets on account of the high tariff on the raw material, when, in fact, for foreign trade, foreign raw materials are practically free. This principle was recognized as early as the administration of George Washington, and has been enlarged and made applicable to all imported materials, the drawbacks varying from 99 to 100 per cent. What becomes, then, of the cry for free raw materials in the presence of this fact? The truth is, we are not so much concerned about the foreign market as we are about the home market. The latter is the best, and we have not yet been able to control it, and until we do, that should be our chief concern; but if any of our people are sighing for a foreign market, and value it more highly than our own, they can import foreign raw material practically free of duty, and after advancing into the higher forms of manufacture can go out and possess the world's markets. Taxed raw materials do not stand in their way, and it is hypocrisy to claim otherwise. "The markets of the world" in our present condition are a snare and a delusion. We will reach them whenever we can undersell competing nations, and no sooner. Tariffs do not keep us out, and free trade will not make it easier to enter them. Let me give you a brief exhibit of some of our foreign trade, what we buy and what we sell. In the year ending June 30, 1887, we bought of Mexico, the Central American States, British Honduras, and the governments of the West Indies and South America, products to the value of $172,468,923, and sold these governments of our products about 33½ per cent. in amount of what we bought of them, or about $60,000,000; and as a showing that our protective tariff did not produce this uncomfortable balance against us, I need only state that more than one-half of the products we bought were not subject to any tariff tax at all, but were admitted free of duty.

THE Mayor of Chicago boasts of fifty-seven pairs of trousers.

ARE YEZ SHURE IT WILL HOULD WATHER NOW, MISTHER MILLS?

GEN. HARRISON.

Thousands Welcome Him to the Ohio City, Where He Delivers a Telling Address.

The Voters Asked to Work For and Support American Principles and Protection.

[TOLEDO CORRESPONDENCE.]

It was raining when Gen. Harrison left Indianapolis for Middle Bass Island, Put-in-Bay. The first demonstration of any kind along the route occurred at Kokomo, fifty-four miles from Indianapolis, where hundreds of workmen and railroad employes had congregated awaiting Gen. Harrison's arrival. They cheered the General, and went to the rear platform and shook hands with him. The General made no address.

Just before the train arrived at Peru it stopped at the shops of the Lake Erie and Western Railway and the workmen, in their aprons and soiled hands, ran out to greet the General, who stepped down in their midst and shook hands during the brief stop.

At Peru a crowd of nearly 1,000 greeted the General and his party as they alighted. It was with a great deal of difficulty that the General made his way to the waiting-room of the depot, where he received the people.

From Peru to Fort Wayne, fifty-six miles, the trip was made without special incident, every little station furnishing its crowd to satisfy whom the General appeared on the rear platform. In the meantime the occupants of the car passed the time chatting and reading, the women enjoying a game of euchre. Gen. Harrison read the newspapers. There was no demonstration at Fort Wayne, and people at the depot were in ignorance of the General's presence until the arrival of the train. The General alighted there and shook hands with the few that were on the platform and then walked back and forth exercising himself until the train started.

A crowd of 10,000 or more was assembled at the depot in Toledo when the train steamed in, and when Gen. Harrison stepped on the platform he was received with deafening cheers. He was escorted to the residence of Mr. Wm. Cummins. Subsequently a public reception was given the General in Memorial Hall, where an audience of 10,000 to 15,000 assembled. The appearance of Gen. Harrison on the platform was the signal for tremendous cheering.

J. M. Brown, President of the Executive Committee of the United Republican Clubs of Toledo, made a brief speech explaining the circumstances under which the guest of the evening appeared before them, after which he introduced Gen. Harrison. Prolonged cheering greeted the latter, who then spoke as follows:

MY FRIENDS: You have already been told that this reception was not planned by me, and yet I do not regret that I have yielded to the earnest solicitation of your representative and have consented to stand for a few moments in the presence of this magnificent and instructive audience. I say instructive, for that public man is dull indeed who does not gather both instruction and inspiration from such meetings as this. I thank you for any measure of personal respect and interest which your coming here to-night may witness. But I do not see in this immense gathering any testimony that is personal to me. I prefer to regard it as another witness added to the long number I have seen before of the deep-seated and earnest interest of our people in the public questions that are to be settled in November. I choose rather to regard it as a pledge that this interest which you manifest to me to-night will not stop here, and is the pledge of continued and earnest personal work by each one of you for those principles which have won the consent of your minds and the love of your hearts.

I cannot enter into any detail in the discussion of public questions; I would not at all put myself between you and these great important issues. I would in all I may say put them to the front. We are here, citizens of a great and prosperous and magnificent nation. We have common interests. We are here charged with the common duties to perpetuate, if we can, the prosperity and to maintain the honor of this great republic. We are here to-night in the enjoyment of free government. We are here in the individual possession of better opportunities of development, of larger prosperity, and of more individual comfort than are possessed by any other people in the world. The great economic question as to what shall be our future legislative policy is stated with a distinctness in this campaign that it has never had before, and I believe the verdict and decision will have an emphasis and finality that it has never had before.

If there is any one here present to-night that knows of any land that spreads a more promising sky of hope above the head of the poor and the laboring man than this I would be glad if he would name it. The one fact that I do not need to demonstrate by statistics, the one fact that I could call out of this vast audience hundreds of witnesses to support by their personal testimony, is that the scale of American wages is higher than that of any other country in the world. If this were not true, why is it that the workingmen and the workingwomen of the older lands turn their faces hitherward—if there is a better country, one that offers better wages, fuller hopes, than this? Why is it that those who are in quest of such better things have not found it out and turned their faces thitherward? Now, if that is true, then why is it true and how is to be continued the condition of our country? It is because, and only because, we have for years, by our protective tariff, discriminated in favor of American manufacturers and American workingmen. Strike down this protective tariff, bring our workingmen and workingwomen into equal competition in the products of their toil with those who labor abroad, and nothing is clearer than that these mills and factories must reduce wages here to the level with wages abroad or they must shut down. You have the choice to make—you the free citizens of this country, whose ballots sway its destiny, will settle these questions in November. I ask you how? Don't be deceived by the suggestions that this is any contest over a 7 per cent. reduction in a tariff schedule. We are allowed now to say, I think, that all those who are entitled to speak for the Democratic party have declared that it is opposed to protection. That being so, the issue is clear—distinctly, strongly drawn. I beg you all, not in my interest, but your own; in the interest of your families and the country you love, to ponder this question; to think upon it with that seriousness its importance demands, and, when you have thought it out, settle it; settle it in November, so that we shall be free for years to come from this agitation in behalf of free trade.

I thank you again for this kindly demonstration. I beg you to accept these brief suggestions as the only but inadequate return that I can make you for this kindness.

The following morning Gen. Harrison and party left for Middle Bass, going on Col. S. C. Reynolds' steam yacht, the Signa, the finest vessel of the kind on the lakes. They will be the guests of William Cumming while at the island. They will occupy the beautiful cottage belonging to Peter Berdan of this city, who has placed it at their disposal. They will take their meals at the Middle Bass Club House. The length of their stay is undetermined, but is left to be dictated by circumstances. The Middle Bass Club desire the request made public that Gen. Harrison shall not be disturbed by visits of delegations while at the island, in order that he may be able to recuperate from the intense strain to which he has been subjected ever since his nomination.

FARMERS AND THE TARIFF.

Warner Miller Tells How Protection Has Brought a Market to the Farm.

[From the Utica Herald.]

In the course of his address at Angelica on Thursday night, Hon. Warner Miller said: "The President argues in his free-trade message that the farmers are injured by the tariff system. If it is an injury, then away with it, for agriculture is the foundation of our prosperity. The President tells you that the duty on foreign goods is added to the price of the domestic on the foreign articles, and therefore it is a robbery of the consumer. How much of your products do you think are consumed here at home? Over 92 per cent. When we had no protective tariff we had no such market. Now we send to Europe a paltry 5 or 8 per cent. of our products. We raise in this country 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter yearly, and of that only a paltry 38,000,000 pounds go to Europe. The home market has consumed it all. Corn are the price of butter now and in 1860, before the protective tariff system was adopted. Butter was sold for only 12 cents a pound. Then the Democrats say that the price of agricultural implements would be lower. Why, we make agricultural implements so low in price now that we are selling them in England and all over Europe. You get 100 per cent. more for your farm products than you did in 1860, and the prices of manufactured products are 50 per cent. less than they were then. Why Democrats should have put wool on the free list I am puzzled to understand. The President says that the high tariff does not benefit the working classes, that they have to pay a tax on everything they buy, which loses them the advantage of their own high wages. The protective tariff has led to an improvement of the breed of sheep and of the quality of wool. Our mutton is as good as that of England. Break down the tariff and you will destroy the finer grades of sheep. How much wool goes into a suit of clothes? In a heavy suit not over seven pounds, worth $1.40. Now, therefore, your suit would cost you that much more, but if you have fifty sheep your loss by the abolition of the duty on wool would be $30. Therefore, to save $1.40, you would lose $30. I can't see the profit of that. Moreover everything we consume on the table, with the exception of sugar, is cheaper than in Europe. Our laboring men have meat twice a day. The laboring man in Europe who should have meat twice a day would think himself an aristocrat."

THE CUMBERLAND BALL.

LATEST FREAK OF THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

A Monster Harrison and Morton Ball to be Rolled from Maine to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The most striking feature of a recent political parade in New York City was a huge ball, 14 feet in diameter, which it is proposed to roll all over the country as a sort of a campaign document. The sphere is called the Harrison and Morton ball, and is painted red, white and blue and inscribed with more or less rhythmic verse. The idea of the construction of this ball was conceived in Cumberland, Md., by several citizens of that town upon the day of Gen. Harrison's nomination, and its appropriateness struck them most forcibly when they remembered that the first ball of the kind ever made, and which was rolled about from one town to another by enthusiastic young politicians, was built in

THE CUMBERLAND BALL.

that very town of Cumberland in honor of the nomination of Gen. Harrison's grandfather. It formed one of the most novel features of the Tippecanoe campaign, and was rolled from Cumberland to Baltimore, where it was subsequently broken up for kindling wood. That ball, however, was not nearly as large or elaborate as the one which is to be started rolling in this parade.

The ball is a canvas-covered sphere, 42 feet in circumference, and is built about an immense wheel or rim on which it rolls. This wheel is about 8 inches thick, of heavy wood, with a quarter-inch iron tire. From its inside edge 38 iron hoops bend toward the poles, and upon these the canvas cover is stretched, the number being symbolical of the states of the Union. Fifteen gross of screws and 128 bolts were used in the construction of the monster, and the whole weighs over 1,000 pounds, though it rolls easily and may be propelled by a couple of men. The shaft of the ball is a piece of 3-inch gas pipe, which projects one foot at either pole. On this are fastened two standards, working on rollers, to prevent the ball from toppling over. Ropes can also be rigged to the shaft, so that enthusiastic Republicans can pull the monster along like a fire-engine.

The ball was made by D. E. Brockett, of Cumberland, Md., who will accompany it on much of its travels. In red letters on one end are painted the words: "Cumberland, Allegany Co., Maryland." Some of the other mottoes are as follows:

Old Allegany in 1840
Started the ball for Harrison;
In '88, as they did then,
We roll it on for gallant Ben.

Roll along, roll away,
Keep the ball in motion;
The spirit of our men is up
From Rocky Hills to ocean.

With heart and soul
This ball we roll;
May times improve
As on we move.

The ball was dedicated at a ratification meeting held in Cumberland on the 2d inst., and after a preliminary roll it was taken apart and shipped to New York. It is not proposed to roll it along the country roads from one place to the other, but to ship it by rail and put it together, so that it may appear in the campaign parades all over the country.

HOW LABORING MEN SHOULD VOTE.

Edward P. Allis' Circular for His Fifteen Hundred Employes.

[Milwaukee (Wis.) special.]

Edward P. Allis, proprietor of the Reliance iron-works, has issued a printed pamphlet to each one of his 1,500 employes, giving his reasons why each one of them should support the Republican national ticket. Mr. Allis is considered an Independent in politics, but in former years had a leaning toward the Greenback party, and was that party's candidate for Governor some years ago. In explanation of what he calls his open letter Mr. Allis said he had been asked his opinion of the present political situation by so many of his men that he thought best to speak to all of them. The question of protection and foreign labor he discusses at great length. In concluding, he says:

I can only add that I think our present Labor representative in Congress, Henry Smith—with whom I have formerly been in sympathy—in voting for the "Mills" bill, has betrayed the cause of labor, which he was elected to represent, and deem that it is my duty at the present time, temporarily sinking all other questions—to be revived at a more auspicious time—to do my utmost in this election to strengthen the Republican party, which broadly and openly espouses the cause of protection to American industries, and trust that every one of you who loves his family, his home, and his country will do the same. When we have succeeded in rendering permanent our present position of vantage, when we can look forward and strive for other benefits and advances, but if we lose what we now have our condition will be helpless indeed.

What Shall the Tariff Be?

Cutting the tax from the sheep's white wool,
Cutting the tax from the silken spool,
Cutting the tax from the cotton hose,
What shall the tariff be?
Oh, what shall the tariff be?

Cut by Cleveland and cut by Mills,
Cut in platform and cut in bills,
Slashed from everything you see,
Free, oh free, shall the tariff be.

Lopping it off from the farmer's flax,
Lopping it off from the cutler's ax,
Lopping it off from the weaver's web,
Lopping it off from the spinner's thread;
What shall the tariff be?
Oh, what shall the tariff be?

Paying England for boots and shoes,
Paying England for all that we use,
Starving our labor and shutting our mills,
Killing our commerce with free-trade bills;
What shall the harvest be?
Oh, what shall the harvest be?

Ten to One.

The fact is not to be denied that that the Republican party is receiving daily accessions from the Democratic ranks in all the Northern States. It is impossible to know just how numerous these recruits are; but there can be no doubt that in the aggregate they exceed by as many as ten to one the desertions from the Republican camp. The great moving cause, of course, is sympathy with the policy of protection and hospitality to the Mills-Cleveland conspiracy in the interest of foreign nation against American labor and prosperity.—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat.*