FOES OF PROTECTION.

CLEVELAND AND HIS PARTY CONFESSED FREE-TRADERS.

Conclusive Proof of Democratic Hostility to America's Protective System—Utterances of Prominent Democrats in Congress That Fully Commit the Party to the English Doctrine of Free Trade.

It is astonishing how difficult it is in this world to get things called by their right names, and yet the names are not the essential things except as affording short and concise terms which enable you to designate the object without circumlocution. The horse has a different name in every language, and yet is the same animal to every eye. The difficulty of getting the true names attached to things is much enhanced when the true name reveals sinister designs. No criminal, for instance, likes to have his action described in legal terms. It is much easier to get the photograph of an honest man than the countenance of one who is to adorn a gallery consecrated to study by detectives. The sitter in the last case goes in to contortions which at once spoil his beauty and render his identification difficult. Nevertheless, whether the face is in repose or in motion, the same man is in front of the camera. So with ideas and principles, the essential thing is to get at the verity, under whatever name they may be called.

In this campaign the purpose of the President's party friends is to break down protection by slow degrees; no slower, however, than is absolutely necessary for the success of the plan. In order to do this they commenced operations at the beginning of this session of Congress by intrusting the formation of a bill to reduce the tariff to a committee, at the head of which was Mr. Mills, of Texas. As soon as the country was thoroughly aroused to the nature of the bill, its framers and supporters found that there was so strong a feeling in favor of protection throughout the country and within their own party, that they have latterly taken upon themselves the task, not only of denying the tendencies of their bill, but of denying their own intentions. When the meeting of ratification in New York took place, the feeling was so strong that large job lots of Congressmen were sent over to that city to asseverate the contrary of what, amid the great applause of their fellow-members, they had declared on the floor of the House. The notable instance of Mr. Mills will be touched upon later in detail.

All of them seemed to be anxious not to be called free-traders. They seemed after the launching of their craft to have the same dread lest it should be christened "the Free-Trader," as did Grover Cleveland when he wrote the one-topic message which proposed the plans and laid the keel. It becomes, therefore, highly important to find out what these gentlemen say in what, under our American newspaper system of reporting the doings of Congress, is the profound and confidential secrecy of the House debates. We must put the camera upon them at moments when they did not expect to be put into the gallery to be examined by all good citizens. The faces will be more natural than when they are contorted for the stump, after the discovery that the people do not want "free trade," under whatever name the odor may be given forth.

Of course no one will expect that these gentlemen will wear their hearts on their sleeves and boldly announce in precisely the language which will be most dangerous to them and their party the views they really possess and mean to put into action. It is only in their incidental talk that they use the phrases which reveal the ultimate goal of their designs. Out of some of the very speeches which are carefully prefaced with denials of free trade tendencies crop the indications which show what is below. These things pervade every speech delivered by those who belong to the dominant wing of the party and control the party action. Not once, but many times during the debates have these men been invited to deny their allegiance to free trade, and never once, when surrounded by their associates, have they dared so to do. In each case they have had to put the distance from Washington to New York between them and the faces of those who know their real sentiments. Some detached sentences will show how they feel. It is perfectly true that many sentences which I shall quote are inconsistent with other sentences in the same speech, but in no case inconsistent with the whole speech, its purpose and intent. For instance, Mr. McKinney of New Hampshire, who has joined himself very cordially to the dominant wing of his party, but who has too many flourishing industries in his district not to deny that he is a free-trader, forgets "in the heat of debate" all about his exordium, and in the ecstasy of his peroration bursts forth into this invocation, which even Frank Hurd might envy:

"Give us a free and open market with the world; break down the barriers which a false system has built around us."

Mr. McDonald, of Minnesota, also, who had heretofore been careful to put the word "high" before the word "tariff," and to say "we are no free-traders," bursts the barriers before he gets through, and declares in so many words that "American manufacturing industries do not need protection any longer," and speaks of the "legalized robbery called a protective tariff" in precisely those words. No wonder he says, "I am frank to say this bill does not meet my unqualified approval. I am not fully satisfied with it, because it does not go far enough." These last expressions were so common in the debate, sanctioned as they were at the outset by the declaration of Mr. Mills that "the bill we propose is not all we could have asked," that it is a marvel that any attempt should be made to disguise the tendency of the present action, and to turn away from the future action which its framers intend to take, should the present scheme be successful.

The declarations against protection as a system were not confined to any section of country or any class or condition of members. They were not confined to the South nor to the West. They were as widespread as the President's party. They were uttered as well by members who have not yet made for themselves a national reputation as by the members of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, that secret tribunal which not only framed the bill in darkness but afterward farmed out amendments to the deserving faithful.

"The protection system has violated the letter and spirit of the Constitution," said Mr. Shaw, of Maryland, in his speech of April 25. "Sir," said Mr. O'Ferral, of Virginia, on the first day of May, himself in favor of the iron-ore "tax" because iron ore is produced in his native village, "sir, I believe commerce between nations should be relieved so far as possible from all fetters and all restraints," and himself at last, bursting all fetters and restraints, denounces "the blood-sucking protectionist." "Sir," said Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, though anxious lest any outsider should call him a "free-trader," "sir, the present system is fundamentally wrong in its operation and fundamentally ridiculous in the pleas set up for its continuance." Mr. Landes, of Illinois, a little bolder, declares that "a tariff for protection is indeed a piece of finesse to persuade men into slavery."

From the State of Henry Clay comes Mr. Caruth, who tells a prosperous and successful people that "this tariff is a most insidious enemy," that "it is really stealing our substance and destroying our lives." Breaking into metaphor, he exclaims: "It is not a highwayman who boldly gallops upon the public road and boldly demands your money or your life, but the sneak thief who in an unconscious moment (sic) filches your purse." His colleague, Gov. McCreary, from the same State, follows up the attack by talking of "the robbery which protection brings."

Hatch, of Missouri, who throws into his opposition to protection the whole force of a strong mind and a vigorous body, puts his feelings into a single sentence when he declares that "the whole system was conceived in greed and avarice, and it has been maintained from that day to this by misrepresentation and fraud." Not only born bad, you see, this demon of protection, but has held its own with undeviating wickedness.

Major Martin, fresher even than Mr. Mills, himself from the plains of Texas, and whose bump of caution has not yet been enlarged by the blows coming from a protectionist world, declares in a set phrase which that future eminence likely to happen to any Texas statesman may hereafter cause him to repudiate in New York: "I am opposed to the protective policy of our Government," which declaration, liable to be so troublesome to his future fame, he supplements with a prophecy that "the day of protection is fast drawing to a close." Mr. Lane, of Illinois signalized his first year in Congress by an essay from which I cull a few samples, which show that he has not yet learned, like some of his more experienced brethren, to look one way and row another. "The protective system is un-American, and is a perversion of the laws of nature, of God and man." "This barbaric policy shall and will have to go." So well does he like the phrase "Protection is a delusion and a snare" that he reneats it like a refrain, with just that little variation which the genius of the English language seems to require, "Protection is forever a cheat and delusion."

Not to be behind his colleague, Major Martin, in the display of the prophetic instinct, Mr. Hare, of Texas, disclosed at once his ignorance of the future and his knowledge of the sentiments and purposes of his party when he announced that "a protective tariff must go down with the monopolies it has created." Mr. Townshend, of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, whose constant reelection shows him to represent his people, and whose constant and unflagging utterances of the views of his party show his devotion thereto and his knowledge of its purposes, asseverated in open House, May 12, that among the "principles and doctrines which have been advocated by the Democratic party from its foundation to this day * * * is opposition to protective tariff."

But it is hardly worth while to linger so long on what one of the members of the majority of the Ways and Means called the "militia of this fight." The "regulars," the line-of-battle ships, the authorized exponents of the faith, have not been behindhand in the use of unguarded expressions which reveal their real intentions.

Mr. Bynum, of Indiana, who seemed so anxious on the last day of the five-minute debate to show that this bill was really protectionist, allowed himself to say in the earlier days of the first debate: "To show how American labor has been pillaged and plundered by this masked robber of protection I have obtained" certain statistics.

Mr. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, who twice refused invitations and opportunities in the five-minute debate to declare himself against "free trade," asseverated in his speech in the general debate: "This is the kind of protection we have to-day. * * * This, Mr. Chairman, is not only a foolish but it is a wicked policy of protection that it behooves a people to prevent or escape from."

Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia, another member of the Ways and Means, roundly talks in quite contemptuous fashion of "such an antiquated and mediæval device as a protective tariff."

Thus have spoken some of the lights of the President's party, of whom some are greater and some lesser lights; some were "militia" and some were regulars; but they were all in the same battle on the same side.

It is worth while now to see how some of the field marshals and officers of high rank stand, as also the commander-in-chief and the second in rank, who was selected because he had seen Rome and was about to die.

The leader selected for the operations of the President's party in the House of Representatives was Mr. Mills, of Texas. He was selected with his antecedents fully known and after much and painful deliberation. The country staggered under the surplus for many weeks while it awaited the choice of Mr. Mills. We are, therefore, justified in regarding Mr. Mills as the exponent of the President's party. So universal is the sentiment that he represents the party that Mr. Henry George, a bold and outspoken free-trader, and consequently a bold and outspoken supporter of the President and his measures, seems to have come to Washington on purpose to examine with his own eyes and other organs of sense the leader in the House of his party. After full and fair examination, Mr. George returned to New York and over his own signature pronounced Mr. Mills a "free-trader from base." But fortunately Mr. Mills' position does not rest upon the opinion of even so competent an observer as Mr. George. Four years ago Mr. Mills, having perhaps at that time more freedom of utterance than he has now, made a speech, on the 15th day of April, 1884, which can be found in the *Record*, which itself defined his position then:

"We must remove, both by legislation and diplomacy, every hindering cause which prevents the free exchange of the products of our labor in all the markets of the world. We must unfetter every arm and let every muscle strike for the highest remuneration for its toil. We must let wealth, the creation of labor, grow up in all the homes of our people. Then every industry will spring forward at a bound, and wealth, prosperity, and power will bless the land that is dedicated to free men, free labor, and FREE TRADE!"

The capitals are not mine, but those of Henry George, who makes the quotation with due emphasis, so that the faithful may wink incredulously one unto the other when an inaccurate newspaper makes Mr. Mills deny the faith.

In order that he might have room to declare his repentance, if he had repented, the passage was read to him in open House on the 6th day of June, 1888, and he made no reply. In order that Mr. Mills might not fail to remember that he once knew what free trade is when he saw it, Mr. Burrows, of Michigan, read to him an extract from another speech of his, as follows:

"Our policy should be to take the smallest amount of taxes we can by customs, and we should gradually decrease the amount until our customs taxes come alone from non-competing articles entering our custom-houses."

To this he also made no reply except to demand a vote. Really that was the only reply he could make. He was looking then and there into the eyes of too many men who knew what his real sentiments were.

Yet only a few days before this unrepentant silence Mr. Mills had been to New York, and, according to the report of the New York *Times*, said: "No Democrat desires free trade." Of course no one believes that he said it. It only shows how newspapers misrepresent public men.

But why should we spend so much time upon details as to individuals, when one scene in the House lights up the entire group? Mr. McComas, the able young member from Maryland, on the 2d of May put to the President's friends the point-blank question:

"Why in this debate has every friend of the Mills bill lauded the English free-trade tariff system, which only levies duties upon articles not produced at home?

"Has any friend of this bill in this debate uttered one sentence in favor of the American tariff system, which discriminates in favor of the home producer and laborer?

"I will pause and yield a half minute to any member on the Democratic side to name the sentence or the member's name who uttered it."

This challenge, broad as it was, could be answered in only one way, and accordingly Mr. Hooker (Dem.) of Mississippi, responded with a frankness and fullness which some of his shivering Northern colleagues must have envied: "No, there was no one; and you won't hear any Democrat utter one."

A curious little letter from the gentleman on the President's ticket whose Roman firmness the proposed next administration is expected to need—in all things perhaps except civil-service reform—reveals the sentiments of the one who is to be second in command.

It seems that Mr. Thurman, habituated as he was to the customs of the Roman republic, had a scruple which the President, himself a man of scruples, did not share, against "assisting" even by so much as a letter at a meeting called to ratify his own nomination. The Tammany braves, not understanding the customs of ancient Rome, and fully sympathizing with those of modern Buffalo, were angry because Thurman did not write a letter. Thereupon the noble Roman wrote a letter to Mr. Cox to explain his feelings. Now, Mr. Cox had made a speech fuller of free trade than an egg is of meat. Mr. Cox is a believer in Bastiat, and would no more think of denying free trade in New York than Mr. Mills would think of denying free trade in the House of Representatives. If you want to know what the country would have to expect of Mr. Thurman, if ever promoted, listen to the enthusiasm over Mr. Cox's speech: "I have not thanked you," wrote he under date of July 21, "for your magnificent speech on the tariff, which ought to immortalize you." Surely this is a recognition of free trade cordial enough to satisfy the stanchest friend of Great Britain.

As to the views of the President himself, we must have recourse to the great fact that the substance is what sensible people are after, not the name. If his views are utterly, absolutely and demonstrably free-trade, does it make any difference if he denies the title? The close of his message—the one-topic message—reminds me of the caricature which Carlyle describes in his "French Revolution." The cook went out into the barnyard and said to the fowls: "How would you like to be cooked?" and they all replied: "We don't want to be cooked at all." Said the cook severely: "You are dodging the question; it is a condition which confronts you; not a theory. Free trade is entirely irrelevant." After a whole message, not one sentence of which sounds in protection, it always did seem to me that the declaration that free trade was not involved in the discussion was an exhibition of monumental nerve. It is as if Wendell Phillips had closed one of his wonderful attacks upon slavery with a declaration that the question of the abolition of slavery was entirely irrelevant, or as if Robert Ingersoll had finished one of his assaults on the Bible by declaring that Christianity had not been alluded to. What is the essence of free trade? It is the belief that all the import duties are added to the price at which imports could be bought if no tariff law existed, and that all protected domestic productions are enhanced in price by the amount of the duty on like imported articles. But the President states this fundamental belief more strongly than even the Free-trade Club would dare to state it. Whoever belies that statement is either in favor of abolishing the duties or in favor of perpetuating a visible wrong; is either a free-trader or palters with his constituents; and the horns of the dilemma are so close together that there is no no room for a grown man between them.

Why should all the English newspapers, who have no motive to conceal their real opinions, recognize with one voice their new-found friends? Why do all the free-trade clubs push themselves to the front, unless they know that they are welcome and at home?

When Mr. Garrison, of Massachusetts, addresses himself to a Democratic audience at Hyannis, on July 21, what more fitting words could he use than to say:

"I am myself a thorough believer in absolute free trade. I look forward to the day when custom-houses will be regarded as an emblem of barbarism—an anomaly and an anachronism in a true republic. At the same time I am aware that the Democratic party makes no claim to be a free-trade party. Shall I therefore decline to recognize its steps in the direction of progress? On the contrary, I hail it with joy and hope."

While the English manufacturers and the English newspapers, Henry George and his free-trade clubs, Mr. Garrison and his co-believers, hail the first outset of the President's party with joy and hope, can those who believe in the other doctrines shut their eyes to a truth so clearly displayed, to a picture all the details of which are as plainly visible as the black clouds of a rising storm?

THOMAS B. REED.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Measure 209 feet on each side and you will have a square acre within an inch.

HARRISON'S ELOQUENCE

SPEECHES DELIVERED TO VARIOUS VISITING DELEGATIONS.

A Tribute to the Manhood of New England—Protection Defended—Wage-Workers Could Not Exist on Free-Trade Earnings.

My Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana friends, these cordial manifestations of your personal regard move me deeply; but I do not at all appropriate to myself the great expressions of popular interest of which this meeting is only one. I understand that my relation to these public questions and to the people is a representative one—that the interest which thus expresses itself is in principles of government rather than in men.

I am one of the oldest Republicans—my first Presidential vote was given to the first Republican candidate for that office, and it has always been a source of profound gratification to me that, in peace and in war, a high spirit of patriotism and devotion to our country has always pervaded and dominated the party. When, during the civil war, the clouds hung low, disasters thickened, and the future was crowded with uncanny fears, never did any Republican convention assemble without declaring its faith in the ultimate triumph of our cause. And now, with a broad patriotism that embraces and regards the interests of all the States, it advocates policies that will develop and unite all our communities in the friendly and profitable interchange of commerce, as well as in a lasting political union. These great Western States will not respond to the attempt to excite prejudice against New England. We advocate measures that are as broad as our national domain; that are calculated to distill their equal blessings upon all the land.

The people of the Great West recognize and value the great contribution which those Commonweaths about Plymouth Rock have made to the civilization, material growth, and manhood of our Western States. We are not envious of the prosperity of New England; we rejoice in it. We believe that the protective policy developed her great manufacturing institutions and made her rich, and we do not doubt that a continuance of that policy will produce the same results in Michigan, Ohio and Indiana. We are not content to remain wholly agricultural States in our relations to either New England or Old England. We believe that in all these great Western States there are minerals in the soil and energy and skill in the brains and arms of our people that will yet so multiply and develop our manufacturing industries as to give us a nearer home market for much of the products our soil, and for that great surplus which now, and always perhaps, we shall not consume at home, we think a New England market better than a foreign market.

The issue upon this great industrial question is drawn as sharply as the lines were ever drawn between contending armies. Men are readjusting their party relations upon this great question. The appeal that is now made for the defense of our American system is finding its response; and many of those who are opposed to us on other questions are committing such questions to the future for settlement, while they help us to settle now and for an indefinite future the great question of the preservation of our commercial independence. The Democratic party has challenged our protected industries to a fight of extermination. The wage-earners of our country have accepted the challenge. The issue of the contest will settle for many years our tariff policy.

The eloquent description to which we have listened of the material wealth of the great State of Michigan has been full of interest to us as citizens of Indiana. We cannot doubt that the people of a State having such gorgeous invitations to the development of a great home wealth in manufacturing and mining pur uits will understand the issue that is presented and will cast their influence in favor of that policy which will make that development rapid and sure; and, more than all, and better than all, will maintain in her communities a well-paid class of wage-earners. Wage-workers vote; they are American citizens; and it is essential that they be kept free from the slavery of want and the discontents bred of injustice.

Address to a Delegation from Chicago.

Comrades and friends, it is a rare sight and it is one very full of interest to us as citizens of Indiana, to see this great hall filled with the people of another State, come to evidence their interest in the great principles of government. I welcome to-night for myself and for our people this magnificent delegation from Chicago and Hyde Park. We have not before, in the procession of these great delegations, seen its equal in numbers, enthusiasm, and cordiality. I thank you profoundly for whatever of personal respect there is in this demonstration, but, above all, as an American citizen I rejoice in this convincing proof that our people realize the gravity and urgency of the issues involved in this campaign. I am glad to know that this interest pervades all classes of our people. This delegation, composed of the business men of Chicago, and of men who wield the hammer in the shops, shows a common interest in the right decision of these great questions. Our government is not a government by classes or for classes of our fellow citizens. It is a government of the people and by the people. Its wise legislation distills its equal blessings upon the homes of the rich and the poor. I am especially glad that these skilled, intelligent workmen, coming out of your great worshops, have manifested, by their coming to their fellow workmen in Indiana and throughout the country, their appreciation of what is involved for them in this campaign. May the God, who has so long blessed us as a Nation, long defer that evil day when penury shall be a constant guest in the homes of our working people, and long preserve to us that intelligent, thrifty, and cheerful body of workmen that was our strength in war, and is our guaranty of social order in times of peace.

Comrades of the civil war, it was true of the great Union army, as it is said to be of the kingdom of heaven—not many were rich. It was out of the homes of our working people the great army came. It was the strong arm, inured to labor on the farm or in the shop, that bore up the flag in the shock of battle, carried it through storms of shell and shot and lifted it again in honor over our National Capitol. Notwithstanding so many historical illustrations of the evil effects of abandoning the policy of protection for that of a revenue tariff, we are again confronted by the suggestion that the principle of protection shall be eliminated from our tariff legislation. Have we not had enough of such experiments? Does not the history of our tariff legislation tell us that every revenue tariff has been followed by business and industrial depression; and that a return to the policy of protection has stimulated our industries, and set our throbbing workshops again in motion? And yet, again and again, the Democratic party comes forward with this pernicious proposition—for it has been from that party always that the proposition to abandon our protective policy and to substitute a revenue tariff has come. I had placed in my hands yesterday a copy of the London *News* for Sept. 13. The editor says, in substance, that, judging the purposes of the Democratic party by the Executive message of last December, the English people were justified in believing that party meant free trade, but if they were to accept the most recent utterances of its leader, protesting that that was not their purpose, then the editor thus states the issue presented by the Democratic party. I will read but a single sentence: "It is, at any rate, a contest between protection and something that is not protection." It is not of the smallest interest to you to know what that other thing is. It is enough to know that it is not protection. Those who defend the present Democratic policy declare that our people not only pay the tariff duty upon all imported goods, but that a corresponding amount is added to the price of every domestic competing article; that for every dollar that is paid into the Treasury in the form of a customs duty the people pay several dollars more in the enhanced cost of the domestic competing article. Those who honestly hold such doctrines can not stop short of the absolute destruction of our protective system. The man who teaches such doctrines and denies that he is on the road to free trade is like the man who takes passage on a train scheduled from here to Cincinnati without a stop; and, when the train is speeding on its way at the rate of forty miles an hour, denies that he is going to Cincinnati. The impulse of such logic draws toward free trade as surely and swiftly as that engine pulls the train to the appointed destination. It inevitably brings us to the English rule of levying duties on such articles as we do not produce at home, such as tea and coffee. That is a purely revenue tariff, and is practical free trade. Against this the Republican party proposes that our tariff duties shall, for an intelligent purpose, be levied chiefly upon competing articles; that our American workmen shall have the benefit of discriminating duties, upon the products of their labor. The Democratic policy increases importation; and by so much diminishes the work to be done in America. It transfers work from the shops of South Chicago to Birmingham. For if a certain amount of any manufactured article is necessary for a year's supply to our people, and we increase the amount that is brought from abroad, by just so much we diminish the amount that is made at home, and in just that proportion we throw out of employment the men that are working here. And not only so, but when this equal competition is once established between our shops and the foreign shops, there is not a man here who does not know that the only condition under which the American shop can run at all is that it shall reduce the wages of its employes to the level of the wages paid by the competing shops abroad. This is briefly the whole story. I believe that we should look after and protect our American workingmen, therefore I am a Republican.

The Reduction of the Mills Bill.

The duties collected from foreign importations for the year ending June 30, 1887, statistical abstract, 1887, page 16, was	$212,032,423.90
Additional and discriminating duty	2,189,885.75
Making a total of	$214,222,309.65
Duty equal to unpaid internal revenue tax on domestic spirits and tobacco brought back, but included in "additional," etc	1,996,528.49
Leaving entire duties from foreign importations	$212,225,781.16
Mills' estimated reduction by his bill according to the official statement of the Ways and Means Committee	78,176,054.22
Average reduction, 36 8-10 per cent.	

The Nub of It.

If you want to keep up the system under which the highest wages in the world are paid to labor in this country—vote for Harrison.

If you want to try an experiment with your daily bread and see if you can't better the best conditions for labor the world has ever seen—vote for Cleveland.

This is all there is of it. You are asked to exchange a certainty for a possibility; a fact for theory. And all when the great rivals of our trade and manufacturers are asking this step to be taken.—*Philadelphia Press.*

THE BULL IN THE CHINA SHOP.

BLAINE AT ADRIAN.

A RINGING SPEECH BY THE MAINE STATESMAN.

A Powerful and Convincing Argument in Favor of Protection to American Industries—Cleveland and His Free Trade Idols Shattered.

Following is the text of Mr. Blaine's speech at Adrian, Mich.

There is a contest going on in 1888 which must be decided one way or the other for a generation, because if the protective tariff is lost in this election let none of you who are careless as to your votes flatter yourselves that it may be caught up next year or the year after. You will not have an opportunity for year upon year, and the Democrats who are assaulting it know equally well that if they lose this year and the cause of protection triumphs they are beaten finally for this generation. It is a joining of issues for a final combat such as has not occurred in this country on that question since 1833, and every voter within hearing of my voice will take my word for it that whichever party triumphs this year triumphs for all the time in which he will be a political actor on the stage. So that your vote does not only count for this year or next year, but it perhaps counts for all the time that you will be an actor on the political stage.

Now, this question comes to this: Great Britain is a manufacturing country of immense power. She supplies fabrics to the largest number of people on the globe. She has 200,000,000 subjects in India; she supplies the whole of them. She has the colonies of Australia and South Africa and other colonies scattered over the whole globe and she has a practical monopoly in them; but there is one market which she knows is larger and better and grander than all those colonial markets put together. She knows of one market in which 65,000,000 of the most intelligent people on the globe are purchasers and consumers—the United States of America—and she knows that if she can get into that market it means a revival of her trade such as has not been known for a century and such as could not be known before the United States had attained to the great power and the great wealth we now have. England seeks an entrance into this market, and the Democratic party following the lead of President Cleveland is doing everything it can to destroy our home market and give a large share of it to nations beyond the sea. They say, to begin with: "Let us have no duty on wool. Why should we give protection to wool? Why not say to Australia: 'Bring your wool here and you have just as good a market in this country as an American citizen has for his wool.'"

They say to Canada: "Everything you can raise for your vegetable product, your grains, your dairies, shall come in here and have just as good a chance under the American flag as our own people who pay taxes here and support our own Government."

They say to all the people throughout the globe: "You who produce salt, come here and you shall have just as good a chance in our market as the State of Michigan or the State of New York, which supply the United States with salt. And so on throughout the whole list, each State in the Union is struck in one great staple, or two great staples, or three great staples by the declaration that they shall not be allowed to furnish an article which so many American citizens are laboring to produce unless they do so in direct competition with importations from nations that do nothing to support the United States, who pay no taxes to the Government of the United States, and who are not in any way interested in the Government of the United States. Now, do you think that is fair play? Is that fair play that you, the great State of Michigan, with over 2,000,000 of people contributing your share to the support of the State Government and of the National Government, should have no more right and no more favor under the flag of your country than the men who live in a foreign country beyond the sea? Is that ordinary fair play between man and man?

Well, now, speaking of free trade, there are advantages in free trade, and I will tell you one of them. We are 65,000,000 of people; we have thirty-eight States and eight Territories; we have 3,500,000 square miles of territory; we have 17,000 miles of ocean front, and over that vast area—nearly as large as the continent of Europe, with a much greater water-front on the ocean—we Americans, among ourselves, around the hearthstone and by the fireside, have absolute free trade. We do not erect a barrier on the border of any State against another State. If you have a particular article you can come to Maine, to New York, to New England, or you can go to California or Oregon, and you will not be met on the whole way by custom-houses or tax-collectors of any kind. So that, as a matter of fact—and I have brought it to the attention of people beyond the sea—there is not, nor has there ever been, so great a number of millions of people in the world who have had the greatest and highest blessings that free trade can give them as the people of the United States.

But we know also that is free trade among ourselves. That is the intercourse between the great family of the American people, who do not tax each other, and every State in which is guaranteed a home to any man that chooses to settle in it, and every man has the same right in one State that he can have in any other State. But when you come to the question whether the foreign peoples, who pay no taxes, who are not of our family, who live alien to us, who live far beyond the ocean, shall enter into this great home market, that opens another question. There comes in the great doctrine of protection. More than that, let me say here that the principle of protection is not always in every country alike profitable. The principle of protection cannot be applied in every country with the same value and the same profit, and I will tell you why, and I will tell you why it has become of lasting profit to the United States. It is because the United States is a world within itself. Now, if we were a little narrow country that only had one or two products, probably if we sought to protect those products we would only raise the price upon ourselves; but we have a country that extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf to the Lakes, from latitude 25 degrees on the borders of the Tropic of Cancer to latitude 49 degrees, away off on the borders of British Columbia. We have the semi-tropical products in Southern California, and in the northern latitudes we have the cereals; we have the fruits, we have the cotton, we have wool, we have hemp—we have a world within ourselves. And so large does this principle of protection become and so varied is its application that no man can say that this man or that man is protected at the expense of his neighbor, because every pursuit, every calling in which man engages, comes in for a share of the great beneficient influence which protection gives to a Nation situated as the United States is situated. So that when they talk to us about free trade I tell them in England that as compared with us they know nothing about it. We have got absolute free trade among 65,000,000 of our own people, and we have protection against the 1,000,000,000 of people that live outside of us.

Now, I understand my duty to be to look out for these 65,000,000 of people at home. The old saying used to be that the city of Prague was the cleanest city in Europe, and the reason was that every man brushed his own doorstep. Now these philanthropic statesmen, like President Cleveland—if I may say so—who want to look out for trade beyond the sea and to benefit mankind beyond our keeping, I think have got a larger job on hand than than they will accomplish; and I know that the nation which most and best looks out for itself is acting not only according to the law of intelligent selfishness but according to the best law of brotherly love and philanthropic regard for man; for the richer we grow the more we impress ourselves upon the entire world as an exhibition and a proof of what intelligent men can do under self-government without the aid of a noble or a king. That is what this country has done. We framed our Government without the protection of kings and in spite of them. We grew up without the favor of the great in Europe and in spite of them. We grew up without the patronage of nations in Europe and in spite of them; and to-day we have grown so large that the little nation of 3,000,000 in the struggle of 1776 has become so great and grand and so powerful that it overshadows them all. The example of this Nation is worth more to struggling nationalities and to suffering humanity throughout this world than anything that it was in the power of the American people to produce. The policy which has done that is the policy of protection, which has built up every industry at home, which has caused our wide interchange of domestic products, and which has surrounded our interests by a great power against injurious intrusion from abroad and with perfect safety at home.

DUTIES REDUCED BY REPUBLICANS.

Articles Not Produced in America Put on the Free List.

[From the Boston Journal.]

One of the Democratic party's favorite modes of attempting to impose upon uninformed voters is to assert that our present tariff is a "war" tariff, and that the Republicans have never consented and never will consent to change it. How false such assertions are the Nashua (N. H.) *Telegraph* very neatly shows in this compact statement of some of the tariff changes for which the Republican party is responsible:

The Republican party reduced the duty on steel rails from $28 to $17.

The Republican party abolished the duty on coffee.

The Republican party abolished the duty on tea.

The Republican party abolished the duty on hides.

The Republican party abolished the duty on camphor.

The Republican party abolished the duty on indigo.

The Republican party abolished the duty on macaroni.

The Republican party abolished the duty on nutmegs.

The Republican party abolished the duty on bleaching powders.

The Republican party put sago on the free list.

The Republican party put shellac on the free list.

The Republican party put raw silk on the free list.

The Republican party put tin bars on the free list.

The Republican party abolished the duty on anthracite coal and reduced the duty on bituminous from $1.25 to 75 cents per ton.

These are some of the things which the Bourbon shriekers about the "war tariff" never refer to.

Parties and Pensions.

"It is better to trust those who are tried than those who pretend," said Gen. Logan in one of his speeches. The Democratic party pretends to be the soldier's friend, the Republican party has been and is. Every pension law on the statute books to-day is the work of the Republican party. The following tabulated statement of votes on pension bills shows who passed the pension laws and where the opposition to them came from:

NAME OF BILL.	Democrats for.	Democrats against.	Republicans for.	Republicans against.
Repeal of arrears limitation, Forty-sixth Congress	48	61	116	....
Mexican pension bill, with Senate amendments, Forty-eighth Congress, first session	39	84	87	....
Mexican pension bill, with Senate amendments, Forty-eighth Congress, second session	57	84	72	1
Widows' increase, Forty-ninth Congress	80	66	118	....
"Senate bill 1886," Forty-ninth Congress (never reported back in the House)	7	14	27	....
Dependent pension bill, Forty-ninth Congress	66	76	114	....
Dependent pension bill, Forty-ninth Congress (to pass over President's veto)	37	125	138	....
On all the bills (aggregate)	334	510	572	1

Cleveland on a Second Term.

"When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office-holders, with a zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognise in the eligibility of the President for reelection a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and intelligent action which must characterize government by the people."—*From President Cleveland's letter of acceptance, Aug. 18, 1884.*

"My friends, you will never have any genuine reform in the civil service until you adopt the one-term principle in reference to the Presidency. So long as the incumbent can hope for a second term he will use the immense patronage of the Government to procure his renomination and secure his re-election."—*From a speech by Hon. Allen G. Thurman, Columbus, Ohio, 1872.*

"Pay to the order of W. J. Canda, Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee the sum of TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS—[to help re-elect me to a second term].

"GROVER CLEVELAND."

DEM. NATIONAL TICKET.

For President,
(*Second Term*)
GROVER CLEVELAND,
of New York.
For Vice President,
ALLEN G. THURMAN,
of Ohio.

IF Cleveland shall be elected, within four years a Democratic United States Supreme Court will be holding terms in Washington and making decisions on the constitutional amendments. The Democratic Convention of 1868, in which Chief Justice Fuller was a delegate, declared that the reconstruction act, including the amendments, were "unconstitutional, revolutionary and void," and Justice Lamar has said but recently that he regarded the amendments as "irregularly" adopted.

PROTECTION seems to work better than free trade in getting a nation out of debt. Free-trade Great Britain had a public debt in 1878 of $3,875,000,000. It is now $3,680,000,000, a decrease in ten years of $195,000,000. The United States, in 1878, had a debt of $2,256,000,000. It is now $1,154,000,000, a decrease of $1,102,000,000.