THE OHIO DEMOCRAT
JOB OFFICE.
All Kinds of Job Printing Done at LOWEST PRICES.

THE OHIO DEMOCRAT.

LARGER CIRCULATION
THAN ANY PAPER IN THE VALLEY.
More News for Less Money.

VOL. VI. NO. 13 LOGAN, O., SATURDAY, OCT. 3, 1891. TERMS, $1.50 PER YEAR.

THE PEOPLE'S BANK
OF LOGAN.

Cash Capital, - - $50,000.00.

Deposits secured by Individual Liability of over
Four Hundred Thousand Dollars.

Does a general banking business. Foreign Drafts and Steamship Tickets for sale at lowest rates.

OFFICE, Room No. 5, Opera House.

LAWRENCE A. CULVER, President.
GEORGE W. PULLEN, Vice Prest.
REUBEN D. CULVER, Cashier.

THE FIRST BANK
OF LOGAN, OHIO.
Office Hours from 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.

Paid in Cash Capital, $50,000.

John Walker, President.
Chas. E. Bowen, Cashier.

Does a general banking business, receives deposits, discounts paper, and buys and sells Exchange.

☞BANK—In central room in the James Block.

ATTORNEYS.

G. W. BREHM.
Attorney-at-Law and Notary Public,
Dollison Building Logan, O.

Collections of Claims, Notes and Accounts Mortgages, Leases, Contracts, Deeds, Wills, Mechanic's Liens, &c., drawn and acknowledged. Partition of Lands, Dower, Foreclosure of Mortgages and Liens attended to. Abstracts of Title furnished. Probate Business, Sale of Lands by Executors, Administrators, Guardians, Assignees or Trustees, and their accounts and Settlements prepared.

WM. M. BOWEN,
Attorney-at-Law & Notary Public.
Office, Second Floor, James Block.
LOGAN, OHIO.

Room formerly occupied by the late James R. Gregan.

Abstracts Titles, Collections made, Soldiers Claims and Probate Court business prosecuted. Mortgages, Real and Chattel written upin fact all business pertaining to the profession, promptly attended to.

JOHN HANSEN, JOHN SMITH.
HANSEN & SMITH
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
Office second Floor Collins Block, Logan, O. Rooms No. 3 & 4.

S. H. BRIGHT,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
Office Second Floor Collins Block, Rooms No 1 & 2.

CARL H. BUERHAUS,
ATTORNEY --- AT --- LAW.
Office in James Block, Logan, Ohio.

JOHN F. WHITE,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
Notary Public and Justice of Peace. Office Second story of James Block.

O. W. H. WRIGHT,
ATTORNEY -AT- LAW.
Office Second Floor McCarthy Block Front.

PHYSICIANS.

Z. V. RANEY,
Dental Surgeon
Office over Rochester Sons' store.
Teeth Extracted Without Pain!
Teeth inserted on rubber and metal plates, and all work warranted.

H. G. CAMPBELL,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON.
Office one door West of Rochester's Store, Logan, O.

J. H. DYE,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,
Office and Residence with Dr. James Little,
Main Street, Logan, O.

W. D. MANSFIELD.
PHYSICIAN and SURGEON.
Makes a specialty of all Chronic and Constitutional Diseases and Diseases peculiar to Women.

G. W. DOLLISON,
Physician & Surgeon..
Visits the sick day and night when called upon. Special attention paid to sick children, and chronic diseases. Office in Dollison Block. My residence is on Main St. near street leading to the depot, where I will be found at night.

For Sound Indemnity,
Prompt Adjustment of Losses,
and LOWEST RATES call on
J. P. CANTY
General Insurance Agent.
Successor to Canty & Pilcher.
Dollison Block, - Logan, O.

TEACHERS

The school examiners of Hocking County, O will meet at the UNION SCHOOL HOUSE, on the FIRST and THIRD Saturdays of each month, at 8 o'clock A. M., except January, July and August.

Testimonials of good character will be required of those unknown to the Board

J. W. FILING, Sec.
F. M. GORDON, } Ex.
W. E. ENGLE,

TRUSTS.

The Linseed Oil Trust, the National Lead Trust

And the White Lead Trust.

THE LINSEED OIL TRUST.

NEW YORK, January 20.—The manufacturers of linseed oil who have been in conference in this city, for the past three days, decided to-day to advance the price of both raw and boiled oil, one cent a gallon, or fifty cents a barrel. Every mill in the United States, representing a consumption of 13,000,000 bushels of linseed a year, was represented at the meeting. —(Associated Press.)

When the linseed oil manufacturers adjourned the meeting they held in Buffalo, on January 8, to devise arrangements to put their trade on a more satisfactory basis, they agreed to assemble again in New York City. They met in the office of President Thompson, of the lead trust, at No. 1 Broadway, January 27, 1891.

It was declared by the manufacturers that there was no need of an agreement by which the trade might be so handled as to return satisfactory profits on the capital invested. When the National linseed oil company began operations it gathered in many of the concerns, big and little, but it didn't get them all. Competition, especially in the West, was active, and some new firms entered the field. The result was the state of things which led to the last meeeting.

It was said that there were represented nearly all the concerns in the country which it decided to get together. The National company, or the trust, as it is sometimes styled, had delegates there. Col. Thompson, who represented the lead trust, presided. Among the firms outside of the National company who had envoys present, were Kellogg & Miller, of Amsterdam. Campbell & Thayer, Dean & Co., of New York; the Cleveland Linseed Oil Co., Mann Brothers, of Buffalo; Metzger Brothers, of Toledo, O. and Chicago; the Wright & Hills Co., of Chicago; Taylor, Major & Co., of Toledo; Pope & Co., of Dayton, O.; the Mound Paint and Color Co., of St. Louis, Mo.

The meeting reaffirmed the action taken at Buffalo, and appointed a committee to formulate a line of action to be followed by the firms in the agreement. About $25,000,000 of capital is represented at the meeting.

When the linseed oil trust was formed four years ago the price of oil was thirty-eight cents a gallon. The trust forced up prices, till last year, at the very time when the McKinley bill was in course of preparation and discussion, oil was being sold at from sixty-one to sixty-four cents a gallon, from twenty-seven to thirty cents above the price in England, the duty being twenty-five cents a gallon.

In the first year of the trust's existence the price was increased nearly 40 per cent., and the combination has held it up ever since. Without the aid of a high tariff duty the trust could not have done this. The duty under the old law was 25 cents a gallon, or about 75 per cent. It was so high that foreign oil was shut out, even after the trust had raised the price of domestic oil.

Although no manufacturer came before McKinley, so far as the published reports show, to ask for higher protection, the duty was nevertheless raised to 32 cents, which is almost 100 per cent. A suspicious circumstance about this duty is that the house had voted for 30 cents and the senate for 27 cents; yet when the bill was reported from the conference committee the duty had been raised to 32 cents. Seven cents were added in order that the trust might be able safely to make the price of oil still higher if it choose to exact a greater tax from consumers.

This is a beautiful illustration of the benefits of a protective duty. The annual production of linseed oil in the United States is about 28,000,000 gallons. By the union of all the domestic producers, domestic competition is killed; the duty of 32 cents keeps out foreign oil, and the consumers, who were persuaded to consent to the laying of the duty under the false pretense that it would make linseed oil cheap, are compelled to buy their oil at an advance of 69 per cent.—all because a popular and paternal and patronizing government has laid a beneficent tariff duty, just to make the dear people happy with cheap oil. Not much longer will the farmers and workingmen of Ohio continue to be bamboozled by such balderdash as this. Soon they will learn the true inwardness and real purpose of the "combination" and "trust" fostering tariff, and then this tariff wall will fall as completely and quickly as did the walls of Jericho at the blast of Joshua's trumpet.

THE NATIONAL LEAD TRUST.

The National lead trust shareholders met in New York on the 4th day of February, 1891. It was announced that the trustees had declared a dividend of 50 cents a share, payable April 15, the same to be first of quarterly dividends which shall hereafter be declared. The second annual report of the trustees was made by Col. W. P Thompson, president of the trust. He stated that at the date of the last report the capitalization was $39,447,050, for which certificates were outstanding. There has been no change in the capitalization since that time. The valuation of the property then was $22,361,900. The balance sheet for fiscal year 1891 showed investments of a value of $24,217,638.61 in the stocks of the corporation, divided as follows: Plant investment, $17,992,989.80; other investments, $459,234.79; working capital, $6,156,778.27; less mortgages to the amount of $891,364.24. Other net assets of the trust amounted to $910,785.80. The net amount expended for betterments during the year was $153,802.05; and net earnings, $2,028,552.23. Up to January 1, 1891, the profits were $803,535, and the total profits since the trust organization, $2,857,218. The sales during 1890 aggregated $19,898,000.

The average ad valorem rate of duty paid last year on lead, was 68.84 per cent. on the ore, pigs, and bars; 60.84 per cent. on sheets and bars, and 45 per cent. on shot and manufactures of lead. The duty on sheet and bar manufactures was practically prohibitory, as only $950 worth of the former and $360 worth of the latter was imported. Protected from foreign competition by those high rates of duty, the manufacturers of lead, seeing that a combination would cut off all domestic competition, organized the National Lead Trust Co., with headquarters at St. Louis. The aim of this syndicate is to keep up the prices of lead. Among those composing the company are St. Louis, New Mexican, and Colorado Smelting works owners. The maintenance of this "trust" is favored by the almost prohibitory duties laid on lead. It is the aim of these duties to keep out foreign lead, and it is the aim of those who make these combinations to kill competition at home, and to exact from consumers a price almost high enough to invite competition from abroad; to make the people pay to protect home manufacture almost as great a tax as they must pay to the government when they buy the same kind of goods from foreign manufacturers. By thus combining to the people's injury, do they not invite a reduction of the tariff rates, which enabled them to form monopolies? And why should not the government accept the invitation?

The National Lead Trust controls one-eighth of the linseed oil business, one-eighth of the lead smelting business and 98 per cent. of the white lead business.

THE WHITELEAD TRUST

is protected by a duty of three cents per pound, or 58 per cent. The Mills bill reduced the duty on whitelead, but McKinley, as the friend and defender of everything in the shape of monopoly, refused to make any reduction. Assured of the protection of McKinley and the republican party against any interference with their monopoly of the home market, the whitelead concerns have organized their trust and set about squeezing every cent possible out of the American people.

When the thoughts of the American citizen, "in the spring time," turn to the cost of painting houses, the history and operations of these great "combines" should not be overlooked.

"The power of these great organizations, (trusts,) having vast amounts of capital at their command and crushing out individual competition everywhere remorselessly, has become a distinct menace to the national peace and prosperity. In very self-defense the people, acting in their political capacity, through their legally-elected representatives, are abundantly justified in enacting measures to put them down."

JOHN E. MONNOT.

Canton, O., Sept. 19, 1891.

The Republican Party and Good Crops.

The republican press and the republican stump orators, Maj. McKinley included, claim the good crops as one of the beneficences which accompany republican management.

The people heretofore have looked on the blessings which the earth and the seasons give as the gift of God. The republicans claim them as the result of the McKinley bill. Their effrontery in this matter is without parallel in the history of peoples, or of parties. Instead of, with thankfulness, magnifying the abundance as a manifestation of the love and mercy of the Author of all good, they claim that the prosperity of the day is evidence that the McKinley tariff bill is a panacea, healing the wounds of the suffering people. Now, let every farmer in the state ask himself these questions: "In what manner has the increased tariff duties benefitted me? What have I bought cheaper this year than I did two years ago? If my crops were no larger than they were in 1890 would I be as able to provide for my family as I was in that year? In what manner has increased tariff duties benefitted me? If there were not strong foreign markets would the home market consume my products? Do the good prices which are promised me result from a demand from home consumption, or have their origin in the fact the harvests have partially failed in Great Britain and in Europe? Did the McKinley bill blight the crops of Europe and England? Will it blight them next year? How have the increased tariff duties affected me? I recognize that sugar is cheaper than it was, but I am told that was brought about by abolishing the duty on sugar, and not by increasing the duty. Now, if instead of abolishing the duty on sugar the duty had been increased would that have lessened still more the cost of sugar? They increased the duty on glassware, woolen goods and tin. Do I get these articles cheaper than I have heretofore bought them? Certainly not. Now, if the abolition of the sugar duties lessens the cost of what sugar I use, why was not the duty on woolen goods, glassware and tin abolished? If free sugar is such a good thing, why are not other necessaries of life put in the position in which the sugar stands? If I was robbed when I paid tax on the sugar I used, am I not robbed when I pay tax on the clothes I wear?"

The farmer who answers these questions honestly to himself, will not vote for Maj. McKinley for governor. He will vote for James E. Campbell.

Unless Blaine be nominated by acclamation, unless Harrison gets a majority of the convention on an early ballot, McKinley will be taken out of the field of vice-presidential possibilities by nomination for president. That is why the Blaine boomers play with fire when they try to tempt him to help pull their cart with offer of second place on the ticket.—Portland Oregonian (Rep.).

If the abolition of the tariff on sugar has lessened its cost to the consumer, what is the effect on the consumer of increasing the duties on blankets, carpets and clothing? Will our republican farmers answer that question?

TARIFF PROBLEM.

How It Enriches the Few at the Expense of the Many.

Maj. McKinley and his friends set up and persist in the claim that the aggregate increase of wealth in Ohio from 1860 to 1890 was the direct result of the robber tariff.

Suppose we admit the truth of this for the sake of the argument. If it created the wealth it also distributed it.

Wealth, population and social conditions go together, the latter depending upon the manner in which the former is distributed among the people. Here are three incontrovertible propositions:

1. If wealth does not increase with the increase of population, or retrogrades while population increases, pauperism and crime increases at a greater ratio than population increases.

2. If wealth increases normally, and is unequally distributed, a favored few getting the great bulk of it, pauperism and crime increase at a greater ratio than the increase of population.

3. If wealth increases and the increase is evenly and equitably distributed among all classes, pauperism and crime increase in proportion to the increase in population, or at a less ratio, never in excess of it.

The absolute truth of these propositions is demonstrated by the statistics of all governments at all periods of history.

Let us consider the wealth represented by real estate, agricultural and city, for the past thirty years in the light of these facts.

We will first apply the analysis in Franklin county, as it will serve as a fair example for the whole state, and afterward analyze the figures for the entire state of Ohio.

Franklin county is centrally located in the finest agricultural district in the state, and is well situated as to markets and has fifteen competing lines of transportation. Here agriculture should flourish if anywhere.

Columbus is a manufacturing center, where tariff can get in its protecting work, if anywhere.

With that view let us analyze the figures to be found in the official records in the offices of secretary and auditor of state.

Here they are, and, assuming that the robber tariff had something to do with producing the increased wealth, they show how it distributes it and how it affects the social conditions:

1. In 1860 the farm lands of Franklin county were valued at $12,712,663; in 1870, $12,627,283; in 1880, $16,350,950; in 1890, $16,525,370; increase in thirty years, $3,813,087; increase per cent. 30, or an increase of one cent. per annum.

2. In 1860 the city property in the county was valued at $6,878,122; in 1870, $9,651,315; in 1880, $22,654,950; in 1890, $32,836,100; increase in thirty years $25,961,488; increase per cent. 360, or nine and six-tenths per cent. per annum.

3. The number of paupers supported in the county at public expense, in the infirmary or by out door relief, in 1860, 1,283; in 1870, 2,304; in 1880, 5,804; in 1890, 9,889; increase in thirty years, 7,606; increase per cent. 600, or 20 per cent. per annum.

4. The number of persons confined in the county jail in 1860 was 156; in 1870, 216; in 1880, 528; in 1890, 682; increase in thirty years, 526; increase per cent. 337, or ten and three-tenths per cent. per annum.

5. The population of the county in 1860 was 50,561, in 1870, 63,019; in 1880, 86,797; in 1890, 124,087; increase in thirty years, 73,726; increase per cent. 156 or five and six-tenths per cent. per annum.

The following facts are made indisputably clear:

1. Farm values increased 1 per cent. per annum.
2. City values increased 9.6 per cent. per annum.
3. Pauperism 20 per cent. per annum.
4. Crime increased 10.3 per cent. per annum.
5. Population increased 5.6 per cent. per annum.

Are not these figures somewhat startling to contemplate?

The increase of $29,874,195 in real estated values in thirty years has been distributed in the proportion of $1 to the farming district to $9.60 to the protected district.

The $12,712,663 valuation of property in the farming district in 1860 had only increased to $16,525,370 in 1890.

At the same time the $6,878,122 valuation of city property in the protected district in 1860 had increased to $32,839,610 in 1890.

Can not the farmer see the inevitable result of the robber tariff system?

Taking the comparative values in the farming and protected districts in 1860, the values would have stood thus upon an equal division: Farm values, $32,695,393; city values, $16,864,487.

But the robber tariff exactly reverses this, as will be seen by the figures giving the farmer but $1 increase while the man in the protected district gets $9.60.

Can even the republican farmer longer afford to uphold such an outrageously one-sided system?

As we have already said, an unjust and inequitable distribution of increased wealth, shows a proportionate increase in pauperism and crime.

Is not this borne out by the figures?

The increase of the population in the country for thirty years was 5.6 per cent. annually.

Had there been as just and equitable a distribution of the wealth in 1890 as there was in 1860, the increase in pauperism and crime would have been in proportion to the increase in population, standing thus:

Paupers 3,184 and not 9,889.
Criminals 390 and not 682.

Now let us apply the analysis to the entire state:

1. In 1860 the value of farm lands in the state was $486,068,520; in 1870, $684,338,058; in 1880, $648,826,516; in 1890, $725,642,254; increase in thirty years, $239,573,726; increase per cent. for thirty years, 48 per cent., or 1.5 per cent. per annum.

2. City real estate in 1860, $147,147,128; in 1870, $329,106,448; in 1880, $412,683,314; in 1890, $506,603,058; increase in thirty years, $359,521,840; increase per cent for thirty years, 243 per cent., or 8.5 per cent per annum.

3. Value of personal property in farming districts 1860, $134,204,145; in 1870, $189,765,456; in 1880, $168,215,321; in 1890, $191,206,505; increase in thirty years, $57,002,360; increase per cent in thirty years, 35 per cent., or 1.2 per cent. per annum.

4. Value of personal property in protected city districts in 1860, $114,204,145; in 1870, $269,919,405; in 1880, $397,970,813; in 1890, $854,616,660; increase in thirty years, $240,412,415; increase per cent. in thirty years, 210 per cent., or 7 per cent. per annum.

5. Paupers supported at public expense in 1860, 14,103; in 1870, 21,256; in 1880, 35,878; in 1890, 44,306; increase in thirty years, 30,303; increase in per cent. in thirty years, 214 per cent., or 7.2 per cent. per annum.

6. Prisoners confined in jail in 1860, 3,122; in 1870, 5,603; in 1880, 7,263; in 1890, 9,461; increase in thirty years, 6,339; increase per cent. in thirty years, 230 per cent., or 7.3 per cent. per annum.

Population in 1860, 2,339,511; in 1870, 2,665,260; in 1880, 3,148,062; in 1890, 3,672,316; increase in thirty years, 1,332,805, or 60 per cent., being 2 per cent. per annum.

It will be seen by these figures that the comparisons in Franklin county hold good throughout the state.

While the farmers' real estate increased $1.50 each year on the $100, the real estate in the protected city districts increased $8.50 on the $100.

The increase in personal wealth was distributed in the ratio of $1.50 to the farmer to $7 to the protected citizen.

The result of this inequitable distribution is shown in an increase in pauperism and crime 5 per cent. greater than the increase in population, each year.

Why should any farmer vote to continue a system which, if carried on for thirty years longer, will reduce the agricultural interest to absolute serfdom to the tariff barons?

Why should any farmer throw away his vote when he goes to the polls?

W. A. TAYLOR.

Where the Wealth Is.

The Middle and New England states possess more money, five times over, than do all the other states in the union. We are not now speaking of real estate values, but of money and its equivalents, bonds, mortgages and evidences of credit. These states are great manufacturing communities. Rhode Island has more personal wealth than Indiana; Massachusetts more personal wealth than Iowa, Wisconsin, Nebraska and Minnesota put together; New York five fold more than Ohio; Pennsylvania five fold more than Illinois. Now, why is this? Is it because the people of the Eastern states named are more industrious and more economical than those of the west? Is it because nature has done more for them by making their fields more fertile and the bowels of the earth richer? Not at all. It is because the west has paid tribute to the east. It is because Pennsylvania has demanded tribute for her iron and coal, her carpets and other woolens. Because Massachusetts and Rhode Island have demanded tribute for their calicoes, their sheetings, their muslins and all their other manufacturers. It is because New York has arrogated to herself, not only tribute on her manufactured products, but the control of the money of the country. It is immaterial how much the western farmer may suffer. His crops may fail and his resources become exhausted, government never comes to his aid. If he protests he is called a grumbler. But let hard times come on the bankers and stock gamblers of New York and there is an immediate appeal to the government for relief. It is asked to anticipate the payment of the interest on the public debt, or throw out from its vaults millions of dollars. That, too, in violation of law, as instanced in the act of Secretary of the Treasury Richardson, when he reissued forty millions of greenbacks, which, under the law, had been redeemed for cancelation. Let stagnation overtake the manufacturing interests, and the millionaire proprietors discharge their employes and shriek for increased tariff duties. Never, however, has the government relieved the agricultural interests. They must suffer in silence. How long must the beast be "hewers of wood and drawers of water?" Just so long as they remain the aids and abetters of the most iniquitous tariff policy which ever gorged comorants or robbed the masses. By voting for Maj. McKinley the people assist in binding the shackles still closer, and thus bearing their backs for heavier burdens.

If in accordance with the doctrine of McKinley, the bounty on sugar is a good thing, why not have a bounty on wheat, corn, oats, potatoes and all other farming products? Why not furnish a bounty for every profession, industry and enterprise? And then again if the principle of supporting industries by taking public funds is a good thing for the nation, why not for the states and cities? Why not have our city council pass an ordinance providing an annual bounty for every business in the city?—Bucyrus Forum.

Maj. McKinley says that a tariff for revenue is a tax, and that a tariff for protection is not a tax. For naked balderdash that assertion is the baldest ever uttered by a public man. It is the quintescence of contradiction and exhibits an intellectual obtuseness which amounts to moral turpitude.

There are two kinds of "reciprocity." There is what is known as "Blaine reciprocity." Then again there is the "Ohio platform reciprocity," of which Maj. McKinley is the author. Will the Ohio republican boss be kind enough to explain the difference between the two?

There is an excellent harvest, but this will not make the farmers relish McKinley prices on their necessaries of life.

Yes, the McKinley tariff has built up an industry in this country. It is a shoddy industry.

Position of the Two Parties on Silver Compared.

For centuries throughout the world, and through all the history of this country down to 1873, gold and silver were held to be alike money metals to which everybody could have recourse, without restriction, for money supply and for every money purpose. Both together constituted the money standard and obligations of every description were payable in coin of either metal. Silver was no more redeemable in gold than gold in silver. Neither metal alone at any time constituted the money standard, but both together. Though coined separately, it was the mass of the whole, as much as if coined as a composite metal, that formed the real money standard and constituted the money of final redemption for all obligations.

The coinage of the two metals in the United States was equally free and unlimited from the establishment of the mint by the concurrence of Washington, Hamilton and Jefferson in 1792, till the silver was demonetized in 1873.

The total quantity of coined money in the world in 1873 was about $3,500,000,000 of silver and $3,750,000,000 of gold, or of both together, say $7,250,000,000. This mass then constituted the real money standard. The silver part was as much money of final redemption as the gold, and as much contributed to form the money standard as the same quantity of gold. If this mass had been melted together and coined as a composite metal the means of payment and the effect on prices would have been no different from that produced by the mass of the two metals coined separately.

But by the monetary revolution of 1873 gold alone was declared the standard and the sole money of final redemption. Thus at one stroke the money standard was changed from a volume of $7,250,000,000 for the world to one of $3,750,000,000. For it is and has been the theory of Mr. Sherman and his party that, since 1873, silver and silver notes or certificates are kept at a parity with gold by being redeemable in gold.

The Cincinnati Commercial Gazette in a recent issue said:

"Under our present system as adopted by the republican party there is a market for every ounce of silver that is produced at its value in bullion as measured by the gold standard. Upon these certificates are issued. * * * * These certificates are good because they are indorsed by the government and are always redeemable in gold coin if that should be demanded."

Mr. Leach, director of the mint, said in reply to a question when before the coinage committee of the house that silver dollars were kept at parity with gold because of the faith that the government would always "redeem a silver dollar with a gold dollar."

And this is everywhere understood to be the position of the republican party. On their theory gold alone is the standard, and the only money of final redemption for every other form of money. Silver as well as paper must be kept at a parity with gold by being limited in quantity, and made redeemable in gold. On the narrow basis of gold, too, the whole fabric of bank credits is made to rest. This is the doctrine of the republican party as expounded by its leaders. They, therefore, virtually approve the change in the standard made by the act of 1873.

In contrast with this the position taken by the democratic party at Cleveland, and the position always held by that party, as a party, is that silver is as much standard money or money of final redemption as gold; that silver is no more to be redeemed in gold than gold in silver; that gold and silver together constitute the constitutional standard of money in this country, and that, in the language of Jefferson, the money unit "must stand on both metals." The convention at Cleveland declared that the demonetization of silver in 1873 was an "iniquitous alteration of the money standard in the interest of creditors against debtors, tax-payers and producers." Who can truthfully deny this? Was the change from gold and silver to gold alone—from a money volume of $7,500,000,000 to a volume of $3,750,000,000 for the world—not an iniquitous alteration of the money standard? The only thing that removes this act from the calendar of the greatest crimes against mankind to the calendar of "blunders greater than crimes" is that it was done in ignorance, (if it was not altogether in ignorance,) or, as Mr. Groesbeck said at the money conference in 1878 "inadvertently." At any rate nobody has been hanged for this act and Mr. Sherman still lives and is an issue in this campaign. The effect of this act has been to increase 50 per cent. the value of gold, and, in effect, is precisely the same as if the bushel measure, the yard stick and the pound weight had each been increased 50 per cent., altering all contracts in that proportion. And what is more, as declared in the democratic platform, the demonetization of silver "by shutting off one of the sources of supply of primary money operates to continually increase the value of gold, depress prices, hamper industry and discourage enterprise." Is there any doubt of this? Can production and trade be successfully carried on with a money standard constantly increasing? Are the people of this country expected to submit forever to such injustice? They most certainly will not. "Oh," say the advocates of the single gold standard, "we want honest money." Oh, yes, honest money! Is that an honest yard stick that is constantly growing longer? Is that an honest pound weight that is all the time getting heavier? Is that any more an honest dollar that is all the time getting dearer? With Sherman and McKinley the longer the yard-stick gets the "honester," apparently, it becomes; and in like manner the bigger or more valuable the dollar, the "honester" that will be. But with honest men that, and that only, is an honest dollar which maintains stable relations to commodities, and preserves an even balance between the debtor and creditor.

Silver all these years, although denied the right of mintage accorded to gold has maintained comparatively stable relations to commodities, while gold has increased in value fifty per cent.; and intelligent people understand that the change has been in the gold and not in the silver or in commodities. The report of the bureau of statistics, just out, shows that leading staple commodities are lower now than any time before in the century; lower even than in the '40s, before the gold discoveries of California and Australia.

The production of gold has declined from $150,000,000 a year to about $100,000,000, while its use in the arts and dentistry has greatly increased—increased, till there is little or no new gold for money. At the same time the gold standard has been extended till more than 150 millions more people use gold now as the exclusive money standard than in 1873. No other reasons are needed to explain the past and continued increase in the value of gold—In the presence of facts so patent, to talk about "honest money," as if gold only was honest money, or as if the silver dollar, one of the oldest and best known of coins, was not an honest dollar, is simply ridiculous and marks him who repeats it as a knave, or a fool echoing the cry of a knave.

The prototype of our dollar, the Spanish milled dollar, has been for 400 years a standard coin. It was the money unit of the colonies and was made the standard coin by the Continental congress and was adopted as the "dollar, or unit," in our system in 1792 and has never been changed by a grain of pure metal.

The democratic platform demands the "reinstatement of the constitutional standard of both gold and silver with the equal rights of each to free and unlimited coinage." Can any democrat object to this? To object to it is to object to one of the cardinal doctrines of the founders of the party. To kick against it is to kick against the whole history of the party on this question. The standard of both gold and silver can not be reinstated in any other way but by the "free and unlimited coinage" of both. Is it not rather a reproach to all parties that for eighteen years one of the most important provisions of the constitution has been set aside at the bidding of a foreign credit holding class?

One thing more remains to be noticed and that is the imbecile cry that under free coinage the miner will be permitted to take eighty cents worth of silver to the mint and get a dollar for it. The absurdity of this proposition has been exposed a thousand times. In the first place, under free coinage, the government does not buy silver at all any more than it buys gold. It simply stamps it for the holder and the price of a bar of silver is the coins—the dollar pieces—that can be minted from it. That is all there is to it. There can be no difference under free coinage between the value of silver in the form of bars and in the form of coins. A given weight of silver as, for instance, a bar weighing 3,712½ grains will be worth exactly $10, because it will coin into exactly ten dollar pieces and there is no profit about it to any one. Hence to talk about profit to silver miners is to try to shift the question onto false ground. Profit to anybody, either in the coinage of gold or silver, is merely incidental to the main question, which is one of money supply proportionate to increase of population and wealth, without which stability in the value of money is impossible, and without which there can be no stability of prices, and no permanent prosperity for this country or the world. There is no danger of any country having too much gold and silver money. Nor is there danger of an oversupply of silver. The next half century will require more of the precious metals for money than the American continent has produced since its discovery by Columbus four hundred years ago.

A. J. WARNER.

Gall and Dishonesty.

No opportunity is permitted to pass wherein the republican press can bring a dishonest democrat to the front. If some petty democratic official is short in his accounts they head-line his crime with "Another Democratic Defaulter." If a republican thief is detected in the betrayal of his trust, they head-line it with "A slight shortage in a treasurer's account. It will be made good." Or, "A discrepancy in a treasurer's accounts." This last week there was an exhibition of this gall. A defalcation of a few hundred dollars by a democratic petty official was blazoned forth as "Another Democratic Defaulter." In the same issue was an account of a treasurer, living in the city of Youngstown, who was a defaulter to the tune of many thousands of dollars. This was headlined, "A slight shortage in a treasurer's accounts," and the political affiliations of the thief were not mentioned, because he was a prominent republican local leader. It takes a great deal of gall and still more dishonesty to attempt to make political capital in this manner. Now, a thief is a thief, whether he be a democrat or a republican, and should be treated as a thief. Were a comparison made between democratic and republican thieves the democratic rascals would be doubly discounted by the republican thieves. Where would the democrats find comparison for the "Credit Mobilier thieves," "the whisky ring thieves," "the Star route thieves?" and to come to more recent incidents, "the Beardsley-Marsh" thieves, of Pennsylvania. Fortunately the democrats are not able to match this high class of thieves.

The republican press had better go slow in this work, lest it incite a comparison, with details all given. We believe that the state treasury of Ohio was looted once and only once. Perhaps some republican paper can give us the facts of that defalcation.

The republican party is trying hard to catch the vote 'a-comin' or a-goin'." They point with pride to their protective tariff tax averaging 60 per cent., and with ecstacy to their free trade fraud called reciprocity. "You pays your money and takes your choice," just so you vote to keep the G. O. P. in power, which is their real and only principle—Bucyrus Forum.