

where is the money? It is in the hands of some one; it is not out of the country—the millionaire monopolists have it. The advantages of monopoly have been drawing it gradually into its great maw, taking it away from the people by driplets, as it were—a sucking process that has been going smoothly on for the last several years until it has brought depression upon us. Take one instance for illustration: The tariff made a sugar monopoly, and it is fifty per cent. When you buy \$3.00 worth of sugar you only get \$2.00 worth—one dollar is tax. This sustains the sugar monopoly of Louisiana, because it gets \$1.00 bonus on every \$3.00 of sugar it sells; or, in other words, it sells \$2.00 worth of sugar for \$3.00. It is claimed the domestic product is not increased in price by this excessive tax. Well, go over to your grocery store and sample the sugar and you find one price, whether it is the imported or domestic article. It is so in the dry goods and hardware stores. You know not the difference, if any, in the imported and the domestic goods, and there is one price. The imported goods have paid a high tariff to the government, while the domestic goods have paid none. The tariff alone is extortion to profits on the domestic article and cause immense monopolies to grow up to manufacture; while the cost of manufacture is less in America on most things than it is in England, as hundreds of articles of American manufacture are shipped to English markets and sold there in competition with British prices. The reason for this I will discuss hereafter. It is clear that depression must last until the labor of America can accumulate a little surplus money to circulate again for a time in the channels of business and enliven trade. Then the "sucking process" of monopolies will be busy again, and in a few years another crop of millionaires will come on or old ones double up their millions, and then count upon another period of depression. When this government withdraws its great and powerful aid to all individual enterprises, and refuses to build up men at the expense of others, then it will be the government of the people and for the people, and then there will be a better and firmer basis of business and regular prosperity.

PROSPERITY OF THE COUNTRY.

They talk in general terms of the grand prosperity of the country and claim the increased wealth and development is due to Republican rule. The people are not wholly ignorant and will not be deceived by this claim, though I will examine it. I ask, did not the people themselves do something to develop the country? Did they not plough the land and garner the harvests? Did not they make splendid farms and build highways? Did not they build school houses and churches, and build towns and cities? Did not the working, intelligent people of America pay their taxes and do these things, or was it done by one hundred and fifty thousand Republican officeholders at Washington? Did the horde of officeholders of twenty-four years' tenure develop your farms, and sow and reap your harvests? No, none of these things. Then what did they do? I had thought the people did all these things themselves and paid and supported this horde of officeholders besides for a quarter of a century. I always thought that patient toil from one shore of this country westward to the other, directed by skill and intelligence, brought volume, expansion and development.

God Almighty gave his children in America rich lands, good climate, timber, coal, iron, silver and gold, the bountiful showers and the glorious sunshine. I never knew the officeholders at Washington did all this before. These men step up to the old farmer and tell him that they developed his farm, made his house, planted his orchard and built his barn, and say: See your boys and girls around you, the Republican party gave you all these things! The old veteran farmer opens his weather-eye and slowly says, I made all these myself, sir! They speak of the increased population under Republican management, so I conclude they claim the fatherhood of all the boys and girls of the country. All of it is an insult to common intelligence. They claim credit in full for all the good things, but are silent as a tombstone on the bad things. Do they claim credit for all the jails and penitentiaries built in the last twenty years? Do they claim credit for the increase of crime in the same period? Do they claim credit for the multiplied alms houses, labor strikes, and bankruptcies? Are the whirlwinds and cyclones due to their care of public affairs? Shall we charge the great Ohio floods to them? Did they cause yellow fever and smallpox? I wonder if the earthquake in New York was a warning that they must cease wickedness.

PROHIBITION.

We have the prohibitory fight over again this year. The people decided against this issue two years ago. It comes up now in another way. Several amendments were submitted to the people by the Legislature and ratified by them and became a part of our Constitution. This did away with the necessity for a Constitutional Convention. Two amendments supported by the Republicans, and opposed by the Democrats, in the Legislature—the Woman Suffrage Amendment and the Prohibition Amendment, were not submitted. The people decided against submission of these amendments at the last election, and sent a majority of Democrats to the Legislature who voted them down. I said the amendments adopted by the people—seven or eight, I think—did away with the necessity of a Constitutional Convention. Then, tell me, my Republican friends, why you put in your platform, that you wanted a Constitutional Convention? Was it to amend the Constitution, to include Woman Suffrage and Prohibition? That is the sole purpose of the proposed Constitutional Convention. The people of the State are to be put to the expense of \$200,000 to add these provisions to the Constitution of our State. It was a sly plank in the platform, but our people will not be caught asleep. They intend to force prohibition down the people of Indiana if possible, and no cunning work will be omitted to accomplish the purpose. Will Cumback and a majority of the Prohibition Convention declared their support for the Republican ticket on account of this plank in the platform and their support for Blaine for the reason that

he (Blaine) had written prohibition tracts and contributed able columns to the prohibition press and supported the prohibitory laws of the State of Maine. My friends, do you want Prohibition and Woman Suffrage? If so, vote the Republican ticket.

TARIFF REFORM.

A tariff is a duty levied upon all goods, property and merchandise shipped to America for sale. It is called a tax. The government owns Custom Houses in the seaport cities and puts in them collectors of custom duties. The importer of goods, property and merchandise must send them through the Custom House before they can go into the American markets. They cannot go through the Custom House without payment of a certain per cent. of their value called tariff-duty or tariff-tax, which goes into the public treasury for the government. This is the way the Federal government gets money for its support. It also collects taxes on tobacco and distilled spirits. The importer pays the Custom House collector the tariff-tax directly, and adds it to the selling price of his goods, property or merchandise. When sold, he receives back the tariff-tax. The wholesale purchaser of the imported goods pays back to the importer the tariff-tax he directly paid the government at the Custom House. He sells the goods to small buyers and they pay to him the tariff-tax in the price of the goods. They finally come to the consumer and he pays the tariff-tax back in the price of the article. So, at last, the consumer pays all this tariff-tax that supports the general government. The people are the consumers, and they pay it all. Then the question is, shall there be a high tariff-tax or a low one? The people can pay a low tax much easier than a high tax. A high tax makes higher prices for the consumer to pay—a low tax makes low prices. A protective tariff is a high tax—a revenue tariff, sufficient to raise money enough to support the government, and no more, is a low tax. The people have this tax to pay, and shall it be a high or low tax? The present law is highly protective, and, therefore, imposes high taxes. It is also unequal in its protection—the tax being high on some articles and lower on others of equal necessity and value in home consumption. I want this law reformed so as to do away with the inequalities and to reduce the taxes generally. The Morrison bill was a measure to reduce the taxes. That was all. It was not a measure to revise the law, not a measure to correct its inequalities, but solely a measure to reduce taxation. It was not thought advisable to offer and press a bill in Congress to generally revise the tariff law for the reason the Senate was opposed to a revision, but all seemed to believe that a measure reducing taxation would be supported. I was surprised to see the Republican members vote solid, excepting four, against the reduction of taxes. The government had a surplus of \$100,000,000, and why keep up the rates of taxation? by reduction of the tariff taxes we thought the millions might be left back among the people to aid them in their trades and business, which is better than to have them idle in the treasury. The forty Democrats voting against tax reduction represented high tariff districts, and they voted in the interest of their constituents. They admitted the measure was right for the whole people. I was surprised to see Republicans, representing the farmers and consumers of the Great West, voting with their high tariff brethren of the East. The high tax districts of the East get all the benefits of high tariff, and they are interested in maintaining it; but how the consumers of imported goods in the South and West want a high tax to pay, when they purchase the goods, is not readily seen. The tariff-tax should not be one cent higher than is necessary to support the government—any higher tax is robbery. A tariff tax high enough to raise one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars, which is now required to support the government, gives ample protection to home manufacturers. Will any man tell me why he wants more protection given them? Will any Republican, within the sound of my voice, say they ought to have any more? This vast sum of money the consumers of this country pay—as much for the protection of our manufacturers as they do to support the government. Why the manufacturer wants more than one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars' protection is more than any honest man can comprehend, unless the purpose is robbery of the consumer. The manufacturer is not in it to the consumer when he wants a higher tax on imports than is necessary to support the government. The manufacturers are no longer experimenters, but giants in their business. They can compete with the world. They have raw materials at home, the best skilled labor and an abundance of capital. They do manufacture most articles cheaper than in any other country. England is the greatest of foreign countries in manufacturing, but she must import her raw materials thousands of miles. She comes to North and South America for raw material, ships them across the Atlantic and rehandles them to her mills and factories. She goes miles under the sea for her coal. Our manufacturers have none of these disadvantages. Our cotton and woolen mills turn out better goods than can be purchased in England. The high tariff men admit this but say the cost of labor is higher than in England. I deny this; but, say it is true, the average cost of labor is about 20 per cent. of the cost of the manufactured article. The average tariff is about 42 per cent. The tariff-tax could be reduced 20 per cent. and then they could have their labor free; that is, tariff enough is allowed them to pay for all their labor. They ought to compete with the world—with free labor certainly. The consumers must pay tariff-tax enough to more than make labor free to the manufacturer. Their labor is not only free but they draw from the consumers a bonus of over 20 per cent. after they get their labor free. They talk continually of labor when the people pay for their labor twice over in the tariff. Any sane man must say this is shameful, and they wonder at hard times among the people. Will Cumback and a majority of the Prohibition Convention declared their support for the Republican ticket on account of this plank in the platform and their support for Blaine for the reason that

he (Blaine) had written prohibition tracts and contributed able columns to the prohibition press and supported the prohibitory laws of the State of Maine. My friends, do you want Prohibition and Woman Suffrage? If so, vote the Republican ticket.

TARIFF REFORM.

A tariff is a duty levied upon all goods, property and merchandise shipped to America for sale. It is called a tax. The government owns Custom Houses in the seaport cities and puts in them collectors of custom duties. The importer of goods, property and merchandise must send them through the Custom House before they can go into the American markets. They cannot go through the Custom House without payment of a certain per cent. of their value called tariff-duty or tariff-tax, which goes into the public treasury for the government. This is the way the Federal government gets money for its support. It also collects taxes on tobacco and distilled spirits. The importer pays the Custom House collector the tariff-tax directly, and adds it to the selling price of his goods, property or merchandise. When sold, he receives back the tariff-tax. The wholesale purchaser of the imported goods pays back to the importer the tariff-tax he directly paid the government at the Custom House. He sells the goods to small buyers and they pay to him the tariff-tax in the price of the goods. They finally come to the consumer and he pays the tariff-tax back in the price of the article. So, at last, the consumer pays all this tariff-tax that supports the general government. The people are the consumers, and they pay it all. Then the question is, shall there be a high tariff-tax or a low one? The people can pay a low tax much easier than a high tax. A high tax makes higher prices for the consumer to pay—a low tax makes low prices. A protective tariff is a high tax—a revenue tariff, sufficient to raise money enough to support the government, and no more, is a low tax. The people have this tax to pay, and shall it be a high or low tax? The present law is highly protective, and, therefore, imposes high taxes. It is also unequal in its protection—the tax being high on some articles and lower on others of equal necessity and value in home consumption. I want this law reformed so as to do away with the inequalities and to reduce the taxes generally. The Morrison bill was a measure to reduce the taxes. That was all. It was not a measure to revise the law, not a measure to correct its inequalities, but solely a measure to reduce taxation. It was not thought advisable to offer and press a bill in Congress to generally revise the tariff law for the reason the Senate was opposed to a revision, but all seemed to believe that a measure reducing taxation would be supported. I was surprised to see the Republican members vote solid, excepting four, against the reduction of taxes. The government had a surplus of \$100,000,000, and why keep up the rates of taxation? by reduction of the tariff taxes we thought the millions might be left back among the people to aid them in their trades and business, which is better than to have them idle in the treasury. The forty Democrats voting against tax reduction represented high tariff districts, and they voted in the interest of their constituents. They admitted the measure was right for the whole people. I was surprised to see Republicans, representing the farmers and consumers of the Great West, voting with their high tariff brethren of the East. The high tax districts of the East get all the benefits of high tariff, and they are interested in maintaining it; but how the consumers of imported goods in the South and West want a high tax to pay, when they purchase the goods, is not readily seen. The tariff-tax should not be one cent higher than is necessary to support the government—any higher tax is robbery. A tariff tax high enough to raise one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars, which is now required to support the government, gives ample protection to home manufacturers. Will any man tell me why he wants more protection given them? Will any Republican, within the sound of my voice, say they ought to have any more? This vast sum of money the consumers of this country pay—as much for the protection of our manufacturers as they do to support the government. Why the manufacturer wants more than one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars' protection is more than any honest man can comprehend, unless the purpose is robbery of the consumer. The manufacturer is not in it to the consumer when he wants a higher tax on imports than is necessary to support the government. The manufacturers are no longer experimenters, but giants in their business. They can compete with the world. They have raw materials at home, the best skilled labor and an abundance of capital. They do manufacture most articles cheaper than in any other country. England is the greatest of foreign countries in manufacturing, but she must import her raw materials thousands of miles. She comes to North and South America for raw material, ships them across the Atlantic and rehandles them to her mills and factories. She goes miles under the sea for her coal. Our manufacturers have none of these disadvantages. Our cotton and woolen mills turn out better goods than can be purchased in England. The high tariff men admit this but say the cost of labor is higher than in England. I deny this; but, say it is true, the average cost of labor is about 20 per cent. of the cost of the manufactured article. The average tariff is about 42 per cent. The tariff-tax could be reduced 20 per cent. and then they could have their labor free; that is, tariff enough is allowed them to pay for all their labor. They ought to compete with the world—with free labor certainly. The consumers must pay tariff-tax enough to more than make labor free to the manufacturer. Their labor is not only free but they draw from the consumers a bonus of over 20 per cent. after they get their labor free. They talk continually of labor when the people pay for their labor twice over in the tariff. Any sane man must say this is shameful, and they wonder at hard times among the people. Will Cumback and a majority of the Prohibition Convention declared their support for the Republican ticket on account of this plank in the platform and their support for Blaine for the reason that

he (Blaine) had written prohibition tracts and contributed able columns to the prohibition press and supported the prohibitory laws of the State of Maine. My friends, do you want Prohibition and Woman Suffrage? If so, vote the Republican ticket.

TARIFF REFORM.

A tariff is a duty levied upon all goods, property and merchandise shipped to America for sale. It is called a tax. The government owns Custom Houses in the seaport cities and puts in them collectors of custom duties. The importer of goods, property and merchandise must send them through the Custom House before they can go into the American markets. They cannot go through the Custom House without payment of a certain per cent. of their value called tariff-duty or tariff-tax, which goes into the public treasury for the government. This is the way the Federal government gets money for its support. It also collects taxes on tobacco and distilled spirits. The importer pays the Custom House collector the tariff-tax directly, and adds it to the selling price of his goods, property or merchandise. When sold, he receives back the tariff-tax. The wholesale purchaser of the imported goods pays back to the importer the tariff-tax he directly paid the government at the Custom House. He sells the goods to small buyers and they pay to him the tariff-tax in the price of the goods. They finally come to the consumer and he pays the tariff-tax back in the price of the article. So, at last, the consumer pays all this tariff-tax that supports the general government. The people are the consumers, and they pay it all. Then the question is, shall there be a high tariff-tax or a low one? The people can pay a low tax much easier than a high tax. A high tax makes higher prices for the consumer to pay—a low tax makes low prices. A protective tariff is a high tax—a revenue tariff, sufficient to raise money enough to support the government, and no more, is a low tax. The people have this tax to pay, and shall it be a high or low tax? The present law is highly protective, and, therefore, imposes high taxes. It is also unequal in its protection—the tax being high on some articles and lower on others of equal necessity and value in home consumption. I want this law reformed so as to do away with the inequalities and to reduce the taxes generally. The Morrison bill was a measure to reduce the taxes. That was all. It was not a measure to revise the law, not a measure to correct its inequalities, but solely a measure to reduce taxation. It was not thought advisable to offer and press a bill in Congress to generally revise the tariff law for the reason the Senate was opposed to a revision, but all seemed to believe that a measure reducing taxation would be supported. I was surprised to see the Republican members vote solid, excepting four, against the reduction of taxes. The government had a surplus of \$100,000,000, and why keep up the rates of taxation? by reduction of the tariff taxes we thought the millions might be left back among the people to aid them in their trades and business, which is better than to have them idle in the treasury. The forty Democrats voting against tax reduction represented high tariff districts, and they voted in the interest of their constituents. They admitted the measure was right for the whole people. I was surprised to see Republicans, representing the farmers and consumers of the Great West, voting with their high tariff brethren of the East. The high tax districts of the East get all the benefits of high tariff, and they are interested in maintaining it; but how the consumers of imported goods in the South and West want a high tax to pay, when they purchase the goods, is not readily seen. The tariff-tax should not be one cent higher than is necessary to support the government—any higher tax is robbery. A tariff tax high enough to raise one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars, which is now required to support the government, gives ample protection to home manufacturers. Will any man tell me why he wants more protection given them? Will any Republican, within the sound of my voice, say they ought to have any more? This vast sum of money the consumers of this country pay—as much for the protection of our manufacturers as they do to support the government. Why the manufacturer wants more than one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars' protection is more than any honest man can comprehend, unless the purpose is robbery of the consumer. The manufacturer is not in it to the consumer when he wants a higher tax on imports than is necessary to support the government. The manufacturers are no longer experimenters, but giants in their business. They can compete with the world. They have raw materials at home, the best skilled labor and an abundance of capital. They do manufacture most articles cheaper than in any other country. England is the greatest of foreign countries in manufacturing, but she must import her raw materials thousands of miles. She comes to North and South America for raw material, ships them across the Atlantic and rehandles them to her mills and factories. She goes miles under the sea for her coal. Our manufacturers have none of these disadvantages. Our cotton and woolen mills turn out better goods than can be purchased in England. The high tariff men admit this but say the cost of labor is higher than in England. I deny this; but, say it is true, the average cost of labor is about 20 per cent. of the cost of the manufactured article. The average tariff is about 42 per cent. The tariff-tax could be reduced 20 per cent. and then they could have their labor free; that is, tariff enough is allowed them to pay for all their labor. They ought to compete with the world—with free labor certainly. The consumers must pay tariff-tax enough to more than make labor free to the manufacturer. Their labor is not only free but they draw from the consumers a bonus of over 20 per cent. after they get their labor free. They talk continually of labor when the people pay for their labor twice over in the tariff. Any sane man must say this is shameful, and they wonder at hard times among the people. Will Cumback and a majority of the Prohibition Convention declared their support for the Republican ticket on account of this plank in the platform and their support for Blaine for the reason that

he (Blaine) had written prohibition tracts and contributed able columns to the prohibition press and supported the prohibitory laws of the State of Maine. My friends, do you want Prohibition and Woman Suffrage? If so, vote the Republican ticket.

TARIFF REFORM.

A tariff is a duty levied upon all goods, property and merchandise shipped to America for sale. It is called a tax. The government owns Custom Houses in the seaport cities and puts in them collectors of custom duties. The importer of goods, property and merchandise must send them through the Custom House before they can go into the American markets. They cannot go through the Custom House without payment of a certain per cent. of their value called tariff-duty or tariff-tax, which goes into the public treasury for the government. This is the way the Federal government gets money for its support. It also collects taxes on tobacco and distilled spirits. The importer pays the Custom House collector the tariff-tax directly, and adds it to the selling price of his goods, property or merchandise. When sold, he receives back the tariff-tax. The wholesale purchaser of the imported goods pays back to the importer the tariff-tax he directly paid the government at the Custom House. He sells the goods to small buyers and they pay to him the tariff-tax in the price of the goods. They finally come to the consumer and he pays the tariff-tax back in the price of the article. So, at last, the consumer pays all this tariff-tax that supports the general government. The people are the consumers, and they pay it all. Then the question is, shall there be a high tariff-tax or a low one? The people can pay a low tax much easier than a high tax. A high tax makes higher prices for the consumer to pay—a low tax makes low prices. A protective tariff is a high tax—a revenue tariff, sufficient to raise money enough to support the government, and no more, is a low tax. The people have this tax to pay, and shall it be a high or low tax? The present law is highly protective, and, therefore, imposes high taxes. It is also unequal in its protection—the tax being high on some articles and lower on others of equal necessity and value in home consumption. I want this law reformed so as to do away with the inequalities and to reduce the taxes generally. The Morrison bill was a measure to reduce the taxes. That was all. It was not a measure to revise the law, not a measure to correct its inequalities, but solely a measure to reduce taxation. It was not thought advisable to offer and press a bill in Congress to generally revise the tariff law for the reason the Senate was opposed to a revision, but all seemed to believe that a measure reducing taxation would be supported. I was surprised to see the Republican members vote solid, excepting four, against the reduction of taxes. The government had a surplus of \$100,000,000, and why keep up the rates of taxation? by reduction of the tariff taxes we thought the millions might be left back among the people to aid them in their trades and business, which is better than to have them idle in the treasury. The forty Democrats voting against tax reduction represented high tariff districts, and they voted in the interest of their constituents. They admitted the measure was right for the whole people. I was surprised to see Republicans, representing the farmers and consumers of the Great West, voting with their high tariff brethren of the East. The high tax districts of the East get all the benefits of high tariff, and they are interested in maintaining it; but how the consumers of imported goods in the South and West want a high tax to pay, when they purchase the goods, is not readily seen. The tariff-tax should not be one cent higher than is necessary to support the government—any higher tax is robbery. A tariff tax high enough to raise one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars, which is now required to support the government, gives ample protection to home manufacturers. Will any man tell me why he wants more protection given them? Will any Republican, within the sound of my voice, say they ought to have any more? This vast sum of money the consumers of this country pay—as much for the protection of our manufacturers as they do to support the government. Why the manufacturer wants more than one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars' protection is more than any honest man can comprehend, unless the purpose is robbery of the consumer. The manufacturer is not in it to the consumer when he wants a higher tax on imports than is necessary to support the government. The manufacturers are no longer experimenters, but giants in their business. They can compete with the world. They have raw materials at home, the best skilled labor and an abundance of capital. They do manufacture most articles cheaper than in any other country. England is the greatest of foreign countries in manufacturing, but she must import her raw materials thousands of miles. She comes to North and South America for raw material, ships them across the Atlantic and rehandles them to her mills and factories. She goes miles under the sea for her coal. Our manufacturers have none of these disadvantages. Our cotton and woolen mills turn out better goods than can be purchased in England. The high tariff men admit this but say the cost of labor is higher than in England. I deny this; but, say it is true, the average cost of labor is about 20 per cent. of the cost of the manufactured article. The average tariff is about 42 per cent. The tariff-tax could be reduced 20 per cent. and then they could have their labor free; that is, tariff enough is allowed them to pay for all their labor. They ought to compete with the world—with free labor certainly. The consumers must pay tariff-tax enough to more than make labor free to the manufacturer. Their labor is not only free but they draw from the consumers a bonus of over 20 per cent. after they get their labor free. They talk continually of labor when the people pay for their labor twice over in the tariff. Any sane man must say this is shameful, and they wonder at hard times among the people. Will Cumback and a majority of the Prohibition Convention declared their support for the Republican ticket on account of this plank in the platform and their support for Blaine for the reason that

he (Blaine) had written prohibition tracts and contributed able columns to the prohibition press and supported the prohibitory laws of the State of Maine. My friends, do you want Prohibition and Woman Suffrage? If so, vote the Republican ticket.

TARIFF REFORM.

A tariff is a duty levied upon all goods, property and merchandise shipped to America for sale. It is called a tax. The government owns Custom Houses in the seaport cities and puts in them collectors of custom duties. The importer of goods, property and merchandise must send them through the Custom House before they can go into the American markets. They cannot go through the Custom House without payment of a certain per cent. of their value called tariff-duty or tariff-tax, which goes into the public treasury for the government. This is the way the Federal government gets money for its support. It also collects taxes on tobacco and distilled spirits. The importer pays the Custom House collector the tariff-tax directly, and adds it to the selling price of his goods, property or merchandise. When sold, he receives back the tariff-tax. The wholesale purchaser of the imported goods pays back to the importer the tariff-tax he directly paid the government at the Custom House. He sells the goods to small buyers and they pay to him the tariff-tax in the price of the goods. They finally come to the consumer and he pays the tariff-tax back in the price of the article. So, at last, the consumer pays all this tariff-tax that supports the general government. The people are the consumers, and they pay it all. Then the question is, shall there be a high tariff-tax or a low one? The people can pay a low tax much easier than a high tax. A high tax makes higher prices for the consumer to pay—a low tax makes low prices. A protective tariff is a high tax—a revenue tariff, sufficient to raise money enough to support the government, and no more, is a low tax. The people have this tax to pay, and shall it be a high or low tax? The present law is highly protective, and, therefore, imposes high taxes. It is also unequal in its protection—the tax being high on some articles and lower on others of equal necessity and value in home consumption. I want this law reformed so as to do away with the inequalities and to reduce the taxes generally. The Morrison bill was a measure to reduce the taxes. That was all. It was not a measure to revise the law, not a measure to correct its inequalities, but solely a measure to reduce taxation. It was not thought advisable to offer and press a bill in Congress to generally revise the tariff law for the reason the Senate was opposed to a revision, but all seemed to believe that a measure reducing taxation would be supported. I was surprised to see the Republican members vote solid, excepting four, against the reduction of taxes. The government had a surplus of \$100,000,000, and why keep up the rates of taxation? by reduction of the tariff taxes we thought the millions might be left back among the people to aid them in their trades and business, which is better than to have them idle in the treasury. The forty Democrats voting against tax reduction represented high tariff districts, and they voted in the interest of their constituents. They admitted the measure was right for the whole people. I was surprised to see Republicans, representing the farmers and consumers of the Great West, voting with their high tariff brethren of the East. The high tax districts of the East get all the benefits of high tariff, and they are interested in maintaining it; but how the consumers of imported goods in the South and West want a high tax to pay, when they purchase the goods, is not readily seen. The tariff-tax should not be one cent higher than is necessary to support the government—any higher tax is robbery. A tariff tax high enough to raise one hundred and seventy-five millions of dollars,