

IROQUOIS BRAVES.

The Famous Democratic Club Indulges in a Superb Banquet.

Speaker Carlisle Elegantly Reviews the Condition of America's Great Industries.

Hon. Joseph E. McDonald on the "Benefits of the Democratic Administration."

At the annual banquet of the Iroquois Club of Chicago, given at the Palmer House, the questions of tariff reform, the national finances, and the proper method of dealing with the public lands were elucidated by Speaker Carlisle, Senator Beck, and Commissioner Sparks. Letters of regret were read from many prominent Democrats, the list being headed by President Cleveland, Governor Fitz Hugh Lee, Abram S. Hewitt, and Fitz John Porter.

JOHN G. CARLISLE.

The Renowned Kentuckian on the Tariff and the Evils Thereof.

Responding to the toast "American Industries—Their growth and prosperity cannot be promoted by unnecessary or unequal taxation," Hon. John G. Carlisle said:

Although the toast just read asserts a self-evident truth, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that even in this age of philosophical speculation and practical knowledge there are men in the front ranks of literature, politics, and business who still believe that the Government can make its citizens rich and prosperous by taxing them. If these gentlemen should attempt to convince the public that the farmer could be made more prosperous by increasing the tax on his land, or that the manufacturer could be benefited by compelling him to pay a high rate of taxation on his machinery, or his income, the absurdity of their position would be so apparent as to excite universal ridicule, and yet such propositions would be no more absurd or unreasonable than the assertion that the prosperity of the people generally can be increased by imposing taxes upon their food, their clothing, their houses, their materials, their means of transportation, and the tools and implements used in their industries. Taxes will not create wealth; they destroy it. All taxation, whether it be direct or indirect, and no matter how it may be disguised or in what manner its payment may be enforced, is ultimately a charge upon labor, while its immediate and invariable effect is to withdraw the full amount of the taxation from the productive industries of the people. When it is equitably imposed for public purposes only, and its proceeds are honestly used in defraying the necessary expenses and meeting the just obligations of the Government, all are equally benefited, and no one has a right to complain; but when a tax is imposed upon the rest of the people or one class of industries simply for the purpose of increasing the profits of another part of the people, or another class of industries, or when it is imposed by any system of taxation or any policy of legislation which is too obvious to require comment.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF REVENUE.

Absolute equality in the adjustment of the rates of taxation and in the designation of the articles upon which it shall be imposed is not to be expected, and, in fact, is not attainable; but substantial equality and uniformity are essential elements in every just revenue system. So long as the power of taxation is exercised only for the purpose of raising revenue for the support of the Government, the principles of equality and uniformity can be recognized and enforced in a large degree, at least; but when the power is perverted and used to increase the profits of private individuals and prevent the collection of revenue by the Government, it is impossible to regulate its exercise by any rule or principle, except favoritism and selfishness. In such a case equality and uniformity would necessarily defeat the primary object of the tax, because it is evident that if all were compelled to pay equal tribute to each other nobody would be benefited, and it is just as evident that if all do not pay, some who may be cheated. American industry and by no means a man to include every honest and useful occupation, is not promoted by any system of taxation or any policy of legislation which discriminates between them and compels one to contribute a part of its own earnings to increase the profits or prevent losses in another. There should be no expatriated or persecuted industries in this country. There should be no ranks or degrees among the legitimate occupations of the people, nor any road to the favor or bounty of the Government not open to all alike. Mining and manufacturing, and the occupations dependent upon them, are great and valuable industries, and should be cherished and supported in every proper way. They afford employment to many millions of capital and many thousands of laborers, and their products contribute largely to the wealth and comfort of the people; but they are not by any means the only American industries.

INDUSTRY STRUGGLING WITH NATURE.

In the households of the poor, in the fields and forests, in the mines and factories, in the stores and shops, on the railroads and canals and rivers, on the high seas—everywhere there are American industries struggling with the mighty forces of nature, and subduing, combining, and utilizing the elements of the earth and the air; and any view of our industrial system which fails to comprehend all these necessarily leads to partial and erroneous conclusions, taking but a partial view of them which comprehends the multiplied, as well as the greatest, and appreciates the interests of the whole instead of a part only, is unable to understand how their growth and prosperity can be promoted by taxation in any form. It is not difficult to see how a system which prevents competition, and therefore increases prices, may enable an individual who has capital involved in a particular industry to realize profits instead of suffering losses, but it is manifest that this must always be done at the expense of the consumers of his products, who are also, as a general rule, engaged in industrial pursuits. In every such case the actual losses are precisely the same as if competition had not been prevented, and prices had not been increased; but instead of being borne by the individual who enjoys the benefit, they fall upon the purchasers of his products, and are paid out of the earnings in other industries. The other industries, therefore, not only make stock losses, but pay him a profit besides, thus giving him a bonus for investing his capital, and wasting his skill and labor in an unprofitable business.

EFFECTS OF PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

That taxation for protective purposes has resulted so far in a continuous waste of capital and labor in this country is conclusively shown by the present condition of the so-called protected industries, and by the history of our legislation on the subject. The early advocates of the system proposed it only as a temporary expedient to aid in the permanent establishment of certain industries, and insisted that after a few years of dependence upon the bounty of the Government the people there would be strong enough to stand alone and compete successfully with their rivals, not only in the home market but in all others. Under the influence of this argument the first protective tariff was enacted in 1816, and yet, after seventy years have passed, many of the same industries which then asked temporary assistance only are now demanding more than double the rates of duty then deemed sufficient, and their accredited committees and organs unanimously declare that unless these enormous bounties shall be indefinitely continued the industries must cease to exist. According to their own showing, the policy inaugurated nearly three-quarters of a century ago for the purpose of rendering them independent and self-sustaining has had exactly the opposite effect. Its constant tendency has been, and is now, to limit their ability to compete with the products of similar industries elsewhere and to make them more and more dependent upon bounties and special legislation for support. It has added largely to the cost of production by increasing

the price of machinery and materials and the necessities of life; it has confined the products of the so-called protected industries to the home market exclusively, so that the amount of production must be regulated by the domestic demand alone, and operations must be suspended when that demand is satisfied; it has obstructed international exchanges, thus partially excluding the products of our other industries from profitable markets abroad, diminishing their earnings and arresting their growth and prosperity; it has provoked other Governments to resort to retaliatory measures, discriminating against our products and trade in their own ports and markets, and giving preference to the products and trade of their own national rivals, and here at home, by encouraging capital and labor to rely upon legislation for profits, rather than their own capacity, it has greatly impaired that spirit of independence and enterprise which is absolutely indispensable to the successful prosecution of business in this age of improvement and progress.

EX-SENATOR MCDONALD.

He Speaks of the "Benefits of the Democratic Administration."

Hon. Joseph E. McDonald responded to the toast "The Benefits of the Democratic Administration," and on being introduced he was warmly received. He said that on the 4th of March, 1844, after an interval of twenty-four years, a Democratic administration was induced into office. It was true that in 1876 the Democratic candidates were duly elected—[applause]—by a popular majority of over 250,000, but the Republican party then being in power, its leaders perpetrated a political fraud, the will was stamped upon their party through all time. In 1830 the Democrats would have been successful again for the bribery and corruption practiced by the Republican party, but in 1844 the public will had to be obeyed, and the candidates receiving the highest electoral vote in the college were duly installed in office, and the first fruits of that great victory is a restored Union. The civil war had left its imprint, and the people were divided, with many wounds yet to heal before they could be united. For a long time after that war these wounds remained unhealed, the Union was still a Union in name, but not in heart. The Republican party did not seem to be able to bring the sections of the country together. The leaders did not desire to do it. It had become so much political capital to them that as long as they could array the South against the North, and dominate the North, they could maintain their power. They reopened the wounds, and were opposed to having a united people, and were continually bringing back the issues of the war, which had to be fought over again. Men who had not done any of the fighting during the war had become valiant so deters in peace, and insisted on drawing their Falstaffian swords and thrusting them into the dead carcass of the rebellion. They were opposed to a union of hearts and a union of hands. The union resulting from the success of the Democratic party was inaugurated with the reformation of

of the country. The speaker did not refer particularly to the civil-service law, of which he might have something to say, but he spoke of the civil service as the Democrats had found it. The Republicans had acknowledged that their civil service was corrupt, and again and again had resolved to reform it, but they had never done so, and it had continued to grow worse from year to year. Federal officers were multiplied beyond the necessities of the country, and they drew their salaries from the party in power. When Cleveland was nominated in the Chicago Convention he said, in his letter of acceptance, that it was the civil service was reformed, and he was bound to carry out that pledge. But the state since then were a series of officers, inspectors of revenue, inspectors of post-roads, and pension inspectors; these latter fellows having more interest in the political affiliations of an applicant for a pension than they had in his claims for services during the war [applause]; and there were deputy marshals drawing \$5 per day for helping carry the elections for the party in power. Those fellows are not so plentiful in office now, and there are fewer workers swarming around them. Now, it may be that Cleveland has prosecuted this reform further than some people would be inclined to, but it is right and proper for every man who holds office to clearly and distinctly understand that he is paid, not for the pay services he may have rendered, at the same time the speaker did not see why some Government employees should not devote some of their leisure time for the purpose telling their friends how good an administration this is, and if they did so he did not see why they should be chided for it. It was not, in his opinion, a political offense. He rather felt inclined to commend them for it, and so far as the President was concerned he would probably modify his views in that direction, for he had shown himself to be an honest, sincere, and able executive officer. At the close of the first year of Mr. Cleveland's administration, outside of the expenditures for the ordinary expenses for the conduct of the Government there were \$2,50,000 more than the year before. In the Pension Office alone, over which one of the distinguished sons of Illinois presided, there was a balance of \$303,000 of the appropriation, and that was covered back into the Treasury. It was the first time in the history of that department that a balance had been turned into the Treasury, nothing of the kind having ever been found before. The Pension Commissioner's report had been like the report of the Treasurer of Rhodes in Tippecanoe County: "All paid in; all paid out." Now, the same could be said of the various departments of the Government. The distinguished Commissioner of Public Lands had already stated what he had accomplished in regard to our public domain in order to prevent the lands for the people. The public land system was based upon the ordinance of 1785, written by Thomas Jefferson, for the purpose of carrying into effect the munificent grant which the State of Virginia made to the United States of America, embracing the Northwest Territory, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. That ordinance treated the lands as being vested in the United States as a great public trust for the benefit of the people. It also recognized the fact that the States in which these lands were situated had an interest in them, and so many sections should be set apart in each township as school-fund property. The States were also given lands in return for internal improvements, and the speaker happened to be a member of Congress in 1840, and voted for the Douglas grant, which is now owned by the Illinois Central Railroad. These grants were not made to corporations, but to the States, and the State could dispose of them to corporations if they saw fit. It was a noteworthy fact that in all the time the Democrats were in power, prior to and subsequent to that, not a single grant was made to a corporation. The grants were made to the States, and the States could do with them as they saw fit. When the Republican party came into power it

INAUGURATED A NEW SYSTEM.

and under it they granted nearly \$20,000,000 and yet when they assembled here in Chicago they said: "Oh, we want the public lands held for settlement in small holdings," and if there had not been a change at that time there would have been no public lands left but sage-brush, alkali plains, and mountain sides.

A New Hampshire Democrat's Views.

Hon. Frank Jones, the ex-Democratic Congressman from New Hampshire, is in the capital, and says: "New Hampshire came to the front with a hurrah. My own county went Democratic for the first time in thirty years, every officer nominated by the party being elected. The new Mayor of Concord is the first Democrat elected to the position in twenty years, and the Mayor of Manchester had been filled by Republicans for nearly as long a period. The honest policy of the administration did much to turn the tide in New Hampshire, although I think that the Democratic losses throughout the country are due mainly to President Cleveland's civil-service reform policy. I am thoroughly in accord with his ideas, but it doesn't seem that the rank and file are."

"What effect do you consider the late returns will have on the national election?"

"A very healthy one. The reverses will be

beneficial in the long run. They will bring the loiterers into line and put the party on its mettle to sweep the country two years hence."—*Washington Special*.

CHAS. FRANCIS ADAMS.

He Passes Peacefully Away, After Suffering for Years from Brain Trouble.

His Public Services in Politics, Diplomacy and Literature—A Useful Life.

The Hon. Charles Francis Adams, Sr., died at his residence in Boston on Sunday, Nov. 21. Mr. Adams' mental and physical powers had been declining for nearly a decade. Until the very last, however, he was a quiet, dignified gentleman, who simply took no interest in what was going on about him. His intellectual collapse was so complete that for fully two years he had been unable to identify any of his family, except, perhaps, his wife. Nothing roused him except an occasional outburst of merriment in his presence, when he would join sympathetically in the general laughter. There were no offensive features of his infirmity whatever, the outward effect being simply complete reticence.

No apprehension of his immediate death was felt until the day preceding his demise, when Mr. Adams showed slight symptoms of fever. A physician, who was called at once, said his wasted strength would not be able to resist the attack, mild as it was. Mr. Adams lingered some sixteen hours, when his life left him as quietly as a breath of air extinguishes a candle flame. The end, when it came, was simply the flickering out of the last spark of vital fire, which had been fading away so gradually that the change from day to day was not perceptible.

Sketch of His Life.

Charles Francis Adams, grandson of John Adams, second President, and son of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, was born at Boston, August 13, 1808. His father holding diplomatic positions in Europe, he spent most of his first ten years abroad, returning to America in 1817, when he entered Harvard College, graduating in 1825. He was admitted to the bar in 1838, but never engaged in practice, having previously married the daughter of Peter C. Brooks, a wealthy Boston merchant. Previous to 1848 he had served as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature for five years. In 1848 he was nominated by the newly organized "free-soil" party for the Vice Presidency of the United States. This party, composed mainly of Democrats who were opposed to the extension of slavery, cast but few votes, but its members, finally coalescing with most of the Northern members of the Whig party, formed the Republican party, which came into power in 1860. Meanwhile, in 1858, Mr. Adams was elected a member of Congress.

In 1861 Mr. Adams was appointed by President Lincoln Minister to Great Britain, a post which he retained until 1868, when he was recalled at his own request. In 1871-2 he acted as arbitrator for the United States in the commission to settle the respective claims of Great Britain and the United States growing out of the civil war. He was one of the originators of the "Liberal Republican" movement in 1872, but was defeated by Mr. Greeley in securing the Presidential nomination. He subsequently joined the Democratic party, by which he was nominated for Governor of Massachusetts in 1876.

Mr. Adams has furnished many contributions to the *North American Review* and to the *Christian Examiner*, and in 1870 delivered before the New York Historical Society an able discourse on "American Neutrality." He has published "The Life and Works of John Adams," ten volumes, and "The Life and Works of John Quincy Adams," thirteen volumes.

John Quincy Adams, the Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts in 1871, and Charles Francis Adams, Jr., who has long been identified with railroad development, are sons of Mr. Adams.

UNCLE SAM'S NAVY.

What the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair Says of It.

The Chief of the Naval Bureau of Construction and Repair, in his annual report, to the Secretary of the Navy, says that the Lackawanna, Tennessee, and Shenandoah are beyond repair, thus reducing the number of serviceable vessels in the navy to two first-rate, ten second-rate, twenty-third-rate, and seven fourth-rate vessels, the latter class including two torpedo rams. The Franklin, Wabash, Minnesota, and New York, all first-rate vessels, are set down as requiring extensive repairs, and thirteen ironclads require more or less repairs. In addition the naval list comprises thirteen iron and twelve wooden sailing vessels used for receiving and transport ships.

The new vessels completed, building, or authorized to be built are summed up as follows: One (the *Dolphin*), complete; two (the *Boston* and *Atlanta*), armament incomplete; five (the *Chicago* and the *Monitors*), incomplete; five (the *Baltimore*, *Charleston*, and *Newark*, and two gunboats), under advisement; and four (an armored cruiser, a battleship, a pneumatic dynamite boat, and a torpedo boat), not yet designed. To this list can be added the *Alert* and the *Ranger*, four guns each; the *Monocacy*, paddle-wheel gunboat, six guns; *Michigan*, paddle-wheel gunboat, four guns; *Alarm*, one gun; *Intrepid* (yet to be completed), gunboat, two thirteen-inch guns. The remainder of the iron-built vessels now in the service consist of thirteen river and harbor monitors with single screws rated as fourth-rates, which could not be got ready for service without an expenditure of \$200,000 under this bureau.

Of the second-rates the *Trenton*, *Omaha*, and *Vandalia* can probably be continued in service ten years longer, the *Lancaster* and *Brooklyn* six years, and the *Harford*, *Richmond* and *Pensacola* five years.

What the rank and file are.

"What effect do you consider the late returns will have on the national election?"

"A very healthy one. The reverses will be beneficial in the long run. They will bring the loiterers into line and put the party on its mettle to sweep the country two years hence."—*Washington Special*.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY BENTON

President Cleveland Issues an Official Order Reinstating Him.

A Letter from the Suspended Officer Explaining Certain Matters.

The President has reinstated M. E. Benton as Attorney for the Western District of Missouri. Following is the correspondence in the case:

BENTON TO GARLAND.

NEOSHO, Mo., Nov. 10.

Hon. A. H. Garland, Attorney General, Washington:

DEAR SIR—Your letter of the 1st inst., with inclosures, apprising me of the basis of my suspension from the office of Attorney for the United States for the Western District of Missouri. I am received. I desire to make a plain statement of facts in relation to the list of appointments to make campaign speeches. The United States District Court for the Eastern Division of the district convened on the 6th day of September. I had been there with my assistant several days prior to that date preparing cases for the District business, except a few pieces of property, was finished on the 24th of September, and on the following day was adjourned. On the night of the 24th I spoke at Jefferson City. I then went to Kansas City, and Rush (my assistant) and I prepared ourselves for the October term of court for the Western Division. Meanwhile I had, at the earnest solicitation of Messrs. F. Dickey, Cravens, and others, candidates for Congress and the Democratic State Central Committee, and with the knowledge of Senators Cockrell and Vest, agreed to make some campaign speeches. After so arranging them as to time to not to interfere with my official business, I gave a list to D. H. Shields, Chairman, and this list was published, the dates beginning Sept. 24, 1886, to Aurora, Mo. The appointments were made on each side of the district, so I could go to each town, and I did once each week to look after the routine business of my office. My assistant (W. M. Rush) was in the office all the time I was away. Two of my appointments were made (Wobblie City and Sarcoxie) conveniently to Joplin, where I appeared in two important cases on the 14th day of October before Clark Crawford, United States Commissioner. I filed my engagement to Saturday, October 16, at Seneca. Monday, October 18, the District Court for the Western Division began its term. Every indictment and information was prepared. In consequence of this the grand jury was dismissed at noon on the third day. I had thought I would get through with the business of this short term in a week. I had two engagements to make during the week—one at St. Joseph, which I did not fill; the other at Kansas City I did fill at night after the adjournment of court. I found on Saturday, the 2d of October, I had six important cases which I believed should be tried. On that night I came here and got my partner, Hon. Joseph Cravens, Hon. John T. Teel, of Mount Vernon, and Dr. James Evans, of Nichols, Greene County, to agree to fill my appointments, beginning with Southwest City, on the 2d of October, and immediately returned to Kansas City and announced that I was ready for trial the hour the 1st District Court docket was called. I remained in court attending to cases until I received the President's letter suspending me. As far as my record as a public officer, I am willing for the Department to publish a statement of my success in trials, the court officers of the Circuit and District Courts, and those who had business with the office to say. I relied on the following clause of the President's letter of July 19 in making engagements to speak:

"Individual interest and activity in political affairs are by no means condemned. Office-holders are neither disfranchised nor forbidden to exercise political privileges, but their privilege is not enlarged nor is their duty to party increased or pernicious activity by office-holders.

making political speeches is the cause of my suspension, I can make no defense, but if it is true that I neglected my official duties by so doing, I am now ready to ask full scrutiny into the facts. I respectfully ask that this communication be referred to the President, with such recommendation as you desire, and will be glad to add that I had no idea that the making of political speeches would be taken as a violation of the President's letter of July 19, 1886. Very respectfully, M. E. BENTON.

CLEVELAND TO BENTON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Nov. 10.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of the 10th inst., addressed to the Attorney General, has been submitted to me and I know of your character, convincing me of the truth therein related touching the conduct which led to your suspension from office. When I issued the warning to office-holders to which you refer as an "order," I expected to be much harassed by all manner of complaint, and I did not intend to condemn the making of political speeches by appointees under the present administration in the "pernicious activity" in politics against which my warning was directed. I hoped, however, that by careful consideration of the spirit as well as the language of such warning those in good faith intending to respect it might not be in doubt as to its meaning, and would themselves apply it to conditions and circumstances which was impossible for me to specify. I did not intend to condemn the making of a political speech by a Federal officer to his neighbors and friends, not at any time and place where it was entirely incidental, if the speech itself was decent and true, but I do not think such official can enter as a participant in a political campaign, and consenting to a long list of engagements to address political meetings, widely separated and of daily occurrence, and fill such engagements without neglecting his duty, if he holds an office worth having, not without taking with him in the canvass his official power and influence. Therefore this course is condemned. The number of speeches that can be properly made can not be specified, nor the time when, nor the place where, nor the circumstances in which they are proper, nor can their character be prescribed. The standard of conduct can be determined on without difficulty. I believe in the right of a desire to hold the spirit of the admonition given by divorcing the conduct of a citizen from the use of official influence in a political campaign, illustrating at all times the truth that official duty is paramount to partisan service, maintaining the dignity of office-holding, avoiding any pretense of control over the political action of others by reason of official place, and teaching the lesson to the people that public positions are not bestowed or held under a pledge of active partisan service