

THE LODGE INFAMY.

REPUBLICANS PROPOSE A REVOLUTIONARY MEASURE.

A Bold Step in the Direction of Centralization—The End of Popular Government and a Proclamation of Imperialism—It Is Hostile to the Liberties of the People—A Departure from the Old and Tried Ways of the Republic—Violation of the Constitution and a Partisan Intrigue—Able Argument in the House Against the Scheme by Judge Chipman of Michigan.

It is doubtful whether the present discussion is a practical one. We have a bill under consideration, it is true, but we may at the last minute have a substitute thrust upon us more hostile to free institutions in all its provisions than it is. The majority have reserved the right to do that. They cling to the policy of making every measure an ambush, every report of the Committee on Rules a surprise. I do not know, no man save one close to the throne knows what is in store for us what new mine may be sprung upon us, what new plot the people, Sir, the bill before us, the subject of this bill, certainly ought to be discussed in the spirit of the purest patriotism. It ought not to be approached in a partisan spirit. The institutions of our country are got together from which to threaten or cajole, selfish rewards for ourselves and bad fortune for our political opponents. There are certain grounds of political action which ought to be common to all the people. The element of popular rights, like the elements of the Christian religion, should be the same meaning to all men as were these rights are concerned there should be to one. It is as clear as sunlight that no party is true to liberty which seeks to in-reach itself in power by seizing the machinery through which the will of the people is expressed. No party actuated by honest motives will even attempt to do that. No man who has either the pride of intellect or the virtue of patriotism will dare go into history as the inventor or the aider of so great an infamy. No one on the floor here to-day will gainsay this. Yet a great change is proposed in our institutions. I will not call it revolutionary, because that word applied to an honest cause has no terror for Americans. Fanatics and knaves alike use it a siboleth of their faith or a halo to their villainy.

But, sir, it is a great change, a departure from the old ways and the tried ways of the Republic. It is a bold step toward consolidation; it is consolidation, centralization in its most positive form. It is the end of popular government. It is the final, authoritative utterance of the doctrine that people are unfit to govern themselves in the old-fashioned way through their local officers; that the township and county authorities, the executive and Legislatures of States shall be curbed and bitted and ridden by the irresponsible appointees of the government. It is a proclamation of imperialism. Why, sir, if these returning boards and supervisors derived their power from some source other than the people, and if they have confidence, we might tolerate them because the power to make would be the power to rule. But, sir, how will you reach the judges? Who can check a judicial officer whom the law authorizes to be a politician and whose party demands that he shall be a partisan. Sir, there are but two despotisms in this country to-day, the speakership of the House and the federal judiciary—the first omnipotent because the incumbent is expected ex-officio to be the leader of a party, and the last because of the power which may lay its hand on every man's person and property, and because of the respect which it carries in the ambient and shuts from his ear the just criticism of his conduct. I repeat, sir, how will we control the judges? What guarantee is there in this bill that the honest and unpartisan in the exercise of their appointive power? A constant temptation is set before them. Visions of political advancement will haunt their waking and sleeping hours. The great political prizes of the country will seem constantly within their reach. Judges have heretofore, without the aid of this great power, aspired even to the Presidency of the Republic. They are men like unto other men. You propose to put a great temptation before them. Sir, the functions conferred upon them by the bill are not judicial functions. They are essentially political, essentially partisan. They will drag the judicial down instead of exalting them. The inclinations of judges in great public crises will be subjects of solicitude and they will be expected to stand with their party when "emergencies arise." It is certain that these duties are not judicial. They do not come within any purpose for which courts are instituted or for which we are under the Constitution permitted to institute them. I protest that the spirit of the Constitution is violated when functions of the executive nature are imposed on the judges. It is a confusion of two distinct departments of the Government, a distinct departure from the theory of the division of powers.

But there is another violation of the Constitution in the bill. The measure it proposes is not meant to apply universally or to be the absolute rule in the conduct of elections. You do not say that in every election district in the United States this machinery shall be set in motion. The voices of fifty or a hundred men, according to the locality, are required to extend the blessings of pure elections to the constituencies. Why is this? What secret of partisan intrigue is hidden under this provision? Why shall Congress abdicate its power to establish a rule to govern all elections and delegate it to a handful of men here and there through the country? What secret of ours there who may exercise this power of overruling the election laws in some of the States, while the laws of other States remain in force? What monstrous spectacle is this which will keep in force at the same time two different sets of election laws, one for Massachusetts, another for South Carolina? What manner of men are they who may do this great work? Of what moral standard shall they be, of what intelligence, of what patriotism? Will they come from the slums of cities? Will they be the mean paupers of ambitious leaders? Will they seek the elections or partisan advantage? Will they be the champions of free representations or the instruments of a party which requires this machinery to retain domination of this House?

I know that appeals to the Constitution are irksome to some gentlemen on this floor. They believe in "meeting emergencies" when they arise, and the restraints of the Constitution fret their noble spirits; but, sir, that instrument tried as it has been by the storm of battle, assailed by the lust of money and the lust of power, still stands in the path, the bulwark of the people against oppression. It prohibits you from changing the terms of the election laws of all the States are the permanent standard, not to be departed from except on the greatest necessity. Its spirit and interest demand that when you set up you shall establish a general rule applicable uniformly to all the country, a rule evolved, not from party exigencies or local habitude, but from the best interests of all the people. You cannot say—and if you constitutionally can you ought not to say—that one law shall prevail in one district and another in the next, that a State shall have two different rules of election procedure present within its border, one Federal and the other local, or within the same Congressional districts, and that different States have different regulations. The special kind of legislation relieves partiality to sections and places easy. It makes the oppression of other sections and places easy. It savors too much of taking care of the salvation of the saints and providing for the damnation of the political opponent. The Constitution prescribes, above all, that whatever is done shall be done by Congress, and not by companies of fifties and companies of hundreds; that here and there only by your voices shall a uniform rule be proclaimed, which shall prevail in every precinct of every country or every district in every State of the Union. You will apply your new everywhere. The rural constituency of the North must bear under it with Democratic cities of the North and the people of the South. That is the only law you have power to make. You cannot delegate your power. Nor can you end this bill by saying that the rule is universal, that the fifties and the hundreds may apply to put it in operation everywhere. The fifties and the hundreds are unknown powers to the Constitution. The legislative power of this country is not hidden in the vest pockets of a few dissatisfied citizens or of political tools. It is your power, the power of the people speaking through Congress in the same tones everywhere, and imposing rules which no section is favored to escape and with which no section can be crushed into political death. Sir, your law is unconstitutional, and no man in this House

dares try to make it constitutional by applying it to every part of the country.

I observe, sir, that the author of this bill shrinks from altering the registration law in its stead. I wonder at this forbearance. You endeavor to strike out with the dash of a pen the entire election machinery of the States. Why not make the next step, the constitutional, invasion and establishment of added machinery to the State election boards, you give power to appointees of irresponsible judicial officers to override the decisions of inspectors elected by the people. Why did you not complete the work by abolishing the State system of registration? You can never be safe until you do that. I know that this bill provides for espionage in the registration boards of the States, but why preserve even the form of respecting the standard of qualification set up by the States?

You will find that you cannot subjugate the Democratic cities of the North. They will continue to demonstrate and the first fruit of the enforcement of the law will be to bring reprisals against you. I notice, sir, that in this bill you have a special eye on those cities. I notice, too, that you provide for domiciliary visits, that the homes of the citizen may be invaded by the men who are empowered to overturn the people's laws. I notice, too, that there is a peculiar venom in the bill against the naturalized citizens, that they are treated as suspects, and may be dogged by spies and harassed when they try to exercise their right to vote. You have all the machinery to annoy the citizen, to terrify, cajole, to corrupt him. You have at the public expense political minutemen to keep watch and ward of the public fortune, an army of spies and informers under political command, who may hang at the heartstrings of the people. But, sir, you cannot, even by this engineering, subjugate this people. The tide has turned against your party, and even this audacious bill cannot stay it.

This bill means centralization of all power in the Federal Government, because it strips the people of their old security that they shall have fair representatives in this House. Is centralization good for any citizen? Will it bless the black man while it curses the white man? Can you do anything by this kind of legislation save to reight the fires of race prejudice? Those are questions, and only yesterday seemed to be dying out, but now propound again to thrust the same question in a political field and to make the negro the pawn on the board of your party necessities. Is this well for him? Will it raise him in either the social or political scale to keep him constantly the bone of contention between party strife? What, too, let me ask, is to be gained by your proposed treatment of naturalized citizens? Under the law they are part of us, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, as much members of the national family as we are. Why treat them as objects of suspicion? Have they not been brave in war, law abiding in peace? Have not their brain and brawn been as beneficial to the country as yours? Why shall they be spurned and despised and hang at their heels? Why shall the mean prey of your bill fall on them and watch them as if they are dangerous to the public welfare? If there is need of Congressional interference to purify elections you begin at the wrong place. The great power of corruption to-day is money, the immense sums which control conventions and so poison the elective franchise at its fountain head, money contributed for the mysterious purposes known as "campaign expenses," and rewarded by the great and small offices of the Government. That is the imminent evil, that is the power which debacles, which reaches to high places and which is certain to reach your returning boards and to fill this House with its minions. Why not pronounce it a felony to contribute immense sums to defray "campaign expenses"? Why not tell the truth and declare the man who uses his purse to elevate himself to office or to gain a partisan advantage an enemy of the people and a traitor to free institutions? Here, sir, is a fertile field for the vigor of virtue and the zeal of reform. The plutocrat is the foe of popular rights, the champion of centralization. His interests are not the interests of the people. His ways are not their ways. He demands new ways, the ways of federal life appointed, dominating the ways of elected election officers, the ways of one-man power, the ways to overturn popular rights, the ways of monopoly, of class legislation, of money despotism. You are patriots, if you burn with zeal to bless your country, strike at him. Make his chief political virtue, the expenditure of money to influence elections, the greatest of civic crimes.

Sir, we do not need this proposed law. The people know we do not need it. Every honest town officer, every inspector of an election precinct in the bill are not judicial functions. They are essentially political, essentially partisan. They will drag the judicial down instead of exalting them. The inclinations of judges in great public crises will be subjects of solicitude and they will be expected to stand with their party when "emergencies arise." It is certain that these duties are not judicial. They do not come within any purpose for which courts are instituted or for which we are under the Constitution permitted to institute them. I protest that the spirit of the Constitution is violated when functions of the executive nature are imposed on the judges. It is a confusion of two distinct departments of the Government, a distinct departure from the theory of the division of powers.

But there is another violation of the Constitution in the bill. The measure it proposes is not meant to apply universally or to be the absolute rule in the conduct of elections. You do not say that in every election district in the United States this machinery shall be set in motion. The voices of fifty or a hundred men, according to the locality, are required to extend the blessings of pure elections to the constituencies. Why is this? What secret of partisan intrigue is hidden under this provision?

Why shall Congress abdicate its power to establish a rule to govern all elections and delegate it to a handful of men here and there through the country?

It is a violation of the Constitution in the bill.

From the Chicago Herald.

The Buffalo Courier says that some time ago Senator James K. Jones asked C. R. P. Breckinridge, of the House Ways and Means Committee, to prepare for W. L. Terry of Little Rock, a statement of the amount of tariff duties on a bill of goods bought by a representative farmer. In reply Mr. Breckinridge furnished an exhibit based on actual transactions between R. M. Knox, a merchant of Pine Bluff, Ark., and D. W. Branch, a farmer who bought the goods. Mr. Breckinridge explains that "this is calculated upon the basis of copy from the books of Mr. Knox and upon the rate of taxes actually paid upon competing articles at the ports as provided by law." The bill as it appears in Mr. Knox's books is subject to a tariff of 1887.

Art. Cost. Tariff. Jan. 26—To cassimere suit clothes \$11.00 \$4.00 2 pair brogans, \$1.65 3.30 75

Feb. 5—1 bell collar..... 1.50 75 2 pair plow lines..... 70 16 1 pair boy's brogans..... 1.25 29

17—1 box axle grease..... 10 2

21—1 Every plow..... 3.50 1.00

2 buck boards, 50c; 9 pounds nails at 6c, 55c..... 1.05 29

1 bushel salt, 75c; 1 pair misses' shoes, \$1.25 2.00 62

March 8—1 pair shoes, \$1.75; 1 pair of hinged 25c..... 2.00 50

1 leather proof..... 75 30

26—1 pair brogans..... 1.60 37

2 yards celico, 10c..... 2.20 9

1 water bucket, 25c; 1 spool thread, 5c..... 30 9

April 9—11 pounds nails, 6c..... 60 14

22—2 hats, 65c; 1 yard lawn, 50c..... 1.80 51

20 yards stripe, 12c..... 2.50 1.06

14 yards calico, 10c..... 1.40 60

3 yards jeans, 50c..... 1.50 70

; dozen thread..... 40 13

12 yards ticking, 25c..... 3.00 1.25

1 set cups and saucers..... 75 29

May 3—1 mat..... 75 25

June 8—2 pair men's shoes..... 4.00 47

1 pair suspenders..... 75 20

24—10 yards bleached domestic, 11c..... 1.25 54

July 25—2 suits clothes, \$7.50, \$9. 16.50 5.79

2 yards oil cloth, 40c..... 80 12

10 yards gin, 10c..... 1.00 35

1 currycomb and brush..... 18 5

Aug. 19—35 yards bagging, 9c..... 3.15 1.05

1 bundle ties, \$1.50; 12 pounds nails, 5c, 60c..... 70 21

Sept. 8—12 pounds nails, 5c..... 70 21

1 box A grease, 10 pounds soda, 10c..... 20 6

16—35 yards bagging, 9c..... 2.80 95

1 bundle ties..... 1.50 39

10 yards Osnaburgs, 11c..... 1.10 34

Oct. 24—1 suit jeans clothes..... 7.50 2.67

2 wool hats, \$1 and \$1.50..... 2.50 1.02

1 boy's wool hat..... 75 32

10 yards worsted, 20c..... 2.00 87

18 yards worsted, 17c..... 2.20 95

1 set plates..... 65 24

1 set goblets..... 65 21

1 dozen knives and forks..... 2.75 91

2 dishes, 40c and 60c..... 1.00 36

35 yards bagging, 8c..... 2.40 93

1 bundle ties..... 3.13 95

\$101.50 \$33.80

The Key West and other domestic manufacturers of cigars from Havana tobacco are very much awake to the ruin of their business which would be worked by the McKinley tariff. The duty on their imported material it is proposed to increase from 35 cents to \$2 per pound, which will amount to an increase of \$80.00 on the quantity required for making a thousand cigars, or 4 cents on each cigar. Meantime, the customs duty on the imported cigars is to be increased only \$20 per thousand, or 3 cents each. The in-

crease of duty will be therefore one-third more on the domestic manufacture than on the imported. So much for the "home industry" under Mr. McKinley. The customer's part will be to pay 15 cents for a 10-cent cigar.

In the fiscal year 1880 we sold Great Britain \$380,000,000 worth of our products, mostly agricultural. It is the object of the English protectionists to destroy this export trade or as much of it as possible. Should they succeed our farmers would be mainly confined to the home market for the sale of their surplus and would have to reduce their production accordingly. For we could not find a market at home to take the place of the British market. Supposing that we stopped buying of Great Britain, as well as selling to her, we should reduce our imports by only \$178,000,000, while our loss of patronage would amount to \$880,000,000. Our net loss would, according to the Louisville Courier-Journal, be \$200,000,000. This is the consumption toward which British protectionists are laboring.

In view of the foregoing facts there does not seem to be a great deal of intelligence back of the encouragement which American protectionists occasionally give to their British brethren. Both are laboring to "check imports" into their respective countries, and the consequence of the success of both would be the destruction of commerce between the two nations. But as Great Britain is a better customer to us than we are to her, the advantage of such a result would seem to be largely on her side—at least, if we consider the protectionist contention that the true policy of a country is to sell as much as possible abroad and buy nothing.

The British protectionists are numerically so weak that it may be a long time before they will be able to secure the adoption of retaliatory duties against this country. But the idea is growing abroad, and has already taken shape in Mexico and France within the past few months. Other countries are discussing the propriety of a similar course upon the passage of the new tariff bill. It may as well be understood, at once that we can not pursue our policy of "checking imports" without provoking retaliation and injuring our export trade.

The merchant tailors of the United States are up in arms against the Republican party on account of a clause in the McKinley tariff bill which admits into United States ports free of duty \$500 worth of clothing.

In St. Louis there is an organization of merchant tailors known as the Drapers and Tailors' Exchange, of which B. F. Myers, of the Myers-Lahre Tailoring Company, is President. Mr. Myers was seen by a Republic reporter and asked for some information on the subject of the proposed tariff. The members of the Republican party among the members of the tailors exchanged words, said that the merchant tailors all over the country had memorialized Congress not to pass that section of the McKinley bill, but that they had passed it in the House, notwithstanding the protest of the tailors. The law will be highly detrimental to the interests of merchant tailoring in the United States, and in the tailors' petition to Congress not to pass it attention is called to the fact that it virtually admits duty free \$500 of value of wearing apparel by each person arriving within the United States, and further that each such individual importation by adult male passengers would represent at least fifteen suits of foreign made clothes, representing a value in the United States of at least \$1,200,000. Adult male residents of the United States for and return from Europe annually, and further, that the average tourist's trip abroad is once every third year, and that the \$1,000 worth of clothing will supply such tourist with ample clothing during the said period of three years; and further, that the money value limit in the McKinley bill would induce those residents of the United States visiting Europe who do not now purchase foreign-made clothing to do so.

The merchant tailors have already begun to send agents to this country to employ American cutters," said Mr. Myers. "There is no tariff on the raw material there, and consequently they can make a suit of clothes and sell it for \$2 that cannot be made and sold for less than \$40 here. They propose to come to this country and get cutters, and then employ men to travel back and forth across the Atlantic bringing the goods they make up into our market. The effect of the law would be felt most keenly by the merchant tailors in the Eastern cities but it would not be long before it would sweep clear across the country. There was no duty on the materials out of which clothing is made we could compete with the foreign tailors, but when the import duty is left on raw materials and is taken off the made-up goods, as the Republican party proposes in the McKinley bill, it would not take long to ruin