

FIFTH PRECINCT.

This is the great "Liberal" stronghold, and it was to be expected that they would poll a heavy majority in it. At 11:45 the total vote was 511, of which the "Liberals" claimed 375, conceding to the People's Party only 135.

At four o'clock the total vote was 795, of which the "Liberal" tally-keepers gave the People's Party only 210, claiming a majority of 375.

THE TWO GREAT PARTIES OF THE DAY.

To the Editor of the News:

Your issue of July 3, under the above heading, said:

"The line of demarcation between the two great political parties of the nation, so far as political doctrine goes, is quite thin and rather indefinite. The two organizations are as hostile as ever. But each has absorbed theories that were held by the other, and there are few essential differences of opinion between them."

"There are Republican free traders and Democratic protectionists. And neither party would now advocate a complete policy on either principle."

"What they fight about is the manner in which the common end shall be reached, and the articles which should be relieved or protected."

"So in regard to the doctrine of local self-government—an essentially Democratic doctrine. The party that has preached it for a century has gone back on it as it relates to the Territories, adopting the extreme Republican notion of the supreme power of Congress and other anti-Democratic ideas."

Perhaps a brief statement of the main differences and resemblances between the two parties may be of interest to your readers.

The writer of this is not a Democrat because he thinks the Democratic party a model of consistency, or purity, nor does he think there is no virtue in Republicanism. He believes, however, that there are rather greater differences between the two parties than the above quotations seem to indicate. Some differences are as follows.

THE TARIFF.

The line of demarcation between the two great parties has become very decided and definite on the tariff within the last two years. Never before, in my judgment, has the line been more definitely drawn. President Cleveland's famous message declared the existence of a dangerous surplus revenue, showed that it should be reduced by lightening the taxes on food, clothing and other common necessities of life, and urged immediate relief from "a condition and not a theory that confronts us."

The Republican party declared that a surplus was better than a deficit, and that "rather than surrender any part of our protective system, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes." Here, then, is one broad difference: the Democratic party would levy taxes mainly on

luxuries, and leave necessities untaxed; the Republican party would levy taxes on necessities and leave luxuries (i. e., whisky and tobacco, the internal revenue article) free from taxation. Cheap food and clothing versus cheap whisky and tobacco, is a decided contrast.

It is no answer to this public avowal and subsequent actual practice of each party, to say that republicans like Knute Nelson said they preferred "cheap lumber, salt and clothes" to cheap whisky, or that Democrats, like Mr. Dana, believe in the doctrine of protection. Because some "Liberals" favor low taxes, and some People's Party men favor high taxes, does not show that there is no difference between the parties. Some "Liberals" are opposed to disfranchising the majority here, and some of the majority are apathetic on the question; but that does not prove any identity between the two parties, one of which is working to accomplish the disfranchisement, the other to defeat it. In pursuance of the democratic principle, the Mills Bill was framed. It reduced the rate of taxation from an average of 47 per cent to an average of 42 per cent, and provided that raw wool, raw flax, hemp and jute, lumber, salt, tinplate and certain chemicals should be added to the free list. This bill, it was estimated, would reduce the revenue about \$60,000,000 a year.

In pursuance of the Republican policy, the McKinley bill has been framed. It increases the rate of tax to 52.8 per cent, as it passed the House, and to 51.97 per cent, as amended by the Senate. This bill, as shown by the report of the Senate finance committee, will increase the revenue \$45,000,000 a year, and this, too, under a measure entitled, "a bill to reduce the revenues."

The average war duties in 1835 were 47.56 per cent.; the highest war duties ever reached were an average of 48.83 per cent. in 1868.

The Republican party is the party of war taxes; the Democratic party would reduce the tariff to a revenue basis.

The Ohio Democratic platform says, "We demand such judicious reduction of the present burdensome tariff as shall result in producing a revenue sufficient only to meet the expenses of an economical administration of government."

The Ohio republican platform says, "We are in favor of a protective tariff, and we denounce the Ohio democratic platform of a tariff for revenue only."

Tariff for revenue only, is free trade. Free trade England collects over \$100,000,000 yearly from her taxes on imports, chiefly luxuries; protected Uncle Sam collects \$161,000,000 yearly on imports, chiefly common necessities. That is the difference, and the only difference, between the so-called "free trade" and the so-called "protection." Except on a few articles, there is no such thing as absolute free trade or absolute protection.

TRUSTS.

President Cleveland commended the zeal of our fathers to preserve

equality before the law, and under whose rule "combinations, monopolies and aggregations of capital were avoided or sternly regulated and restrained."

Jas. G. Blaine said that "trusts are largely private affairs, with which neither Congress nor President Cleveland himself has any right to interfere."

President Harrison said it was not the length of the step towards free trade made by the Mills bill, that alarmed all good republicans, but the direction of it. Accordingly, his party has calmed its constituents by taking a step in the opposite direction—towards higher taxes. Democrats claim that taxation is a necessary evil, which should be kept within the narrowest possible limits. Republicans claim that taxes may be made a wealth producing factor if applied to the payment of bounties to manufacturing corporations, or if so levied as to give the manufacturer a monopoly of the home market. To this President Cleveland replied, "He mocks the people who propose that the government shall protect the rich, and that they, in turn, will care for the laboring poor." He remarks that when the government enters gratuitously into partnership with these favorites, it destroys equality before the law.

THE SURPLUS.

Republicans believe the surplus should be reduced by spending it. Democrats believe the surplus should be reduced by decreasing the taxation.

The last year of Democratic taxation left a large surplus in the treasury; the present year of Republican administration will cause a deficit unless the McKinley bill shall become a law.

The Democratic party believes too much money is already paid in pensions; the Republican party believes in universal pensioning to soldiers. The pensions paid last year amounted to \$87,000,000; and this year, it is supposed, will reach over \$100,000,000—a sum greater than that paid for the maintenance of the immense standing army of Germany.

STATE RIGHTS.

Social self-government is a fundamental principle of the Democratic party, and the writer knows of no community that has yet been deprived of that right through laws made by Democratic majorities. Many Democrats once believed a State might lawfully secede from the Union. The utmost liberty of the State consistent with the preservation of the Union is now the doctrine of all Democrats.

The Republican party is taking long strides toward the centralization of power in the hands of the federal government. The Blair educational bill, the Lodge election bill, the Thomas-Edmunds bill, and others are familiar examples.

The republican party has deprived certain communities of local self-government in the past, and proposes to do so with another in the immediate future. By means of the Lodge election bill, it proposes, in Mr. Reed's words, "to do its own regulation, its own counting, its own