

per cent. wool hats from 72 to 88, and the same is true of cotton goods, farm implements, etc., and the revenue was reduced in proportion. The general average of the new tariff was 32 per cent, the highest rate in the country or any other free list. But it was (of course, to protect the laborers (?) of this country, and to give a home market to the agricultural products. Yes, the tariff was raised on all the farm products, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Woomer) says that the farmer ought to be content to pay a little increase on the merchandise he has to buy, as all are reciprocally benefited. The gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Pickler) always springs to the defense of the farmer like a lightning bolt from the brain of Jove, and says: "He is distressed because he has been put upon the free list." For twenty-five years the Republican party has been trying to help the sheep-raiser by putting a tariff on wool, and, to compensate manufacturers who must pay the tariff, they give them four and one-half times as much on the product of that wool as they have paid duty on the wool, and give the farmer the London price for his wool, as is shown by the most reliable statistics. We are asked to pay 40 per cent to the men who make our clothing in order to build up the sheep industry, and the number of sheep is decreasing year by year. North Carolina has lost 13,704 since the McKinley bill passed. Mr. Chairman, let us examine some of the blessings of the McKinley law, and see to what extent it has kept out farm products from our market, and how much has been coming here to compete with ours.

Figures Tell the Story

To call the attention of the committee to the statistics on the importations of certain leading agricultural products, and especially do I desire the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Pickler) to the reports for 1890, before the McKinley law was passed, and also for the year 1892, when it was in effect:

Articles	1890.		1892.	
	Quantity.	Tariff.	Quantity.	Tariff.
Corn, bushels	1,587	20 cents	5,774	25 cents
Corn meal, bushels	268	10 cents	228	20 cents
Wheat, bushels	4,361	20 cents	9,807	25 cents
Rye, bushels	30	10 cents	203	10 cents
Hogs, head	1,592	20 per cent.	16,947	\$1.40
Mules, head	15	\$30 per head.	8	\$30 per head.

It strikes me that this is a pretty bad showing for the farmers. They have actually lost the home market to the extent of 4,946 bushels of wheat, 4,120 bushels of corn, 173 bushels of rye, and 14,355 head of hogs; and by this stimulating process he has raised the market for 37 bushels of corn meal and 7 mules. [Laughter.]

Pickler Becomes Inquisitive

MR. PICKLER. Who made that report?
MR. CRAWFORD. I got the figures for 1890 from the McKinley bill, and those for 1892 from the Bureau of Statistics.
He is not so bright to the intelligence of the American people to insist that the farmer can be protected by a tariff either in the sale or price of his farm products?
That very year, 1892, after supplying the 47,000,000 of people of this country with all these things, they had to seek a market in foreign countries for the sale of \$799,328,000 of these products which you are trying to protect—\$169,508,000 more than was exported in 1890. How is this for a home market, Mr. Chairman? But, strange as it may seem, our friends on the other side congratulated the country and the farmers in particular, upon the fact that they have found good foreign markets since the McKinley bill passed. We imported in 1892 \$27,402,462 worth of foreign merchandise. If your policy of taxing everything out of this country which can be produced here should prevail, and admitting everything free which can not be produced here, how will you get revenue for the support of the Government, and where will our people find a market for their surplus? It is clear to everyone that the farmer can not be benefited by a tax on their corn, wheat, and meats, for they are sellers and not buyers of these things. The argument in support of such a tax is a fraud and is intended to deceive, and the higher duties levied by the McKinley bill on those products are a dry bone thrown to the dog, as it were. At this point I desire to call attention to the speech of that bold, able, and fearless Republican, Mr. Butterworth, in the House of Representatives on the McKinley bill:
Now, Mr. Speaker, will you address the attempt to satisfy the farmers and other laborers and producers and to induce them to believe that they will find greater prosperity, lighter burdens, and greater strength to bear them in the clause of this bill which imposes increased duties on agricultural products; that they will derive a benefit from a duty on Canada corn, a duty on potatoes and barley, a duty on rye and corn. We are exporters of these things and not importers, and yet they would build a dam to keep the water from running up hill.
And he said further:
Certain it is that in some lines of production we have, by our system of adjusting the tariff, enabled a few individuals to accumulate more money than the entire agricultural and working population of some States have been able to earn during the same period of time. Protection was not necessary as against competition in the cases mentioned, but because the individuals who consume these products were unable to impose upon Congress as to their real needs, and thus prevent a reduction of the tariff.
But this will not be accepted as evidence in this discussion, Mr. Chairman, for there is no limit to the beneficence of the tariff from the standpoint of that side of the House. It matters not what promise is laid down, the conclusion is the same, and that is that the tariff makes wages high and the products of labor cheap. And your logic reminds me of the examination of a civil-service applicant. He came to the question, "Which was

the greater general, Caesar or Hannibal?" He replied, "When we come to consider who Caesar and Hannibal were, and ask ourselves the question which was the greater, we most decidedly answer in the affirmative!" [Laughter.]

Would Deceive the People

You lost the force of your "cheap John" argument that the foreigner pays the tariff when you made sugar substantially free. You ingeniously compare the price of goods in this country with the price forty years ago, but you studiously avoid comparing prices with free-trade England. Prices have declined the world over on account of improved methods of manufacturing and transportation. Nobody understands better than you gentlemen that machinery and skilled labor are the great agencies which have reduced the cost of production. You have seen the great engines and water-powers set in motion thousands of looms and spindles, which displace the old-time methods when everything was done by hand or imperfect machinery. In these factories one skilled laborer can turn out more finished goods than a hundred could have done forty years ago. The people know all this; but you would have them believe the tariff did it. Nobody knows better than you that the prices of such products are higher in this country than any other under the sun, and that the object of the tariff is to maintain the price against the cheapening processes.

You all admit, either directly or indirectly, that the effect of this bill will be to reduce the cost of foreign-made goods to the same extent as the tariff is reduced, and you also admit that the domestic goods must be reduced in the same proportion in order to hold the American market. The gentleman from New York (Judge Daniels), a life-long Republican and an eminent judge of the supreme court of his State for twenty odd years, frankly admits the truth of our contention as to existing conditions. He said a few days ago, in discussing prices in this country as compared with those of other countries:

Go to England, France, or Germany, and as a matter of fact, demonstrated by researches that admit of no possible doubt, those countries are able to produce manufactured articles at least one-half the cost that the same business is subjected to in the manufacturing interests of the United States.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Draper), a Republican and a manufacturer, said, on this floor, on this very point:

In lines where the duties are to-day needed for protection, where foreign producers compete to-day under present duties, a lessening of duty will lower the wholesale price of foreign goods. This done, American prices must be lowered to correspond or American producers go out of business.

Then declares that wages will be reduced. These friends of the laboring men refuse to entertain a suggestion that the profits of the manufacturer might be reduced instead of the wages of his employees. They never recognize any man as an American laborer unless he works in a factory. They lose sight of the millions of honest, deserving, and needy laborers who cannot be protected, the farmers, the mechanics, the masons. They have no sympathy nor relief for these men.

South Demands Simple Justice Only

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Hull) in a colloquy with myself a few days ago reflected on the labor of the South. I say to him that we ask no protection for the workingmen, white or black, but we demand for them fair and even-handed justice. Pathetic appeals have been made to this side of the House in behalf of the "American laborer," which means the man in the factory, whether he be a German, Hun, Pole, or Bohemian, whether he has been in this country one month or ten years. They are all on the "free list." They may not be able to speak a word in the English language, but they are taught to sing out in concert "America for Americans." [Applause.]

We do not claim, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is a remedy for all the evils which have grown up under the protective system, but we do feel that the country may be congratulated upon the fact that it is a step in the right direction.

It will lighten the burdens of the people by reducing taxation on most of the necessities of life from a prohibitory to a revenue basis, and will at the same time unfetter trade and commerce, thereby giving us a better opportunity to sell and buy in the best markets of the world. It destroys the power of monopolies to levy unreasonable and unjust bounties upon the consumption of the people. It reduces the tariff on woolen goods from 98 to 40 per cent. This of itself ought to commend this bill to the masses of the people. It is estimated that the people of this country consume annually \$400,000,000 worth of woolen goods, and the bill will reduce the cost at least \$100,000,000 every year—a blessing which will be felt in every household in the land. Cotton goods, iron and steel manufactures, and a hundred things the people use are reduced in the same proportion; besides, many of the absolute necessities of life have been made free.

Salt and Iron, Fat on Free List

God created man and beast to require salt, and he filled the earth and the ocean with the inexhaustible supply, and a few men have taken possession of it and are charging a tax of 80 per cent, and are asking this Congress to protect their labor, but the fact is it is for the benefit of the great railroad companies and the salt trusts. I find this statement in the New York Tribune of December 10, 1892:

Liverpool salt is sold in New York for \$3.50 a ton after paying the duty, and if the tariff is taken off, it will be sold for \$1.90 a ton—ten cents less than the freight from Buffalo to New York.

We have put it on the free list for the sake of humanity, and say to the people that no tariff baron shall ever again collect tribute from an article of such prime necessity. So long as the Democratic party is in power it will be as free as the air, for it is as boucteous as the oceans. [Applause.]

And further, Mr. Chairman, when we think of the thousands of people throughout this broad land to-day who are suffering from cold, I do not understand upon what principle gentlemen ask us to continue a tax on their fire. An all-wise Creator so constituted man that fire is necessary to his comfort and well-being in the colder climates, but in His merciful providence He has stored the mountains with an unlimited quantity of coal—a supply sufficient for all the coming generations. And a few rich, avaricious own most of the coal lands and are protected by a tariff far in excess of the cost of mining the coal, which enables them to charge exorbitant prices. We have put it on the free list, and once more the people will have light, heat, and air free of taxes.

Iron ore is also put upon the free list in the interest of the whole country, and more especially in the interest of the farmers, who use more iron and steel than any other class in proportion to the amount of business they do. Hence we are able to place agricultural implements, cotton ties, and such like on the free list, so that the farming classes may buy them in the cheapest markets of the world where the price of farm products is fixed, whether sold at home or abroad. The London price for wheat and cotton controls the New York and Chicago price.

Wealth Must Bear its Share of Burden

The tax levied by this bill is with a view of revenue only, and if it falls short of a sufficient amount to meet the public demands the deficiency will be supplied by the income-tax feature of the bill, levying, as it does, a tax of 2 per cent. on all incomes exceeding \$4,000. This will bring millions into the Treasury, and will come from the rich men of the country who have heretofore borne comparatively none of the tax burden. But I am aware that this provision may meet a defeat through the efforts of that side of the House, aided by a few gentlemen on this side. But whether this tax is imposed or not at this time it will be done in the near future. Wealth must bear its reasonable proportion of the burdens of government, and if the people of this country fail to sustain this bill as the initiatory step of reform, I shall, to a great extent, lose confidence in their capacity for self-government. The Democratic party appealed to the people when you passed the McKinley bill, and we are here to-day with their commission to wipe it from the statute book. In the meantime the manufacturers have appealed from the decision of the people to Congress, and you Republicans are singing the same old songs you sang in 1890 and 1892. The people did not believe you then, and they do not believe you now. But you persist in appealing from "Philip-sober to Philip drunk." [Laughter.]

The McKinley Bill

The McKinley bill was entitled, "A bill to reduce revenue and equalize the duties on imports," and I reckon the country is willing to admit that it was a complete success in reducing revenue. It raised the tariff to a prohibitory point, thereby reducing the revenue to the Government, and Republicans talk as if they are amazed at the condition of the Treasury. Surprised that we have no money to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government? Surprised that financial and industrial panics have a tight grip on the country? It has all resulted from your unwise and vicious legislation. It is the result of a "condition, and not a theory," as may be seen by investigation. When Cleveland turned over the Administration to Harrison in 1889 there were \$185,000,000 in the Treasury, \$85,000,000 clear surplus, the appropriations were kept within the bounds of economical expenditures, and everything was moving on in the usual course of prosperity.

But after the McKinley passed, the tax from imports fell from \$220,576,000 in 1889 to \$174,124,000 in 1892, a loss of \$46,452,000, and at the same time you increased appropriations \$122,421,000. The increase of pensions alone amounted to \$79,232,283 a year. When Harrison turned over the Government to Cleveland last March there was not a dollar of surplus in the Treasury, and but for the fact that the Sherman law of 1890 covered into the general fund the national bank redemption fund, amounting to \$54,000,000, there would have been a deficit of \$27,000,000. Will Republicans close their eyes to the fact that Mr. Foster, Harrison's Secretary of the Treasury, went before the Finance Committee of the Senate and urged the issue of bonds to meet the bankrupt condition of the Treasury, and that his estimates were based on conditions existing prior to the election of 1892? And a Republican Senate passed a bill authorizing a bond issue, in compliance with the Secretary's recommendation, but a Democratic House refused to pass the bill. In the face of this you have the audacity to say that the fear excited by the Wilson bill has depleted the Treasury. You shift the responsibility of the result of the McKinley law, the Sherman law, and all the bad laws that you enacted. And the only remedy you have is to ask the people to hold on to the bad laws until you can give them more of them.

Falsity of the Prediction

You had legislated on the financial question so as to give the great national banking corporations absolute control of the financial policy of the Government, thereby enabling them to control all the surplus money of the country with which business is done, and when this great organized money power wants certain legislation it stops the wheels of commerce until it is granted. When you voted to repeal the Sherman law unconditionally; you admitted that your legislation on the silver question was a huge failure; you admitted that that law was directly responsible for the panic which has paralyzed all business, and scattered want and suffering from one end of the country to the other. You predicted that the repeal of the Sherman law would restore prosperity immediately. Senator Sherman said in the Senate in support of the repeal, that it would take only ten days to do it. I am sorry many Democrats fell into the same error. Time has proven the utter falsity of the prediction. The country needs and should have had proper affirmative legislation, recognizing silver as a money metal at the time the friendless Sherman law was repealed. If the Republicans, after having had thirty years to establish a financial policy, have any policy whatever, nobody knows it. I trust that the Democratic party will be able to build out of the wreck a financial system worthy of the American people. [Applause.]

On the other hand, the protected manufacturers have been so accustomed to being consulted when a tariff bill was to be framed that they now protest against the people's elected Representatives reforming or modifying the laws which have been putting money into their coffers by the millions. And when it is understood that the Democrats mean to take it out of the power of these parasites to levy their usual tribute upon the people in the name of taxation, they close their factories and turn the laborers out into the streets to beg for bread—the very men for whom all these eloquent appeals have been made during this debate, and in all the campaigns—turned them out on the cold charities of the world, and refuse to give them either work or bread for their starving families; the very men whose skill and labor accumulated the vast fortunes of these millionaires who demand that Congress shall guarantee them prices as an inducement to resume business. This is the result of thirty years' protection of the American labor-

ers. Down with it; it is a sham and a fraud. And I believe—

Refused to Extend His Time

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.
MR. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended ten minutes.
MR. HICKS. I object.
MR. CRAWFORD. I can finish what I desire to say in a few minutes.
THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Henderson) asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended ten minutes.
MR. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I object.
MR. TUCKER. I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes.
MR. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I object.
MR. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from New York is always on the floor and yet he gets up and objects to others occupying the time of the House. [Applause.]

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN.

From The French Broad Hustler.

Those who have witnessed the discussions of the political issues involved in this campaign by Messrs Crawford and Britt, democratic and republican candidates for a seat in the 60th congress, must in all candor, admit that Mr. Crawford has literally torn into shreds every argument advanced by his opponent. Mr. Britt makes a strong defense of the policies, if such they may be called, maintained by his party, but the sledge hammer blows administered by the democratic standard bearer come with such force and power as to completely demolish the claims of Dingley protection, indiscriminate immigration and the fallacious suggestion that Mr. Cleveland's administration is responsible for the panic which came upon the country in 1893. Mr. Crawford's speeches show him to be a man of affairs and one thoroughly conversant with the political history of this country from the foundation of the government to the present day. His review of the past records of the democratic and republican parties is superb and inspiring and democrats who hear him cannot refrain from rejoicing in the fact that their cause is being so ably defended by a man whom they delight to honor.

These two representatives of their respective parties met in joint debate at Brevard last Saturday and at Columbus on Monday of this week. In these discussions and former ones, Mr. Britt contends that Mr. Crawford's exposition of the conduct of certain republican leaders in North Carolina is not an issue and calls it "silly twaddle and clap trap." Mr. Crawford replies that they are officers of the government and their conduct is therefore a legitimate subject for discussion; that the records of Federal office-holders contributes in making the record of the republican party, which must be judged by the men who make its history. He quotes from the recent speech of Secretary of War Taft, at the Greensboro convention, Blackburn's newspaper, Judge Bynum and others, in establishing his contention that the republican party in this state is condemned by the evidence of its own members, and in his own original way presents the case most strongly. Mr. Britt and his supporters squirm while democrats applaud, as Mr. Crawford lays bare the unseemly conduct of many republican leaders in North Carolina, whose insatiable desire for pie has eclipsed every other consideration. He calls attention to the fact that the republicans have only one representative from this state and by the assistance of Mr. Britt they tried to put that one in the penitentiary. So you see, says Mr. Crawford, that it is a dangerous thing for a republican to be elected to congress from this state and the people will put an end to the trouble on the 6th of November by electing ten democrats to represent them.

Mr. Crawford dwells upon the theory of democrats, founding and organizing the government and states that Thomas Jefferson, the father of democracy, was the author of the declaration of independence and one of the framers of the constitution and that the democratic party established every institution of this great government, judicial and legislative departments organized the state governments, fixing the relations between state and nation; established relations with all other countries; provided systems of taxation for the support of the government—even creating the tariff; created our financial system; organized and provided for navy; established the merchant marine which carries eighty per cent of our products to all ports of the earth; fought the wars and provided for peace, all before the republican party was born. He challenges Mr. Britt to name a single institution established by the republicans (which the latter is unable to do) and says instead of establishing any they have abused those founded by democrats for the people's welfare, in the interest of rich manufacturers, trusts, money gamblers and bond jobbers.

The great issue in this campaign, Mr. Crawford maintains, is the tariff, or

Federal taxation. The first levy under the constitution, was 15 per cent. In 1832 it was raised to 32 per cent., through the influence of manufacturers who advocated protection for American industries. It was called the tariff of abomination. Mr. Clay, in advocating a compromise by which it was reduced to 26 per cent., stated in a speech on the floor of congress that if the American people would acquiesce in the proposition for nine years the manufacturers would be able to compete with all the world. Seventy-five years have elapsed and still these infant industries are clamoring for more protection. After they have acquired hundreds of millions from the sweat and toil of the people, by reason of these excessive tax laws which gives to them the markets of United States, the Dingley law, which Mr. Britt says has brought all the prosperity to the country, is an intensified tariff law as compared with the old Clay compromise and levies the largest tax on the American people that they have experienced in the history of the country, being an average of 50 per cent. Mr. Crawford meets every argument advanced by the republicans and is fully meeting the expectations of his friends.

BUTLER AND RUSSELL.

In the announcement that ex-Senator Marion Butler would speak at Smithfield, he handbills in Johnson county said he would divide time with Governor Glenn or either of the United States Senators.

Political discussion and debate have always been encouraged in North Carolina, and have done much to educate the people. When he first espoused the cause of the People's party and advocated its principles, Governor Glenn, Governor Aycock, Solicitor Luffy and other distinguished speakers met the ex-Senator in public debate in the discussions of political questions.

But there are two men in North Carolina whom their acts have made it impossible for any respectable public man to meet in joint debate—one of these men is ex-Governor Russell and one is Marion Butler. When the Governor ordered the State Treasurer not to issue new bonds for the old bonds offered in exchange under the act of 1870, he was guilty of robbing the state of which he had been made chief trustee. When Butler as Senator conspired with Russell and Pettigrew to make a way to sue North Carolina on the very bonds Russell held up, he committed moral treason. If these acts of treason had been committed during the term of office of Russell and Butler and their infamous conduct had been made known to the people, Russell would have been impeached and Butler would have been forced to leave his seat in the Senate or defy the authority of the Legislature to demand his retirement.

In all North Carolina no two public officials have been guilty of such treason to the state that put them in position to protect it.

There is one crime that the people never forgive in a man—robbing widows and orphans for whom he is trustee or guardian. There is one crime in a public official that ought never to be forgiven—conspiring with anybody to wrong the State he has sworn to serve.

Butler may issue his challenges. They will be treated by reputable men with the contempt which they deserve. In North Carolina treason, moral or legal, does not prosper.—New York Observer.

The Right Place to Transfer.

When you have reached the corner of your mind where you can't see any good in the world.

When you have reached the avenue where you want to walk down it to meet some good fellows just to take a drink.

When you get to where you can stop in your work to hear the latest indecent story.

When you come to the place where you are content to let things go half done because you're doing it for some one else.

When you will go in debt for something you don't have to have but want it because some one else has it.

When you have reached the place where you think that no one appreciates you.

When you find it more convenient to speak abruptly than pleasantly to inferiors.

When you can't be pleasant around the house in the morning.

When you have got to the place where you are not bothered with the ghost of work badly done.

When you haven't any time to listen to another person's misfortunes.

When you can't see any merit in any one who works at the same thing you do.—New York World.