

# The Statesville American.

VOL. XXVII.

RALEIGH, N. C., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1884.

NO. 30.

## SPECIAL TAX BONDS.

**Democratic Misrepresentations.**  
“They (the people of the State) cannot forget that by reckless appropriations and the issue of fraudulent bonds, for which the State received nothing in return, the Republicans destroyed her credit and reduced her to bankruptcy, and that the Democrats have annihilated the fraudulent bonds.” &c.—Extract from address by R. H. Battle, Chairman of Democratic State Executive Committee.

MR. EDITOR:—The above extract purports to be made “for the Committee,” and not on Mr. Battle’s individual responsibility. When a great party sets forth in an address an assertion of facts and principles, upon which it claims the confidence and support of the people, it is its duty scrupulously to adhere to the truth of history. If it perverts that truth and, presuming on the ignorance and prejudices of its former adherents, wilfully attempts to mislead them, then the people should distrust all of its pretensions to favor, but it from power, if it be in power, and leave its leaders to learn political integrity in the severe school of humiliation and defeat.

The address, to which I have alluded, is teeming with misrepresentations from beginning to end. I have selected only one for criticism. It is a fair sample of the rest. I do not accuse Mr. Battle of personal falsity. I have known him for many years and entertain a high regard for his personal integrity; but there must be something radically wrong in the constitution of the Bourbon Democracy, that can blind such a man as Mr. Battle, and induce him deliberately to give the sanction of his name to a paper that, in my opinion, slanders some of the purest and best men of the State, living or dead. The living ought to repel the charge; the dead will find, I hope, a vindication in this article.

But, Mr. Editor, the Democratic press and speakers, of high and low degree, and of no degree at all, have so long and so persistently asserted, that the Republican party alone is responsible for the issue of the Special Tax Bonds, and that these bonds are the most conspicuous monument of its corruption, that some of them really believe the assertion to be true.

For instance, I find the following in an editorial of a highly respectable paper of recent date: “The special tax bonds, which now amount to nearly twenty-three millions, were issued by a Republican Legislature for the ostensible purpose of building railroads, but not a dollar of them was spent on railroads. The money was used by private individuals for their own use.”

The editors of this paper are honorable gentlemen and would not willingly do injustice to any one. They were misled by overconfidence in the assertions of others. I quote it simply to show the tone and spirit of the Democratic press, and what wide spread mischief the various Democratic Executive Committees of the State and their coadjutors have wrought on the public mind.

Of course they never appeal to the journals of the General Assembly to prove their statements, or to enable a candid and anxious hearer, or reader, to learn the truth for himself. Were they to do so, the venom would drop hurtless from their pens, and their wild wags, filled with declamatory froth, would be thrown aside, or useless, from their swelling cheeks.

Even General Scales, who ought to know better, condescends to make this one of the chief articles of arraignment of the Republican party. If he aspires to be a statesman, he should first inform himself, and thus qualified, go forth and teach his fellow-citizens.

But in charity the writer believes, or rather hopes, that he does not know any better or he would not descend to such depths of demagogism. It may be, that the Democratic Executive Committee, of which R. H. Battle is chairman, has misled General Scales, or General Scales has misled the committee, or some better informed and less scrupulous person has imposed on their credulity and misled them both.

But be this as it may, let us proceed to the charges of the committee. They are in substance: I. That the Republicans fraudulently issued the special tax bonds.

II. That they fraudulently sold them.

III. That the State has received nothing in return for them; and

IV. That the Democrats have annihilated them, and thus protected the State against this meditated Republican swindle.

No one can admire, more than the writer, the ingenuity with which the author of the address has condensed in one short sentence so many false statements. There is not a word of truth in a single one of these assertions; but on the contrary I maintain the following propositions: I. That the bonds were not con-

ceived in corruption, nor fraudulently issued, but were the result of high patriotic motives.

II. That if they were negotiated with intent to defraud the State, Democrats were much more deeply involved than Republicans in the felonious attempt. I will prove the proposition to the satisfaction of every fair minded and intelligent man in the State, who will to me the honor of reading this paper.

I relieve the committee of the necessity of proving their charges. I assume the aggressive and will prove mine. Let them stand on the defensive, the only position that the Democratic party should ever occupy. I am aware of the responsibility I assume; for every Democratic newspaper and every speaker, from Senator down to a township constable, for the last fourteen years, time and again, have made these charges against the Republican party.

As to my first proposition: One would suppose, that State pride, respect for the General Assembly, a decent regard for the honor of one hundred and twenty members, who enjoyed the confidence of their constituents, should and would restrain a good citizen or even a man of ordinary humane feelings from making, against such a body of men, or a majority of them, without the most convincing evidence, a charge of corruption. The courts will nevertheless uphold a statute unless it is manifestly unconstitutional.

But I invoke no such defence for the General Assembly of 1868-69. Its action can be vindicated against the “envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness” of the Democratic party by appeals to its journals and to the history of the times.

Slavery had just been abolished, and all men, without distinction of party, looked, it may be too confidently, for the State, under the new order of things, to shoot forward on a course of prosperity hitherto unparalleled.

A spirit of enthusiasm seized on the minds of the people, very unwisely it is true, and hurried them on far beyond the bounds of prudence.

Similar instances are not unknown in this country and in Europe. Students of history will recall the South Sea Bubble in England and Louis’ Mississippi scheme in France. A similar craze swept over England in 1846. Millions were invested in railroads, that paid no dividends, and wide spread bankruptcy followed; so in our own Western States at a later period.

Governor Holden in his Inaugural address well expresses the sentiment of the whole State at the time. He says: “A vigorous and well directed system of internal improvements, from the sea shore to the Tennessee line, thus placing us in direct communication with the Mississippi valley, with cheap rates of freights and travel, would stimulate agriculture and the mechanic arts, build up our sea ports, increase our commerce, both foreign and coastwise, draw thither immigrants from the Northern States and from Europe, arrest emigration from the State, give employment to thousands of our people, and thus place us at no very distant day in the front rank of American States.”

See Doc. No. 2, 1868-69, page 9. This hope pervaded all ranks of society and under its inspiration these bonds were issued; members of both parties voting, some for them and others against them.

Let me not be misrepresented. I do not defend the issue of these bonds. It was a great misfortune, but was not criminal.

Now what Democrats voted for them? In the Senate, Messrs Lindsay, Love, Osborne and Robbins for North Western North Carolina Railroad. See Senate Journal 1868, page 108. Messrs. Lindsay and Osborne for Atlantic, Tennessee and Ohio Railroad. Journal 1868-69, page 64.

In the House, Messrs. Durham, Ferebee, Gatling, JARVIS, ROBINSON for Williamston and Tarboro Railroad. Journal 1868, page 171. Messrs. Davidson, Durham, Gatling, Malone, Robinson and Welch for W., C. & R. R. Journal 1868-69, page 187-8. The same gentlemen voted for W. N. C. R. R. See House Journal pages 188-9. These appropriations amount to \$8,640,000.

Governor Jarvis did not vote on either of these last two bills. If he was in the House, then he seems to have dodged; if he was absent, upon his return he could, if he had wished, have had his vote recorded either for or against them.

Were these men, guilty of fraud and corruption? I do not believe it.

But this I say, that if the Republicans of the General Assembly “issued fraudulent bonds, destroyed the credit of the State and reduced her to bankruptcy,” the above named Democratic members, who voted with them, were guilty of the same atrocious crimes. If Mr. Battle’s charge is true as to the Republicans, it is equally true as to the Democrats; and the Democratic party, instead of elevating one to the office of Governor, another to that of Lieutenant Governor and still another to a seat in Congress, should have consigned

them, one and all, to an infamous obscurity.

So much for my first proposition: that these bonds were not conceived in corruption, nor fraudulently issued, but were the result of patriotic motives.

II. Now as to my second proposition: Democratic orators from Deacon Pogram and the Hon. Petroleum V. Nasby at the grocery near “Confederate Cross Roads,” up to General Scales, candidate for Governor of North Carolina, charge that the Republican party attempted to swindle the State by squandering the bonds and misapplying their proceeds, of which the State received nothing, and that the Democratic party relieved her by annihilating them.

This charge is more palpably untrue than the first. Let us appeal to the record.

There were issued \$15,390,000 in bonds, which went into the hands of various Presidents to be sold. Seven of these Presidents were Democrats and two were Republicans.

Of the above amount \$12,070,000 went into the hands of Democratic Presidents and \$3,320,000 to Republican Presidents, as follows:

PENITENTIARY BONDS.	
John M. Heck, Democrat	\$ 100,000
WESTERN N. C. RAILROAD.	
Geo. W. Swepson, Democrat	6,540,000
ATLANTIC, TENNESSEE AND OHIO RAILROAD.	
William Johnston, Democrat	1,750,000
CHATHAM RAILROAD.	
W. J. Hawkins, Democrat	1,200,000
WILLIAMSTON AND TARBORO RAILROAD.	
Jesse R. Stubbs, Democrat	300,000
NORTHWESTERN N. C. R. R.	
Belo, Democrat	1,080,000
WILMINGTON, CHARLOTTE & RUTHERFORD RAILROAD.	
R. H. Cowan, Democrat	1,000,000

Seven Democratic Presidents received.....	
\$12,070,000	
WESTERN RAILROAD.	
A. J. Jones, Republican	1,320,000
WILMINGTON, CHARLOTTE & RUTHERFORD RAILROAD.	
William Sloan, Republican	2,000,000

Two Republican Presidents received.....	
\$ 3,320,000	

See report of fraud commission, passim.

Some of these men are living and some are dead. The living can take care of themselves; and if they are willing to remain silent I am content: But on behalf of the honored dead, whose lips are sealed, I lift up my voice in the sternest accents of denunciation against any man or set of men, who, actuated by party malice, would with their poisoned arrows pierce the breasts of their friends in the mad attempt to destroy their adversaries.

Plato Durham, Judge Osborne and Ferebee are dead.

Does any man outside of the Democratic party believe, or dare assert, that these men voted in favor of issuing fraudulent State bonds? If the Republicans who voted for them were guilty of fraud, so were they, who voted with them. They must stand or fall together. There is no escape from this conclusion, except to suggest that the Democrats were all fools and the Republicans all knaves, who overreached their weaker brethren.

No! these men were neither knaves nor fools. Through life they discharged with fidelity and honor every trust committed to their keeping.

One would suppose, that the charge, made by the Democratic State Executive Committee, by their press and by their speakers, that these bonds were fraudulently issued, were sold with intent to swindle the State and that she has received no part of their proceeds, would not be very pleasant Sunday reading for those Democratic gentlemen, still alive, who either voted for their issue or, as financial agents of the State, negotiated their sale.

Well may they exclaim with the Psalmist: It is not an open enemy that hath done me this dishonor; for then I could have borne it. Neither was it mine adversary that did magnify himself against me; for then peradventure I would have hid myself from him: But it was even thou, my companion, my guide, and mine own familiar friend.

Now a few words to the Democrats of North Carolina: I know a great many of you are honest, conscientious men, sincerely desirous of knowing and following the truth. Unfortunately, education in our State is very limited and, therefore, you have confided too implicitly in your leaders. They have deceived you by perverting the truth and by appeals to your passions and prejudices. You asked for bread and they

gave you a stone; you asked for fish and they gave you a serpent.

I ask you for once to investigate for yourselves. If the assertions contained in this article are false, they can be easily refuted by reference to the Journals of the General Assembly of 1868 and 1868-69, copies of which can be found in the Superior Court Clerk’s office of every county in the State. Examine for yourselves, and if you find my statements are true and that your trusted leaders have deceived you for sixteen years, then as honest and good men turn your backs on them and trust them no more forever; for if they have deceived you in this great matter, about which they could not be mistaken, they do not deserve your confidence in any statement they may make.

**The Political Arena.**  
**BLAINE TO SWEEP THE PACIFIC SLOPE.**  
**His Strength in the East—Testimony from Many Quarters.**  
(New York Tribune.)

The week has been full of hope and promise for the Republicans. Assurances of deep interest on the part of the people have been brought in by every mail. Contributions from the working people have been received in this canvass as they never have been received before. The National Committee feels that the people who demanded the nomination of Mr. Blaine are enlisted for the canvass, and that each voter will make the success of the National ticket a personal matter so far as he can do so. Saturday was an active day, and the two members of the committee on duty were engaged with callers till after 4 o’clock in the afternoon. Among the visitors were Senator Miller, California; Logan H. Roots, Arkansas; Senator John W. Briggs, New Jersey; and Fred Miles, Connecticut.

A. L. Morrison, of New Mexico, chairman of the Irish Republican National League, said to a Tribune reporter: “I have just been to Ohio. The Irish voters in that State are determined to defeat the candidates of the London Times and Godden Club. They are moving over to Blaine in large numbers. I have here a list of 500 Irish voters who are disgusted with the Democrats and have promised to support Blaine. These names are from a single small city. I want to relieve the Democrats of the idea that Cleveland will get all or even a considerable part of the Irish vote. One hundred and twenty-eight delegates from one county have pledged themselves to attend the convention at Cincinnati on the last day of September. I am receiving each day large lists of names from Ohio. The best of feeling prevails. They will unite to defeat the common enemy. August H. Bode, president of the Cincinnati Central German Republican Club, wrote: “When a person pretending to be a German Republican announces in the papers here that the Germans are going to vote against Blaine, because the Irish are going to vote for him, the object sought to be accomplished is too plain to deceive anybody. The question at issue being for American citizens to decide, let it be done by them regardless of their birth-place or descent. Let Irish-Americans and German-Americans fight shoulder to shoulder with the Republican hosts for victory of the party of liberty and progress—the defeat of empty promises and Free Trade British policy.” The German and Irish voters of Ohio will do their full duty by Mr. Blaine.”

Senator Miller, of California, said of the political outlook on the Pacific Slope: “The prospects for Republican success are excellent. Blaine is personally very popular, and the people want him elected. The abuse upon him has only strengthened him. He is a little stronger every day. We do not hear much of the independent movement out in California, nor of the Greenback or Labor parties. The fight is between the Democratic and Republican parties. General Butler will not receive many votes, and the support which he does will come from the Democrats. There is some prohibition sentiment, but it is not crystallized and aggressive. The working men of California and our citizens of Irish extraction are moving over grandly to the support of Blaine just as they are doing here in the East. There is no trouble about the Pacific States. If we do proper work we shall carry them all.”

William H. Sears, collector of the port of San Francisco, said: “There will be a political revolution in California this year. The present Governor, Mr. Stoneman, a Democrat, was elected by more than 20,000 majority. Then, the Republicans did not give their candidate hearty support, and they were divided upon many local issues. Now, the situation is changed—reversed; the Democrats are divided and unharmonious; the Republicans are united and working together splendidly. The State is well organized, and the

active campaign will begin in about ten or twelve days. It is a question of majorities simply, on the Pacific slope this year—Republican majorities I mean. We can carry Oregon, Nevada and California by a majority of 6000. The Republicans will elect three, and possibly four Congressmen. The whole California delegation in the House at Washington is Democratic at the present time. We have also an opportunity to elect a Republican Legislature and thereby secure the election of a Republican Senator of the United States. The Democrats are making the fight on personal issues, and they are losing by it. The Republicans will discuss the tariff question, and can make a good campaign on it. The very considerable wine interests of California are in favor of a protective tariff. Cleveland has at no time moved the Democrats to enthusiastic demonstrations. The man is a little known, and people as a rule, have no wish to form a closer acquaintance. His letter of acceptance added to the unfavorable impression which the people have of him. A great many Democrats will vote for Mr. Blaine, and as for the Independents, one could almost count them on one’s fingers.”

Clarence P. Dresser, of Chicago, said to a member of the committee: “I accompanied General Logan on his triumphal progress through New York, and have since visited all of the New England States and taken pains to ascertain from persons who have the best means of knowing the political situation at the present time, and the outlook for the future. In New York I have visited forty cities and towns, and I am confident that I am not overstating it when I say that New York will give Mr. Blaine a majority of 50,000. Many persons of whom I have met, careful and conservative politicians, estimated Mr. Blaine’s majority at a higher figure, and I am not surprised that they do so. I am not sure but that the situation warrants it. Politicians of both parties told me that they had not seen such a popular campaign since 1840, or one in which the people took such a deep and active interest as they do in the Republican canvass this year. I talked frequently and freely with Democratic politicians and they did not attempt to conceal their disappointment in Cleveland. The best heart in the canvass, they talk as though they were conscious that fate is against them, and that they are playing at a losing game. Cleveland’s letter was a sorrowful disappointment to all Democrats, and a prominent Democrat at Buffalo said to me: “This letter is the finishing blow to his chances. The American people will never consent to have a man of his calibre in the White House.” Mr. Blaine will carry New England; Massachusetts a plurality of 20,000, and New Hampshire and Connecticut will each give him a comfortable majority. I have some late advices from Indiana. Mr. McDonald’s friends will slaughter Governor Hendricks. Mr. McDonald has a strong following which is still bitter and angry over the treatment of its candidate at Chicago. Friends write me from San Francisco and Portland that Mr. Blaine will carry all of the Pacific States.”

## THE RESULT IN MAINE.

### A Magnificent Victory for the Republicans—Large Gains Over 1880.

The aggressive campaign begins to show results. The Republicans have hoped to gain eight or ten thousand in Maine, over the result in the September before Garfield was elected. The returns thus far received indicate that they have gained at least twelve thousand, and it is believed that full returns from the back districts will raise the majority to fifteen thousand. On a total vote of 147,000, four years ago, this would be a gain of more than 10 per cent. of the entire vote of the State. A like gain in New York would give 130,000 majority for Mr. Blaine; a much smaller gain would carry every Northern State, and some Southern States by majorities too large to be overcome by fraud.

It is a most gratifying feature of this splendid victory that Mr. Reed has been re-elected by an increased majority. In Portland where the worst work of the Democrats was done, the Republicans nevertheless have made handsome gains, while in Bangor the majority is larger than ever since 1868. The dispatches show that special and local causes appear in few towns where the Republican gains are not extraordinary.

But this magnificent victory would have been incomplete had not Augusta, the town in which Mr. Blaine lives, given the largest majority ever given to any candidate. In six towns in that county the gain is 1,100, and the majority in the county appears to be unprecedented. This victory in Maine will at once be attributed by the opposition to Mr. Blaine’s personal popularity. They will say, “He runs well in Maine, as is natural, but no such gain can be expected elsewhere.”

Then Mr. Blaine has popularity where he is best known, has had until yesterday we were told that the people who knew him best, the voters of New England and especially of Maine, were up in arms to rebuke and defeat him. But, in the State where the people have known his whole public and private life for thirty years, they give unprecedented gains because they know him, in Augusta the largest majority ever given, and in Maine 12,000 or 15,000 more than was given when the election of President Garfield was thought to depend upon the result.

Will it not be found that the people elsewhere like him, and trust him? The verdict of “Republican Revolt.” The Republicans are there, but not the revolt. After all the boasts and efforts of the so-called Independents, the distribution of vast numbers of elegant addresses by persons of superhuman excellence, the promises of an uprising that should sweep Mr. Blaine and the Republican party out of sight, it appears that the Independent recruits help the Democratic party about 15,000 votes less than nothing. It may be expected that in other States this movement will also be found to consist of wind and not of substance.—[From the N. Y. Tribune.]

**Another Democratic Boomer—Mr. Patrick Burns Tells Why He Refuses to Support Cleveland.**  
(Special reporter for the press.)  
NEW YORK, Sept. 15.—Another Irish American of local prominence has found time to write to support the nominee of the Democratic Convention for the Presidency, Assemblyman Patrick Burns, of the Fourth Assembly District of Kings County, has been outspoken in his opposition to Grover Cleveland ever since the day the latter was nominated, and this afternoon he sent the following letter to the Chairman of the Kings County Democratic General Committee:

BROOKLYN, Sept. 1, 1884.  
“DEAR SIR:—I most respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Democratic General Committee of Kings County, of which you are the President, for the reason that I cannot support Grover Cleveland for any position in the gift of the people. His recommendations and votes since his inauguration as Governor of this State have not met with the approval of the working classes, of which I claim to be a member. My opposition to Grover Cleveland on the floor of the Assembly during the legislative session of 1883-84 leaves me no other course to pursue. I cannot stultify my position as a representative by supporting him for the Presidency now.

“I regret that circumstances have forced me to take the position that I now assume after advocating and voting the Democratic state and national tickets for a period of 32 years.

(Signed) PATRICK BURNS.”

Patrick Egan for Blaine. Patrick Egan, the recently elected president of the American branch of the Irish Land League, has addressed a letter to the Lincoln, Neb., Democrat, in reply to some unwarranted strictures on his political opinions. The following is an extract: “Before the late Boston Convention of the Irish National League I had, as the result of close observation and careful research, made up my mind that there existed no good grounds on which the Democratic party should hold any mortgage on my vote because I happened to be an Irishman.

“I weighed with care and deliberation the merits of the two presidential candidates, and I came to the conclusion that neither as Irishman nor an adopted citizen of America, could Mr. Grover Cleveland have my support. The case of Mr. John Devoy, on which you so persistently harp, and when you have again and again referred to as the only ground of my opposition to Mr. Cleveland, was only one of the many objections which I entertained to that gentleman. Did, indeed, consider the treatment meted to Mr. Devoy of the very basest kind, and strong evidence of either the hostility or contempt of Mr. Cleveland for Irishmen of national opinions, but I objected also to Mr. Cleveland as the pet candidate of the London Times, the London Standard, the London Daily Telegraph, the London Daily News, the London St. James Gazette, the London Saturday Review—in fact, of the entire English press. I objected to him as the pet candidate of Puck and Harper’s Weekly; as the author of innumerable vetoes in the interest of the great monopolies, and as a man who had, as I believed, proved himself the enemy of every just right to the toiling millions. I objected to Mr. Cleveland because I felt proud of the country of my adoption, and because I felt that, in the words of the Boston Pilot, a straight out and-out Democratic organ—he has not a single quality to fit him for the presidency of the United States.

“I had made up my mind to sup-

port Mr. Blaine because, from long observation, I had come to regard him as the very opposite of all this, as an American of Americans, a man among men, as an able statesman fitted by nature, culture and experience to fill with credit to the country and to himself the position of president of this great nation.”

**What Makes the Rate of Wages.**  
Edward Atkinson of Boston, last week read before the British Science Association, assembled in Montreal a learned paper upon the above topic. He demonstrated that the proportion of wage earners to the population was 12 to 1, and after making light upon the stigma of excessive population, contended that labor and capital combine to produce the annual product of industry, and that it is not the character of labor, but the rate of wages. He assumed that in the United States the maximum rate of profit on capital does not exceed 10 per cent, and that the overwhelming mass of annual profit is shared by those depending on work for subsistence. He argued that the relative share of wage earners must be determined by the competition of the laborer with laborer. Their share was the increasing part of an increasing product. In the long run the wage-earners must get 20 per cent of the annual product. High wages were equivalent to low cost of production; low wages implied a gross cost of production. These points Mr. Atkinson illustrated most forcibly. One man’s labor on 8000 bushels of Dakota gave him an annual surplus of 1200 bushels of 50 ¢ to sell in market. Delivered in New York the flour represented four men’s labor for one year; baked into bread it represented seven men’s annual labor, and it would feed 1,000 men for one year. This and kindred facts led him sometimes to think that Mr. Vanderbilt was the chief communist of the day, since he had exacted a dollar for his fellow men for every cent he made, through the consolidation of transportation.

Mr. Atkinson gave the results of the manufacture of cotton sheeting in the United States during fifty years, showing that for that fabric wages had increased 64 per cent; that the cost to consumers had diminished 43 per cent. The profit in manufacturing were only one-half what they were fifty years ago, and while they were steadily diminishing, the wages of workmen were advancing.

When it is pretty clearly demonstrated that 90 per cent of the annual product of this country represents the wage of laborers, it will be readily seen why labor favors a protective tariff.—[Durham Republican.]

## The Tariff and the Farmer.

The farmers of America appreciate the fact that of the fifty five millions of people in America, fifty millions depend upon what they can earn in wages to pay for what they eat and wear—the more wages they receive, the more they can buy of both luxuries and the necessities of life. Every article bought from foreign countries takes just that much from the labor of this country, and consequently that much from the ability of our laboring people to buy of the farmer. If we consume only foreign manufactured goods our farmers could only sell of their produce that portion that foreign countries will buy, which of what is only one-fourth raised, of pork 1-200th portion, of beef 1-10,000th portion, and so on. In that state of the case, butter, cheese, corn, pork, wheat, beef and all farm products would fall to such little value the farmer would have to consume what he raised in the primitive fashion of one hundred years ago. Low tariff and unprotected labor means substantially such a calamity. This is putting the question squarely as it belongs and states results that would follow as of course. Then can any farmer, upon fair principles, support the Democratic party, when that party is always in the attitude of destroying the only market the farmer has—that is, the consumption of the food product by the paid labor of this country?—San Luis Obispo Tribune.

A story of terrible loss of life in one of the provinces of China is told in the San Francisco dispatches. Seventy thousand persons are reported to have been drowned. If the report is not exaggerated this is one of the great floods in the world’s history, aside from the Deluge. But it does not come up to the flood caused by the breaking of the dykes in Holland, in 1530, which swept away 400,000 persons, or the one before that in the same country, from the same cause, in 1421, when over 100,000 people perished. The province of Kiang See, however, is a long way off from those parts of China where news for the outside world is gathered, and the story of the disaster has probably grown as it travelled. Moreover, it is singular that some reference to so great a calamity has not appeared in the cable dispatches from Canton supplied so freely nowadays to the European press.

“I had made up my mind to sup-

port Mr. Blaine because, from long observation, I had come to regard him as the very opposite of all this, as an American of Americans, a man among men, as an able statesman fitted by nature, culture and experience to fill with credit to the country and to himself the position of president of this great nation.”

**What Makes the Rate of Wages.**  
Edward Atkinson of Boston, last week read before the British Science Association, assembled in Montreal a learned paper upon the above topic. He demonstrated that the proportion of wage earners to the population was 12 to 1, and after making light upon the stigma of excessive population, contended that labor and capital combine to produce the annual product of industry, and that it is not the character of labor, but the rate of wages. He assumed that in the United States the maximum rate of profit on capital does not exceed 10 per cent, and that the overwhelming mass of annual profit is shared by those depending on work for subsistence. He argued that the relative share of wage earners must be determined by the competition of the laborer with laborer. Their share was the increasing part of an increasing product. In the long run the wage-earners must get 20 per cent of the annual product. High wages were equivalent to low cost of production; low wages implied a gross cost of production. These points Mr. Atkinson illustrated most forcibly. One man’s labor on 8000 bushels of Dakota gave him an annual surplus of 1200 bushels of 50 ¢ to sell in market. Delivered in New York the flour represented four men’s labor for one year; baked into bread it represented seven men’s annual labor, and it would feed 1,000 men for one year. This and kindred facts led him sometimes to think that Mr. Vanderbilt was the chief communist of the day, since he had exacted a dollar for his fellow men for every cent he made, through the consolidation of transportation.

Mr. Atkinson gave the results of the manufacture of cotton sheeting in the United States during fifty years, showing that for that fabric wages had increased 64 per cent; that the cost to consumers had diminished 43 per cent. The profit in manufacturing were only one-half what they were fifty years ago, and while they were steadily diminishing, the wages of workmen were advancing.

When it is pretty clearly demonstrated that 90 per cent of the annual product of this country represents the wage of laborers, it will be readily seen why labor favors a protective tariff.—[Durham Republican.]

## The Tariff and the Farmer.

The farmers of America appreciate the fact that of the fifty five millions of people in America, fifty millions depend upon what they can earn in wages to pay for what they eat and wear—the more wages they receive, the more they can buy of both luxuries and the necessities of life. Every article bought from foreign countries takes just that much from the labor of this country, and consequently that much from the ability of our laboring people to buy of the farmer. If we consume only foreign manufactured goods our farmers could only sell of their produce that portion that foreign countries will buy, which of what is only one-fourth raised, of pork 1-200th portion, of beef 1-10,000th portion, and so on. In that state of the case, butter, cheese, corn, pork, wheat, beef and all farm products would fall to such little value the farmer would have to consume what he raised in the primitive fashion of one hundred years ago. Low tariff and unprotected labor means substantially such a calamity. This is putting the question squarely as it belongs and states results that would follow as of course. Then can any farmer, upon fair principles, support the Democratic party, when that party is always in the attitude of destroying the only market the farmer has—that is, the consumption of the food product by the paid labor of this country?—San Luis Obispo Tribune.

A story of terrible loss of life in one of the provinces of China is told in the San Francisco dispatches. Seventy thousand persons are reported to have been drowned. If the report is not exaggerated this is one of the great floods in the world’s history, aside from the Deluge. But it does not come up to the flood caused by the breaking of the dykes in Holland, in 1530, which swept away 400,000 persons, or the one before that in the same country, from the same cause, in 1421, when over 100,000 people perished. The province of Kiang See, however, is a long way off from those parts of China where news for the outside world is gathered, and the story of the disaster has probably grown as it travelled. Moreover, it is singular that some reference to so great a calamity has not appeared in the cable dispatches from Canton supplied so freely nowadays to the European press.

“I had made up my mind to sup-