NEW SERIES_VOL. XXIV---NO 2,314

You are liable to an attack of some form of Bowel Complaint and should provide yourself with the best known Remedy, Dr. Seth Arnold's Balsam. Warranted by King Drug Co. and G. W. Stancill, Hope Mills.

WHAT SHALL WE HAVE FOR DESSERT?

Try JELL-O, the dainty, appetizing economical dessert. Can be prepared instantly—simply add boiling water and serve when cold. Flavored just right; sweetened just right; perfect in every way. A 10c. package makes enough dessert for a large family. All grocers sell it. Don't accept substi-tutes. JELL-O complies with all Pure Food Laws. 7 flavors—Lemon, Or-ange, Raspberry, Strawberry, Choco-late, Cherry, Peach.

because they are good and do their work without making a fuss about it." These painless parifiers sold at B. E. Sedberry's Son's drug store. 25c.

Pain anywhere stopped in 20 min utes sure with one of Dr. Shoop's Pink Pain Tablets. The formula is on the 25-cent box. Ask your Doctor or Druggist about this formula! Stops pains, headache, pains any Write Dr. Shoop, Racine, Wis for free trial, to prove value of his Headache, or Pink Pain Tablets. Sold by B. E. Sedberry's Son.

Kennedy's Laxative Cough Syrup is It tastes nearly as good as maple sugar. Sold by Armfield Drug Co.

RECREATION, RACES, REJUVI NATION-AT THE CUMBERLAND FAIR, OCT. 218T, 22ND AND 23RD.

PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

O. K. NIMOCKS, Rooms I and 8 K. of P. Building. -) AVESTEVILLE, N. Phone 229

H. McD. Robinson, John G. Shaw. (Notary Public) ROBINSON & SHAW, Attorneys-at-Law, Offices on second floor National Bank of Fayetteville.

H. S. AVERITT, Attorney-at-Law, (Notary Public). Office—125 Donaldso Street, Fayetteville, N. C.

V. C. BULLARD Attorney and Counsellor at Law,

Notary Public, Surveyor, Office K. of P. Building, FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

DR. WM. S. JORDAN, Physician and Surgeon. Office in Palace Pharmacy. Hours: 9 to 12 and 3 to 5.

Dr. E. L. HUNTER. Dentist,

North-east Corner Market Square, Fayetteville, N. C.

Dr. A. S. CROMARTIE. DENTIST.

Over Shuford, Rogers & Company, Phone 338.

J. M. LILLY, M. D. Practice limited to diseases of the eye, ear, nose and throat. Office in Highsmith Building, 115 Green street. Hours 9 to 1 and 2 to 5. 'Phone No

G. B. Patterson, D. D. S. J. H. Judd, D. D. S. Drs. Patterson & Judd, Offices 2191/2 Hay Street, over Dunn & Co.'s Store, 'Phone 55.

E. J.S. SCOFIELD, M. D. Offers his professional services to the citizens of Fayetteville and surrounding country. Office with Dr. J. H. Marsh, 249 Hay Street, 'Phone 77; Residence, St. Luke's Hospital, 'Phone

Mackethan Real Estate TRUST CO

Real Estate bought and sold.
Loans inscolated and guaranteed
Reats and interest collected.
Titles sxamined, conveyances made,
asurance premium taken and loaned he

B. R. Muckethan, All'y. 1000 Monroe Place, Ardiussa; \$1800 Culbreth Place, 160 acres, with improvements, near Hope Mills; \$600 New 4 room cottage, Canal street; \$600 fine 4 room cottage, corner Mechanic & McKay streets; \$300 fine lot, Arsenal Avenue, highest point; \$50 to \$150 several remaining lots Fairground Park; \$50 to \$75 Choice lots Normal Annex; Tilghman lot, corner Green &

Rowan streets, best vacant lot in

For Rent: 2 Currie Stores in Brick Row.



TARIFF SPEECH OF WILLIAM JEN-NINGS BRYAN.

In my notification speech I stated that, as the campaign progressed, I would discuss the question, "Shall the People Rule," as it applies to the valous issues involved in this campaign, begin with the tariff question, because it is the most lasting of our omic questions and the one upor which the leading parties have most frequently opposed each other. Other questions may come and go, bu uestions which affect taxation, like Tennyson's "Brook" "go on forever." As the Government is not a Lady Bountiful, with unlimited means, but merely an organization which must collect on the one hand what it pays out on the other, the subject of taxation is an ever present one. We may liscuss how much we should collect what methods we should employ in col-lecting, and how best to distribute, through appropriations, the money collected, but we are never far removed from the subject of taxation. Iowa has been selected for the presentation of what I desire to say up a this subject, because the Iowa Republicans pioneers in the effort to secure tariff revision at the hands of the Re-·I come among them to define and defend the Democratic osition on the tariff question, because believe it will commend itself to them. That the issue may be clearly stated, I shall read you the Democratic plank on this subject, and then the epublican plank:

The Democratic platform says: "We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform now offered by the Republican party as a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democrat ic position on this question; but the ple cannot safely entrust the exe cution of this important work to a pary which is so deeply obligated to the ighly protected interests as is the Republican party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promsed relief was postponed until after the coming election—an election to succeed in which, the Republican party must have the same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power, no action whatever has been taken by the Republican con-gress to correct the admittedly exist-

ing tariff iniquities.
"We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should she made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restor the tariff to a revenue basis.

"Existing duties have given the man-ufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge.
"We demand the immediate repeal

of the tariff on wood pulp, print pa-per, lumber, timber and logs, and that these articles be placed upon the free

The Republican platform says: "The Republican party declares une ulvocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of congress imnediately following the inauguration of the next president and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of existing schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, togethe with a reasonable profit to American

"We favor the establishment of maximum and minimum rates to be adninistered by the president under limitations fixed in the law, the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets and the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home; the im and purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, withut excessive duties, that security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers and producers are entitled, but also to naintain the high standard of living of the wage earners of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries

of the protective system. "Between the United States and the Philippines, we believe in a free interchange of products, with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestle interests."

Secretary Taft refers to this sal ject briefly in his notification speech -only briefly-but as I shall quote such passages from his speech as are pertinent to this discussion, it is not necessary to read his remarks in full. It will be noticed that the Republi can party has abandoned the earlier arguments advanced in support of "Infant Industries," that must be ten derly cared for "until they can stand upon their feet;" there is no suggestion that the "foreigner pay the tar iff." and nothing about the "home mar ket." These catch phrases have had their day—they are worn out and cast aside. The Republican leaders are no longer arrogant and insolent; they cannot longer defy tariff reform Their plan now is to seem to yield without really yielding.

I submit that the Democratic pla form accurately described the Republican position when it refers to "the belated promise" made by the Repub lican leaders as "a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic pesition on this question." The Demo-cratic party in its platforms and through its representatives in Congress has for years pointed out that he tariff schedules are excessively Republicans have, until recently, recessity for reduction. They now con-fezs, through their platform and through their presidential candidate s to justify the party in declaring vocally for a revision of the tar work is to be undertaken at "a special easion of Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next president." The use of the word "unquivocally" indicates that those who wrote the platform recognize that they are under suspicion. They want to

tiously fulfilled, it might not have been necessary to thus strengthen the promise made this year. The use of the words "immediately after the inau-Des Moines, Iowa, Aug. 21, 1908. guration" is evidence that the Repub-lican leaders are conscious that the patience of the public has been strain-to the point of breaking, and it is alwhich they now feel about doing a

which, but for wilful neglect, might have been done at any time during the last ten years. Are we not justified in saying that "the people cannot safely entrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican Party?" The "fat fry-ing" process has become familiar to the American people. Pressure has been brought to bear upon the protected interests every four years—and to a less extent in the congressional campaigns between presidential elections -to compel contributions to the campaign fund in return for former favors and in anticipation of favors yet to come. It is difficult to overestimate the corrupting influences introduced into the political life of the nation by this partnership between the govern-ment and the favored industries. The iterature circulated in support of a protective tariff has studiously cultivated the idea that suffrage should be employed to secure pecuniary returns, and the appeal made by the Republican leaders has come to be more and more a selfish one. Every man engaged in a protected industry has been approached with the proposition that t is dollars in his pocket to maintain the system, while those who could not possibly trace any tangible benefits to themselves have been beguiled with the assurance that it was all a matter of public spirit and that they ought to support the system out of patriotic love of country. If attention was called to the fact that the farmer was taxed for the benefit of the manufacturer, the triple answer was that it would come back to him indirectly; that it did not amount to much for each farm er anyhow: and that a man was small ninded who would begrudge so insignificant a contribution to the nation's prosperity. The plan has been to keep he tax-payers quiet by keeping them in the dark as to the operation of the law, and then to concentrate the votes and influence of the tax-eaters in faor of a continuation of high tariff legislation. If a tariff of fifty per cent was imposed upon a given article of merchandise, it was assumed that hose engaged in the production of the article would contribute liberally to teep up the tariff. It was also assumed that the employees would vote with heir employers to keep from having their wages reduced, and it was exown would also vote for the tariff because of the business brought to the community by the protected indus-try. Those who are acquainted with tariff fight know to what an extent the pecuniary argument has been used. The recent Republican platform is a bugle call to every beneficiary of special privilege, to enlist again under the Republican banner, and when the election is over and the Republican committee publishes the list of contributors too late to make the information valuable—it will be found that

the Republican party has again so obligated itself to the protected interests as to be unable to make a revision in the interests of the consumers With a President who, toward the close of his term, admitted the necessity for tariff revision, with a two thirds majority in the Senate and neary sixty majority in the House, the tepublican party has refused to permit any revision whatever. Mr. Williams, the leader of the minority in the House, introduced a bill providing for a reduction of the tariff to 100 per cent, wherever it is now more than 100 per cent. It would look like the Republican party might have taken this step toward tariff revision, had t been deeply in earnest; but no, the bill was not even reported from the committee Whenever attention was called to an indefensible schedule answer was that they could not afford to open the subject for debate just be fore a campaign, but there is no force in this objection because the House rules are so framed that the majority

can cut off debate, prevent amendmen and silence opposition. The administration has claimed credt for the fine against the Standard Oil Company in the case which was lately reversed but no effort has been made to relieve the people from the fine which is imposed upon them every day by the Standard Oil Company through the operation of the tariff law which gives that company more than 100 per cent protection against its chief rival. Russia. can a real tariff reformer, whether he he a Republican or a Democrat, repose in the Republican leaders, when they deliberately put off all reduction until after election, and then call for con tributions, with the understanding that the public shall not know the names of the contributors until after

the polls are closed? The Republican platform says that the tariff is intended for the American manufacturers, farmers and producers, and especially for wage earners. If the farmer and the wage earner are really the chief beneficiaries of the protecive system will the Republican candidate explain why the farmer and the wage earner have contributed so little to the Republican campaign fund? Is he willing to publish a list of con-tributors on the 15th day of next Oc tober and allow the relative advantage of protection to the manufactur er, the farmer and the wage carner to be measured by the contribution. received from each class? Why is it that the manufacturers are expected to furnish so large a proportion of the money to run the campaign, if, as the Republicans claim, the farmers and the laborers enjoy so large a propor-tion in the benefits of the system? Is t not a significant fact that the farm ers and wage earners who are always put in the foreground when the bless ings of a high tariff are being enum erated are in the background when the lections are being made. Is it no significant that the manufcaturers, who furnish the funds, are so little adertland as beneficiaries? Is it not significant also that the wage earners instead of the manufacturers, are al ways described as "the most direc neficiaries of the protective sys

But let us suppose, for the sake argument, that the Republican party sincerely repents of its delay in beginning tariff reform, repudiates its facturers and honestly begins a What rule is to govern the re-

"In all tariff legislation, the truare under suspicion. They want to distinguish this promise from the unkept promises of the past by adding as emphatic an adjective as could be found in the dictionary. If former Report in the dictionary is a publican promises had been conscientable profit to american industries." principle of protection is best main-tained by the imposition of such du-

Mr. Taft endorses this rule and says that "in a number of schedules the tar-iff now exceeds this difference, and that the excess offers a temptation to those who would monopolize the production and sale of such articles in this country." He adds, however, that "there are some few articles on which the tariff is not sufficiently high to give them the measure of protection they should receive."
Will be explain upon what rule the

resent tariff was framed? When have

the Republicans claimed more protect

tion than enough to cover the difference in the cost of production here

to American Industries" is an addi

tion to the rule, and is likely to be

ff. And, by the way, to what other

used as an excuse for raising the tar

The "reasonable profit

and abroad?

business does the government guaran tee a "reasonable profit"? To the far mer, or the merchant or the laborer tariff the Republican party is to work upon exactly the same plan (or a plan contemplating a higher rate) what hope have we that the new tariff will be lower than the present one. Are the present leaders more hones ones who framed the exist ing tariff? Are they not, in fact, the same men who are responsible for tag-iff extortion during the last decade. If this new-born zeal for revision were an hundred times greater than his no indicates, wha chance would the Republican candi reform at the hands of such Republicans as now represent that party in the Senate and House, the very men who represented it in the recent national convention Speaker Cannon, who has suppressed tariff legislation in the present congress, was a domi-nating factor in the convention and if the Republicans retain control of the House, will be the Speaker of the next congress. Does his prominence afford tariff reformers any assurance of a reduction of the tariff in the in terest of the consumers? In case of Republican victory, Congressman Sherman will become the presiding of confidential companion of Speaker Cannon, and in the convention it was Speaker Cannon who vouched for him. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Sherman's standpatism needed no endorsement; his record is a guaranty that no bene ficiary of special privileges will be disturbed. It was Congressman Sherman who, in a speech in the House on the 18th of last April, boastfully declared 'We recognize the fact that we have a Republican majority in the Senate, that we have a Republican majority in this House, that is ready to resort o every legal, every proper constitutional right to enact such legislation as it deems for the best interest for the greatest number of our people, and which is willing and ready to accept full responsibility for all those measures which are introduced here

and which are not enacted into law." The Republican platform suggests that there should be a maximum tariff and a minimum, the maximum to be used in retaliation and the minimum in ordinary cases. This is merely adding delusion to procrastination and unertainty. We have prominent Repubican authority, Senator Dolliver and Senator Hanna, to prove that in the present law the rates were knowingly made higher than necessary with the understanding that reductions would e made to secure foreign trade. Mr. Dolliver said in the Senate on January 13, 1903: "It is true that in the bill which he (Mr. Dingley) reported from the committee on ways and means he did put duties up for the express pur pose of having them traded down." Mr. Dolliver insisted that the reciprocity provision in the Dingley act was as distinctly a part of the tariff policy as the coal schedule and complained that "not one line of the wisdom of James G. Blaine remained on the statute books" and that "not a ed the manufacturers naturally assume step had been taken to fulfill the purture that it is intended that they shall take ose of the last Buffalo address of President McKinley." And yet the very men who present this new plan

The schemes resorted to by the men who have grown rich by laying tariff burdens upon the country are more numerous than novel. measures which embody the princi egislators although as a matter of they generally bear the courtesy names of legislators; they are really drawn by the representatives of the interests which demand protection. These representatives claim to be the guardians of the laboring men, and yet they carefully avoid writing into the law anything that will require the guardians to execute the trust. It is trange that so many voters have seen so long deceived as to the ob and the operation of the laws which are ostensibly designed for the protection of the wage earners; it can only be accounted for on the the ory that the voters have not under stood either the theory of protection or the facts that are relied upon to

prevented the carrying out of the old

In ordinary affairs there is no difference between a tariff reformer and a protectionist. They meet together business, in society, in the lodge room and in the church. In their daily life they apply the same rules and are guided by the same business rules. similarity manifests itself al! through life and up to the very hour of death. If a protectionist makes a will, he makes it upon the same plan the tariff reformer follows. death approaches, he estimates the value of his property, leaves to his wife and children what he wishes them o have, and then makes such bequests as he likes to public instituons and to those outside of the famly; and such part as he leaves to his vife and children, he carefully divides among them, giving each a definite hare. He does not give all his property to one child and say that he trusts the child to deal fairly with the rest of the family. Why? Because he knows his children and would put child in a position where selfishness might lead him to do injustice to other members of the family. No, he would not trust his own flesh and blood to deal fairly with those reared at the same fireside with him; and he is wise n not placing this temptation before one of his own family. But when protectionist comes to make a tariff law, he acts on an entirely different olan; he votes millions, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars to manufacturers whom he has never seen, and trusts them to be just in the distribution of the trust fund among their employees And what has been the result? Jus what might have been expected:-the

paid their employees only such wages The Homestead strike occurred at ter the Republican convention of 1892, but before the Republican candidate wrote his letter of acceptance. He could not ignore the strike, for it pre-

manufacturers have appropriated

trust fund to their own use and have

to see. So Mr. Harrison, the candi date, referring to the strike, said:
"I regret that all employers of labor are not just and considerate and that capital sometimes takes too large a share of the profits!" "Too large a share of the profits"? Yes; more than that. The protected manufacturers have secured, in many cases, a tarthis man's will remains the law." iff of more than twice the percentage

paid to workmen in wages. The net profits of the steel trust last year were just about equal to the entire amplaintiff; ount paid in wages, and the wages constituted less than twenty-five per cent of the total value of the product According to this statement working man employed by the steel trust earned, on an average, not only the amount paid him, but one hundred

per cent profit besides for his employ-And, I may add, while these beneciaries of protection have been pretending to make the tariff laws for he direct benefit of the employees, these same employees have, as a rule, een kept close to the hunger line, while many of the employers have be come the possessors of the "swollen ortunes" which now menace the naion's morals as well as its business.

And yet the Republican party was not willing that a single item on the steel schedule should be touched, and the Republican campaign committee will not dare to publish, before the election, the contributions that have been made or will be made to the Re publican campaign fund by the mer

Let me show you how the tariff oper ates. I have here a statement made by Mr. H. E. Miles, Chairman of the Tariff Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and head of the Agricultural Implement Trust. The statement appears in the American Industries of November 15th, 1907, a paper which is now supporting the Republican ticket and making a special fight against the labor plank of the Democratic platform. Here is what Mr. Miles says:

"I have made money every year out of the Tariff Graft. Not much, but still a little.

"The tariff barons raised their price \$50,000 to me. I made a charge against the jobber of \$60,000 and I know that he charged more than \$70,000 for the \$60,000 he paid me. Before reaching the consumer the \$50,000 charge be came about \$100,000 to be paid by the agricultural consumer. "The manufacturer who would pro-

er must make a double profit, one y shrewd management of his busiess and another by still shrewder manipulation in Washington. "We have no great difficulty in shopoing abroad for we could get as high

prices as at home. We are so held p, however, by our supply people that most of us there is very scant pro in foreign business. "When Congress gave us forty-five

er cent, we needing only twenty per ent, they gave us a congressional per nit, if not an invitation, to consoli date, form one great trust and advance prices twenty-five per cent, beng the difference between the tweny per cent needed and the forty-five er cent given." Mr. Miles shows how the tariff rais

s prices to those who, in manufac turing have to buy other manufactur d products. This expense is transerred to the next purchaser. The job per charges a profit on the tariff as well as on the cost of the article, and ich person who handles the product sollects a profit, so that, according to Mr. Miles, the first charge of \$50,000 becomes \$100,000 by the time it reaches the consumer. Mr. Miles in another article estimates the total loss to the people at \$500,000,000 annually. statement of Mr. Miles also shows that the tariff law is an invitation to consolidate, and that having been given the tariff on the theory that it is need. advantage of it, even if they have to combine to do so.

How will Mr. Taft explain to the avrage man the benefits of protection He can easily convince a trust that i profits by the tariff, but what about

he victim of the trust? No Republican leader will now deny hat reductions ought to be made, but who is to make the reductions? nly answer given by the Republicans s that the tariff ought to be reformed y its friends: that is, that those who ade the last tariff law should be en rusted with the making of a new tariff law. But suppose the people adopt the Republican idea and entrust the oaking of the tariff law to Republican longressmen; what will be the method procedure? Fortunately for the vo Mr. Miles explains this also. In the pril, 1908, number of American Inustries, Mr. Miles says: "The people struct and trust Congress to gran ust, equitable and ample protection." is not that just what the Republica aders claim to favor? They want ou to "instruct and trust Congress grant just, equitable and ample pro And what does that mean ction. Mr. Miles says that Congress "trusts Ways and Means Committee."

and a Republican leader will tell you that this is also proper. Then what Mr. Miles says that "this committee trusts such persons as Mr. Dalzell, and that "they-they trust the trusts. The method of procedure is simple It is a case of confidence. The voters have confidence in Republican leaders; the leaders have confidence in a Republican Congress: a Republican Congress has confidence in the Ways and Means Committee: the Ways and Means Committee has confidence in secure to themselves the right to levy tribute upon the public. So accustomed have Republican leaders become to allowing the protected interests to write the tariff schedules that so eminent and honorable a man as Senator Hoar of Massachusetts said, in discussing the McKinley bill, then before the

"Instead of coming before your sub mmittee for a formal hearing on our Massachusetts industries, I thought the best way was to carefully prepare a table of all the various industries, per with me and ascertain what the people wanted in each case, and if there were any cases where the committee had not already done exactly what the petitioners desired or had not in-flexibly passed upon the question, I necessities are much more unif likely to be, is entirely satisfactory

Mr. Miles, whom I have before quoted, says, in American Industries of pril of this year:

sented an object lesson which even a lile were by that representative re-smallest per cent from those with high-tariff Republican could not fall ferred to a New England manufacture the largest income. It is only fair, ule were by that representative re-

er, the official agreeing to act in ac- therefore, that in an attempt to re cordance with the protected manufac-turer's wishes. Said the manufactur-er: 'I wrote that schedule myself. I over-burdened, should be given first did not intend that it should be interpreted as severely as it has been, but having been so interpreted, I will not consent to a modification of it.' And

We would not expect a jury to do justice to the defendant if it was composed entirely of the relatives of the iff; neither can a Congress to do the masses if it is composed of men who are in sympathy with, and obligated to, the corporations which have for a generation been enjoying special privileges.

There is no prospect of relief from Republican President and Congress. The Democratic party, if entrusted with power, can and will reduce the tariff

The Democratic platform not only demands a reduction of the tariff, but it plainly outlines the course to be purued in securing the reduction. It be gins by proposing that articles which come into competition with articles controlled by a trust be placed on the ree list. What better place to begin? Years ago Mr. Havemeyer, the head of he Sugar Trust, said that the tariff was the mother of trusts-and her chiliren are many. Secretary Taft, in his notification speech, says that an exces-sive tariff serves no useful purpose but offers a temptation to those who would monopolize the production and the sale of such articles in this coun-try, to profit by the excessive rate."

Now suppose the manufacturers, who have been favored by legislation, do conspire against the public and enter into a monopoly. What penalty to the Republicans suggest? whatever. These men are to be consulted about proposed changes, and if the next Republican tariff is made like former Republican tariffs, nothing will be done without the unanimous consent of the beneficiaries. What would be the effect of the

remedy proposed by the Democratic platform? Simply this: A law goes into effect at some fixed date in the future, and if the Democrats pass a law, putting upon the free list articles coming into competition with those controlled by a trust, the trust will have until that date to dissolve. If the trust considers the law too drastic, it can avoid it by giving up its monopoly. Secretary Taft calls this remedy "ut

terly destructive" and in his anxiety

to prevent it overlooks the fact that the Democratic party has other reme dies for the trusts. If we can succeed in dissolving existing trusts, and in preventing the organizzation of new ones, there will be no trusts against which to use the remedy of which he complains. There is now a law against trusts, but it has not been sufficiently enforced to prevent trusts. The Den ocrats demand its enforcement; if its enforcement rids the country of trusts then this policy which Mr. Taft so much fears will become perfectly harmless. If the Democrats secure control of both the House and the Senate, they are pledged to legisla tion which will make a private monop oly impossible. If the Republicans re tain control of part of the legislative machinery of the government and re fuse to join in the effort to make a private monopoly impossible, they are not in a position to complain of tariff egislation aimed at trusts. If they refuse to assist us in exterminating the principle of private monopoly, they cannot well object to legislation neces sary to protect the people from trus extortion. Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen

Mr. Taft did not refer to the platfrom demand that would pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs be placed upon the free list. Why? Because the President vainly besought Congress to enact a law embodying complain of the exhaustion of our for ests while we encourage their detsruc tion by a tariff on the products of for eign forests. But such legislation be omes not only a folly but a crimwhen it is remembered that a hand ful of men monopolize the benefits flowing from the tariff on these things the whole country bears th burden of the tax. Hon. R. F. Pettigrew, of South Dakota, in a speech made in the United States Senate, re ferred to an important statement which appeared in the North-western Lumberman, February 27, 1897. Sen ator Burrows of Michigan had referred to a Mr. Winchester as a man of great reliability and truthfulness, and Sena tor Pettigrew quoted Mr. Winchester

as saying in the North-western Lumberman: There were a lot of gentlemen from the Northwest, up Minnesota way, in Washington the other day, and they vere sitting in Senator Burrows' room An interesting incident occurred there Senator Burrows is chairman of the committee. The committee had not had a meeting for a long time. They happened to be seated in that room and one of the gentlemen from Minn sota had an envelope and lead pencil He walked around the room and ci phered up a little bit, and he said: 'Mr. Burrows, do you know what \$1 a thousand would mean to this

crowd of men in here?" There were not as many in the om as there are here. He said: "'An advance of \$1 a thousand on lumber would mean \$6,125,000 on last year's product.

Could more conclusive proof desired? And the Senator Burrows mentioned is the same Senator Burrows who acted as Temporary Chairman of the men who represent the trusts, and the last Republican National Conventhe trusts write the tariff law and thus tion and sounded the keynote of the campaign.

How long will the Republican farmrs, merchants and laboring men pernit a few men to make the tariff laws for their own pecuniary advantage and at the expense of the rest of the coun-The second step in the reduction of

the tariff is a "material reduction up on the necessities of life, especially upon goods competing with such Am rican manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home. At present the articles used by the haps some sixty or seventy in all, and poor bear a higher rate, ad valorem than the articles used by the rich This statement can be verified by an examination of any of the schedules. A tax upon consumption, even who laid with absolute impartiality, bears dexibly passed upon the question, I necessities are much more uniform that have a hearing before you, but I than our possessions. People do not and in every instance the action of eat in proportion to their income; they the Committee, as Mr. Aldrich thinks do not wear clothing in proportion to their income; they do not use taxed to the interests I represent, with the goods in proportion to their income exception of one or two, and the pa-As all taxes must come out of one's pers in regard to those cases I have income, no matter through what sys-handed to Mr. Aldrich." effect, income taxes, and taxes on con sumption are really graduated incomtaxes, the largest "People asking a government rep-resentative for relief on another scend-the smallest income and with smallest per cent from those

consideration. Then, too, a reduction brings a benefit to all the people, while a reduction in the tax upon luxuries would benefit but a portion of the per

Surely no one will object to a reduc tion being made upon articles which come into competition with American manufactures which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home. The American manufacturer who sends his goods to foreign lands and there, with out any protection whatever, com petes successfully with the manufac lurers of all the world, does not need a high tariff to meet competition in the home market. And there are enough articles sold abroad at a low price to assure a large advantage to the American consumers through the carrying out of this one plank.

Mr. Taft, however, finds the greatest alarm in the following clause in our platform

atform:
"Gradual reductions should be made GOLDEN n such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a reve nue basis."

He regards this threatened depar

ture from the protective system as fa-tal. We are here brought face to

face with the theoretical difference between the positions of the two parties on the subject of tariff. The Democratic party regards a tariff law as a revenue law, the protection it gives being incidental; the Republican party regards a tariff law as framed primarily for protection, the revenue being incidental. As the effect of a given rate on a particular article is the same, whether levied for the purpose of revenue or for the purpose of protection, it may be well to define the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. A revenue tariff is so framed as to collect a rev enue and you stop when you get enough; a protective tariff may be ramed as to collect but little revenue, and yet lay a heavy burden upon the people-and you never know when to stop. To illustrate: a tariff may be made so high as to absolutely prohibit importation. If, in such a case, the manufacturers yield to the temptation mentioned by Mr. Taf: and combine to take advantage of the duty, the nsumers will be heavily taxed, and

yet none of the money will reach the

Let us suppose another case: If we import one-tenth of a certain kind of merchandise and produce at home line-tenths, and the imported domestic rticles sell at the same price, then the treasury receives duty on the for eign article and the manufacturers collect nine times as much on the donestic article as the treasury collects on the one-tenth imported. It becomes matter of great importance, there-ore, to the people at large, whether the tariff is intended to raise a reve nue or is framed in the interest of the manufacturers and for the purpose of rotection. No one would think of employing in a city, a county or a state, a tax system under which the bulk of the tax would go to the col-lectors, and yet the Republican leaders demand the continuance of a sysem under which the protected interests receive far more than half the collected from the people through the operation of a high tar-As a tariff law interferes with the

natural laws of trade, one who pro-poses a protective tariff, takes upon himself the burden of proof to show. first, that a protective tariff is righin principle; second, that it is wise as a public policy, and, third, that it is necessary. And, yet, what protectionist attempts to present an argu-ment in support of any one of these propositions? Is it right to tax all of the people

or the benefit ommunity has attempted to collecaxes for the aid of an industry, evan when the industry was to be located is he community, the highest court in the and has declared such a tax to be larceny in the form of law. government cannot rightfully tax all he people to bring an industry Into the city, where such benefits as are conferred are more easily seen and more universally enjoyed, who will say that a farmer in the Misosuri Val ley can be rightfully taxed to support an industry in a distant state? As a matter of public policy, is i

wise that the industries that do pay should be compelled to carry upor heir backs industries which, accord ing to the arguments made by their epresentatives, could not live without aid? Have we not seen this system introducing corruption into politics and it is not building business upon an unsubstantial basis? Having seoured a tariff from one party, the beneficiaries loudly declare that the country will be ruined if any other party obtains control of the government. Manufacturers have intimidated their employes and threatened them with a reduction in wages unless a party fa-vorable to the system was continued n power. This is an old device, and there are indications that it is resorted to again. The New York Leather Belting Company has sent out number of letters to companies with which it has business dealings, asking them to post in the factories a notice saying: "Belleving that the election of Taft

and Sherman means a safe and conservative administration, the day following the election we shall start this plant on full time and keep going. Here is a direct attempt to influence the election by a bribe It is virtually a promise of wages if the Republi can ticket is successful and an implied threat in case of Democratic success; but the offer is so made that it gives the employes no guaranty of its fulfilment. The same kind of promises were made in 1896, and yet for six months after the election times were worse than they were before. There were business failures and bankruptcles, and many institutions that prom ised their employes steady work and good wages, shut down or reduced wages. If any factory posts up the sign which the Leather Belting Company is sending out, the employes ought to get together and ask for a guaranty as to the amount of wages they are to receive and as to the length of time during which the guaranty is to extend. If the votes are to be bought, the purchase price, at least should be made secure. If the employes' heritage-citizenship-is to be sold, he ought, to be sure of his mess of pottage. But the whole system is vicious

Business should not be built upon legislation; it should stand upon its own merit, and when it does stand upon its own merit we shall not only have er politics, but we shall have less flucmore equitable distribution of the pro ceeds of toil.

(Continued on Page Two.)

FAYETTEVILLE MARBLE AND GRANITE WORKS Strictly First-class

Work. Call at my yard or write for prices Respectfully, E. L. REMSBURG, Proprietor, Fayetteville, N. O

Some of Our Old Customers

are stilling calling

CROWN COLOGNE

because it is refined, delicate and re-

H. R. Horne & Sons VIOLET AMMONIA

SO REFESHING FOR THE TOILET AND BATH 15 AND 25 CTS.

VIOLET WITCH-HAZEL DELIGHTFUL AFTER SHAVING

25 CENTS. B. E. SEDBERRY'S SON.

OUR AIM

IS TO GIVE THE BEST POSSIBLE SERVICE,

AND BEST IN QUALITY OF GOODS.

WE SOLICIT YOUR ORDERS.

A. J. COOK & CO. DRUGGISTS AND PHARMACISTS.

Next P. O. 'Phone 14'.

GO TO THE WIDE - AWAKE

YOU'LL GET WHAT THE DOCTOR ORDERS

ERUG STORE!

ON THE BUSY CORNER.

KING DRUG COMPANY.

McDuffie Drug Store.

On The Square.

JUST RECEIVED

QUALITY Chocolate.

NONE BETTER Mackethan & Co.

Druggists.

NEW GOODS!

We have just received a well

HAIR BRUSHES AND COMBS which we are selling at small

profit. Other new goods in TOOTH BRUSHES, WHISK BROOMS, BATH MITTS, SPONGES, ETC.

Armfield's Drug Store

Prescriptions Filled only by Regletered Drugglet.