

# The Lincoln County News.

Vol. V.

LINCOLNTON, N. C. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1911.

No. 96

## The Tariff Controversy.

BY FARMER.

Away back in the 80's in the days of the Farmers' Alliance the cotton farmers of the south had a tug with the jute bagging trust and succeeded, as they thought, in bringing the Trust to terms and they got the price of bagging lowered some. Some time in August I wrote an article for The Lincoln County News, the intention being to show the farmers that the jute bagging trust was not whipped but that they had got a protective tariff put on all foreign made bagging and also they had got the raw material admitted free therefore being protected the manufacturer of this country could make their own profitable price on bagging that the cotton farmer had to wrap their cotton in that went to all parts of the world without any protection on it and sign the article a "Farmer," not thinking that what I had written would get me into a political controversy. But the editor of The Lincoln County News took exception to what I had said and in his characteristic way came at me and said, "Some farmer writing in The Lincoln County News is fool enough to be willing to take 8 or 10 cents for his cotton crop in order to be able to get 'free trade' cheap bagging to wrap it in. Then he said, 'That is like the dog that dropped the bone to grab at the shadow.'" Well I replied to that in the columns of The News. Then he published it and replied to it in The Times and said if I wanted to discuss the tariff he would entertain me provided I would sign my name to my article. That I did not want to do. Knowing him to be a disciple of Blackstone and Bacon, I being just an ordinary "barnyard" farmer naturally hesitated to attach my real name to the articles in print. Then too, not being accustomed to high sounding words that some people use in discussing political questions made me feel a natural hesitancy in approaching the footlights. But be that as it may, the readers of The News know what I have said and the readers of The Times know what has been said by its editor and those that have read both papers know what we both have said. In this discussion I have been honored with titles that I never dreamed of. Such high sounding names as "Democratic ward heeler," (but I'll be shot if I know what that is as I never lived in a ward) "Barnyard editor" etc. Now the public knows what has been said by each of us and they will be the judge. In his paper of November 17 the Times editor complains because I have not given my real name and says that I am a fake farmer and charges The News editor with the responsibility of what I have said. But I want to say that I will daddy all that has been said by "Farmer" and that The News editor nor no one else has dictated but myself. Then The Times of November 17th starts out to reply to my article of November 3rd and says that I said, "That if the Democratic congress is the cause of low price cotton, why is it that cotton mills have not made money but have lost money ever since 1907." All I ask is that The News readers read what I did say and see if it sounds like the above quotation. Then he says, "In the present discussion we are not interested in what the cotton mills make or lose. We are talking about the price the farmer gets for his cotton." Well now, don't that stump you, when all through this discussion he has claimed that the Republican party and high protective tariff was the father of all high prices and that the Democratic party daddied all low priced things! Then when I asked him why the cotton mills had not made any money in the past four years under a Republican administration and a high protective tariff he flies off and says, "That cotton was too high under Republican congresses." Now, brother, please tell me if a Republican congress can make cotton a high price with the whole cotton growing world to compete with on a free trade market why in the thunder can't they make the price of yarns higher protected by a tariff law!

In his answer to another question he said, "The only reason other farm products are now high, while cotton is low, because the Democrats in congress didn't have time to tinker with the tariff on but a few articles, cotton especially." Why Charley Taft called congress together to pass a free trade law, so that wheat, hogs, sheep, cattle and other farm products could be shipped into this country out of Canada without paying any tariff. Then he thinks he has got me in a hole on the indictment of the cotton bulls—that they have been indicted for twelve months. True, but the lower courts set aside these indictments and the Attorney General took an appeal to the Supreme court. That court has not yet handed down its decision. But the bull speculators will not ply their trade while they are under indictment. But have you in mind sir that they did all they could to help the cotton farmer get 15 cents for his 1911 crop! Then he wants The News barnyard editor to tell why cotton was selling for 14 cents on July 1st. Now any 8-year old school boy knows that it was the 1910 short cotton crop that was selling on that date and from the time the June report was made till July 1st, cotton had fell \$7.50 on the bale. That was before the cotton bill was introduced in Congress. Then in July the new crop of 1911 began to go on the market. With a government estimate of 15 million bales it was natural for the price to go down, and with a combined force of bear buyers to force the price down, with the bull force shut out by indictments in the United States courts every cotton farmer with any intelligence knows that the above is a correct idea of the situation and there is not a man of intelligence in the country that believes or would argue otherwise without he was a partisan political fanatic. Then he tries to reply to what I said about what a bale of cotton would buy now and what it would buy during the panic of 1893. Of all the argument I ever heard a smart man make that beats all. And this is what he says, "Under Cleveland you had your free trade on everything." That is the broadest assertion I ever read of a public man making, when every school boy that has ever read the history of the United States knows that this has never been a free trade country, that there has always been a tariff tax on foreign made goods and he knows that the Democratic party has never been a free trade party, but has always stood for a tariff for revenue only. The only thing they ever ask for is a reduction of the tariff and a more equalization of the tariff tax. But what the farmers of this country have to kick about whether he be a republican or democrat, is the class legislation the tariff makers are guilty of, and that is what I tried to show up in my first article about the jute bagging, not dreaming that I would be led into a partisan political controversy and in it I have tried to stick to the truth as I know it and as history gives it.

The Editor of The Times says that the Republican party is a high protective tariff party. That it true. But it is a free trade party too. It has always kept our ports open so that our wheat, corn, cotton and all other farm products would have the world to compete with for a market. Egyptian cotton is shipped to this country free of any tariff charges to compete with our own products, but the sugar trust is protected by a tariff on foreign made sugar and the consumers know what a high price they have to pay for it. Great manufacturers of farm tools are so protected by high tariff law that it completely shuts off the outside world from competing with them. But they are allowed to compete on foreign shores and thus they sell their binders on foreign markets for \$80 or \$90 for what we American farmers (that are shut up by a high protective tariff wall) will have to pay \$125 for. The Editor of The Times says that he does not agree with me that we had to

send our cotton to Europe as a remedy for the low price of it now but that it will all be manufactured here at home. That assertion proves to me that he does not know what he is writing about and that he knows nothing about the markets of the world. Why if all of our 14 million bales of cotton would have to be manufactured by our own mills we cotton farmers would not have to plant another cotton seed in the next three or four years for we already have enough on hand to last our mills that long. There is another thing it seems that he does not know, "that the raw cotton that we export to foreign markets brings to this country more money than any other one article we export which amounts to something like \$400,000,000." Close our ports from shipping cotton out of this country and the price would not be two cents per pound. He surely does not know that there are not enough mills in this country to spin one third of what we produce in one year. Then if we had the mills we would have to import pauper labor from Europe to work in them as some people are doing now to work in their brick yards. Our ports are already open for free admission of European pauper labor and many hundreds are now employed in the cotton mills and other industries of this country. And when the Times builds two thirds more mills in this country to spin all the cotton that we produce and get his pauper labor from Europe to run them, then he will shed crocodile tears over American labor. For then the great middle class will disappear and there will be but two classes—the very wealthy and the very poor, but that would only be history repeating itself where a centralizing government by making laws that centralized the wealth of the country into the hands of the few. It is that, that has destroyed political freedom and independence in all down falling governments in the past and will destroy this if the great middle class does not rise up as one man and demand equal rights and privileges as was guaranteed to them by the founders of this government, irrespective of partisan politics. For when the government gets so rotten that a seat in its highest law making department cost \$100,000 what hope is held out to the poor man of the great middle class. The Times editor may not know it but he is pursuing a course that will eventually centralize the wealth and power of this country into the hands of a few unscrupulous men and when his children go before that power and cry for bread that power will do like Czar of Russia did some months ago when his subjects were clamoring for human rights. He ordered his police to shoot them down and after killing several he told the rest to go home he would forgive them. Yes brother, you are pursuing a course that will bring want, misery and ruin on your children, that you think other people are trying to bring on you. The Editor seems to take offense at my suggesting the aid of Marion Butler. Now I ask him to tell his readers how a Democratic congress who has not as yet put a law on the statute books could possibly put down the price of cotton all over the world and at the same time raise the price of everything else that the human family needs to live on. Now I know he could not explain nor answer that question although he has contended all along that Congress had put down the price of cotton. Mr. Butler had made the same assertions and knowing him to be one of the brainest men the state has produced and broadminded in every way and well posted in governmental matters, I thought he could give a barnyard editor and other people that are as ignorant as he is, some light on the subject. And the editor of The Times need not think my intention was to malign and slander Mr. Butler. If I can't discuss a subject without maligning and slandering my opponent I will quit. I will not malign or slander anyone, I will not get that low down. And in this discussion I have tried to stick to the truth and facts under discussion. It is said "That a drowning man will grasp at a straw." The editor of The Times grabbed at

his last straw when he said, "We understand 'Farmer' is one of the county officials of the Farmers' Union. The farmers need never expect to succeed with their organization as long as they select as their leaders ward politicians who are farmers only in name instead of men who devote their time and ability to real farming rather than partisan politics." Now I want to inform the editor of The Times that being a member of the Farmers' Union does not conflict with a man's religious or political views. And it is also true that partisan politics nor sectarianism is not allowed discussed in the meetings but the Farmers' Union does not debar a member from discussing political questions publicly. One would infer from the above that the editor thinks that the farmer that does real farming should devote his time and ability to his work on the farm, and let the other fellow attend to the political and other public questions. Why brother the farmer has always known how to do real farming and really devotes too much time to his farm, and let the other fellows do the rest. Now farming has two ends to its business. One end is on the farm and the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union was started to teach the farmers the other end of the business such as controlling the marketing and making prices on what he produces and when he takes hold of the marketing and selling end of his business he naturally will run on political questions that directly concerns him and these questions will be discussed and considered in a non-partisan way, and I can inform the editor that the Farmers' Union will never go into partisan politics nor start a new political party, but when it wants any laws passed or aid from the government they are going to ask for it as a brotherhood of farmers in a nonpartisan way and the party in power is the one they are going to ask. The union in its business knows no political party and in the selection of its officers it knows no man's politics. And when a member of the Farmers' Union discusses a public question in a newspaper that directly concerned him and all cotton farmers a partisan political newspaper editor butted into him and called him a fool which drew him into this discussion and when the farmer got the best of the argument he gets mad or something like it and calls me ward politician and a fake farmer and insinuated like that a man that done real farming did not have the ability to discuss political questions. Now in conclusion I will say to The Times editor that as he is so anxious for me to come out from under cover and daddy my articles with my real name I will gratify him and say that I am sorry that all the readers of his paper did not get to read all what has been said in this discussion on both sides and now all I ask him to do is to give me facts and figures and answer the many sensible questions that I have asked him in my "Farmer" articles if he wants this discussion to go on, and not answer me by maligning, insinuations and innuendos. That is not arguing.

W. W. BIGGESTAFF.

### Return After Absence of Twenty Years.

Dr. George E. Williams of Lincoln, Neb. has returned to North Carolina for a month's visit among the friends of his childhood and young manhood days—Dr. Williams who left the State at the age of twenty one, is a native of Catawba county. He visited at the home of Dr. and Mrs. L. A. Crowell this week. From there he went to Shelby to visit other friends and relatives. Dr. Williams has amassed a great fortune, and, best of all, has made for himself a great name throughout the West, as a physician and surgeon. For the past twelve years he has been living in the city of Lincoln, Neb., the home of William Jennings Bryan, and happens to be a personal friend of Mr. Bryan. He says Mr. Bryan will again be in the presidential race and he fervently hopes to see him win out.

SUBSCRIBE FOR THE LINCOLN COUNTY NEWS.

### METHODIST FIGURES

How the W. State Library Conference Has Grown in 17 Years—Bishop Hoss Reminiscent.

The Western North Carolina Conference met last week in Statesville, Bishop E. E. Hoss presiding. The Conference met in Statesville just seventeen years ago. The Statesville correspondent to The Charlotte Observer grows reminiscent and notes the changes made since the meeting in the one roomed brick church with its high steeple seventeen years ago, and now when it is held in a modern well appointed, many-roomed house of worship, and says:

"There were only 454 Methodists in Statesville then; now there are within a few of 1,000. The salary of the pastor has gone from \$900 to \$1,800, and a second church has been built. In the Western North Carolina Conference there were 64,636 members; now there are 92,607. The pastors were then paid \$77,000; now \$179,000. The value of the churches has gone from \$671,000 to \$1,905,000; 151 pastoral charges have grown to 223. The conference claimants were paid then \$3,705; now \$9,425. The Sunday school scholars have grown from 47,146 to 74,369. The educational assessment was then \$3,000; now it is \$13,585. The salary of the presiding elders has gone from \$10,000 to \$18,257. At that Conference \$3,237 was raised for foreign missions; last year \$19,583 were raised, and the domestic missionary collection has gone from \$4,606 to \$13,411. The church extension fund has grown from \$1,518 to \$7,941. These figures cover only half of the State, as the North Carolina Conference embraces the eastern section of North Carolina.

### NOT ASHAMED OF HIS ORIGIN

Incident That Seems to Show Wholesome Spirit in English Aristocratic Society.

For all the prevailing belief that an Englishman loves a duke above all else, it is nevertheless true that English society has always been affected by a sound and wholesome spirit of democracy. An extract from Lady Chatterton's diary gives a little passage that reflects credit on all concerned, including titled personages: "Last week I met Sir Francis Chantrey and Luttrell at Rogers' house. Lady Dufferin, Mrs. Damer, Lord Lansdowne and Lord Glenelg were there. After breakfast, Chantrey pointed out a sideboard, and said to Rogers: 'Do you remember a poor little fat boy in a common workman's dress, who came one morning, many, many years ago, to take some order about that sideboard?' 'Yes, I do,' said Rogers, 'for I thought what a fine head and intelligent look the poor boy had.' 'Well, he is the now celebrated sculptor, who not only goes to all the best houses in London, but gives parties that people are so good as to call pleasant, where all the highest and most intellectual people honor him with their presence. Can you guess who it is? Well,' Chantrey added, while his honest face beamed with fun, 'that cabinet maker's poor little apprentice was myself!' Everybody present was pleased at his candor and straightforwardness, which was the more to be admired because few had known of his obscure youth or of the disadvantages of education that he had overcome."

### DELICATE SUBJECT.

"What is your favorite pastime?" asked the interviewer. "Ask me anything else," replied Senator Sorghum. "The tastes of my constituents are so distributed to baseball, tennis, golf, bridge whist and pinocle that I wouldn't dare to announce a preference."

### SYMPATHIES TOUCHED.

"What did you do when you met the train robber face to face?" "I explained that I had been interviewed by the ticket seller, the luggage carriers, the dining car waiters and the sleeping car porters and borrowed a dollar from him."

### NOT DESIGNED FOR GOOD MAN

For Said She Would Do Her Best With Baby, but Feared It Wouldn't Avail.

Ever observe what attention a baby on a train attracts? Everybody smiles and chucks it under the chin, provided, of course, the baby doesn't howl. On the way from Atlantic City, a charming young mother sat in a Pullman chair, playing with the baby that smiled and cooed all the way home. Among the others in the car who were fascinated by the baby was an elderly man, who deliberately sat down in the opposite chair and opened a conversation with the mother. "Certainly a splendid youngster, madam," said he. "You ought to be proud of it, and I have no doubt you will do your best to make him a good and useful man." "I'll do my best, sir, but I'm afraid it will be to no avail," she answered meekly. "Oh, pshaw! Why so? Why so?" he demanded. "Well, you see, sir," said the mother, now radiant with smiles, "nature has taken the exactly opposite view, and has designed this baby to become a strong and beautiful and charming woman. She's a girl."—Philadelphia Times.

### STAGE DIAMONDS



The Actress—Heavens, I've lost my diamonds and my pocket book. The Manager—What are you hollering about? The Actress—Mercy, man, the pocket book contained nearly nine dollars.

### KILLING RATS IN JAVA.

A consular report gives the following method of destroying rats adopted by M. de Kruyff of the agricultural bureau of the Dutch Indies at Buitenzorg, Java. All visible rat holes were first stopped with earth to ascertain which holes were inhabited, for the inhabited holes were found reopened on the following day. Half a teaspoonful of carbon bisulphide was poured in each of these holes, and after a delay of a few seconds to allow the liquid to evaporate the mixture of vapor and air was ignited. The result was a small explosion, which filled the hole with poisonous gases and killed all the rats almost instantly. A pound of bisulphide is sufficient for more than 200 rat holes; 131 dead rats were found in 43 holes which were opened after the operation. It is further stated that satisfactory results in exterminating porcupines have been obtained by this method.

### NEW KIND OF CHICKENS.

It's a poor kind of child that can't keep its elders guessing—and chuckling. The normal child, indeed, can say more things in a day than the said elders can absorb in a week, and the juvenile "funny" comes out in the most unexpected places and manners and is frequently all the more effective for being unwitting and unconscious. So with the little city boy whom Bishop Frederick Burgess once described as spending much of his first visit to the country in looking at the hens. "Have you never seen chickens before?" some one asked him. "Oh, yes, I've seen 'em," the child made answer, "but never before they wuz peeled."