

Speech of Hon. J. T. Updegraff.

The House, as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; having under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 2315) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate the question of the tariff and Internal Revenue Laws, Mr. Updegraff, of Ohio, said: I have to say will relate mainly to the interest of labor, and especially to a consideration of the question of the effect of the protective system on the agricultural interests of the country, as this is the point of the free-trade assault.

HOW FARMERS ARE DAMAGED BY PROTECTION.

By the logic of English free-trade pamphleteers and American free-trade college professors protection is an injustice and an injury to the agricultural interest of the country. The farmer is the strategic point of the free-trade assault. No matter how prosperous, he is assured that his apparent success is only a "delusion," that in reality he is carrying a intolerable burden and is on the road to certain ruin. In defiance of facts and reason, he is assured that he gets no protection from protection, and that a "home market" is simply an ideal and wicked invention of an organized band of "robbers," called, in the very mockery of satire, "protectionists." On this floor I have heard the most opprobrious names applied to some of our most indispensable industrial classes, until the argument resolved itself into an assault of epithets. Elsewhere in the parliamentary way, I believe, alluding to the Senate—it has lately been declared by a distinguished person that if American farmers knew more about it they would never submit to a protective tariff. The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. Turner,] who said he had been a farmer all his life, dwelt with pathetic eloquence on the "legalized robbery" of this "odious tariff." True claims was his special grievance, but he declared it compelled the farmer "to pay large and enhanced prices for nearly all he consumes." And when he assumed that a duty of 40 per cent was to be laid not only on the \$48,061,657 worth of imported goods subject to duty, but added the same 40 per cent, to the \$5,000,000 worth of home-manufactured goods, claiming that these were enhanced in price to the consumers \$2,000,000,000, no wonder he should declare in his dismay, "These figures are appalling." They certainly would be if the gentleman's theory can prove that its claim to the appalling figures is valid. It is susceptible of the most absolute and absolute proof that it is not.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a farmer all my life, and every year for thirty years have sold the products of the farm. When manufacturers were fully protected and flourishing I have never seen the time that agriculture was not prosperous, and when manufacturing under "a null" tariff was crippled or broken down I never saw agriculture flourishing. Is there any gentleman in this House who has sometimes a certain product may be in demand temporarily, but the uniform rule as I have stated it, if any member has any other, let him declare it. [Applause.] No the real and permanent interests of a people are always in harmony and interdependence with each other. Each member of a community profits by an increase in the productive power of the whole body. That advantage is increased and multiplied by every increase in the diversity of employments. The farming interest above every other is benefited by this diversity which saves the necessity of carrying bulky products to a distant market; for every intelligent farmer knows that the man who is compelled to go to market must, in some way, pay the cost of going, and the first of all of all the charges paid, by labor or by land, is that for transportation.

But Mr. Mongredien says, in his Golden Rule pamphlet, the farmer neither receives nor seeks legislative protection." False again. He does both. The farmer has carefully and intelligently studied this question, not merely by the theories of bookmen, but in the school of practical affairs. He asks, and has received, full protection for his industries. It is just that he should, for many agricultural products are produced in other countries by paper labor, against which it would be a monstrous outrage that the American farmer should be forced to compete. Surely this English writer could not be ignorant of the fact that protective duties are imposed on all the leading agricultural products where protection is practicable. American farmers know that these duties were laid to protect these articles in the home market, which consumes nearly 93 per cent of all the products of the farm.

It is not necessary to give a full catalogue of all these products and the duty on each, but I mention enough, taken from our tariff list, to show how carefully the interests of the farmer have been considered. The duty on Indian corn is 10 cents a bushel; on wheat, 20 cents a bushel; on oats, 10 cents a bushel; barley, 15 cents a bushel; rye, 15 cents a bushel, peas and beans, 10 to 20 per cent; potatoes, 15 cents a bushel; butter, 4 cents a pound; cheese, 4 cents a pound; poultry, 10 per cent; sugar, 2 to 5 cents per pound; best tobacco, 35 cents a pound; manufactured tobacco, 50 cents a pound; beef and pork, 1 cent a pound; mutton, 10 cents a pound; hay, 20 per cent; on all domestic animals except for breeding purposes, 20 per cent, but those for breeding purposes admitted free in the interest of farming and stock-raising; wool, from 10 to 12 cents a pound, with from 10 to 12 per cent added.

Not only is his interest thus protected but the farmer knows well that the protection to the main acter bonds is still more. He knows that when the great manufacturing industries of various kinds are active and flourishing that there is always a demand for all the variety of his products in the home market. He understands that the product or price of the great staples of wheat and corn, a part of which may be exported, are no measure of the benefit to him of

A HOME MARKET,

which consumes at ready prices the still more abundant and profitable products of the farm which cannot reach a distant or foreign market with out great loss and many of them not at all. The vicinity of a manufacturing establishment, whether it be a rolling-mill, furnace, or factory, not only at once raises the price of every foot of his land, but gives him a daily market for his erisable and small products of the farm, such as fruit, dairy products, vegetables, eggs, poultry, veal, mutton, hay, straw, fodder, berries, cord-wood, and a multitude of minor ar-

ticles, thousands and millions of dollars' worth, with no absolute record can ever find its place in a national balance-sheet, and these are the most profitable of the products of the farm.

Our whole agricultural production for the year 1880 was more than \$9,000,000,000; our whole manufacturing, as estimated, not more than \$5,000,000,000; so that at present our home market, like our manufacturing industry, is yet in its infancy. And yet that home market consumes nearly ninety two per cent of our vast farming products, leaving our cotton and tobacco, and 94 per cent of our manufactured products. But the amount consumed by the home demand is no real standard of the relative value of the home and foreign market. First, the cost of transportation and its risks must always be set against the foreign market. Then instability and uncertainty are always to us essential and necessary characteristics of our European market. Every year that demand leaves us without a foreign demand. Our only reliance for a full demand in the European markets for our vast raw products of the farm depends mainly on the chances of war, famine, or pestilence. No sale or prosper as agriculture can exist, or ever did exist, without the reliance of a regular healthy home demand. The farmer, more than almost any other producer, needs stability in the demands of his market, for his investments must be made a year or more in advance. He cannot afford to crop planted six months or more before its sale to meet fluctuating demands for a different product caused by the multifarious vicissitudes of a foreign demand from a bad harvest, expected to be a full and supplying one up to the very week of its failure. A steady, uniform, reliable European market for American farm products is an absolute impossibility. It changes with every prolonged summer fog in England and every rain storm on the shores of the Baltic. It hangs not only on foreign harvests but on treaties and tariffs, on disasters and diplomacy, on rain and revolution. The farmer meets uncertainty enough in the varied chances of drought and flood, of heat and cold, of frost and weevil, or of short crops, and low prices from abundant ones, without driving him to the wretched gambling, desperate hazard of seeking a weekly changing market 3,000 miles from home. It is of value as an outlet for our surplus of food products, but as a reliance for our vast possibilities it is a delusion and a failure. This is the more so because the price of the whole crop is fixed by the small portion of it exported.

The American farmer received for his crop of 1878, amounting to 2,802,000,000 bushels, the sum of \$914,000,000, or about \$122,000,000 less than in 1877, when his crop was in less quantity by 124,000,000 bushels, and \$230,000,000 less than in 1868 or 1874, when his crop was only 1,450,000,000 bushels. The average home price of wheat was \$1.42 in 1868, \$1.25 in 1871, \$1.15 in 1873, \$1.03 in 1876, \$1.08 in 1877, and \$0.77 in 1878, showing in spite of the growing demand from Europe, a steady decline singularly out of proportion with the increase in production. Thus the crop of 1878, which was larger in quantity than that of 1877 by 6 per cent, was less in value by 21 per cent. Now, the uncertainty of the market for these farm products was largely owing to the changing and uncertain demand of the European market during this time. In some of these years the scarcity of food in foreign countries made an unusual demand for our food products. But to realize how utterly uncertain that demand is, the American farmer has only to remember that an abundant European harvest leaves him dependent almost wholly on the home market. This is the only safe dependence of the American farmer, and whatever enlarges and builds it up helps to make sure and remunerative and independent this great industry, American agriculture, which is the nursing-mother of all our industries.

The price of our commodities in a foreign country is compelled to adjust itself to the lower purchasing power of the European market, while the basis of our own market is the largely greater purchasing power of the American masses. At the same time a better employment of our labor and a gradual increase of our manufacturing population, with the consequent competition, give to the whole people an abundant supply of manufactured goods at prices lower than can be fairly afforded by any foreign commerce.

The gentleman from New York, [Mr. Hewitt,] while advocating free trade, incidentally or accidentally stated a truth which to me seems one of the most conclusive reasons why American farmers dare not rely on the foreign market, which is the Elysium of free-trade. He says: "Our products are agriculture. In years of famine the world will take all we have to spare; in years of plenty there will be a surplus for which there is no foreign outlet."

And this is the reliance to which free-trade theories commend us as the dependence of our immense agriculture, which last year gave us a vast total more than nine billion dollars worth of products. Now, the total foreign population, which consumes our surplus food, produce does not double its aggregate number on an average in less than one hundred years. Therefore our powers of production increase more than five times faster than their capacity for consumption. But the population which constitutes our home market is doubled in every period of twenty-three years. No foreign market thus based on low wages, thus irregular from varying home supply, thus subject to ruin from political revolution, can ever meet the aggressive demands or measure the expansive force of our productive possibilities.

The advantage of the home market is one of the oldest elements of economic science. In 1771, Dr. Franklin, writing home from London, where he had been watching the growth of England's great industries, says: "Every manufacturer encouraged in our country makes a purpose of market for provisions within ourselves, and saves so much money to the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufacturer he supplies. Here in England it is well known and understood that whenever a manufacture is established which employs a number of hands it raises the value of land in the neighboring country all around it. It seems, therefore, the interest of our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufacturers in preference to foreign ones."

So thought, and so spoke and urged Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson. Every one of our early Presidents was a farmer, and understood and advocated the interests of agriculture as the basis of our pros-

perity. Said President Jackson, "Plant the manure of the soil by the side of the farmer." In 1824, when we had a low-duty tariff, and our markets were glutted with British goods, he said, in a letter to Dr. Coleman, of Virginia: "Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus products? Except for cotton he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture? Draw from agriculture the superabundant labor, employ it in mechanism or manufactures, thereby creating a home market for your bread-stuffs, and distributing labor to a most profitable account, and benefits to the country will result. Take from agriculture in the United States 600,000 men, women and children, and you at once give a home market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes. In short, we have been too long subject to British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized."

Some of the professed followers of Jackson on this floor would spurn these patriotic words and satisfy themselves by the theories of British agents that a home market is a delusion, and that we should still continue to be "subject to British merchants."

FREE TRADE AND HARD TIMES.

The lessons of our history attest nothing more absolutely than the fact that prosperous and protected manufactures have never yet been destroyed. With equal step they have thrived or languished. Before the tariff of 1824 our manufacturing industries were protected. What was the condition of agriculture? On the floor of this House Henry Clay declared that "successful untrashed crops of grain have perished in our barns and bays, and for want of a market, and that there was 'an universal complaint of the want of employment, and the consequent reduction of wages.'"

Thomas Ewing, Senator from Ohio, defending the system of protection in the interest of agriculture, speaking of this same period prior to the tariff of 1824, said: "In short, every portion of the world was searched by our intelligent merchants, and all combined did not furnish a market adequate to our surplus products. Every Ohio farmer long knew and felt the pressure consequent on this state of things. Year after year their stacks of wheat stood untrashed, and they were obliged to separate the grain from the straw; so low was it reduced, in comparison with manufactured articles, that I knew forty bushels of wheat given for a pair of boots; such was the state of things in the western country prior to and at the time of the revision of the tariff of 1824."

This condition of things throughout the country brought about the protective tariff of 1824, under which all the industries of the people revived, and the years which followed were years of prosperity and development. Of the seven years which followed, Henry Clay said in 1832, "If any term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which the people have ever enjoyed, the earliest period of their present constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824."

MORE PROTECTION AND GREATER POOR. The passage of the tariff act of 1828 being still more protective, was a direct result of the favor with which the mass of the people received, the operation and effects of the previous one. Labor was in demand at higher wages. Manufacturers were springing into existence, bringing to farmers a ready and eager market for productions which would not bear transportation to a distance. It was passed without any claim of inadequate revenue, for its object was avowedly protection, for protection had created the country, and the proofs of its benefits and advantages. So the bill was voted for by Van Buren, Silas Wright, Thomas Benton, Richard M. Johnson, and John H. Eaton, and by the Representatives from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky, each State about to vote for Jackson for President. The public journals of that day show that the bill reached Charleston, South Carolina, the British vessels in port displayed their flags at half-mast in token of what is still common—British hatred of American prosperity. Though this was an indirect interference with the legislation of an independent nation, it was not so aggressive an insult as the British challenge of this British pamphlet, which I hold in my hand, scattered over the country in the midst of a national election, and telling American citizens how they should vote. But our country had no grown British dictation, and though the tariff was only "a local question" once in that campaign of 1850, it became a great national issue, and the people enjoyed real benefits and surrounded by the prosperity it had brought, carried its banner to victory. [Applause.]

Our own competition brings prices to a just level, and at the same time our protective system preserves our industries by shutting out a ruinous competition with pauper labor, and also protects our English manufactures from destroying our manufactures, as Lord Brougham advised, and then putting up the prices as always had been done. Now, I hasten on to another proof of what I have said.

I hold in my hand a volume of Parliamentary Reports for 1850. It is a free-trade Report, and the Hon. Mr. Archbold, the English consul-general at New York, in 1850, made this report to his government, which was thought of sufficient importance to be published by order of Parliament. He speaks at length of "the effect of the protective tariff in stimulating wool-growing and the production of cloth." It states that "the prices of carpets in the United States in 1879 are 12 per cent cheaper than they were in 1860, while in dress-goods prices had fallen about 25 per cent, in the same period."

In every country labor is the wealth creator. It is the largest part of its capital. It is the productive force of all development. High wages and a measure of the real prosperity of a country. An economic system that does not base itself on full wages for labor in this country is at war with both its interests and its institutions. How grandly did Lincoln, the great American commoner, recognize this in his first message to Congress. He said, "Labor is prior to capital, and capital is the fruit of labor, and could not exist without labor had it first existed. Labor, therefore, deserves much the higher consideration." Garfield said, "It is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor." In contrast with that truly American doctrine, I set the English theory, openly pro-

claimed in Parliament by Huskisson, when a member of the cabinet. He said, "The real capital to obtain a fair remuneration, labor must must be kept down." In England it has been kept down, for on it are piled, tier above tier, castles and ranks and costly establishments and primogenitures and princely prerogatives and all the aristocracy. And it is to-day just as when Huskisson avowed it in the brutal doctrine of English power, that the laboring class is to be kept down. The London Times, of July 10, 1880, says editorially, in speaking of the chances of free trade in this country: "The United States do not approach the question from the same point of view as ourselves. The object of their statesmen is not to secure the largest amount of wealth for the country generally, but to keep up, by whatever means the standard of comfort among the laboring classes."

Yes, that is the object of all true American statesmen, for the laborer is the citizen—the American. And for that reason protection would refuse pauper labor competition with free American labor. The object and the effect of that protection is to make possible better wages and thereby better conditions for all our useful classes, for in this country every useful citizen is a worker in some manner. A distinguished foreigner, traveling in this country lately, said: "Where are your laboring classes? I have not seen them yet." In the United States wages are better and the necessities of life are lower than in England or on the continent.

These higher wages represent the comfort and happiness of American comes. These better wages, better living, better conditions, the possibility of schools, the ownership of homes, the chance for the laborer of now to be the capitalist in a few years, are all made possible by protection. I have come to hate the very name "cheap labor." I know what it means in England. Some years since I spent months in learning something of the condition of the working and other classes in England and on the continent. No statistics, no words can fully describe what cheap labor there means in the destitution and hopelessness of its condition. A single illustration may hint at it. I buy a joint and Sunday in Sheffield, England, an old man said to me in reply to questions: "I have stood thirty-four years in this corner of this room and wrought daily, and when this lad now by me, who has never been a day in school, can make one-third time we have meat at our poor table once a week. Saturday night I buy a joint, and Sunday I have some soup." I said, "Can you not hope for something better?" The tears started down his soot-grimed face as he said: "No, sir; no, sir; not unless I may some day be so happy as to get to America." I never was so proud of my country as then, realizing that in no other country on earth could honest labor claim such reward or command such dignity and comfort.

THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT. The following preamble and resolutions, offered by Hon. James H. Harris, were adopted by the Convention of leading colored men of North Carolina, which met at Goldsboro on the 29th of March, 1882: WHEREAS, The Democratic Legislature of North Carolina has taken from the people the right to elect their magistrates and county officers, contrary to the spirit of our free institutions, and the American system of local self-government; and whereas, The tendency of legislation since the Bourbon Democracy obtained control of our State government, has been to favor the few autocrats of that party as a sacrifice of the popular rights of the people; and whereas, by a shameful gerrymander of our large cities and Senatorial districts minorities are allowed to rule majorities; and whereas, by a shameful gerrymander of our Congressional districts one hundred and twenty thousand Democrats (according to the election returns) are given seven of the eight Congressmen to which this State is entitled, and the one hundred and thirty-seven thousand Republican voters only one representative.

Resolved, That the declared purpose of the President, as set forth in his message, and assured by his well-known character and associations, to secure both the recognition of individual right and protection for personal property, as well as the commercial and business prosperity of the people throughout the Southern States of our Republic, commands the hearty support of every Southern interest and the admiration of every Southern heart; and we pledge him in return the earnest co-operation of the Liberal and Republican voters of our State.

Resolved, That the Liberal Convention, which met in this city on the 7th inst., was the first organized evidence on the part of the liberal and progressive men who have here before acted with the Democratic party of a revolt against the despotism of Bourbon Democracy. That free thought, free speech and independent political action received great encouragement from the action of said convention; that the men who had stood in convention and denounced the destruction of popular rights in North Carolina, are worthy of the confidence and support of the people. That Oliver H. Dockery has always been true to the rights of the people; that he is a man of ability and experience, and the cause of the people in this campaign has been wisely entrusted to his leadership; therefore we endorse his nomination for Congressman-at-Large.

Resolved, That George N. Folk is one of the ablest jurists in the State, is singularly free from prejudice and bias on account of race and political affiliation and is in every way fitted for the important office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; therefore we endorse his nomination as made by the Liberal Democratic Convention on the 7th inst.

Resolved, That the lives, liberty, prosperity and happiness of the people are inseparable from an incorruptible and non-partisan judiciary; therefore we endorse the nominations of Charles C. Pool, John A. Moore, Frank H. Darby, William A. Guthrie and L. F. Churchill for Superior Court Judges.

The following is the certified return of the vote in Wake at the election on Thursday, August 4th, 1881, on the question of Prohibition:

Table with 3 columns: For, Agt., Maj. and 10 rows of names and vote counts.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, JUNE 14TH, 1882.

The Republicans of North Carolina, in convention assembled, do hereby pledge made in all former resolutions and declare as follows: Resolved, That education is the bulwark of American liberty; that the constitution of the United States requires the National Government to secure to each State a Republican form of government; that the money as now collected and disbursed by the State is greatly less than is absolutely necessary to furnish each child with a practical English education; therefore we favor the appropriation of the internal revenue tax on distilled spirits by Congress, pro rata, among the several States and Territories, for all amount of money derived from this source, and to be expended in educating the children of our commonwealth, from the age of two years, requires the collection of the tariff which enables labor and capital employed in our own markets with the labor and capital of foreign producers.

Resolved, That the present system of county government is based upon the monarchical principle of taxation without representation, and is utterly subversive of the rights of the citizen, and should be repealed. The inherent right of the people to elect every officer clothed with a portion of the sovereignty of the State, from the chief executive to the humblest official, must not be denied or abridged, to the end that local self-government may be restored to the people of North Carolina. That an honest count must follow a free ballot, and the majority shall determine who shall make and execute the laws.

Resolved, That the Bourbon leaders of the Democratic party are responsible for the passage of the prohibition bill and the agitation resulting therefrom. The said bill having been rejected by a vote of the people, the Republicans of this State, in maintaining the fundamental principle that a majority must rule, request their candidates for the Legislature to vote for the repeal of said prohibition bill and against all similar measures.

Resolved, That we unreservedly and cordially endorse the administration of President Chester A. Arthur, and realizing the difficulties originally besetting its plan and course of duties, we recognize in its policy—combining wisdom with consistency, justice with moderation, suavity in manner with firmness of execution—the policy of the American people.

Resolved, That the declared purpose of the President, as set forth in his message, and assured by his well-known character and associations, to secure both the recognition of individual right and protection for personal property, as well as the commercial and business prosperity of the people throughout the Southern States of our Republic, commands the hearty support of every Southern interest and the admiration of every Southern heart; and we pledge him in return the earnest co-operation of the Liberal and Republican voters of our State.

Resolved, That the Liberal Convention, which met in this city on the 7th inst., was the first organized evidence on the part of the liberal and progressive men who have here before acted with the Democratic party of a revolt against the despotism of Bourbon Democracy. That free thought, free speech and independent political action received great encouragement from the action of said convention; that the men who had stood in convention and denounced the destruction of popular rights in North Carolina, are worthy of the confidence and support of the people. That Oliver H. Dockery has always been true to the rights of the people; that he is a man of ability and experience, and the cause of the people in this campaign has been wisely entrusted to his leadership; therefore we endorse his nomination for Congressman-at-Large.

Resolved, That George N. Folk is one of the ablest jurists in the State, is singularly free from prejudice and bias on account of race and political affiliation and is in every way fitted for the important office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; therefore we endorse his nomination as made by the Liberal Democratic Convention on the 7th inst.

Resolved, That the lives, liberty, prosperity and happiness of the people are inseparable from an incorruptible and non-partisan judiciary; therefore we endorse the nominations of Charles C. Pool, John A. Moore, Frank H. Darby, William A. Guthrie and L. F. Churchill for Superior Court Judges.

The following is the certified return of the vote in Wake at the election on Thursday, August 4th, 1881, on the question of Prohibition:

Table with 3 columns: For, Agt., Maj. and 10 rows of names and vote counts.

assemble in meeting and there choose an executive committee of three. They will then elect three delegates and three alternates. Each precinct in a township, and each ward in a city or town number over three thousand inhabitants, divided said city or town has voting places in its wards, shall be entitled to the same representation, viz: three delegates and three alternates, and no more.

COUNTY CONVENTIONS. County conventions shall consist of three delegates and three alternates from each township or precinct in such county, duly elected by the Republican voters thereof, under the plan and rules of organization of the Republican party of North Carolina, and no more. Delegates and alternates to county conventions shall be elected only by the Republicans of each precinct in precinct meeting assembled after due notice and publication of not less than fifteen days, of the time, place and purpose of such meeting, and not otherwise.

County conventions shall be organized by the chairman of the county committee, who shall call the convention to order and act as temporary chairman until a permanent organization is effected, with power only to appoint, and receive the report of, a committee on credentials. The certificate of the chairman and secretary of the meeting, setting forth the regularity of the primary meeting of the township or precinct, and the election of the delegate and alternate thereat, shall be accepted when uncontested, as good and sufficient credentials for such delegate and alternate. No executive committee shall have power to elect or appoint delegates to conventions.

WE present below a form of credentials. Should the delegate not be able to attend the county convention, he will place the credentials in the hands of his alternate. This paper is to be taken to the convention and surrendered when called for by the committee on credentials: COUNTY.

This is to certify, that at a primary meeting of the Republicans of _____ precinct, _____ township, held on the _____ day of _____, 188____, said meeting having been regularly called, in conformity with the plan of organization of the Republican party, _____ was duly elected one of the three delegates to represent said precinct in the county convention, to be held on _____, on the _____ day of _____, 188____.

It is further certified, that _____ was, at the same meeting, duly elected alternate to the above named delegate.

Witness, the signature of the chairman of the said meeting, and that of the secretary thereof, the day and year first above written. _____, Ch'n. _____, Sec'y.

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION. RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

I.—County Organization. The election precinct shall be the unit of county organization. Each precinct shall have an executive committee consisting of three active Republicans. They shall be biennially chosen by the Republican voters of the precinct—the voters to meet only upon the call of the chairman; in precincts where there is no executive committee, the Republicans of the precinct may assemble in meeting and there elect an executive committee—and shall elect one of their number chairman. They shall convene together at such time and place as the majority of them may elect. They—a convention of all the precinct executive committees—shall biennially elect a county executive committee to consist of not less than five members, who shall elect a chairman from their number. Vacancies in precinct committees shall be filled by the voters of the precinct, and in county committees by a convention of the precinct committees duly called: Provided, That in case a vacancy occurs within thirty days prior to an election, such vacancy may be filled by the vote of the remaining members.

II.—Congressional, Judicial and Senatorial Districts. There shall be a Congressional, Judicial and Senatorial District Committee, composed of not less than one member from each county, no less than seven members, biennially—the Judicial committee quadrennially—elected by the several district conventions, each of whom shall elect a chairman from their number: Provided, That a senatorial district committee shall only be elected in districts embracing more than one county. Vacancies occurring within thirty days of an election may be filled by the vote of the committee.

III.—State Executive Committee. There shall be a State Executive Committee, composed of one member from each Congressional District in the State, to be designated by the district delegations in State Convention assembled; two members at large—three for 1882-'83—to be elected by the State Convention, and the chairman of the convention at which the election is held. They shall be biennially elected at the State Convention, shall choose one of their number chairman, and shall elect a secretary who is not a member, who shall reside at Raleigh.

IV. The chairman of the respective county, district and State executive committees shall call their conventions to order and act as temporary chairmen until a permanent organization is effected, with power only to appoint, and receive the report of, a committee on credentials. Precinct meetings are called to order

by chairman of the precinct executive committees, who preside until the election of a chairman and a secretary of the meeting. V. No executive committee shall have power to elect or appoint delegates to any convention, whether county, district, State or National. VI. No member of an executive committee or delegate or alternate duly chosen shall have power to delegate his trust or authority to another. Vacancies among nominees, caused by death or declination, may be filled by the Executive Committee of the class in which the vacancy occurs.

VII.—Representation. Representation in county conventions shall consist of three Republican voters as delegates, and three Republican voters as alternates from each precinct in the county, and no more. VIII. Representation in Congressional, Judicial, Senatorial and State Conventions, shall consist of two delegates and two alternates only, for every member of the lower House of the General Assembly, and shall be apportioned in the several counties accordingly: Provided, That each county voting with another county for member or members of said lower House shall have two delegates and two alternates, without affecting the representation of the county with which it votes. Until the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, 1882, the representation shall be as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Delegates, Alternates. Lists names of counties and their respective delegate and alternate counts.