

Collars, 5c.

Cuffs 10c.

Beginning Friday morning we will sell

500 DOZEN

Linen Collars
And Cuffs

At the above named prices.
These goods are four-ply
Linen, standing or lay down,
and are worth from 15 to 25
cents.

Lee S. Warner

The One-Price
Clothier, Tailor, Hatter
and Furnisher.

Successor to J. A. Joel.

City Laundry.

125 South Green St.
Crawford Block

Everything New and Nice
Clean Work Guaranteed

A. C. JENNISON,
The Old Reliable
PIONEER ABSTRACTER
(Loan, Real Estate
And Insurance Agent.
(Over 121 E. Main St. - Crawfordsville, Ind.)



FOR SALE BY
ED. VANCAMP.

A. H. HERNLEY,
Special Collector.

All kinds of notes and accounts promptly
looked after. Settlements made and all busi-
ness entrusted to his care promptly done. Of-
fered with J. J. Miller, 109½ S. Washington St.

B. F. WOODSON
SELLS

Buggies & Buckboards
Repairing & Specialty.

305 North Washington St.

T. S. PATTON,
204 Main St.
FIRE INSURANCE.

Represents the following Old Reliable
Companies: Orient Insurance Co., of
Hartford, Conn.; Giese Falls Insurance
Co., of New York; Firemen's Fund In-
surance Co., of California.

DAILY JOURNAL.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1893.

LIGHTS AT STREET CROSSINGS.

Railroads Compelled to Maintain Them
Duty of the City Council.

Ex Mayor Carr called THE JOURNAL'S
attention yesterday to an act passed by
the last Legislature and approved March
4, 1893, which is of considerable import-
ance to this city, in case the City Con-
council should see proper to pass an ordi-
nance or resolution to give it full force
and effect. The act contains but one
section and provides for the maintenance
by railroad companies of lights at every
street where their tracks cross. In many
cities of the State ordinances have been
passed in conformity with this law.
The discovery of the act will serve as a
suggestion to our City Council. It
reads as follows:

That the Common Councils of all
cities of this State, not working under a
special charter granted by the Legisla-
ture of the State of Indiana, shall have
the power to provide by ordinance a
resolution for the security and safety of
citizens and other persons from the
running of trains through any city, by
requiring railroad companies running
and operating a railroad through any
city, to keep and maintain lights on all
nights that the Common Council may
direct, at the point where the railroad
tracks cross a street in any city, and
may in such ordinance or resolution
provide what kind of lights the railroad
company shall maintain, and the man-
ner of enforcing the compliance with
said resolution or ordinance by the rail-
road company, and for that purpose
shall have power to pass and enforce a
penal ordinance. Provided, That no
city shall have authority under this act
to pass any resolution or ordinance re-
quiring any railroad company to main-
tain any different kind of lights than
that maintained by said city.

FROM HERE AND THERE.

—Harry Duckworth is in Chicago.
—John L. Shrum is visiting in Chi-
cago.

—Mrs. T. B. Eastman is over from
Indianapolis.

—J. A. Gilbert and wife are home
from Chicago.

—Lou Benna's family has moved
back to Salem.

—Tom Ream, of Peru, is in the city
contemplating the idea of opening a
steam laundry.

—Mrs. Celia Slattery and Mrs.
Bridget Donohoe have returned from
a week's visit at the World's Fair.

—Gaylord McClure, C. M. Scott and
Dr. McMechan are among the pros-
pective candidates for City Clerk.

—Ed Voris' bond for \$14,000 has
been filled out and returned to Wash-
ington. He will soon be ready to use
the postmastership.

—The iron bridge saloon is now, for
the first time in the memory of man,
unoccupied. The police have succeeded
in getting every one of its recent ten-
ants on the stone pile and declare their
intention of putting every future one
there.

—J. C. Edgeworth has a force of men
at work tearing down the old frame
building on his lot on Fifth street pre-
paratory to the erection of a one-story
business block similar to that of R. C.
Taylor, on the same street.—Logan-
port *Pharos*. It is rumored that Mr.
Edgeworth will soon marry one of the
most accomplished ladies of Logansport.

—TAKE Uncle Sam's Cough Syrup. It
contains no chloroform, is safe and effec-
tive for all. Sold by Cotton & Rife,
the progressive druggists, for 25 cents a
bottle. 3 25/4.

—THE ladies will be interested in the
new millinery goods arriving at Mrs.
Cresse's.

—SCARLET, all wool, medicated twilled
flannel at lowest prices at Louis Bis-
choff's bazaar.

—MRS. CRESSE is ready to show the
Fall styles in millinery.

—Invitation.
Everybody invited to see the new fall
goods and styles in cloaks, dress goods,
silk, velvets, lace, kid gloves, hand
kerchiefs, corsets, lace curtains, portieres
and general line of merchandise.

LOUIS BISCHOFF,
Ladies' Bazaar.

Vandata Excursions.

To Chicago and return via St. Joe and
boat, berths not included, \$4.50. With
berths, 10 days, \$6. With berths good
till Nov. 5, '93.

To Kansas City and St. Joseph, Mo.,
\$9.95 one way. Other points equally
low.

One way to Denver, Pueblo and Col-
orado Springs, \$20.70.

St. Louis and return, Tuesdays and
Thursdays to Oct. 19, \$9.10 the round
trip, account exposure.

Also hunters' tickets after Sept. 20.

J. C. HUTCHINSON, Ag't.

Only \$3.00 to the World's Fair.

On Monday morning for the 2:22
train the Monon will sell tickets to Chi-
cago and return for \$3.00 the round
trip. Good returning on train leaving
Chicago at 11:45 p. m., Oct. 10, giving
its patrons two full days in Chicago.

L. A. CLARK, Ag't.

DR. PRICE'S
Cream Baking
Powder.

The only Pure Cream of Tartar Powder.—No Ammonia; No Alum.

Used in Millions of Homes—40 Years the Standard.

WHO PAYS THE TAX?

The Tariff Question Simplified—Three
Prominent Charges Made by Democrats
Refuted.

To the Editor of the Crawfordsville Journal.

It is with confidence that I, an humble
plebian, ask space in your invaluable
JOURNAL for a further elucidation of the
labor question, for the tariff, rid of its
labor element, would be void of a soul.
It would be but the question, as I have
shown in previous articles, who shall
pay the expenses of this government,
the American citizen or the importer of
foreign goods.

It seems to me that no time in the
history of this Government has the op-
portunity been better, to get an honest,
candid serious hearing on this subject than
now. The masses learn best in the
school of experience, and that school is
now being opened by a Democratic Con-
gress, now in session, in fact its first
lesson with its accompanying woes are
now being experienced.

The great Democratic party has de-
clared that a protective tariff is uncon-
stitutional, and as they have always
been strong sticklers for the the consti-
tution—as they explain it, of course
they will eradicate every particle of pro-
tection from our tariff laws. They cer-
tainly will not favor unconstitutional
measures. Then it is a foregone con-
clusion that in the tariff laws that they
are giving us, no vestige of pro-
tection will appear.

I wish in this article to hastily refer
to the three prominent charges made by
the Democratic party last fall, that be-
yond all doubt carried the elections
against the Republicans. The first one
was, that tariff is a tax on the Ameri-
can consumer. Second, that it furnishes
opportunities for powerful manu-
facturing combines. Third, that it opens
up opportunities for men to grow
rich—to become millionaires.

That tariff is a tax I shall not deny.
If it could be shown that the tariff tax
is heaped upon the American consumer it
ought not to prove very objectionable
to the loyal American. The Democrats
say that the last Congress was a billion
Congress. The first session of the pres-
ent Congress cost over a half billion
hence the present Democratic Congress
will cost at least one billion. This
enormous expense must be paid by some
one, in some way. That is the question
between the two dominant parties. This
tax must be paid, either by an ad
valorem direct tax, an income tax, a
tariff tax, or the two or three combined.
To pay this tax by a direct ad valorem
system would be, to tax every tax payer
in the United States, great and small,
on an average \$100. This would make
the average tax payer not less than
\$200 general government tax, besides
his State and county tax. It would be
probably more than this, for it would
cost near forty per cent to assess and
collect this enormous tax. The above
facts run out of possibility a direct
ad valorem tax. The next then, would
be an income tax. This would so cripple
and enervate the business interests of
this country that it could not possibly
be sustained by the popular vote. Then
there remains but one possible plan, and
that is by tariff, and income. Upon this
plan both parties are agreed, but the
manner in which the tariff duty is to be
laid is the issue between the two domi-
nant parties. The Republican party
asks to lay it, so as to raise revenue,
and at the same time protect American
labor and the American consumer, while
the Democratic party asks to lay it, so
as to raise the greatest revenue without
protecting American labor, or the Ameri-
can consumer. Now there is no question
but what a non-protective tariff will
raise a larger revenue than will a protec-
tive tariff. To remove protection will
cripple American manufactures, make
the country dependent upon foreign
importation; in fact if we depended upon
foreign manufacturers altogether it
would quadruple the importation, and
hence become a greater source of rev-
enue than would any protective system,
but would it be better for American in-
terests? I presume that all parties will
admit that it would prove minus to
American interests to have it so.

Now the issue upon this tariff
question as it now exists, is in the manner of
laying it. The Republican party in
sists upon laying the tariff so as to com-
pel the foreign importer to pay the duty,
thereby releasing the American con-
sumer from paying it. Whilst the Dem-
ocratic party insists upon laying it so
that the American consumer will be
forced to pay the duty, thereby estab-
lishing the Democratic proposition that
"tariff is a tax" upon the American con-
sumer. In order to make this issue
clear to the reader it will be necessary
first, to illustrate, and secondly, to refer
to the unmistakable facts.

The Republican party wishes to lay
the duty heaviest upon the articles that
we can and do produce, and to admit
free the articles that we cannot produce.

The Democratic party, ignoring pro-
tection, wishes to lay the duty so as to
raise the greatest revenue, sturdily
avoiding the recognition of the protec-
tive principle. In order to do this he
will place the duty as near horizontal as
possible, that is, evenly upon the arti-
cles that we do and do not produce.

Now for illustration let's compare the
results of these two rules of protection
and see which plan tallies with the facts.

We will first lay the Republican plan by
placing a duty of three cents per yard
on prints, by so doing we stimulate
American manufacturing, until we pro-
duce a sufficient amount to supply the
American consumer, and by the com-
petition reduce the price to 6 cents per
yard. Now suppose the English im-
porter ships a load of English prints
into an American port he pays a duty of
three cents per yard, will just as good an
article be sold for 6 cents per yard? Cer-
tainly not. The importer would be
compelled to sell at the American price,
and only realize 3 cents per yard for his

prints. Again we have by an abundant
supply and strong competition reduced
the price of the self binder from \$225 to
\$125. Suppose a foreigner ships into
this country self binders, no better than
the American machine, and when he ar-
rives in the American port he pays \$20
duty on each machine. Will he sell his
binder at \$125 plus \$20, equal, \$145? No
sir. Even the free trader cannot
help but see that Mr. Importer would be
compelled to pay the 20 cents duty.
Now if the foreigner can, with advantage of low
priced labor, manufacture his binder
\$20 cheaper than can the American,
with his high priced labor, he can pay
the \$20 duty and then sell his machine
for as large a profit as can the Ameri-

can. Again we will suppose coffee to be
worth 15 cents per pound on ship board in
a Brazilian port, and this government
puts 20 cents per pound tariff, would
the importer pay the 20 cents duty? If so he
would sell his coffee in an Ameri-
can port at 15 plus 20 equal 35 cents
per pound. This is just what he would
do, and why? We cannot produce the
article in this country and hence are at
the mercy of the foreigners' price, hence
the Republican protective system puts
no tariff upon coffee.

Again we will suppose coffee to be
worth 15 cents per pound on ship board in
a Brazilian port, and this government
puts 20 cents per pound tariff, would
the importer pay the 20 cents duty? If so he
would sell his coffee in an Ameri-
can port at 15 plus 20 equal 35 cents
per pound. This is just what he would
do, and why? We cannot produce the
article in this country and hence are at
the mercy of the foreigners' price, hence
the Republican protective system puts
no tariff upon coffee.

Let's go back of 1860 when we had for
years endured a Democratic non protec-
tive tariff. Under this tariff our manu-
facturers languished for the want of
protection, labor was much lower in
Europe than here, which prevented the
American manufacturer from competing
successfully with the foreign manu-
facturer. Capital was slow to invest in
manufacturing from the fact that labor
was from fifty to one hundred per cent
lower in the old countries. Under these
circumstances we did not more than
supply one-half the American demand
for cotton and woolen textures, for rail-
road bars, nails, cutlery, etc. What was
the result?

Turn with me to an old ledger kept
by a country mercantile firm, in the vil-
lage of Parkersburg, Montgomery County,
Indiana, in 1856, and we see charged:
May 19, 1856, Thos. Grange, Dr.
To 6 yds. muslin at 14¢ per yard 14¢
Peter Bellows, Dr. 84
John P. Serris, Dr. 25
May 20, 1856, 8 lbs. Orleans sugar at 12½¢ per lb. 1.00
May 22, Thos. Grider, Dr. 1.00
To 1 lb. yeast and anise 2.25
May 25, Joseph Millinger, Dr. 15
To 2 lbs. soap at 7½¢ 1.75
June 1, 1856, 10 lbs. flour at 7½¢ 5.00
To 2 lbs. nails at 7½¢ 1.75

The above were the prices paid in the
country by consumers in 1856, under
Democratic tariff, when the labor of the
consumer was 50 per cent lower than in
1892. Thus you see that whilst he, the
consumer, worked for less wages, he
paid more than double for the manu-
factured articles, that he was compelled
to have. Why was this? The question is
easily solved. Under non protection
American machinery lay idle and rust-
ing. We depended for more than half
of the manufactured articles required in
this country, upon foreign countries.
As a matter of course Americans could
not, need not establish competition.
They could not fix the price to the con-
sumer hence the importer fixed the price,
and of course being free and untram-
meled by American fixed prices, he
added the tariff to his wares. The
American manufacturer took advantage of
this Democratic shield and raised the
price of his article.

As to the second charge in the Demo-
cratic indictment against the Republican
party, that protection only protects the
manufacturer, I would answer by form-
ulating the following question: If the
American manufacturer when labor was
lower in 1856, had to sell his cotton
shirting at 14 cents per yard, his prints at
12½ cents per yard, his iron nails at
7½ cents per pound, did not make a profit,
what do they make now in the way of profit,
when they sell cotton shirting to the consumer at 6
cents per yard, prints at 5 to 6 cents
per yard, and iron nails at 2 cents per
pound? I affirm without the fear of
successful contradiction that the Ameri-
can manufacturer is selling his pro-
ducts at a less per cent, than ever before
in the history of this country, and if it
was not for the protection to the com-
mon laborer and the consumer that Ameri-
can manufacturer could double his prof-
its under a non protective system.
Hence low prices and small profits is the
mother of manufacturers' combines, to
protect them from the ruin of over com-
petition.

As to the third count in the indict-
ment, that it opens up opportunities for
men to grow rich, to become million-
aires. (This charge cannot be brought
against Democratic legislation!) In a
well ordered social system, the mutual
relations existing between the rich and
the well to do, and the poor, have been
more or less strained. This should not
be and would not exist were it not for
that egoism, or selfishness that morbidly
exists in human nature. It is natural
for the thrifless to attribute their fail-
ure to some social law beyond their con-
trol. In this country this is a mistake.
All are free to travel the road to wealth
if they have the ability. Nearly all of
our very wealthy men have been poor
in their beginnings. The wealth in this
country, like political and social honor,
changes as each successive generation
makes its advent. The families of this
generation that are wealthy, are as a
rule, poor in the next generation, and
the families in this generation that are
poor are rich in the next generation.
This is largely owing to habits of indus-
try with the laboring classes, and habits
of prodigality with the rich. Again our
decent laws dividing real and per-
sonal wealth equally between the several
members of the family, tend to prevent
the perpetual accumulation of wealth in
the hands of any one favored branch of
a family.

There is an artificial gentility in this
country whose wealth,