THE MORRISTOWN GAZETTE.

By JOHN E. HELMS. MORRISTOWN, TENN., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1880. VOL. XIV---NO. 27.

THE MORRISTOWN GAZETTE.

Subscription Price, $2.

SPEECH

OF

Hon. Robert L. Taylor,

OF TENNESSEE,

In the House of Representatives,

Saturday, May 22, 1880.

On the bill (H. R. No. 6109) to amend the sixth subdivision of section 2244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to licensing dealers in leaf tobacco.

Mr. TAYLOR said:

MR. SPEAKER: I beg the indulgence of the House to offer a few remarks suggested by the bill under consideration, bearing upon the civil service as related to the existing internal revenue laws, and the effect of these laws upon some of the important interests of the country.

As the immediate representatives of the people we are intrusted in a great part with the guardianship of their interests. It is therefore incumbent on us to institute such a line of policy, enact such laws, and establish such regulations as will best promote the "general welfare" and maintain the rights of all the people.

Among our duties there is none I conceive to be more important than that of instituting a wise and just financial policy, and of so regulating our revenue system as to meet all the legitimate demands of the Treasury, and not thereby cripple or diminish our pecuniary resources, but strengthen and enlarge them.

The nation owes a vast bonded debt, aggregating more than $2,000,000,000, for the payment of which, and particularly of the interest, we *must provide*; for the necessary expenses of the Government and for its obligations to our soldiers and sailors *we must provide*; for the just and honorable and as yet unrecognized or unadjudicated claims of many citizens for property and services we *must provide*. To raise the money to satisfy these demands without undue friction at any point, without alarming capital or crippling trade and commerce, discouraging enterprise or repressing labor, and, above all, without wounding *agriculture*, is the grand problem which this Congress, in its patriotism and wisdom, is called upon to solve. If it succeed, it will merit and receive the approbation of a generous people; if it fail, it will justly incur their condemnation.

I may have little to say now, sir, in reference to *capital*, since capital is Argus-eyed, sleepless, vigilant, all powerful, and always has commanded *brains* enough to take care of itself, even though it seldom gives evidence of possessing a soul or even a heart. Neither do I propose to discuss commerce, but if possible to demonstrate the injustice, the unconstitutionality and hurtful folly of some of the features of the existing revenue laws, and the crying necessity for their repeal or modification by this Congress. The privileges and immunities, the blessings and benefits of this Government belong alike to all its States and to all its citizens; and upon the same principle, universally acknowledged, the *burdens* must be equal upon all the States and all the citizens of the Republic. Any *restrictions*, therefore, of any of these blessing or benefits to any section of the country or any class of citizens would not be any more clearly unjust than would be the unequal distribution of the necessary *burdens* of the Government.

Thirty-eight individuals are mutually and equally interested in a joint stock corporation for the prosecution of some business, and in the process of its operations a debt is incurred for the benefit and protection of the association. Would any intelligent court in Christendom decree that the debt should be collected out of the individual property of any member of the company, and not out of all the members equally? Undoubtedly not. And why not? Simply because such a decree would be a most gross and wicked injustice and an act of unpardonable oppression. Is it any less an outrageous injustice, is it any less a shameful act of oppression, if the Representatives of the thirty-eight States of this great body politic and corporate shall solemnly enact that the debt or any part of the debt of this nation shall be collected out of the products of the land and labor of a *part* only of the people and not equally out of all alike? No, sir! It would be unjust and partial and as severely oppressive in the one case as in the other.

And yet such is the meaning, intent, and effect of your revenue law in reference to that portion of our people engaged in the production of that important staple tobacco. It is oppressive because it overburdens almost to prohibition the labor and land employed in its production. To show how partial is its operation, let me state from the reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that for the six years preceding June 30, 1878, Virginia alone has paid the sum of $42,561,842 *tax* on tobacco—an average annual sum of over $7,000,000. During the same six years the six New England States paid the sum of $9,756,384, as the whole of their internal revenue tax, averaging the trifling amount of $1,292,730 per annum—about one-sixth of the internal revenue tax on this single Virginia product; and yet the population of Virginia, according to the ninth census, is only 1,225,000, while that of New England aggregates 3,487,000. Thus a single product of the land and labor 1,225,000 citizens of the single State of Virginia, which has two Senators and nine Representatives in Congress, is burdened with a tax of nearly six times the amount exacted from *all* the products of all the land and labor of 3,487,000 citizens of six States of New England, which have twelve Senators and twenty-seven Representatives in Congress. As tobacco tax alone every man, woman and child in Virginia is made by this law to pay to the United States Treasury $5.71 *per capita*, while the population of New England is required by the same law to pay the sum of thirty-four cents each, and this on their entire revenue tax.

But, sir, I know it will be said by some that this tax does not fall upon the planter, but on the consumer; and that *therefore* it is not, cannot be oppressive. A moment's investigation, I think, will explode this flimsy and false objection. If, however, the proposition *were true*, it does not affect my argument, when it is remembered that the growers of tobacco are also largely *consumers*, and therefore *pay the tax*; and, further, that it can hardly be claimed that any man puts himself outside the protection of common justice and fundamental law only because he chews tobacco or takes snuff. But, sir, it is *not* true; for it is demonstrable that not the manufacturers, not the consumers, but the *growers* of tobacco suffer the burden and feel the crushing weight of the tax. Let us see. The tax, the price of manufacturing, and *cost* of the raw material are the three essentials, making in their sum the cost price of the manufactured article, the last of which, *the cost of the leaf*, alone, is *variable*, while the other two elements are constant, or nearly so. The tax must be paid, the cost of manufacturing must be paid, and *these* are nearly invariable; but the cost of the leaf *may* yield to the pressure of *trade*, and, *still worse*, to the *will* of the manufacturer, whom the law has constituted a *monopolist*, whose margin of profit is to be secured alone in the price of the leaf, which is made dependent largely upon *his own volition*. Thus the manufacturer's investment of capital, by the operation of law, wrings its interests and profits out of the sacrifices extorted from the planter in the price of his toil-worn product.

It is no wonder, sir, that such injustice and oppression, the result of unwise legislation, has brought upon this once profitable branch of agricultural industry decay and ruin. Once, before the tax, manufactories were in *almost every village* where tobacco-growing was a regular business. No capital was needed. Purchasers, the patrons of the farmer, were numberless. Competition was *active* and prices ran high. The planter's labor and land were richly *rewarded*. But the revenue laws have changed all this. *Now* before the manufacturer can *realize* he must put on the *stamps* and pay the cost of manufacturing. To make money largely he must do a business involving heavy expenditures of cash. Large capital is required under the present system even to start the business. None can manufacture, therefore, unless he is a capitalist. Legislation, sir, I repeat, has made the tobacco business (just as it has made the whisky business, the railroad business, the Indian business, and the election business, and every other business) under the manipulation of moneyed rings, a gigantic monopoly in the hands of capital. It has driven all but its own favorites from the market; it has fostered and built up opulent combinations to put down and keep down the price of the raw material, and thus as usual laid reluctant labor on the altar of the money-god, a bleeding sacrifice to the greed of unpitying capital.

It is not a matter of astonishment, therefore, that in some sections there many families once affluent and blessed with every comfort of life now actually suffering for its merest necessaries as a result of such legislation. It is to be remembered that tobacco is a plant requiring for its profitable culture peculiarities of climate and soil not found in every State, nor in every part of the same State. But in its natural *habitat* it is the *staple* of the farmer financially. Its free production supplies the meat and bread and clothing of the family, as well as the luxuries of refined and elegant social life. It gives education and culture to the children; furnishes alms to the poor; supplies liberal means for the purchase of tariffed goods, (thus bringing revenue to the Treasury,) for the erection of useful and charitable public works, for the payment of State, county, and municipal taxes, and thus tends directly to suppress agrarianism and the spirit of repudiation, and for the support of the Gospel at home and abroad. In short, it is the essential basis of financial prosperity and all the resultant benefits and blessings of such prosperity.

How then, sir, without *injustice* and oppression, can we by legislation prostrate and ruin whole communities, I might almost say whole States? How can we justify ourselves in overburdening with taxes the labor of a few localities devoted to the production of a commodity specially adapted to them, and leaving untaxed and free the field labor of other localities? I ask now, sir, is the existing law in accord with the spirit or letter of the Constitution? I answer, first, the Constitution itself declares it was "ordained to establish justice." But I have already shown that this law establishes *injustice* and oppression; it is therefore at war with this clause of that instrument. In the second place, the Constitution, article 1, section 2, reads thus:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers.

And again, in article 1, section 9, clause 4:

No capitation, or other tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

Now, sir, to ascertain whether the law under consideration is in harmony with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, only two questions need be answered: First, is the tax on tobacco a "direct tax?" and secondly, Is the tax on tobacco "laid" and apportioned among the several States "according to their respective numbers" and "in proportion to the census or enumeration?"

The answer to the first question is an emphatic *yes;* incontrovertibly it is a direct tax upon the producer—so direct that the infraction of the law draws after it the most severe personal penalties, the most disastrous fines and humiliating imprisonment.

The reply to the second question is an equally emphatic *no!* Will any man dare declare that the law taxing tobacco and whisky takes any account whatever of "numbers" or "proportions" in imposing its enormous exactions? Why, sir, it is notorious that some half a dozen States—and comparatively small communities in those States—are almost the sole producers of this great agricultural staple; and yet, in the very teeth of the prohibition fixed in the face of the Constitution, in the plainest, most unmistakable language, you are extorting by legislative fiat having not the shadow of warrant in that instrument forty millions of revenue yearly from a small number of citizens of these few States to pay the debts for which *all* alike are bound.

But, sir, this feature of the law is not only unjust and contrary to the Constitution, but it is a hurtful folly as well. If the revenue it yields must of necessity be derived from this commodity, would it not be the part of wisdom to get such revenue, if it can be done, without crippling or crushing the producer? And is it not consummate folly to wound an important industry almost unto death when your revenues can be better secured without hurting the producer? You have so constructed your tax law as effectually to prohibit any sale by the planter except to the manufacturer. As a result, combinations of manufacturers dictate the market of the raw material and effectually control it. Of course it is their interest to reduce and keep down the price of the "leaf" to the utmost minimum, because every fraction of a cent subtracted from the price of the raw product is a fraction added to the manufacturers' profits, and accordingly the prices have gone down lower and lower to the point where ruin and bankruptcy are devastating the fields and blighting the hopes of the planter, and all this without bringing to the revenue a single dollar more than could have been raised without any sensible damage to the interest of the planter or his industry.

Suppose you free the raw material in the hand of the planter from all embarrassment, and allow him to sell it as you allow the farmer to sell wheat, corn, beef and pork anywhere, everywhere, and to whomsoever he can, and place all your tax on the manufactured article alone in the manufacturers' hands! What would be the result? Is it not clear you will have accomplished all you propose to do by the existing law? And is it not equally clear you will have by the same act restored competition and crushed out monopoly and released the planter from the clutches of capital and increased the reward of his labor, and all this without diminishing the revenue by one dollar.

But, sir, I would not have you or the country to infer that the growers of tobacco are desirous of escaping their duty to the Government because they seek the modification of the partial and unjust features of the internal revenue laws. On the contrary, they fully recognize and are perfectly willing to pay their just proportion of the national debt. They would scorn to shirk their proper share of the burdens of the Government. But they appeal to Congress in the name of justice and right to disburden their labor of inequitable and ruinous taxation because they fail to discover any sound argument of law or reason or policy to justify a discrimination so repugnant to right, so hostile to the spirit as well as the very letter of our fundamental law, and so disasterous to their interests.

One other matter germane to the subject in hand I desire to present while on the floor to the consideration of Congress. In some sections of the country people once in easy circumstances are so reduced that luxuries common even to the very poor have been long since banished from their home. Yet these people are the owners of money in the shape of property rotting before their eyes. True their property might procure for them necessary comforts but for the law of fine and imprisonment forbidding them the use of their own property. Under such bloody restrictions property ceases to be property. Certainly it is *not their* property. They own orchards loaded with fruit, but their apples must turn to dust unused. They cannot sell them in the market, because they live far away from the railroad, embosomed in the rugged mountains. The cost of marketing would be more than the apples would bring. Why not make them into brandy? The revenue law intervenes—a bond is required—for a poorman an impossible bond—with solvent securities, and besides a revenue tax of ninety cents on the gallon. That bond and that revenue tax finish the job. It is impossible to him; and so his fruit yields him nothing but vexation and deeper poverty. His store debt drives the cow from his children, and the sheriff levies on his land for taxes he expected the brandy to pay. But the bond! What is it for anyhow? Simply to secure the Government against loss in case the poor fellow should steal a few of his own apples! Now, suppose he could give the bond, what will he profit in the end? Nothing, for notoriously the tax swallows up all the profits, the mammoth distilleries excepted, which turn out whole creeks and rivers of whisky and brandy.

Alas! what floods of temptation are let loose upon poor frail humanity by this legislation for rings and monster monopolies! Contemplate the unhappy victim of moonshining! Away out among the laurel and the ivy, in some obscure mountain gorge, shrouded in deepest shadows, he toils at his crooked art. His right to his land and his orchard has never been questioned. The fruit he thinks is his own, and on this belief he acts. The proceeds of that orchard have supplied the comforts of life to his wife and children for many a year. The memories of past enjoyments tempt him with resistless arguments, and he yields, for a bond is impossible and the tax would leave no pay for his fruit or labor. He is simply devoting what he always believed to be his own property to his own use. Unfortunate man! The hired minions of the revenue have spotted him. Their despicable subsidized decoys and detective informers, like the bloodhound, are on his track. Like Judas, they sell their victims and their souls for money; and, like Judas, betray them with a kiss. He is arrested! He is hurried away from wife and children and home—his property appropriated or destroyed before his eyes—away to trial and the penitentiary.

Sir, what apology can modern statesmanship, illumined as it is by the advanced moral ideas of the age, offer to an enlightened Christian people, to a great nation who glory in the truth emblazoned in the forefront of their Declaration of Independence that "all men are born free and equal" and with certain inalienable rights, conspicuous among which are "life and liberty" and the right to pursue happiness, for such mockery? Will you frown down the just indignation of American freemen by the stale and puerile assertion that the use of tobacco and the drinking of whisky and brandy are indecent and immoral and ought therefore to be taxed out of existence? Is that your apology for trampling under foot the birthrights of freemen? Sir, I blush to see our statesmanship driven to the furtile pretexts and bald subterfuges of mediæval fanaticism to defend its assaults upon republican freedom and personal liberty! Manners are the manifestation of morals, as morals are the outgrowth of religion, and religion is enshrined in the secret sanctuary of the soul, within whose sacred precincts earthly courts and legislatures have no jurisdiction. Tyranny, instigated by fanaticism and ambition, dared for ages to invade that sanctuary, and to achieve its holy ends invested the inquisition, the rack, the *auto da fe*, and in the name of the God-man immolated thousands of innocent victims upon its bloody altars—the same infernal spirit that kindled the fires of Smithfield, that made Saint Bartholomew infamously immortal, transformed the persecuted and exiled Puritans into persecutors and inspired the blue laws of New England that fulminate banishment or death to witches and Quakers.

I had hoped, sir, that we had outgrown these criminal absurdities; but when we enact a code of morals and dictate and define good manners, and establish rules of decency, in short, legislate into imprisonment and poverty thousands of small distillers and tens of thousands of industrious tobacco growers, because the use of tobacco and whisky are indecent and immoral, we are evidently advancing crawfish fashion—backward toward the spirit and methods of medieval church rule, or the still later policy and legislation of New England in her persecution of Quakers and witches. No, sir, this pretext is but a gauzy veil to hide from the public gaze the combinations of greedy capital which inspired the legislation that has built up hideous legalized whisky rings and tobacco monopolies all over the land on the ruins of two great industries and of thousands of good and true citizens.

How absurd and shameless the pretext of "indecency and immorality!" what a straining at gnats and swallowing of camels! Sir, the Constitution we swear to support requires us to "apportion direct taxes among the States according to their respective numbers." I have seen no decision of the Supreme Court construing this claas to mean "according to the *indecency* or *immorality*, or according to the *tastes, appetites, education*, customs, or habits of the people." But if there exists such a judicial construction, and if the legislation complained of assumes to get its warrant there, how far have we conformed the statute to the decision? Have your tobacco and whisky taxes improved the morals, dignified the manners, purified the habits, refined the tastes of the people? Have they cleansed the people from the filthy use of the weed or closed a rum hell or wrought a solitary reform from drunkenness to sobriety, or lessened by a single drop the rivers of intoxicating drink that deluge the land; have they held back from the drunkard's death a single one of the sixty thousand unhappy victims that annually perish in this land from drink? Have they soothed the sorrow of a drunkard's widow or ministered bread or clothing or comfort to a single poor drunkard's orphan child? No, sir. You have only robbed labor of its wages and the land of its profits to glut the greed of lordly capital. You have cut down the little stills of a thousand poor mountaineers, destroyed their property, made them felons, dogged them to the jail, the penitentiary, and sometimes to murder and the gallows, and pauperized their families. Your law for establishing decency and promoting morals has created bands of hired spies, who prowl the mountains and valleys under assumed characters tempting the unwary and ignorant to violate the law that they may earn from the Government wages of treachery as witnesses or prosecutors. You have dried up the *little* streams of whisky and brandy, or made them crooked and criminal for morality and decency, and yet you have flooded the land with mammoth stream hells, whose nostrils breathe forth foul fumes and flames, and from whose fiery bowels are ever gushing forth the liquid essence of damnation, deluging the nation with thefts, robberies, forgeries, arsons, perjuries, rapes, suicides, murders, every hideous and revolting wickedness known in the calendar of crime, and in its remorseless sweep ingulfing religion, domestic ties, social institutions, and millions of bleeding hearts. Sir, away with such shallow hypocrisy! Let the *truth* flash upon every intellect in the nation that this species of legislation is based on the idea that *capital* and not labor is entitled to legislative encouragement and protection; the idea that the money power ought to be, and of right is, supreme, and that therefore every department, office, and agency of the Government should be, *must* be, operated in its interest and for its aggrandizement.

Is this true? Let the act demonetizing silver and making gold the only metallic basis and lawful coin answer! Let all the legislation depreciating the values of land and labor products, and to the same extent appreciating money, answer! Let the fifty thousand business houses which have been crushed answer! Let the hundred thousand business men who have been hurled from opulence to penury, with blighted hopes and broken hearts, answer! Let all the financial legislation for the past fifteen years answer!

But, sir, I would not be understood as waging war wantonly upon capital as such, for as all capital is but the product of labor, and is or ought to be the reward of the laborer's toil; if I strike capital without qualification, the blow wounds the world's greatest benefactor, in the the person of the laborer, *whom* to wound I would be but a treacherous Judas. I would pierce the vitals, if possible, of that conscienceless, soulless monster which, under the forms of law as well as without law, has through all time by fraud and violence grasped and appropriated to its own exchequer all the products of honest labor save only the miserable pittance that keeps soul and body together, and proposes here even in this New World, hid for centuries by God himself from the Old World's rapacity as his last best boon and heritage to liberty and labor, to subjugate all labor to itself, its heirs and assigns, forever. It is against capital so acquired and wielded, and such capitalists who consolidate their ill-gotten riches out of the plundered earnings wrung from other men's honest toil, that I raise my voice and will ever cast my vote.

Let me say in conclusion, sir, labor is the creator of all values, as values are the measures of all wealth—material, intellectual, political, social—and agriculture is the creator of the blood, the bone, the muscle, the brain, and all the activities of labor. Agriculture is the great laboratory in which nature through the co-operation of divine law and human effort combines the elements which constitute the pabulum upon which all humanity subsists. In the proportion in which these elements are combined must be the enlargement or diminution of population, and in proportion to population will be the achievements of labor and the advance of civilization; agriculture is the substratum upon which rests the whole fabric of our civilization. If agriculture prosper, a fresh vitality with electric velocity and power flashes through every nerve and muscle of humanity; civilization advances and develops on every line of thought and endeavor; trade flourishes, manufactures enlarge and multiply, commerce spreads her wings to every breeze and lands her rich argosies on every shore; earth yields her ingots of gold to the caresses of the grimy miner; science delves deeper into the cavernous labyrinths of nature, and plumes her pinions for loftier flights after knowledge among astral suns and nebulous systems; while art with rekindled ardor utilizes the discoveries of science and ministers the creations of inventive genius to the æsthetic as well as the natural want of the world; religion herself, replenished with all the material agencies and instrumentalities of her grand mission, with renewed energy presses forward her invincible armies preparing with song and shout to crown with imperishable and eternal glory "The Bozrah Conqueror."

But, sir, if agriculture falters, if drouths wither, if the frost king blight, if floods destroy, or if unwise and vicious legislation over-burden the fruits of the fields, at once all progress stops, and, the propelling power reversed, rolls backward the entire machinery of civilization toward the yawning chasm of inevitable ruin. Trade languishes *first*, then dies; manufactures suddenly diminish, then cease; the navies of commerce rot at their crumbling wharves; thought feels the terrible paralysis; the gifted in art and science starve in constrained idleness, and every laudable form of human endeavor drops its implements and glides backward with the smitten millions to the shadowy realms of barbarism. Even religion, though heaven-born, yet so closely linked with materiality is she that she must sound the doleful signal of retreat, haul down the banner of the cross, must hang her harp upon the willow, weep over the world's relapse into moral night, and cry, "How long! oh, Lord, how long!"

I know, sir, that these truths are so axiomatic that their statement here might seem superfluous, but such and so many are the clashes and conflicts of minor interests involved in the movements of the complicated and interdependent parts of the machinery of our civilization that recurrence to first principles seems requisite to emphasize the supreme importance of maintaining and protecting this grandest of the arts, the "nourishing mother of all arts," untaxed, untrammeled and free. Sir, if agricultural prosperity is the foundation as well as the mainspring of success in every department of enterprize and industry, as is self-evident, if the adequate reward of universal labor is a condition essential to general financial prosperity, and if general financial prosperity is the only guarantee against national bankruptcy, and the only reliable security for the extinguishment of the national debt, it seems clear to me that the complete enfranchisement of agriculture by this Congress will be an infallible evidence of its statesmanship, a distinguished proof of its wisdom and an enduring monument to its patriotism.

Past legislation has robbed numberless future citizens of their homes by donating hundreds of millions of acres of the people's land to opulent railroad corporations which are now exacting from the people millions of money yearly. *Justice* demands that we replenish the people's treasury with a liberal tax upon the *incomes* of these princely monopolies. Legislation having depreciated national bonds by expansion and after their sale appreciated them by contraction of the currency, and again having increased the value of the bonds by demonetizing silver, all in the interest of capital—in short, by these repeated "hocus-pocus" manipulations having legislated unnumbered money dealers and bond lords into millionaires at the expense of the masses of the people, justice now imperatively demands that this Congress legislate as far as possible the resulting burdens off of the shoulders of labor thus fraudulently depleted and impoverished, and supply the deficit in revenue thus created by laying a tax, not upon bonds, since they are exempted by law, but upon the *incomes* derived from bonds and upon *all* incomes above a reasonable minimum, according to capital. Let us tax these wealthy corporations, those combinations of capital, and these royal monopolies which are a standing menace to liberty. Let us tax the millions of hoarded treasure wrung from the toil and sweat of unrequitted labor by wicked legislation to enrich favorites and rings. From incomes alone in 1866, without overtaxing any that were not abundantly able to bear taxing, we derived nearly seventy-three millions of revenue, touching no income of less than $600. Let us lay again a just and fair income tax and dare to do justice though the heavens fall. Let inherited fortunes and growing wealth and princely incomes bear the burden of their own protection, and let the unfortunate poor and the toiling laborer go free. Let this Congress proclaim complete emancipation to the six millions of farmers of the nation now and forever.

PUBLIC SPEAKING.

Hon. A. H. Pettibone, Republican Candidate for Congress, and Hon. R. L. Taylor, Democratic Candidate for Congress, will address the people of the First Congressional district at the following times and places:

HAWKINS COUNTY.

Stoney Point, Thursday September 30th.
Rogersville, Friday, October 1st.
Bulls Gap, Saturday, October 2nd.

HANCOCK COUNTY.

Kyles Ford, Monday, October 4th.
Sneedville, Tuesday, October 5th.

CLAIBORNE COUNTY.

Yellow Store, Wednesday, October 6th.
Tazewell, Thursday, October 7th.

GRAINGER COUNTY.

Thorn Hill, Friday, October 8th.
Rutledge, Monday, October 11th.
Turley's Mill, Tuesday, October 12th.

HAMBLEN COUNTY.

Morristown, Wednesday, October 13th.

COCKE COUNTY.

Newport, Thursday, October 14th.
Cosby, Saturday, October 16th.
Big Creek, Monday, October 18th.

GREENE COUNTY.

Caney Branch, Tuesday, October 19th.
Mosheim, Wednesday, October 20th.
Romeo, Thursday, October 21st.
Rheatown, Wednesday, October 27th.
Greeneville, Thursday, October 28th.

W. D. HAYNES,
Chm'n. Dem. Ex. Com.
T. H. REEVES,
Chm'n Rep. Ex. Com.

The race for Congress in this District presents the melancholy spectacle of an aspirant for the high and honorable place in the National Congress, who, running in a Republican district, is holding tenaciously to the coat-tails of the Presidential candidate as his only hope of success. Presently the coat-tails, aforesaid, will give way and the Major be left to his own devices in which event no one questions but that his defeat would be sure and overwhelming.—Rogersville *Spectator*.

WHO PUT DOWN THE REBELLION?

To the Editor of The Morristown Gazette:

We hear it charged by all Republican speakers that the Democratic party with a few exceptions were all Copperheads, Rebel sympathizers, etc., during the rebellion—and that they, the Republican party, fought the battles of the Union, gained the victory, and restored the laws and Constitution of the United States. We will look at a few facts which every well-informed Republican knows to be true, whether he will acknowledge it or not, to-wit: That Generals Grant, McClellan, Hooker, Reynolds, Thomas, W. S. Hancock, Buell, Butler, Sickels, Birney, Kearney, Slocum, Sherman, Meade, Rosecrans, Sigel and Logan were all Democrats before and during the war, and all who are living are Democrats still, except Grant and Logan. Fremont being the only general of any note on their side.

We will now see what party the Union soldiers came from in a few States. Delaware sent out 13,651 volunteers, her total vote in 1860 was 13,089 of which 3,815 were Republicans. Maryland sent 49,731, her total vote was 92,502 of which 2,294 were Republicans. That part now called West Virginia, furnished 32,003, her total vote 94,379 of which 664 were Republicans. Missouri sent out 108,773 volunteers, her total vote was 165,518 of which 17,028 were Republicans. Kentucky sent out 78,845, her total vote in 1860 being 146,216 of which 1,364 were Republicans. The blacks are not included in the above numbers. The total number of volunteers for the Federal army, exclusive of the blacks, from the above States, were 282,698, of which number 25,165 were Republicans, and 257,533 Democrats and Whigs. Now suppose the half of the last number were Whigs, we will have over five Democrats to one Republican, or nearly eleven to one taking both Whigs and Democrats together. Tennessee furnished the Federal army 12,077 volunteers, nearly all of which were Whigs and Democrats. We also notice that all the Northern Democratic States sent out more soldiers than the Republicans.

Who put down the rebellion? since out of 18 Federal generals named above 17 were Democrats before and during the war, and only 2 have changed sides since. It was certainly not the Republican party, with only a corporal's guard and one general. There is but one feasible answer to this question, and that is, the Democratic party with a considerable number of Whigs added, and not the Republicans. Why then is all this hue and cry against the very party that commanded the Union armies, fought her battles, and put down the rebellion? It is simply this. In putting down the rebellion it became necessary to carry out one of the leading principles belonging to the Republican party, to-wit: the freeing of the slaves. Then, at the close of the war, while excitement and prejudice had full possession of a great portion of the Union soldiers, the Republican party with a few shrewd wire-workers, taking advantage of the times, bought up Grant by electing him president of their party, and set the machinery of government to work according to their own dictation. And had it not been for the more thinking part of that class of ex-Federal soldiers and citizens formerly belonging to the Democratic and Whig parties withdrawing their influence from said new party, and substituting Democratic principles, our free government would have been lost, State-lines abolished, arbitrary regulations enforced, and in the end a president or dictator for life. But the people are, and have been for some time, waking up as from a deep stupor, asserting their rights as American citizens, and on the 4th of March, 1881, intend to place W. S. Hancock in the presidential chair by the largest number of electoral votes ever cast for any presidential candidate since 1840. Mark the prediction.

***

GUBERNATORIAL CANVASS

The Chairmen of the various Executive Committees, at a meeting held in Nashville on the 27th of August, 1880, agreed on arranged the following list of appointments for joint discussion between Hon. John V. Wright, Hon. S. F. Wilson and Hon. E. M. Edwards, candidates for Governor; and the Committee join in the request that the citizens in the respective localities assemble at an early hour, say 10 o'clock, on the day named.

Kingston	Friday,	October	22
Loudon	Saturday,	"	23
Knoxville	Saturday night,	"	23
Bristol	Monday,	"	25
Jonesboro	Tuesday,	"	26
Rogersville	Wednesday,	"	27
MORRISTOWN	THURSDAY,	"	28
Athens	Friday,	"	29
Cleveland	Saturday,	"	30
Chattanooga	Saturday night,	"	30
Tullahoma	Monday,	November	1

APPOINTMENTS FOR THE ELECTORS-AT-LARGE.

HEADQUARTERS DEMOCRATIC STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, NASHVILLE, TENN., Sept. 7th, 1880.—The following appointments are announced for the Hon. L. T. Sneed, Democratic Elector for the State-at-Large, to which the Hon. John Maney is invited.

JOHN W. CHILDRESS, JR.,
Ch'm of the Dem. State Ex. Com.

Athens, Monday, Oct. 18.
Loudon, Tuesday, Oct. 19.
Kingston, Wednesday, Oct. 20.
Knoxville, Friday, Oct. 22.
Maryville, Saturday, Oct. 23.
Clinton, Monday, Oct. 25.
MORRISTOWN, Wednesday, Oct. 27.
Jonesboro', Friday, Oct. 28.

The Staunton (Va.) *Spectator* has pretty well settled the Hampton matter, and shews that the spirit of his speech was simply in harmony with sound Democratic doctrine and pure patriotism. Nevertheless, the following shot from the Alexandria *Gazette* is too good to be lost: "Suppose General Hampton did say that the Democrats are now contending for the same principles for which Lee and Jackson fought? The statement is no more incorrect than the one made every day by radical leaders to the effect that the Republicans are now contending for the same principles for which Lincoln died and thousands of brave federal officers fought. The latter fought to preserve the union, but the Republicans are now doing all they can to divide it into two sections, and to make the people of each the deadly enemies of the other."

Job printing dispatched neatly and cheaply at the GAZETTE Job Office.