

THE DESERT WEEKLY

PIONEER PUBLICATION OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION.

ESTABLISHED  TRUTH AND LIBERTY. JUNE 1850.

NO. 21.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1892.

VOL. XLV.

DEBATE BETWEEN RAWLINS AND CANNON.

The anxiously awaited and much talked of public political debate between Hon. Frank J. Cannon, of Ogden, the Republican nominee for Delegate to Congress, and Hon. J. L. Rawlins of Salt Lake, candidate for the same honors on the Democratic ticket, occurred in the Ogden Opera house last night, before the largest and most representative political gathering of its kind in the history of this Territory. Upwards of 2000 people occupied seats in the body of the house, in the boxes and galleries, while between 200 and 300 more sat either upon the stage or stood behind the wings. The occasion was enlivened by the strains of stirring and patriotic music.

The stage was set with a beautiful forest and mountain scene. On the right, near the footlights, were life-sized pictures of Cleveland and Jefferson and immediately opposite were the likenesses of Harrison and Cannon. Messrs. Rawlins and Cannon occupied seats near the front of the stage, and immediately surrounding them were such leaders of the two great national parties in Utah as were not in other parts of the Territory proclaiming the principles of their respective parties.

When the curtain went up at 8 o'clock cheer after cheer was given, and for several minutes the hurrahs for Cannon and Rawlins were deafening. H. W. Smith took the floor and after repeated efforts silenced the mighty audience. He informed them that it had been specifically agreed upon by the Territorial committees of the two parties under whose auspices the debate was to be conducted that the speakers were not to be interrupted by applause or cheers, but that they be allowed to proceed with their arguments to the end. He trusted that all Democrats present would respect that agreement; he doubted not that the Republicans would do so.

Judge Leonard, for the Republicans, made a similar explanation and request.

According to the rules of the discussion Rawlins made the opening speech, which lasted one hour. Cannon then followed for an hour and a half, Rawlins closing in thirty minutes.

The utmost dignity prevailed

during the whole debate, which was entirely free from personal allusions and insinuations. The official stenographic report of the discussion contains about 83,000 words, from which it will be seen that the following is necessarily a condensed account.

H. W. Smith introduced

MR. RAWLINS,

who spoke substantially as follows:

A protective tariff is a Republican device. The Republicans say it is a system whereby they compel the foreigner to pay our taxes. My eloquent young friend will tell you, doubtless, how this is accomplished. Major McKinley in his foresight and wisdom did not provide that the foreigner should pay our local as well as national expenses.

All of the continental countries except Belgium and Great Britain have protective tariffs.

It would be quite a draft upon the royal families, who we are given to understand are the rich and the well born and who are indeed the tax consuming aristocracy. Democrats are opposed to the operations of the Republicans' selfishness, which purports to make the foreigner pay our taxes. I might quote to you a long list of articles the tariff on which under the McKinley law actually exceeds the original cost of production 100 per cent. This excess amounts to many millions of dollars annually, and the American people have to pay it and not the foreigner. I expect my young friend will tell, or try to tell you, how the foreigner pays our taxes. Under the McKinley monstrosity, Vanderbilt, with his income of many millions a year, pays but little if any more tariff than his stableman. Why? Because this tariff is levied principally upon the necessities and not the luxuries of life. (Vociferous applause.) I hope my friends will be kind enough to obey the behests of the chairman and maintain order.

A protective tariff in our country originated with Alexander Hamilton, the patron saint of Republicanism. Our industries were merely lilliputians then, but soon these infantile enterprises of steel and iron became powerful giants shipping their products to Great Britain and elsewhere and were amply able to support themselves with protection, which grows upon what it feeds. Republicans originally said they simply wanted the protective tariff until infant industries could

be firmly established that they could support themselves without aid from any outside source. But Republicans in their enlightened selfishness fail to recognize such a time.

Our iron and steel industries have been carried on for more than a hundred years. Woolen and cotton goods have been manufactured during the most of our existence as a nation and still they survive and have survived and prospered.

The Republican campaign book sets forth that our exports have been greatly increased since the enactment of the McKinley bill. It is not true. Protection creates monopolies, monopolies form trusts and trusts limit production and thereby increases the price to the consumer. It operates always in favor of the rich manufacturer and against the poor tradesman. Where is the pauper labor of which we hear so much? The Republicans will probably tell you that it is in free trade England, but that country pays better wages than her protected neighbors. The Democrats in their platform declared that Republican protection was fraud, and so it is.

In Connecticut the operatives in the woolen mills are paid higher wages than laborers are for similar service in the South and in Utah. If Connecticut can successfully compete with the South and Utah, why can she not do the same with England? The labor cost in England, statistics show, is greater in proportion to its producing capacity than in the United States. We are told that English laborers get lower wages than our own. This is true, but it is also true that they get less still in protected Germany. Why should we not pay higher wages in the United States than is paid in any other part of the world? We have a country that is incalculably rich in its varied resources. For centuries hidden treasures have been garnered within our borders by nature. We have a people possessed of marvelous adaptability and industrious habits. The result, so far as we are concerned, of paying higher wages than other countries could not be otherwise. The only way to compare the merits of free trade is to do so by referring to countries similarly situated. Two such countries exist in New South Wales and Victoria. The latter was the more promising of the two. She adopted the protective system and her