

The Lenoir Tonic.

VOLUME XVII.

LENOIR, N. C., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1891.

NUMBER 4.

HO FOR WESTERN

North Carolina!

The Garden Spot of the World.

Variety of Products

Surpasses all other Sections.

Owing to its wonderful natural resources it was possible to establish here the most extensive Herbarium on the Globe, and with it side by side has grown up the

Largest Wholesale Establishment

IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Strangers wonder at its magnitude and are at a loss to understand how it has been accomplished; the explanation is easy:

Fair Dealing, Economical Management, Minimum Profits

—AND A—

LARGE VOLUME OF BUSINESS.

Has been our aim and policy and has contributed chiefly, we believe, to the success we have thus far attained.

It has become a well known fact and is said to the credit of every people that merchandise of every description is sold cheaper in Western North Carolina than anywhere in the South. New Yorkers frequently say to us: "Why you folks sell goods cheaper than we do here."

This we are pleased to admit and it is not a revelation to many of our best merchants. Experienced business men are alive to the fact that the Retail Merchant can buy to better advantage in Baltimore than in New York, in Richmond than in Baltimore and in Statesville better still than in Richmond.

By Making Large Purchases

We are enabled to secure the lowest quantity price, while our expenses are insignificant as compared with houses in the large cities.

Our object, however, in this advertisement was more particularly to call attention to a

New and Handsome Line of Goods,

—BOUGHT—

Especially for the Dried Fruit Season. Our Counters are Loaded with Seasonable goods and there are Bargains in Every Department. Stock is complete and there will be no delay in making shipments.

Very Respectfully,

Wallace Bros.

POLK AND HALL.

SPICY CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THEM.

Polk Tells Hall to Resign From the Legislative Committee.

Following is the correspondence between President Polk, of the national Alliance, and ex-President Hall, of the Missouri State Alliance, regarding the latter's opposition to the sub-Treasury:

POLK'S LETTER TO HALL.
WASHINGTON, D. C., June 21, '91.
Mr. U. S. Hall, President of the Missouri State Alliance, Hubbard, Mo.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER.—It is my painful duty as president of the N. F. A. & I. U., and as chairman of the national legislative committee, to direct your attention to certain matters which have come to my knowledge through letters from brethren in your own and other States, through resolutions adopted by Alliances in your own and other States, and through the public press.

If the alleged representations of your utterances in public speeches on certain Alliance measures be true, it is made my duty under the law, as chairman of the national legislative committee, and of which you are a member, to say to you frankly that such positions are inconsistent with and antagonistic to the duties imposed upon that committee under the law.

A report of a speech purporting to have been made recently by you in Saline county appears in the columns of the *Alliance Watchman* of April 24—a paper published in Marshall, Missouri. In this report occurs these words:

"I am unalterably and for all time opposed to the sub-Treasury bill, and I intend to fight it to the bitter end, all the more as president of the State Alliance, because it will give my words against it more weight. I am its bitter and uncompromising enemy," etc., etc.

If the above is substantially correct, and if this language expresses substantially your position, and views, I beg to call your attention, as a member of the national legislative committee, to paragraph 2, section 29, statutory laws, defining in part the duties of the national legislative council: "That it shall be the duty of the national legislative council to formulate measures and devise such necessary methods in conformity to the principles, purposes and acts of the supreme council, as may secure the enactment of such laws as may be indicated by the supreme council." To this end and in further pursuance of the law (see paragraph 5, section 29) the national legislative council appointed a national legislative committee, of which you were made a member, "to give such personal advice as may, in the judgment of the council, be necessary to a proper presentation of the measures before Congress."

I beg to call your attention to section 32 of our statutory laws, which says: "All measures presented for consideration may be discussed fairly, fully, honestly and thoroughly, and when the action of a majority has been had, all who participated in the meeting are pledged to support such action. It is the duty of every member where the body has spoken to stand as a unit before the world."

Now, as to the position of the Alliance on the sub-Treasury bill, which it is alleged you are publicly antagonizing. After a free and untrammelled discussion at our St. Louis meeting it was adopted with great unanimity. After being extensively discussed for a year and with great interest throughout the country it was again endorsed at our Ocala meeting by a rising vote of the body—only four voting against it—by the adoption of the following resolutions:

"WHEREAS, There is now a bill, known as the sub-Treasury bill, in the hands of the ways and means committee of the House of Representatives, which should have been reported and acted upon at the last session, and which, if enacted into law, would bring the financial relief so much needed by all classes and industries; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the national convention of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union do most respectfully and earnestly ask that said bill be enacted into law as soon as possible—or some other measure that will carry out these principles and meet the necessities of the toiling masses."

The adoption of this preamble and resolution constitutes it one of the "acts of the supreme council," and proclaims it one of its "purposes," and which in paragraph 2, section 29, it is made the duty of the legislative council to urge upon Congress, and it is also one of those "measures" embraced in section 32, above quoted.

At the meeting of the national legislative council, at which you were made a member of the national legislative committee, it adopted resolutions, which were ordered to be sent to the members of the United States Senate committee on agricultural affairs, reciting the fact that the bill was in charge of said committee and had been for nearly twelve months; that it was adopted at our St. Louis

meeting; that the Ocala meeting reiterated its demands for some such relief measure as this, and constituted this legislative committee to look after these legislative demands, and the national legislative council demanded that the measure should be reported either favorably or unfavorably that it might be considered on its merits.

The merits or demerits of this measure or our individual opinions thereon as members of this national legislative committee are matters entirely foreign to the object and purpose of this communication and can have no bearing on it. The question for you, as one of the national legislative committee, and for myself as chairman of that body and as president of the N. F. A. & I. U., is: What is the will of the national Alliance, as expressed in its action, and what is our duty, having voluntarily entered into a solemn compact with the Alliance to carry out that expressed will by accepting appointments for that purpose?

As to what the functions and duties of the national legislative committee are, under the acts of the national legislative council and under the resolutions and laws of the supreme council, admits of no question, in my judgment. Indeed, so clear is it, that had I entertained the remotest doubt as to my duty as a member of the committee, to observe in strictest faith the evident and expressed will of the Alliance and of the council, I should most assuredly have declined the appointment promptly. You will doubtless remember that when the committee was appointed, its duty in this regard was discussed by members of the council, and Brother J. H. McDowell was especially emphatic in his construction, insisting that whatever might be the views of the individual members of the committee on any measure embraced within the province of its official charge, it was the plain duty of the committee to carry out the will of the Alliance and of the council. We all accepted the appointment without one word of dissent to those views.

Now, to the point: If I felt that I could not conscientiously acquiesce in the will of the order, and that I, as an honest, patriotic citizen, was impelled by a sense of duty to oppose measures and antagonize the will of the order publicly, and especially on such measures that I had been instructed to advocate or promote, I should not hesitate a single moment as to my course—I would promptly resign my place on the committee.

I know you are fully prepared to hear this from me, as it is but a repetition of my position on this question which was given to you when in Washington, in response to your inquiry as to my views as to your duty as president of the Alliance in Missouri, in view of your opposition to the sub-Treasury bill.

I think I understand your position thoroughly as to this particular measure. I cannot believe that you would willingly damage the Alliance cause, I cannot believe that you desire to be or appear to be inconsistent, and I therefore say to you, in the utmost frankness and in a spirit of true fraternity, that you owe it to yourself, to the cause, to sever your official relations with the national legislative committee by tendering your resignation as a member of the same. Fraternally yours, (Signed) L. L. POLK, President of the N. F. A. & I. U.

HALL'S LETTER TO POLK.
FARMERS' & LABORERS' UNION OF MISSOURI.
U. S. HALL, President.
HUBBARD, MO., June 27, 1891.

To Mr. L. L. Polk, President of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Replying to your communication of the 21st in which you ask me to withdraw my opposition to the sub-Treasury bill or tender my resignation as a member of the national legislative committee, I have the following to say:

I was uncompromisingly opposed to this measure before, at the time of and since my election as a member of the national legislative committee, and no one in our order knew better than yourself my pronounced opposition to it. You will remember the conversation between you and myself, in the presence of another gentleman, in your office in Washington the day before the February meeting of the national legislative council. In that conversation I told you what you then knew, that I had been an open and avowed enemy of the sub-Treasury bill ever since its presentation to our order in December, 1887, at St. Louis, and told you that I recognized in this bill and in the course taken by its author, C. W. Macune, through the *National Economist*, an attempt to sell out the organization to the protective tariff men of the East; that Macune was using the official organ, the *National Economist*, and editorially declaring that there was "nothing in the tariff question" that it was "a breeder of sectional strife," and that "the agitation of the tariff question was an effort on the part of the Democratic party to galvanize the old ghost of sectional hatred." I further told

you that Macune's object in pushing the sub-Treasury bill was to turn the minds of the farmers away from the tariff issue and commit them to class legislation, the very thing the protective barons of the East most wanted, and you will also remember that you expressed your opposition to it and used this expression: "If I were drawing the financial plank of any political party that I wanted to stand on, it would be but in one sentence, and would read, 'We demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver.'" This was during the same conversation in which I asked you if you would accept a nomination at the hands of a third party for President or Vice President of the United States in '92, and you said you would not answer my question. There was not a member of that legislative council but who knew that I was unalterably opposed to the sub-Treasury bill, and knew this before I was elected on the legislative committee, I having announced to them on all occasions, both in public conversation and in private, and by writing, through the newspapers, my opinion upon that question. I am in hearty accord with all the other demands of our order, except that part of the financial plank which makes the government a money lender to the farmer. Despite these facts I was elected a member of this national legislative committee, and I see no reason for my tendering my resignation as such a member. I am a farmer with every cent I have invested in farming and with no other means of revenue, and feel that I have a personal as well as a fraternal interest in the success of the farming class. You certainly cannot have forgotten that as soon as I was elected on the committee, and during the session of the national legislative council that elected me, you got on the floor and said that the wisest, noblest and bravest thing that the legislative council had ever done was their electing me on that committee, that I had the courage to stand up and denounce a corrupt and guilty man, meaning Macune, when I knew that he was corrupt, in spite of the hisses and jeers of other men, and that I was the only one of the committee that refused to whitewash him. You spoke at great length in that complimentary strain, you knowing full well that I would not support the sub-Treasury bill or any other bill that I thought would ruin the farmers of this country and draw their minds from our greatest curse, the protective tariff. You seem to think, however, that I am bound to advocate that measure because of certain expressions used by J. H. McDowell, who was a co-ordinate member of the legislative council with myself and the other State presidents. Might I not with as much reason say that the other members of the committee were instructed and obligated to oppose the sub-Treasury measure from my remarks made at the same time that it would ruin the farmers of the country if passed. Of course, therefore, there can be nothing binding in any remarks made by Mr. McDowell, or any one else, in discussing measures of that kind or character in a committee room. The other point upon which you rely in saying that I am bound to support that measure in the capacity of committee man is that I was instructed by what you are pleased to call "certain statutory laws and resolutions passed at Ocala. I will now examine this position of yours. You and I and hundreds of other Alliancemen in the United States traveled over our entire country with the constitution and ritual of our order, and induced several million farmers to join this organization. To all applicants for membership we read section 1 of the preamble or declaration of principles of our national, State, county and subordinate Alliance constitution, (this declaration being alike in all) which reads: "The object of this order is to labor for the education of the agricultural classes in the science of economical government in a strictly non-partisan spirit and to bring about a more perfect union of said classes." Also, that in section 1, article 8, of our national constitution, all of the qualifications that are necessary to become a member and consequently an officer of our order, are fully set out, which reads as follows:

"Section 1. No person shall be admitted as a member of this order except a white person, over sixteen years of age, who is a believer in the existence of a Supreme Being, and has resided in the State for more than six months, and is either, first, a farmer or a farm laborer; second, a mechanic, a country preacher, a country school teacher or a country doctor; third, an editor of a strictly agricultural paper." You will further remember that when we were instructing the candidates in the order, and before we asked them to take upon themselves the obligation of the organization, we were required by our law to make the following statement to them: "You are assured that nothing in this obligation shall in any way conflict with your religious or political views." I quote this section 1 from the preamble of our constitution for the purpose of showing that our order is not and can never become, under our constitution, a partisan political body, and that whenever any one, from personal ambition, or any other

motives, tries to make a political party out of our order he subverts our constitution and gives the falsehood to the solemn declaration made by our organizers to the millions of members who took the solemn fraternal obligation of our order. I quote the clause of eligibility for membership for the purpose of showing that no one is debarred from becoming a member or officer of our order for opinion's sake. All that was necessary to join the Alliance was that the applicant be over sixteen years of age, a white person, believing in a Supreme Being and was a farmer, farm laborer, etc. Do we find in that constitution any clause that says if a man does not believe in the sub-Treasury scheme he shall not be eligible either as a member or an officer of our order? Not one word of it, and why? Because this order in its infancy and purity, before it was used as it now is, by designing politicians and corrupt men, to subvert their ambitious and mercenary ends, was for the purpose as set forth in the constitution above quoted, to bring about a more perfect union of said farming classes, and no man was debarred from membership or from holding office in our order on account of any opinion that he might hold upon any political question, which means questions pertaining to National and State legislation. This is the dividing line, and the only one of moment between partisan and non-partisan bodies. If a man is a Republican he will not be permitted to take the stump and denounce the system of the high protective tariff without being read out of his party; if a Democrat he will not be allowed to denounce a reduction of the protective tariff without being subject to like treatment. Then can any sane man claim that freedom of speech and thought can be dispensed with in a strictly non-partisan order, organized for the purpose of uniting the farmers, who have heretofore been divided in opinion, without losing its non-partisan and liberal character? Our order recognized that the great cause of the depressed condition of the farming class is that heretofore (while our interests have ever been the same) we have been divided in the exercise of voting right. You now claim that while those solemn constitutional provisions above quoted are still in force, that the National Alliance can, by statutory enactment, as you are pleased to term it—passed at Ocala last December—declare that a member or an officer has no right to differ from the conclusion reached by a majority of the delegates in the National Alliance meeting. Do you think if this clause had been in our constitution when we organized our order that we could have secured one-tenth of the membership we have now? You seem to lay stress upon the fact of my publicly opposing the sub-Treasury bill. If this sub-Treasury scheme is right, the more fully, publicly and often it is discussed, the sooner it will be enacted into a law. If it is wrong, a full and free discussion will bring out its fallacies only the sooner and thereby enable us to cease advocating a wrong measure. I will never occur in your opinion that any public or general law should be enacted, or the people brought to advocate it, by dark lantern caucuses and discussions in secret societies composed of but one class of people. This I conceive to be in direct violation of the spirit of our government. Your desire to see men ostracized for opinion's sake, and to gag free discussion will not meet the approval of the people who love freedom of speech and the freest public discussions of public questions. I now desire to let the order know how "fairly, fully, honestly and thoroughly" the sub-Treasury bill was discussed at Ocala. The members of that National Alliance were limited to one speech of five minutes each in discussing the sub-Treasury bill—one speech of five minutes to discuss a measure which, if enacted into law, would change the whole financial system of our government since its foundation, and I claim bankrupt and destroy it. I make this statement to the end that I hope my Alliance brother farmers of the United States may know that the sub-Treasury bill was fastened upon this organization at Ocala by a gag law being applied to prevent its heresies being exposed. You say in your letter that I am fully prepared to hear this request for my resignation from you. In this you are entirely in error, for the following reasons: First, you knew my public, open and avowed hostility to this bill from the time of its first inception up to the time I was elected on that committee; secondly, on account of the cordial manner in which you commend the body for electing me to that position; third, another reason why I am surprised at your making such a request is the following one of the demands of the National Alliance adopted at our St. Louis meeting, in December, 1889: "Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special favors to none, we demand that legislation, neither State or National, shall be used to 'build up one industry' at the expense of another," and if this means anything it was intended as a direct thrust at the present protective tariff system; and Mr. C. W. Macune,

who was then chairman of the very committee you and I are now on, the national legislative committee, came out in his official capacity and denounced the tariff issue as being "a hoary breeder of sectional strife," and that the agitation of the tariff question was "a tariff dog fight in which the farmers felt no interest," and in almost every issue of the national official organ the farmers were warned to pay no heed or attention to the tariff question whatever; and when I again drew the tariff plank of our national demands at Ocala, we used the following language: "We demand the removal of the present heavy tariff tax from the necessities of life that the poor of our land must have," and demanding further "that the national government should cease to build up one industry by impoverishing the others," and yet since the adoption of that plank in our national demands, which is equally prominent with the sub-Treasury demands, this same man Macune, holding the two most powerful and important offices in the gift of our order, still continues to denounce the tariff question and say there is nothing in it. Why was it that you did not make it, to quote your own language, your "painful duty as President of the N. F. A. & I. U." to direct his attention to these matters which came to your constant knowledge? The answer is plain and on the surface: You feared Macune while he was holding, as he still holds, the position of editor of the national official organ and chairman of the national Executive committee, and Macune had his own reasons for sneering at the tariff dog of our order, which reasons are best known to him and his protective baron friends. The reason why Macune makes the sub-Treasury demand the most important one of our order is because it is the only demand upon which he can hope to form a Third party out of the farming class—knowing that the existing political parties or at least one of them will come to the reasonable demands of the farmers or that we can force them to come there by untaxed action on our part, and that no political party of any prominence would make the sub-Treasury bill a principle of its platform. This is a most important point that should be considered by the farmers of the United States. This order was created to bring about unity of action among the farmers who were divided so hopelessly by the late war, but you men in pushing this sub-Treasury scheme are dividing us more widely and hopelessly than the war ever did. The ambition of many of us was to build up this order as a great non-partisan balance wheel, to the end that the great conservative, agricultural classes of our country could hold in check the corruption of partisan politics, but you men are tearing it down, decimating our ranks, and bringing the order into disrespect and disrepute in the estimation of all good, patriotic citizens, and only bringing to our aid those men who desire to take office at any sacrifice of patriotic principles. I feel that it is my duty to write you thus plainly, hoping that you may yet see where you are drifting the order, and hoping that you may yet retain enough regard for the poor and oppressed of our land to aid us in calling our brother farmers out of the swamps of class legislation, paternalism and socialism, whither Macune and his henchmen have been sending them in search of that jack o'lantern class legislation paternalism, known as the sub-Treasury bill.

I desire to say that I have for you personally a most kindly feeling and that our relations have ever been of a pleasant character up to this affair, and that I believe you to be an honest man, who would have never been led into these extravagancies except through a pressure that was hard for any man to resist. I take pleasure in bearing witness to the further facts that you have entertained and expressed to me the same opinion of C. W. Macune and his dishonesty and corruption that I have had, saying, as you have often done, that you had no confidence in the man and would hold no communication with him except of an official character, and that communication to be in writing. As I was placed upon this committee by the national legislative council, and as I feel that it is my duty to guard, as far as it lies in my power, the rights and the interests of the farmers in this country, and that I have no right to consult my own personal feelings, and recognizing that you have no right to demand my resignation as a member of that committee, I refuse to tender it. Were I to consult my own personal feelings I would never have accepted a position upon that committee, and would now most gladly sever my connection with it. The salary of \$2,000 would be no inducement or have no weight with me in the premises, and while I suppose from what I have learned through others that the national Executive committee, of which C. W. Macune is chairman, will remove me from the position I now hold, yet I feel that it is my duty to allow them to act instead of aiding them and their scheme by acting myself in tendering my resignation. Very fraternally,

U. S. HALL, Pres. Farmers' and Laborers' of Mo.

er motives, tries to make a political party out of our order he subverts our constitution and gives the falsehood to the solemn declaration made by our organizers to the millions of members who took the solemn fraternal obligation of our order. I quote the clause of eligibility for membership for the purpose of showing that no one is debarred from becoming a member or officer of our order for opinion's sake. All that was necessary to join the Alliance was that the applicant be over sixteen years of age, a white person, believing in a Supreme Being and was a farmer, farm laborer, etc. Do we find in that constitution any clause that says if a man does not believe in the sub-Treasury scheme he shall not be eligible either as a member or an officer of our order? Not one word of it, and why? Because this order in its infancy and purity, before it was used as it now is, by designing politicians and corrupt men, to subvert their ambitious and mercenary ends, was for the purpose as set forth in the constitution above quoted, to bring about a more perfect union of said farming classes, and no man was debarred from membership or from holding office in our order on account of any opinion that he might hold upon any political question, which means questions pertaining to National and State legislation. This is the dividing line, and the only one of moment between partisan and non-partisan bodies. If a man is a Republican he will not be permitted to take the stump and denounce the system of the high protective tariff without being read out of his party; if a Democrat he will not be allowed to denounce a reduction of the protective tariff without being subject to like treatment. Then can any sane man claim that freedom of speech and thought can be dispensed with in a strictly non-partisan order, organized for the purpose of uniting the farmers, who have heretofore been divided in opinion, without losing its non-partisan and liberal character? Our order recognized that the great cause of the depressed condition of the farming class is that heretofore (while our interests have ever been the same) we have been divided in the exercise of voting right. You now claim that while those solemn constitutional provisions above quoted are still in force, that the National Alliance can, by statutory enactment, as you are pleased to term it—passed at Ocala last December—declare that a member or an officer has no right to differ from the conclusion reached by a majority of the delegates in the National Alliance meeting. Do you think if this clause had been in our constitution when we organized our order that we could have secured one-tenth of the membership we have now? You seem to lay stress upon the fact of my publicly opposing the sub-Treasury bill. If this sub-Treasury scheme is right, the more fully, publicly and often it is discussed, the sooner it will be enacted into a law. If it is wrong, a full and free discussion will bring out its fallacies only the sooner and thereby enable us to cease advocating a wrong measure. I will never occur in your opinion that any public or general law should be enacted, or the people brought to advocate it, by dark lantern caucuses and discussions in secret societies composed of but one class of people. This I conceive to be in direct violation of the spirit of our government. Your desire to see men ostracized for opinion's sake, and to gag free discussion will not meet the approval of the people who love freedom of speech and the freest public discussions of public questions. I now desire to let the order know how "fairly, fully, honestly and thoroughly" the sub-Treasury bill was discussed at Ocala. The members of that National Alliance were limited to one speech of five minutes each in discussing the sub-Treasury bill—one speech of five minutes to discuss a measure which, if enacted into law, would change the whole financial system of our government since its foundation, and I claim bankrupt and destroy it. I make this statement to the end that I hope my Alliance brother farmers of the United States may know that the sub-Treasury bill was fastened upon this organization at Ocala by a gag law being applied to prevent its heresies being exposed. You say in your letter that I am fully prepared to hear this request for my resignation from you. In this you are entirely in error, for the following reasons: First, you knew my public, open and avowed hostility to this bill from the time of its first inception up to the time I was elected on that committee; secondly, on account of the cordial manner in which you commend the body for electing me to that position; third, another reason why I am surprised at your making such a request is the following one of the demands of the National Alliance adopted at our St. Louis meeting, in December, 1889: "Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special favors to none, we demand that legislation, neither State or National, shall be used to 'build up one industry' at the expense of another," and if this means anything it was intended as a direct thrust at the present protective tariff system; and Mr. C. W. Macune,

who was then chairman of the very committee you and I are now on, the national legislative committee, came out in his official capacity and denounced the tariff issue as being "a hoary breeder of sectional strife," and that the agitation of the tariff question was "a tariff dog fight in which the farmers felt no interest," and in almost every issue of the national official organ the farmers were warned to pay no heed or attention to the tariff question whatever; and when I again drew the tariff plank of our national demands at Ocala, we used the following language: "We demand the removal of the present heavy tariff tax from the necessities of life that the poor of our land must have," and demanding further "that the national government should cease to build up one industry by impoverishing the others," and yet since the adoption of that plank in our national demands, which is equally prominent with the sub-Treasury demands, this same man Macune, holding the two most powerful and important offices in the gift of our order, still continues to denounce the tariff question and say there is nothing in it. Why was it that you did not make it, to quote your own language, your "painful duty as President of the N. F. A. & I. U." to direct his attention to these matters which came to your constant knowledge? The answer is plain and on the surface: You feared Macune while he was holding, as he still holds, the position of editor of the national official organ and chairman of the national Executive committee, and Macune had his own reasons for sneering at the tariff dog of our order, which reasons are best known to him and his protective baron friends. The reason why Macune makes the sub-Treasury demand the most important one of our order is because it is the only demand upon which he can hope to form a Third party out of the farming class—knowing that the existing political parties or at least one of them will come to the reasonable demands of the farmers or that we can force them to come there by untaxed action on our part, and that no political party of any prominence would make the sub-Treasury bill a principle of its platform. This is a most important point that should be considered by the farmers of the United States. This order was created to bring about unity of action among the farmers who were divided so hopelessly by the late war, but you men in pushing this sub-Treasury scheme are dividing us more widely and hopelessly than the war ever did. The ambition of many of us was to build up this order as a great non-partisan balance wheel, to the end that the great conservative, agricultural classes of our country could hold in check the corruption of partisan politics, but you men are tearing it down, decimating our ranks, and bringing the order into disrespect and disrepute in the estimation of all good, patriotic citizens, and only bringing to our aid those men who desire to take office at any sacrifice of patriotic principles. I feel that it is my duty to write you thus plainly, hoping that you may yet see where you are drifting the order, and hoping that you may yet retain enough regard for the poor and oppressed of our land to aid us in calling our brother farmers out of the swamps of class legislation, paternalism and socialism, whither Macune and his henchmen have been sending them in search of that jack o'lantern class legislation paternalism, known as the sub-Treasury bill.

I desire to say that I have for you personally a most kindly feeling and that our relations have ever been of a pleasant character up to this affair, and that I believe you to be an honest man, who would have never been led into these extravagancies except through a pressure that was hard for any man to resist. I take pleasure in bearing witness to the further facts that you have entertained and expressed to me the same opinion of C. W. Macune and his dishonesty and corruption that I have had, saying, as you have often done, that you had no confidence in the man and would hold no communication with him except of an official character, and that communication to be in writing. As I was placed upon this committee by the national legislative council, and as I feel that it is my duty to guard, as far as it lies in my power, the rights and the interests of the farmers in this country, and that I have no right to consult my own personal feelings, and recognizing that you have no right to demand my resignation as a member of that committee, I refuse to tender it. Were I to consult my own personal feelings I would never have accepted a position upon that committee, and would now most gladly sever my connection with it. The salary of \$2,000 would be no inducement or have no weight with me in the premises, and while I suppose from what I have learned through others that the national Executive committee, of which C. W. Macune is chairman, will remove me from the position I now hold, yet I feel that it is my duty to allow them to act instead of aiding them and their scheme by acting myself in tendering my resignation. Very fraternally,

U. S. HALL, Pres. Farmers' and Laborers' of Mo.

T. H. DEAL, M. DEAL, Lenoir, N. C. Cedar Valley, N. C.

DEAL & DEAL

Lenoir, N. C.

NEW GOODS.

The best line of goods we have ever carried. We have come to stay, and we want our customers to know that they don't get left when they buy their goods from us, for in this we are in accord with the Alliance, live and let live.

We have over \$1,000 invested in clothing and will sell you a pair of pants for

75c, 1.00, 1.25, 2.00 and up to 5.00 each, suits that are worth 5.00, we knock down to \$2.50, we have suits worth 6.00, 8.00, 10.00, 12.00, 14.00, 16.00, when you want clothing don't forget that we will sell them to you for less money you ever bought. Calicoes 4c, 5c, 6c, 7c, per yd. Worsteds 10c, 12c, 14c, 16c, per yd. Flannel dress goods 25c, 30c, 40c, per yd. This is a complete line of cotton and woolen goods—want, ladies the shoes 1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 2.00, 2.50, 3.00, pair, heavy shoes 1.00, pair, men's shoes congress or lace 1.25, 1.50, 2.00, 3.00, hand sewed shoes 4.00, pair, brogans 1.00, 1.25, 1.50, buy 'em. Hats for everybody 25c, up to \$3.00, don't think of giving barehead when you can buy hats so cheap.

All kinds of Notions—Special line of goods that Jerry Simpson don't wear.

We have a few Plows for the least money anywhere.

We keep on hand at all times—bacon, flour, lard, coffee, sugar, canvassed hams—anything you want in the grocery line.

We want your produce at the highest market price, but will give you special prices for cash.

Thanking our patrons for past favors, and will merit a continuance of same by giving you bargains,

We are your friends,

Deal & Deal.

DAVENPORT FEMALE COLLEGE

Lenoir, N. C.

Fall term begins Sept. 10th.

Best Climate Easy of Access. Moral and Refining Influence. Home Comforts.

Scholarly Faculty, Thorough Instruction, Practical courses of study, Special advantages in

Music, Art, Elocution, &c. Superior opportunities for those preparing to teach.

Expenses moderate Free Scholarships. Send for Catalogue.

John D. Minick, A. M., Pres.

B. A. NEWLAND

THE EMIGRANTS FRIEND

Going West or Northwest

Take the Chicago & Alton R. R.

Parties contemplating going West will save time and money going via the Alton route. It is the only line running solid vestibuled trains between St. Louis and Kansas City make direct connection for all points in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, California, Oregon, Washington and Redding chair cars and Tourist Sleepers free of extra charge. For low rates and full information maps and discussion pamphlets of the

West apply to J. CHARLTON, B. A. NEWLAND, G. P. A. Iron Pass Agent, Chicago, Ill. Asheville, N. C.