

# The Carolina Watchman.

VOL. 11--FOURTH SERIES.

SALISBURY, N. C. THURSDAY JULY 19, 1894.

NO. 20.

## What is

# CASTORIA

Castoria is Dr. Samuel Pitcher's prescription for Infants and Children. It contains neither Opium, Morphine nor other Narcotic substance. It is a harmless substitute for Paregoric, Drops, Soothing Syrups, and Castor Oil. It is Pleasant. Its guarantee is thirty years' use by Millions of Mothers. Castoria is the Children's Panacea—the Mother's Friend.

### Castoria.

### Castoria.

"Castoria is so well adapted to children that I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me." H. A. ACHESON, M. D., 111 So. Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Castoria cures Colic, Constipation, Sour Stomach, Diarrhoea, Eructation, Kills Worms, gives sleep, and promotes digestion. Without injurious medication.

"The use of 'Castoria' is so universal and its merits so well known that it seems a work of supererogation to endorse it. Few are the intelligent families who do not keep Castoria within easy reach."

"For several years I have recommended your 'Castoria,' and shall always continue to do so as it has invariably produced beneficial results."

CARLOS MARTINI, D. D., New York City.

EDWIN F. PARSONS, M. D., 126th Street and 7th Ave., New York City.

THE CENTAUR COMPANY, 57 MURRAY STREET, NEW YORK CITY

## Washington Letter.

Correspondence of the Watchman.

Washington, D. C., July 17, 1894. President Cleveland and his cabinet are almost swamped with telegrams from every section of the country congratulating them on the courage and promptness with which they have brought order out of chaos and prevented what at one time looked like it might be a revolution, and volunteering aid to any imaginable extent, in both men and money. The President and his advisers believe that worst is over, but they none the less feel proud of the confidence reposed in them by Congress and the people and will continue their efforts to deserve that confidence.

It is Speaker Richardson, now, if you please, Representative Richardson, of Tenn., having been elected Speaker pro. tem. of the House during the absence of Speaker Crisp, who has been called to Georgia by the serious illness of his brother.

The democrats of the tariff conference committee have held daily meetings this week, and the air is full of rumors each contradictory of the other as to what they have done. These rumors are nothing more than guesses as members of the conference will have nothing to say until they report to their respective Houses.

Had the situation not been entirely too grave, and important to be laughed at the silly talk of Messrs. Hayes, McGuire and French, members of the Executive committee of the Knights of Labor, who are in Washington this week, about beginning impeachment proceedings against Attorney General Olney because of the arrest of Debs, would have been regarded as a good joke. As it is it merely gave the intelligent public an opportunity to gauge the caliber of the men who control a once powerful and influential organization.

Senator Daniel, of Virginia, in addition to being a states' rights democrat of the staunchest sort is known among lawyers as an authority upon Constitutional law. His resolution (offered as a substitute to the semi-anarchist resolution offered by Senator Peffer, of Kans., and supported by the populist Senator in one of the most outrageous speeches ever made in the Senate in which the abolition of Congress and the transfer of authority to a committee composed of one member from each State was advocated), endorsing President Cleveland and his administration for the prompt and vigorous measures taken to repress and repress by military force the interference of lawless men with the due process of the laws of the U. S. and with commerce among the States" and declaring that "the action of the President and his administration has the full sympathy and support of the law abiding masses of the people of the U. S., and will be supported by all departments of the government and by the power and resources of the entire nation," would have been immediately

adopted by a nearly unanimous vote of the Senate as it was the next day only Peffer voting against it—had not Senator Gallinger, of N. H., for some unexplained reason caused it to go over a day under the rules by objecting to a vote thereon and refusing to withdraw the objection although he was begged to do so by his republican colleagues. Speaking of the situation Senator Daniel said: "I am a states rights democrat, and would be the last man to stand idly by and see the authority of the state encroached upon, but I fail to see anything here that encroaches upon the authority of the State of Illinois in any way. The President is acting entirely within the lines of the constitution, and his action is to be commended by all law abiding citizens, regardless of their political predilection or partisan feeling.

This is the way the situation looks to Senator Davis, of Minn., the Republican whose raking down of Peffer will not soon be forgotten: "I have looked into this matter as a lawyer, and my judgment is that the President has gone about this business as a lawyer. He has considered his ground, become acquainted with his authority and then gone in to exercise them in a righteous cause and for the good of the general public. He has not exceeded his authority one whit; on the contrary, he has not as yet exhausted it. If the federal troops are not sufficient for this emergency the state militia is at his command. The President can swear the militia of the various states into the service of the United States, and then send them to Chicago or any other point where their mobilization may become necessary. The constitution is broad enough in this case, and the President is entrenched upon it."

### Two Sides to the Strike.

It ought to be written upon the door of every American home—

1. That every man shall have the right to work when it pleases him to do so.
2. That every man shall have the right to quit work when he so elects to do.

The State Governments should give speedy protection to these two classes when their rights are invaded.

More than twenty years ago we saw on Fayetteville street, Raleigh, a gang of negro masons who had quit work—had struck—intimidate and forcibly prevent another set of negro masons from taking the vacated places. This was a great outrage, and every fellow ought to have been severely punished for this high-handed act if the laws of the State are for such crimes against human rights and liberty. We never heard that the black bull-dozers were ever punished.

Intimidating, threatening, maiming, killing workmen for working must be stopped in this land of the free and of equal laws, at least in theory.

Gen. Gordon, of Georgia, who is Commander-in-chief of the Confeder-

ate Veterans, in a recent interview, gave this sound opinion.

"My sympathy is and always has been strongly enlisted for the laboring classes. They have as much right to organize for their protection and improvement as capital has for its protection and interest, but mob law, mob rule and mob violence cannot be tolerated in this country. It must be put down at any cost, or the Government cannot last."

There the distinction is drawn well and soundly. Let all trades organize for it is their right to do this; but let them never organize for outrage, for oppression, for turbulence, for anarchy. There is a wide, deep gulf between these.

Suppose the picture is reversed. Let the other side be represented. Suppose all the rich men in the North should combine to force laborers to work for them at their own prices; suppose them to hire mercenary soldiers to back them with ball and bayonet to compel the toilers to serve them in their various mills and manufactories. Would not every man see at once the enormity of such an offense—the oppression and wrong of such a demonstration of money—the outrage upon humanity and the very name of citizenship and a free country? Would not the States all take a hand in such devilry and put down an attempt at tyranny, such an infraction of law? Of course they would, and the men of sense and character everywhere would unite in condemnation of the iniquity.

If labor combines by boycott or any other improper process to compel capital to employ them at their own terms is it right? Has capital no rights in our country? Is not sauce for the goose also sauce for the gander? Can it be any more right, any more just, any more more legal, any more humane and considerate for labor to combine to oppress and ruin labor? Look at it, fellow countrymen, and see whether we are tending. Be just and fear God.

The Workingmen's Political Club of Jacksonville telegraph Dictator Debs, who lost his head—his senses—in the turmoil, that they sympathize with him in trying to better the condition of the strikers, but censured the burning, etc. They, however, exonerated Debs and his aiders and abettors from all responsibility in the burning. Would all this racket and wild destruction of property and immense loss to the country by stopping the channels of business have occurred if this Dictator had not undertaken a greater job than he could complete? His methods were unsound and he failed.

This country is a Government strictly of law. When the laws are violated they must be enforced against all offenders.

It is not commendable, perhaps, in the Pullman company to refuse all measures of peace proposed because they see the United States Government enforcing law with armed soldiery. A more generous spirit would no doubt contribute to healing the wounds, restoring confidence and securing for them more of the respect and sympathy of the country.

Debs playing the part of Sovereign came very near precipitating a very bloody conflict. When he talked glibly of a revolution he showed his incapacity for the place he holds and brought himself within the purview of law as a dangerous enemy and stirrer up of strife. After the noise and turbulence have quieted down you will see a movement probably to make a radical change in the requirements of American citizenship. Every native born American has to live here for twenty-one years before he is deemed qualified to exercise safely the right of elective franchise. Can a Turk or Italian or Hungarian or Pole land here, coming directly from a land of bayonets and in a few months so learn the great principles of a free government, and be so enlightened as to understand the vast responsibilities of self-government as to be qualified to help make laws for the natives, who had to go to school for twenty-one years before being invested with such responsibility and power? There will be also changes, we doubt not, as to who may come from foreign lands. Probably no one will be allowed to come who does not come properly accredited either from his own government or the American Ambassador in that country.—Wilmington Messenger.

### President Acts Under Law.

So far as we know ex-President Harrison is correct in saying that never before in the history of our country has the President ordered Federal troops into a State without request of the Governor of such State and over his protest. It is to be hoped that this will never occur again. It all comes from the grave mistake made by the framers of the Constitution in giving the carrying of the private correspondence of a free people to the Federal government. There will be great danger found right there whenever the man on horseback comes riding in the middle of the road, as he will come, we do not doubt soon or late. This Republic is but little 100 years old and we see what has been done. When the government was invested with the power over the mails it carried with it power to enable it to make good its undertaking.

Mr. Harrison does not question the President's right to do as he has done. He could not so question. In 1871, a Republican Congress enacted a law that invested the President with power to do as he has done. It was enacted 20th of April, 1871, (see section 5,297.) On 29th of July, 1891, another section, (5,298) was passed, Democrats helping to do it, clothing the President with the amplest power. The former section provides that "whenever, by reason of unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages of persons, or rebellion against the authority of the government of the United States, it shall become impracticable, in the judgment of the President, to enforce, by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the laws of the United States within any State or Territory, it shall be lawful for the President to call forth the militia of any or all the States, and to employ such parts of the land and naval forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, or to suppress such rebellion, in whatever State or Territory thereof of the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed, or the execution thereof forcibly obstructed."

The section of 1891 provided that "whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any State so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such State are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such State of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled the Constitution of the United States," then the President may lawfully intervene, "and it shall be his duty, to take such measures by the employment of the militia or the employment of the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence or combinations."

So the Congress has given all power to the President to go into the States with the army and in the face of State protest and act as above indicated. President Cleveland acted under the law, and deserves just that much of praise and no more than attaches to an official when he discharges his "duty," for the law above makes it "his duty" to use the army, if the occasion demands. This is certainly a striking exemplification of the steady trend in the legislation of our country towards centralized power. The President has both power and obligation to do as he has done. No one can censure him for doing his duty.

If the laws are bad and dangerous and savor of a strong government, and are inimical to States sovereignty, they ought to be wiped out when the country and men see things in the white light of truth and safety.

That our readers may see how these laws are regarded as a triumph of the Strong Government idea we quote from a leading New York paper, the Reader. It says:

"It is the largest and broadest assertion of the supremacy of the federal government and laws over every inch of territory in the United States, regardless of State lines,

that has been made since the war.

"It is right, because it puts the authoritative foot of a great precedent firmly down in a new field of labor controversy and contention, and declares once more the glorious old doctrine of Lincoln and Grant and the Republican party—'This is a nation.'"

"And that is why it is all the better that it is done by a Democratic administration."

How any sane, sensible, informed American can favor the diminution of State power and the increase of Federal power is beyond us. We hold and believe that the perpetuity of free institutions, the conservation of personal liberty depend upon the unyielding maintenance of State Sovereignty. While Ireland is fighting bravely for local self-government the States of the American Union are surrendering that fundamental principle and chief safe-guard to the all-grasping power of the Federal Creature, set up and formed and made a power by themselves. Beware of the trend to Centralization.—Wilmington Messenger.

### The Righteous Tax.

It is class legislation to make every body with an income of \$4,000 pay on it? If so, then New York, North Carolina and other States are guilty of class legislation for they levy a tax on incomes, and North Carolina upon incomes above \$1,000. As to its being inquisitorial, it is not more so than all other taxes. The truth is men opposing with such bald arguments are hard up. We notice people in New York are writing about the infamous dodges perpetrated in that State by the rich who pay scarcely upon one-fourth they have.

The income tax is just, righteous, fair and necessary. The country needs every dollar of it, and no man will pay upon what he has not got. Mark that. A New York man writes to the World:

"If it were left to me to decide on an income tax I would make it as follows: On incomes from \$5,000 to \$10,000, 1 per cent.; \$10,000 to \$20,000, 2 per cent.; \$20,000 to \$30,000, 3 per cent.; \$30,000 to \$40,000, 4 per cent.; \$40,000 to \$50,000, 5 per cent.; \$50,000 to \$100,000, 10 per cent.; \$100,000 to \$200,000, 20 per cent.; on all over \$200,000, 25 per cent."

Why begin at \$5,000? Senator Vest proposes to begin at \$3,000. That is certainly not too low. A poor man must pay upon his little home with \$300. Why shall not a man pay on \$3,000 of money received upon investments? The World stands bravely by an income tax, but unwisely insists upon starting with \$5,000.

Another New Yorker says in the World, over his own signature:

"If the Lexow committee will investigate the assessments of our trusts and corporations it will discover the source of the corruption of funds used by Tammany in its election campaigns. Assessing the rich at a low valuation and the poor or middle class at a high valuation has more to do with making the rich richer and the poorer than any other single cause."

Unequal taxation is unjust taxation. Under the McKinley law low grade goods are taxed very much higher than fine goods. That puts the heavy tax on the laboring class and the light tax on the rich. Above we see this vile rule obtains in the New York State taxes. It is wrong, it is iniquitous. The rich should willingly pay upon their riches. The poor are forced to pay upon their poverty. The poor will gladly pay a big tax on the wealth if it is handed over to them. The World is exactly right in saying this:

"The hardship is in not having an income large enough to tax—not in paying a trifle upon super-abundance."

The real victims of class legislation ever since the close of the war have been the great mass of poor people, who are taxed in their poverty upon their necessities.

During the war there was created a vast and intricate system of taxation which of necessity took tribute from everybody.

When the war ended one after another of the taxes on wealth and luxury were repealed. \* † The revenue duties on tea and coffee were removed, but beyond this no relief was given to the poor. Indeed the tariff taxes were raised repeatedly and steadily until the McKinley

Highest of all in Leavening Power.—Latest U. S. Gov't Report.

# Royal Baking Powder

ABSOLUTELY PURE

bill exceeded the average of the highest war tariff.

The whole burden of national taxation rests upon consumption. And as the amount of necessities required to sustain existence is nearly the same for poor and rich, the result is a great inequality of taxation. Men pay not according to their ability to pay, or to the benefits which they receive from the Government, but by an arbitrary process that oppresses the many for the advantage of the few."

We believe every syllable of that statement to be true. In 1870, the able Senator Sherman was strong for an income tax, as we have many times shown from his speech, he holding it was the one, safe way of "equalizing the burdens between the rich and the poor." What was true in 1870 is surely true in 1894, for the burdens are far more unequal now than they were then. Sherman said on the 22d of June 1870:

"Here we have in New York Mr. Astor with an income of millions derived from real estate, accumulated year after year by the mere family pride of accumulation, and we have alongside of him a poor man receiving \$1,000 a year. What is the discrimination of the law in that case? It is altogether against the poor man. \* \* \* Everything that he consumes we tax, and yet we are afraid to touch the income of Mr. Astor. Is there any justice in it?"

Under the sun there is no tax as just, sensible and righteous as an income tax.—Messenger.

### Marriage in the United States.

In the current number of The Forum Mr. Carroll D. Wright, Superintendent of the Census, gives a review of the statistics of marriage in the United States. To "the Record" the facts which Mr. Wright presents concerning the excess of men (married and single) over women in Pennsylvania and in other parts of the country are not surprising. It appears from these statistics that there are 377,000 more married men than married women in the United States. Mr. Wright explains this phenomenon by saying that many of the married immigrants send afterward for their wives. This is true to a certain extent; but very many of the immigrants in Western Pennsylvania who have come from Southeastern Europe have no intention of sending for their wives and families; their intention is to return themselves, after having saved a few hundred dollars. These men are succeeded by fresh re-als of married immigrants, whose wives, would be an incumbrance and an expense. In the social economy of these people one woman can cook, wash and keep house for a number of them; and this saves them the expense of maintaining separate families during their stay of a few years at the mines and iron mills. Out of this arises a condition of polyandry.

These statistics also show that in the United States there are almost three times as many widows as widowers. From this it is evident that the fears of the maidens concerning the successful competition of widows in the matrimonial market have no foundation in social facts. It is seen that the widowers marry more frequently than the widows. The same ratio holds in regard to divorced women and men who have not resumed the married relation amounting respectively to 72,000 and 49,000. Divorced men appear less disposed than women to profit by their untoward marital experience.

There is a larger percentage of married persons in the United States than in any other land, although there are, or were in 1890, a million and a half more males than females in the country. In all the countries of Europe the female sex predominates in numbers. The excess of females in some sections of Southern Europe extent the excess of males in the mining and iron manufacturing regions of this country.

Superintendent Wright observes

that since the census of 1880 the number of men who have not entered the married relation is considerably less than the number of eligible maidens. He finds that modern industrial development has exercised an influence in diminishing the number of marriages. In proof of this he points to the fact that the percentage of unmarried persons is much greater in the East and in the large cities than in the rural districts. In the farming regions marriages are most frequent where the Germans and Scandinavians have settled in large numbers. The divorces are not nearly so numerous as has been generally imagined. The number of divorced persons does not amount to more than one-fifth of one percent. of the whole population of the United States, or to not more than a half of one per cent. of the married inhabitants. In the West divorces are most frequent; and they are least frequent in the South.—Philadelphia Record.

### The Government at Washington.

The government at Washington lives, and the people of the United States are behind it, sixty odd millions of them. Anarchists and fools not reckoned. The representative and executive of the nation's authority, majesty and power is President Cleveland. He stands at this moment for all that loyal Americans live for, hope for, are. That he stands firm to his obvious duty no man can now doubt. The administration is doing its duty with respect to the people, and the people must do their duty with respect to the administration. The color of a citizen's political opinions is of no more consequence at such a time than the color of his eyes or hair. As a citizen, as an American, he owes first of all his unqualified, unquestioning, unlimited support to the chosen man who took into his hands on March 4th, 1893, the responsibility for the administration of the nation's laws, and swore then to turn the Government over to his successor as he found it.

Whatever may be the immediate turn of events, President Cleveland and his Cabinet advisers confront a crisis in the nation's history. For or why that crisis has arisen is not the question. How it shall be met is the matter that concerns the sixty odd millions behind the President and the Government at Washington. In half a dozen States of the Union to-day men occupy the Governor's chair who are no more fit to be there than Debs or Johann Most. The United States Constitution guarantees to the citizens of every State the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States. It guarantees to every State a republican form of government. One of the privileges of American citizenship is to live under law, not Anarchy. One of the immunities of American citizenship is immunity from lawless violence. A republican form of government in any State is not government administered by a coward, an Anarchist, or a Governor in sympathy with Anarchy and its objects. Questions of jurisdiction and verbal conflicts of Federal with State authority are bound to arise in any great public emergency involving the exercise of both Federal and State authority. They are technically interesting, as they were in the early months of 1861.

There is ample power in the Government at Washington, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, to preserve the institutions of this country against mob, insurrection or rebellion. The power is not that of any one man, or of any small council of men; it is the might of a great and indestructible nation. We believe that it will be exercised, as it should be exercised, to any extent that may become necessary, with humane prudence and moderation as far as possible, but in any case with unyielding firmness and unremitting vigor. The President's proclamation is a draft at sight upon the loyalty and patriotic support of every loyal and patriotic American. In continuing to perform the perfectly plain duty now thrust upon him as the nation's Chief Magistrate, President Cleveland should have something more than the half acquiescent, half critical countenance which approves the main purpose but watches sharp for minor breaks and mistakes. He should have just that sort of support which we all owe to the flag when it is held up as a signal for Americans to rally to it.—New York Sq.

The Watchman Job Office does turns out first class work.