



VOL. XV.

## THE WEEKLY STAR.

WILMINGTON, N. C., FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1884.

NO. 22

(Entered at the Post Office at Wilmington, N. C., as Second Class Mail.)

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE.

The subscription price of the WEEKLY STAR is as follows:  
Single Copy 1 year postage paid... \$1.50  
6 months... " " " 1.00  
3 months... " " " .50

THE FOOTSTEPS OF CONSOLIDATION.

Senator Blair said in his speech on the Federal education bill that it was the most important one that had been before the Congress since the war. It is certainly a very important bill and it is a dangerous bill. We would rather see every negro in the South go forever illiterate than to have the Federal Government controlling in any degree the public schools of the States. Illiteracy may be bad, but a strong government is much worse. It has never been yet established.

First, that the illiterate whites in the South before the war were not as peaceable, law-abiding citizens as the educated whites in the North.

Second, it has never been established that the education of the mind was either a preventive or a cure for crime. Statistics show that there is a great deal more crime among the whites in the North than among the whites in the South. The Northern penitentiaries are filled with educated scoundrels.

We have already shown in previous articles how damaging it would be for the States to rely on the Pater-nal Government to do for them what they can better do for themselves. We have protested against turning the Federal Government into an Universal Relief Association, or allowing it to enter upon a general Pedagogic business in the States.

We propose now to consider two points. First, the danger that lurks in the project. It is an invasion of State Rights. The best of Republicans, with very few exceptions, have no respect for State Rights. They ridicule the idea that the Constitution guarantees any such rights. They do not seem either to have read that instrument, or if they have read it to have understood its scope and meaning. Where will you find among the Republican lawyers a man who stands up in earnest advocacy of maintaining both the spirit and letter of the Constitution? Senator Blair, of Connecticut, born in the South, seems to be the only exception. When do you ever hear him or any other eminent lawyer of that party insisting upon the maintenance of Constitutional law and that the Congress shall not exercise or claim to exercise any powers not specifically granted in the Constitution?

The Democratic party has the glory of having faithfully urged that the Constitution shall be preserved intact and that the rights and powers of the Federal Government shall not extend beyond what is specifically stated in the great charter of our liberties.

The Republicans, through their newspapers and speakers, make the rights reserved to the States under the Constitution, the subject of jibe and flippant rebuke. They refer to this greatest of all principles as the "State Rights spook." Even so able an exponent of Republican principles as the New York Times favors the Pedagogic business on the part of the Pater-nal Government, and even wishes the bill before the Senate to be extended so as to give the Pater-nal Government a certain control in some particulars in managing matters in the States. It says, and you may put your own construction as to the significance of the claim:

"The country which supplies the money has a right to ask that the education which it pays for shall be the best attainable in kind, and to insist that the direction in which it will do the most good, as far as it can. \* \* \* It could be accomplished by confining a certain proportion of the appropriation to the payment of the salaries of primary teachers, and by requiring that these salaries should be derived from authorities determined in the bill. These authorities would naturally be named in great part by the States, but they should be associated with others to be provided by the Federal Government. Provision might also be made for normal schools in the States, and these should be liberally aided in those States where the Federal money is most largely needed and given, and where such schools are approved on inspection, by competent officers to be provided by the Federal Government."

The Times knows that this is in the direction of centralization and tends to break down the authority of sovereign Commonwealths, for it adds that States thus regarding it may avoid the evil consequences by "declining the money." We hope that no Southern State will ever ac-

cept a penny with any such conditions attached. We hope that the scheme of Northern men to destroy the State Right's idea under the plea of a war upon illiteracy will never be sanctioned by any man in the South who regards a Constitutional Government and holds that the States have rights they have never surrendered.

The United States Senate, that ought to be very jealous if all invasion of the prerogatives and rights of the States, has by a vote of 29 to 14 decided that it is the business of the Federal Government to set up a great National Sanitarium for the treatment of cattle with sore mouths and lame feet. It is now proposed to enlarge the sphere of operations of the Federal Government, and thus give it still greater power, and of a centralized sort, by setting it up to do a regular Pedagogic business for the people in the States.

If these things do not show the tendency in the North to a grand centralized Government and the consequent destruction of local self-government then we confess our ignorance and blindness. Both of those very able Englishmen, historian Freeman and philosopher Herbert Spencer, discerned the true safety that threatens so seriously our safety and perpetuity and pointed it out. The danger is in a centralized power and in breaking down the local self-government of the States. But Republicans in the North can not see this. They have been smitten with political blindness and they grope their way surrounded with the very blackness of darkness. We must reverse the second point for another time. We wish to show that the Congress has no constitutional authority to make the provision against illiteracy by taxing the people and distributing the amount thus raised among the States.

## SUGAR AND REBUDOM.

The Statesville American did the clever thing in copying what the STAR said in correcting an error into which our contemporary had fallen. It comments at large upon what it conceives to be the inconsistencies of this paper. As long as we are satisfied with our own position in the matter of the Tariff and cannot perceive the inconsistencies referred to we are content. Whatever else the STAR may be, it is not in favor of the present High War Tariff. It would cut it down, and keep cutting it down from year to year and as rapidly as the business interests would allow until it was a Tariff for Revenue only and strictly. That is to say, a Republican Supreme Court of the United States having decided that no other kind of Tariff is Constitutional, we would favor that kind and not one for Protection with incidental Revenue.

In the mean time the STAR is for reducing the tax on all necessities and keeping the tax on all luxuries. There is no chance of misunderstanding that position. We would cut down the tax on shoes, hats, iron, sugar and so on. We would keep the tax on silks, satins, velvets, diamonds, wines, spirits, beer, cigars, tobacco, cigarettes, snuff, &c. That is the sort of political economist we are.

When Northern manufacturers that have been bountied for more than twenty years are so willing to reduce the surplus by striking out \$46,000,000 of the tax raised on sugar—a Southern product—whilst keeping the tax on all Northern products, we say not so fast. Your generosity is overwhelming. You are about to ruin yourselves. You are swift to help the country but at the expense of your Southern neighbors. You do not propose to lower one cent the high tax on iron, steel, wool and woollens, shoes, hats, &c., but you do propose to take off the entire tax that is levied upon sugar. You are very cunning. You mode of reducing the surplus smacks of real dishonesty. It is selfishness run mad. You do not care a cent for the country but only for yourselves. This is seen in the fact that nearly every dollar of the \$46,000,000 collected on foreign sugars goes directly into the United States Treasury. This can not be said of any Northern industry that is heavily protected by a bounty. We believe that not more than one-third of the tax collected on them ever goes into the Treasury to help run the Government.

So we say let the tax on all articles be reduced, and not abolished. Reduce the tax on blankets, hats, on window glass, on low grades of crockery, on knives and forks, on cotton ties, on machinery, on spool thread, on medicines, on trace chains, on sashes, on cottons and flannels, on sugar, on every thing into which wool and iron and cotton enter. Reduce is the word. But do not stop here, but go farther. After reducing the heavy tax on all necessities under the Tariff, then if there is still too much tax raised and consequently too much revenue, then cut down

the tax on tobacco first, and if necessary reduce the tax on other articles under the Internal Revenue.

That is the way we would act if in our power. We believe in giving the laboring men a chance in the matter of taxation.

The American attributes a wrong motive to the STAR when it accuses us of sectionalism in the matter of taxation. If it knew us better it would not suppose us capable of so mixing questions. In political economy we know no section. But when we see Northern manufacturers so overwhelmingly generous to them selves at the expense of Southern planters, we say that this is sectionalism and not to be tolerated. It is not the STAR but the Northern manufacturer who is sectional and selfish.

We discuss political economy upon its merits and not as applied to a particular section. The principles of political economy should be applied equally and fairly. We would feed all sections out of the same spoon.

We would not violate for any the axioms of political economists that it is wrong to make sixteen men pay for the enrichment of the seventeenth. The STAR stands unwaveringly by Tariff Reform. If the Democrats should reform the traditions and deliverances of the party on the Tariff and should declare for a policy that ignores the past and should thus stultify itself before the country it will not be done by our consent or connivance.

We believe that the present Tariff is a stupendous outrage. We believe that it is all that it was pronounced to be in 1876, when Tilden was elected. We believe it to be oppressive, unjust, unequal, unscientific, and immoral, and that it injures the country and violates the rights of free-men. It wrongs the farmers and builds up giant monopoly. It enriches the few at the expense of the many.

## THE HOTEL PROJECT.

We are not in despair about the new and elegant hotel for Wilmington. If one is built we hope it will be a large and fine one. It must be one that would do credit to Baltimore, or New Orleans, or Atlanta, or Louisville. We are satisfied that it ought to cost complete at least \$250,000. Mark you, we are not looking to the present only. What will do for Wilmington in 1884 or 1885 will do for Wilmington in 1890, for we expect to grow. With a new hotel of the right sort there will be an impulse given to the industries and commerce such as has not been experienced heretofore. Wilmington will then increase in inhabitants in a ratio that has not marked its growth in the past. Instead of increasing 300 or 400 annually it will probably increase 1,000 or more. We must look to the future. A hotel that will do for Wilmington with 20,000 will not answer when it has 40,000 inhabitants and when Northern well-to-do travellers stay here by the thousands.

But the point is—let us do the hotel. That is a prime necessity. That is the first thing needed and that must be done if Wilmington would grow and flourish. Get the hotel and then will come the multiplying of industries. With the Cape Fear river deepened; with the Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railroad complete from this city to the utmost verge of the State and even beyond; with a railway to New River and Catherine Lake; with the oyster canning interest centering here; with our city crowded with Northern health and pleasure seekers Wilmington will widen her borders, put on new and beautiful attire and will sit "a thing of beauty" upon the banks of the noble river that shall be crowded with the ships of a dozen nationalities. Why not all this? Is there really any reason why it may not be all realized?

A determination on the part of our people that it shall be done will bring all this about. Hearty unanimity, well directed zeal and energy, broad views and a liberal use of money will bring about all we have hinted at and much more.

Madam Anna Bishop, whose death was announced a few days ago, was 70 years old and had been a professional singer for 45 years. She had a great reputation in her best day. She was born in London, was the daughter of an English artist by the name of Reviere. She married Martin Schultz and died at her home in New York.

Virginia Democracy are afraid of the Tariff issue and they are for dodging it. Such is the meaning of the declaration of the State Central Committee. With so many of their papers favoring the present High Tariff, it is surprising that they did not declare for Protection square out.

And now Payne's son declares for the old sick man of New York. It may be that Payne's son is in hopes that this may lead the sick man to declare for father.

## A WRANGLING TO PARENTS.

The perils of childhood are many and various, and it requires constant care and attention to keep them from accident and harm. The very thing that the anxious parent is desirous that the little innocent should shun or abstain from is usually the first to receive its attention, and they are almost constantly getting themselves into trouble of some sort. We have a very striking instance in point, and one that shows the importance of constant alertness on the part of mothers and nurses to prevent serious accident to the little ones. A lady residing in the southern section of the city, on Friday of last week, had her nurse engaged in scouring the floor of one of her rooms, while she nursed the baby. In the meantime she had told her son to go down the street for some purpose, and he had just departed on the errand when she thought of something further she wanted to say to him. Calling the servant from her work she told her to hasten to the door and call her son back, and at the same time put the infant on the floor and followed the woman, to give her boy the necessary directions. She remained at the door but a few moments and then returned to the room she had just left, when, to her unmistakable horror, she found that during her absence the child had crawled to the tub of water which the nurse had been using in scouring the floor and had plunged head foremost into it, only its little feet being visible above the surface. She snatched it from the "jaws of death" which it had so innocently entered, hurriedly applied the restoratives usual on such occasions, and soon had the satisfaction of seeing her darling once more restored to her. When taken from the water the face and limbs of the child had assumed a purplish hue, and a delay of a minute longer would, in all probability have placed it beyond the reach of resuscitation.

## THE FIRE YESTERDAY MORNING.

Yesterday morning, about half-past 4 o'clock, fire was discovered bursting forth from the small store building on the southwest corner of Ninth and Chestnut streets. The alarm was given, but the flames proceeded so far before they were discovered that the building was a sheet of flame before anything could be done to check the rapid progress of the fire. The flames communicated to the dwelling adjoining, a two-story house, the roof of which was broken in, and the Democratic party in Virginia made no effort to kill any, whether white or colored, but the Democratic party did array one class against another on false issues, until the fire was stilled in the "ignorance of both classes."

Mr. Ramsey, of Mass., member of the committee on Elections, said that while the committee was unanimously in favor of the bill to prevent petticoating, it was voted down, and that the bill was rejected by a square vote, so that men who were interested in the bill, and particularly the rule and banking system, were compelled to withdraw their names from the bill.

Mr. Herbert, of Ala., said that he wished the bill to be defeated by a square vote, so that men who were interested in the bill, and particularly the rule and banking system, were compelled to withdraw their names from the bill.

Mr. Broadhead, of Mo., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Morgan, of Ga., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not vote for it.

Mr. Campbell, of Md., voted to defeat the bill, but he expressed his surprise that his friends from the West, who were in favor of the bill, had withdrawn their names.

Mr. Thompson, of Ky., supported the bill, which he said presented the question whether the government would bankrupt one class of citizens if it did not