

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1895.

H. A. LONDON, Editor.

One of the greatest "reforms" promised by every "Fusion" candidate, during the last campaign, was a change in our election law, in order (as they alleged) to secure "a free ballot and a fair count." A stranger visiting our State last campaign and hearing the "reform" speakers denouncing our election law, would naturally have thought that our elections were a farce and a mockery, and that the will of the people was entirely suppressed. And yet it was under the operations of that same much-abused law that the last election was held, and who will now dare to say that the will of the people was then suppressed? Yes, the very best answer that could have been made to all the denunciations of our election law was the result of the last election, at which the democratic party had control of the election machinery and had all the opportunity that it afforded for fraud, and yet that party allowed itself to be overwhelmedly defeated.

Every "reform" candidate waxed eloquent in his denunciations of our election law, and promised the people that if he was elected he would pass an election law that would be the fairest and best ever known. Well, the people believed this promise and elected a large majority of the "reformers" to the Legislature, and they passed a new election law. But is it the "fairest and best ever known?" Let us see:

In the first place three registrars (instead of one) are to be appointed, and three poll-holders (instead of four), only one of whom is to be a democrat and the other two are to be republicans and populists. Our much abused democratic election law gave the democrats two poll-holders and exactly the same number (two) to their political opponents. This gave an equal number—two and two—to the dominant party and its opponents, but our "reform" legislators did not think this fair and so to make it fairer they give the dominant party two and the minority one!

By whom are these registrars and poll-holders to be appointed? By one man—by the clerk of the superior court in each county. And yet our democratic election law was denounced because the registrars and poll-holders were appointed by five men—by the board of county commissioners. Will any fair-minded man say that this is an improvement on the old law?

But the strongest "reform" of all is the way in which the clerk of the court must appoint these registrars. He is not allowed to appoint any registrar whom he may think will be the fairest or most honest, but he is required to appoint such registrars as may be recommended to him by the Chairmen of the State Executive Committees of each political party! Yes, the registrars at every precinct in North Carolina (although appointed by the clerk of the county) are to be selected by three men, who live in distant parts of the State and know nothing whatever about the registrars whom they recommend. For instance, the registrars at Bear Creek precinct, in this county, will be selected by the chairmen of the State executive committees of each political party, who probably do not know a man in that township or even ever heard of the township. And yet this is a "reform" to restore to the people the "right of local self government"!

Each State chairman is required to take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties devolved upon him by this new election law, and is thereby constituted a Commissioner of Elections—a new office never before known in this State. But while the democrats, republicans and populists can have registrars and poll-holders yet the prohibitionists cannot. Yes, this new election law does not recognize the prohibitionists at all, nor allow them to have anything whatever to do with the management of our elections. This glaring injustice to the prohibitionists was called to the attention of the "reformers" when the election law was under consideration in the Legislature and they deliberately voted down an amendment, which would have given the prohibitionists the same rights as were given to the other parties. The prohibitionists of North Carolina are as honest, as patriotic and intelligent as any other persons and are entitled to as fair a representation in our elections as any other persons, and it was an outrage and gross injustice that our "reform" legislators refused to let them have registrars and poll-holders just as they allowed the other three parties. The editor of the

RECORD happened to be in the Senate Chamber when this new election law was under consideration and wrote the amendment (which was offered by Senator Adams) to give the prohibitionists the same rights and privileges as were given to the other parties, and the "reform" senators voted it down. Our prohibition friends will please remember this.

Under this new election law more power and authority is given to men than ever before given by any previous election law—and that man is the clerk of the superior court. Not only does he appoint the registrars and poll-holders (as before mentioned) but he also can establish, alter or create the places of election, a power heretofore given to the board of county commissioners. Wherein is this an improvement? The election returns also are to be made to him and he alone adds up the number of votes given for each candidate and proclaims the result, thus one man takes the place of the former board of county canvassers, which was composed of one poll-holder or registrar from each precinct in the county.

All tax payers, whether they be democrats, republicans or populists, are interested in having the best government for the least money.

For nearly twenty years the democratic party had control of every department of our State government, and its speakers and papers have asserted in every campaign that it had given our people the best government at the least expense. This assertion was denied in the last campaign by the "Fusion" speakers and papers, and they accused the democratic party of extravagance and unnecessary expenditures. Which were right—the democratic or "reform" speakers and papers? The people by their votes decided that the latter were right and entrusted to them the power and duty of reducing these expenditures and giving us a still better government at a still lower cost.

Now, have they done this? Have our "reform" legislators provided the people of North Carolina with a better government and at a less cost? Let us see.

In the first place, they have increased taxation instead of reducing it. Our last democratic Legislature levied a tax of 22 cents for general State purposes, and this "reform" Legislature increased this tax to 24 cents.

2. Our democratic Legislature had each cost, on an average, the sum of \$59,758.55, and our reform Legislature cost \$72,604.66, an increase of \$12,846.11.

3. The appropriations made by this "reform" Legislature were over one hundred thousand dollars greater than the appropriations of our much abused democratic Legislature.

Now, these three statements are facts which cannot be denied and we commend them to the careful consideration of these tax-payers who wish for "reform and retrenchment."

The interest law that was enacted by our late Legislature is claimed by our "reform" friends as one of the best measures adopted by that body, and while we may readily concede this to be true yet it may not even then be of any benefit. The persons who most need relief from a high rate of interest are the people who are now paying that high rate. The persons, who are now in debt, are the ones who most need relief. And yet these persons are not at all benefited by this interest law, because this law expressly states that it "shall not apply to existing contracts". That is, a man who has heretofore given his note at 8 per cent interest will have to pay that rate. The law only applies to contracts hereafter to be made. So that the practical operation of this new interest law will be to make it still more difficult for a poor man to borrow money hereafter, and does not help a man who is already in debt. It is like telling a man who has fallen into a deep pit (from which he is unable to extricate himself) that he will get out you will then help him not to fall into so deep a one again.

The Recons will be pleased to publish a statement from any one of our "reform" legislators showing how much they have reduced the salaries or fees of any sheriff, clerk, register or any other officer. The people are anxious to know how much they have been relieved in this respect.

WHAT a mockery and travesty on "local self-government" for our "reform" legislators to pass a law that gives one man (the Judge of the district) as much power in the selection of county commissioners as is given to all the people of any county!

A STARTLING sensation has been made by the discovery, this week, that our late "reform" Legislature passed a law which will very seriously cripple all business transactions and most effectually put an end to giving and receiving mortgages. The law is in these words: "That all conditional sales, assignments, mortgages or deeds in trust which are executed to secure any debt, obligation, note or bond which gives preference to any creditor or the maker shall be absolutely void as to existing creditors."

According to the literal reading of this extraordinary law no man, who is in debt, can buy anything and give a mortgage to secure its payment!

Of course, if the courts so construe it, this law will work untold hardship on the debtor class of our people, and should however damn the legislators who passed it. What construction the courts will give it is now unknown, and lawyers are divided in opinion. Of course while this uncertainty exists no merchant, or anybody else, will sell anything on a credit to any man who is in debt.

Now, havnt our "reformers" given "relief" with a vengeance?

EVEN the *Progressive Farmer*, in this week's issue, admits that the late "reform" Legislature cost several thousand dollars more than its democratic predecessors, and also that the appropriations were rather too liberal" and that it is "quite likely" there was some "extravagance".

And the *Farmer's Advocate* that "some important legislation was left undone".

So it would seem that all the democratic party of extravagance and unnecessary expenditures. Which were right—the democratic or "reform" speakers and papers? The people by their votes decided that the latter were right and entrusted to them the power and duty of reducing these expenditures and giving us a still better government at a still lower cost.

Now, have they done this? Have our "reform" legislators provided the people of North Carolina with a better government and at a less cost? Let us see.

In the first place, they have increased taxation instead of reducing it.

Our last democratic Legislature had each cost, on an average, the sum of \$59,758.55, and our reform Legislature cost \$72,604.66, an increase of \$12,846.11.

While the new law that was enacted by our late Legislature is claimed by our "reform" friends as one of the best measures adopted by that body, and while we may readily concede this to be true yet it may not even then be of any benefit. The persons who most need relief from a high rate of interest are the people who are now paying that high rate. The persons, who are now in debt, are the ones who most need relief. And yet these persons are not at all benefited by this interest law, because this law expressly states that it "shall not apply to existing contracts". That is, a man who has heretofore given his note at 8 per cent interest will have to pay that rate. The law only applies to contracts hereafter to be made. So that the practical operation of this new interest law will be to make it still more difficult for a poor man to borrow money hereafter, and does not help a man who is already in debt. It is like telling a man who has fallen into a deep pit (from which he is unable to extricate himself) that he will get out you will then help him not to fall into so deep a one again.

The Recons will be pleased to publish a statement from any one of our "reform" legislators showing how much they have reduced the salaries or fees of any sheriff, clerk, register or any other officer. The people are anxious to know how much they have been relieved in this respect.

WHAT a mockery and travesty on "local self-government" for our "reform" legislators to pass a law that gives one man (the Judge of the district) as much power in the selection of county commissioners as is given to all the people of any county!

A STARTLING sensation has been made by the discovery, this week, that our late "reform" Legislature passed a law which will very seriously cripple all business transactions and most effectually put an end to giving and receiving mortgages. The law is in these words: "That all conditional sales, assignments, mortgages or deeds in trust which are executed to secure any debt, obligation, note or bond which gives preference to any creditor or the maker shall be absolutely void as to existing creditors."

According to the literal reading of this extraordinary law no man, who is in debt, can buy anything and give a mortgage to secure its payment!

Providing for their Families.

The "reform" members of the late Douglass Legislature pretended to be very anxious to relieve the people, but they considered themselves and their families as the people and therefore gave them and them only, all the relief that they could, by grubbing all the offices in sight. Last week we published a list of the offices grubbed by the "reformers" for themselves, and now we copy from the *Newspaper* the following list of offices grubbed for their wives and sons and daughters:

Ralph Fortune, son of Senator Fortune; page, \$1 a day.

Frank Hoffman, son of Senator Hoffman; page, \$1 a day.

D. B. Starbuck, son of Senator Starbuck; page, \$1 a day.

R. H. Dally, son of Senator Dally; assistant enrolling clerk, \$5 a day and mileage.

Fred Ham, nephew of Senator Ham; page, \$1 a day.

J. E. Murphy, son of Senator Murphy; page, \$1 a day.

Mrs. M. H. Hoover, daughter of Senator Hoover; page, ten cents a day.

Mrs. S. M. McLean, daughter of Senator McLean; page, enough to cover the committee expenses of justices of the peace, \$1 a day.

Mrs. A. J. Dally, wife of Senator Dally; a pupil, ten cents a day.

Leslie Campbell, son of Representative Campbell; assistant enrolling clerk, \$1 a day and mileage.

H. G. Ewart, Jr., son of Representative H. G. Ewart; clerk to the committee on election of justices of the peace, \$1 a day and mileage.

John G. Walker, brother of Senator Zebulon Walker, clerk to the committee on election of justices of the peace, \$1 a day and mileage.

T. B. L. Dally, nephew of Senator W. R. Dally; assistant to principal clerk of the House, \$5 a day and mileage.

H. C. Satterfield, brother of S. P. Satterfield, chief clerk of the House; page, \$1 a day.

J. C. Clark, son of Representative J. C. Clark; page, \$1 a day.

N. B. Walker, son of S. Ohio, Walker; page, \$1 a day.

M. B. C. L. son of Representative M. B. C. L.; page, \$1 a day.

"Like Master Like Man".

From the *Charlotte Observer*.

"Come on!" said a clerk of the lower house of the lately adjourned Legislature to another clerk who was using the voice on a year old tax proposition. The suggestion was made within the hearing of the Raleigh correspondent of the *Observer*, who was sitting at the reporter's desk. "Don't 'em out!" That was one way of disposing of the troublesome minority in the Legislature. One way of disposing of clerks which it was said should not pass, was to steal them and one way of getting through bills which had been tried and failed was to take them from the table, cross the entries on them, and put them on their passage again, and yet another method of legislating is to present for ratification a document which had passed several readings but had never passed third. Hence the frequent inquiry in Raleigh, already adverted to by our correspondent there: "Did the Legislature really pass that bill or was it passed by the clerks?" The stream cannot rise above its fountain. Like master like man. The clerks of that infamous body cannot in reason be expected to be much better than the men who made them clerks.

The Arrington Committee Adjourned.

From the *Winston-Salem*.

Yesterday the Arrington committee, which is at present in a state of suspended animation, presented a record of proceedings and a list of expenses to the State Auditor.

Chief Justice Campbell, Clerk Haner and Advisory Counsel W. J. Peeler were prominent in the delegations that went up to draw for the permanent referee which they were sent there to make. Many of those who supported the fusion ticket in this county last fall now say they will come back to the Democratic party.

It May Be As Much For You.

Mr. Fred Miller, of Irwin, Ill., writes that he had a severe kidney trouble for many years, with severe pains in his back and also that his bladder was affected. He tried many so-called kidney cures but without any good result. About a year ago he began use of Electric Bitters and found relief quite electric. Electric Bitters is especially adapted to cure of all Kidney and Liver troubles and often gives almost instant relief. One trial will prove our statement. Price only 50¢ for large bottle. At G. R. Phillips' Drug Store.

Fell a Half Mile.

From the *Winston-Salem*.

A reliable citizen of Winston, who was in this place a few days ago and told the story of a Watauga boy who fell over half a mile. He said it was during the recent snow and the boy came running up on the mountain to feel some relief. The snow had crusted over and when he started back he lost his footing and commenced falling and sliding, first going through a fence, then against a rock, which split his head open. He finally landed in a neighbor's workshop. He positively asserts that the distance is over half a mile, and with the exception of a few little trifles the boy was unhurt.

For the present their absurd "expenses" accounts are held in abeyance.

Philipps, Pitt, and Bryan, of Chatham, both left home in the afternoon.

Campbell is still at the Park Hotel.

BILL to Tax Bachelors.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill., March 22.—A bill to tax bachelors and establish an "Old Maid's Home" when the tax fund shall have reached \$50,000, was introduced in the House today by Representative Walbeck.

The bill defines bachelors as single men of thirty two years or over who have never been married, and exempts men who have reached sixty five, who are physically unfit, or who can prove to a board of unmarried women over sixty years that they have proposed marriage at least three times to marriageable females and been refused each time.

Killed by Lightning.

BIRMINGHAM, Ala., March 23.—Lightning today struck the residence of Jephtha Williams, a farmer of Monroe county. Williams ten year old son, sitting before the grate, was killed and his clothing torn from his body. Mrs. Williams, standing near by, was hurled against a wall and killed. Williams was rendered totally blind. A two year old child, playing near his father, alone escaped unharmed.

N. THRELLO.

Miss Alice Turner, living near Axton, Henry county, Va., fell into a well a few days ago, which is 64 feet deep, and escaped unharmed. The most remarkable part of it, however, is that she succeeded, unaided, in climbing

McKinley Against Free Silver.

ST. AUGUSTINE, Fla., March 21.—Gov. McKinley and his party will be the personal guests of Henry M. Flagler, of New York, the Standard Oil millionaire, upon their arrival tomorrow.

In Thomasville yesterday a letter was received by Gov. McKinley from a hundred or more citizens of Georgia—Democrats and Republicans—pledging him the solid vote of Georgia in the National Republican Convention, and assuring him of a big thing chance to get the electoral vote of that State, provided that he will declare himself an advocate of free silver. The letter also intimated that in the Republican national platform of 1892 might contain a silver plank.

When this letter was read aloud to the Gov. McKinley was indignant. He was led back, burst his hands in his trousers pockets and shouted:

"If the Republican party should decide to favor free silver I would decline to be a member of it and I would quit the party forever."

SENATOR FROM THREE STATES.

Three men represent the three States in the United States Senate—William H. Seward, of New York; George F. Edmunds, of Vermont; and George F. Edmunds, of Connecticut.

Mrs. M. H. Hoover, daughter of Senator Hoover; page, ten cents a day.

Mrs. S. M. McLean, daughter of Senator McLean; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.

Mr. Fred Miller, nephew of Senator Miller; page, \$1 a day.