

Three Mths.	5.00
Six Mths.	9.00
One Year.	15.00
Per Line.	1.00
Per Column.	10.00
Per Page.	20.00
Per Month.	3.00
Per Year.	36.00
Per Day.	1.00
Per Week.	7.00
Per Month.	21.00
Per Year.	252.00
Per Page.	20.00
Per Month.	60.00
Per Year.	720.00

CENTRAL EXPRESS

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRAT.
 The greatest weekly Democratic newspaper in Washington and the Express of the Nation. The Democrats will serve you in national politics while the Express will serve you in State and local politics.

A VALUABLE ADDRESS.

The Church in Connection with the Anglo-Saxon Race.

Hon. A. M. Waddell Before the Episcopal Convention at Durham.

The subject assigned to me for discussion on this interesting occasion is of vast proportions, and therefore the most I can hope to accomplish will be to present a very general outline of it.

To the student of church history there have been few spectacles with-in the last two centuries more affecting than the persistent devotion with which—in the face of overwhelming prejudice and aversion—the sons of the church in America, at the close of the Revolution, clung to her. In the hands of ambitious or stupid or reckless Colonial Governors and Councils, who frequently sought to enforce the ecclesiastical legislation of the mother country, upon a people whose environment was wholly different, and because of its identification in the minds of the people with the political government and its oppressors, the church had become an object of suspicion, and finally of intense hate; and when the Revolution closed it was regarded with more hostility than Royalty itself. Left to struggle against this feeling, which dominated the minds of her fellow citizens, and without an Episcopate of her own, they were compelled to see the church, which they loved, decline and wither into numerical insignificance. It had been a growing power, especially in the Southern Colonies, and its adherents had been willing to throw off the Episcopate as they had thrown off royalty, and adopted a new form of Church Government, it might and probably would have enjoyed a very great advantage over any other ecclesiastical organization in the country, so far as increasing its membership was concerned.

Within its folds were gathered many of the greatest and best men in America, who had been chiefly instrumental in the enlightenment of the liberty and independence of the country and these would doubtless, have largely increased their individual popularity and influence by extending their work to the severance of all independence on, or connection with the Church of England. But their faith in the Episcopal form of church government was honest and deep-rooted, and their love of the grand noble Liturgy, to which they were accustomed, was sincere and hearty, and not prejudice, nor hate, nor ridicule, nor abuse could shake their loyalty to their convictions, or induce them to abandon the hope of rebuilding and strengthening the shattered walls of their Zion.

They had only to look back at her history, and in connection with it; the history of the race from which themselves had sprung, to find both support for their convictions and encouragement for their hopes. Such a retrospect would show to them, as it will show to us that the Church is indissolubly connected with nearly all the great achievements of the Anglo-Saxon race, from the first emergence of that race, under her guidance, out of the darkness of paganism to their day and to ours, when its mastery is recognized throughout the earth. The history of the one is, indeed, largely the history of the other, and hence the vastness of the subject to which I have already referred. Let us take a rapid glance at it.

With the history of Christianity in Britain before the Anglo-Saxon invasion we are not concerned. We know that when the pagan English had secured a foothold and acquired ascendancy over the Britons, who were living under Roman government, the religion, law, literature, and manners of the country were swept away, and it became a heathen land. Before the English invasion, Christianity prevailed in every country in western Europe, except Germany, from which the English came, and the conquest of the island by the English thrust a wedge of heathendom into the heart of this great communion made two unequal parts, says a great historian, who also adds that it was "the one purely German nation that rose upon the wreck of Rome." In other lands, in Spain, or Gaul, or Italy, though they were regularly conquered by German peoples, religion, social life, administrative order still remained Roman. In Britain alone Rome died into a vague tradition. The whole organization of government and society disappeared with the people who had used it.

Although Augustine and his monks landed in the year 597, and thereby renewed the union with western world which had been destroyed, and re-introduced the civiliza-

tion, arts and letters which had been driven out, the Roman church soon came into rivalry with the church of Ireland and Scotland which had long existed before they came and was superseded by the latter in the work of converting the English. Christianity in Ireland was more vigorous than elsewhere because that country was exempt from invasion, and had consequently greatly advanced in arts and letters. In the year 634, however, at a council at Whitby, and in a controversy over the trifling questions of the treasure and the proper time for observing Easter, the Irish party were overruled by King Gswl, and they all, accompanied by some English clergy, returned to Iona, leaving the Roman Church triumphant in England.

And now the history of the English Church proper began. Theodore, of Tarsus, a Greek monk, became Archbishop of Canterbury, and at once set about by organizing the Church by adding new sees to the old ones, and grouping them all around the central see of Canterbury. He then settled the clergy, who until then had been chiefly missionaries, and organized parishes. He gathered Synods, and these were the first national legislative assemblies in England, long antedating the *Whittenagemeot*, or the first parliament of the civil government. The canons passed in these synods were the real originals from which the national system of laws sprang. So that, in the matter of organization and legislation, the church in England antedated and formed the model of the State, and it was the only bond of union between the people for about two centuries.

Its noblest product flowered two hundred years later in King Alfred, who has justly been pronounced "the first instance, in the history of Christendom of the Christian King, of a ruler who put aside every personal aim or ambition to devote himself to the welfare of those whom he ruled." A thousand years have passed since his death, but the longing which he expressed—"to leave to the man that came after him a remembrance in good works"—still finds realization in the veneration entertained for his memory by all English speaking people. They recognize in him not only the pious and self-sacrificing monarch and wise ruler, with whose reign English history began, but the real creator of English literature and the educator of his people.

After the death of Alfred appeared the first of the great ecclesiastical statesmen of England, who wielded all the power of the realm for a series of years, Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of great versatility of genius, who gave to the English Constitution its first impress of genuine liberty, and lifted the church which threatened it into a higher and purer atmosphere.

The successive sovereigns and privates of England had frequently resisted, or evaded the exactions of Rome upon the English Bishops, but it was not until the Norman Conqueror ascended the throne that an open defiance of any claim of papal supremacy was made. These claims had, with the persistence that has always characterized them, been continually urged, directly and indirectly, until they culminated in the demand by Gregory VII. upon William to do fealty for his kingdom, when that monarch proudly replied: "Fealty, I have never will to do, nor do I will to do it now. I have never promised it, nor do I find that my predecessor did it to you."

But while he defied Rome he had reduced the Church of England to a state of dependence upon the crown which had crippled its influence for good; and the same policy was pursued by his sons until the courageous Archbishop Anselm re-asserted its rights, and largely restored its independence.

Under the influence of the great religious revival which occurred during the reign of Stephen and by the power of the church, Henry the Second, became King, but his successor, Richard the Lion Hearted, died as he had lived, at war with God and man. Then came that consummate villain of the ages, King John, whose Charter, wrested from him at Runnymede, has ever since been the corner-stone of Anglo-Saxon freedom. The leading spirit in this great historic drama of Runnymede was Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, who, although made Primate by an act of Papal usurpation, rebuked and protested against the submission of John to the supremacy of the Pope, rallied the church and the barons to the support of their liberties, threatened the king with excommunication and saved the country from the ruin that

threatened it. The very first article of this great Charter of English liberty begins with these words: "Imprimis Concessimus Deo, et hac presenti charta nostra confirmantibus pro nobis, et haereditibus nostris in perpetuum, quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit et habeat omnia iura sua integra, et libertates suas illaesas."

First of all, the Church of England was to be free, and to have all its rights and liberties intact. Again in the reign of Henry III, this great churchman, Stephen Langton, whose services in the cause of English liberty were never surpassed, was chiefly instrumental in establishing the great principles that redress of grievances must always be had before a grant to the crown is made by parliament.

The most striking feature of this epoch, however, so far as the church was concerned, was the work of those wonderful men, the Gray Friars, whose self-sacrificing labors in the cause of religion are almost unparalleled in human history. They are doubtless, generally very lightly regarded, because of the subsequent degeneracy of the order to which they belonged, but at this time their services to religion and humanity were almost beyond praise. We all, last year did homage to the Christian heroism of that noble Roman Catholic priest, Father Damien who sacrificed his life in the service of the lepers of the South Pacific islands and he richly deserved the praise of the whole Christian world for his unselfish devotion. The Gray Friars of the thirteenth century in England performed the same service. "The rapid progress of the population within the boroughs," says Green in history, "had outstripped the sanitary regulations of the middle ages and fever or plague or the more terrible scourge of leprosy festered in the wretched hovels of the suburbs. It was to haunts such as these that Francis had pointed his disciples and the Gray Brethren at once fled themselves in the means and poorest quarters of each town. Their first work lay in the noisome lazar-houses; it was among the lepers that they commonly chose the site of their houses."

The patron of the Friars was the patriot soldier and statesman, Simon de Montfort, whose pity equalled his wisdom, and whose reforms in the civil administration were of incalculable value.

It was to this mendicant fraternity that Roger Bacon—after forty years of devotion to study, whose only recompense, as he said, was that he was "unheard, forgotten buried"—allied himself, supposing that thereby he would sink into oblivion; but it proved to be the means of introducing him to fame. Some of his writings coming under the notice of the Pope, he was invited to continue his literary labors, (although no pecuniary assistance was offered), and amidst all sorts of embarrassments and difficulties, he produced his wonderful "Opus Majus," which Dr. Whewell pronounced "at once the Encyclopedia and the *Novum Organum* of the 13th century."

The reign of Edward the First, although the result of a process of evolution, was really the beginning of the England which we know. All the great reforms in the judiciary and in legislation; which, with continued improvement, have reached our day, had their origin during his reign, and chief among these who did the work were the Primate and the Clergy.

But it was in the reign of Edward III that the great reformer John Wyclif drove the wedge which ultimately separated the English church from the domination of the Pope. His work has borne fruit in every succeeding generation. Beginning his warfare on the practice of the church in his day, he proceeded to attack the doctrines then prevalent—the central doctrine of transubstantiation being his first objective point—and by appealing to the masses of the people, in tracts written in their own tongue, he struck a deadly blow not only to that dogma, but to the practice of indulgences, absolutions, pilgrimages, image-worship, and saint-worship, and thus began the movement which resulted in a hundred years afterward in religious liberty.

Contemporary with Wyclif, too, was one whom they called "a mad priest"—John Ball, of Kent—who first stirred the hearts of the people by declaring, what was then regarded as the most abominable of all heresies, the equality of human rights. One of the most exquisite specimens of modern English literature, I think, is William Morris's little essay, entitled "A Dream of John Ball," which portrays the first awakening of this idea and its preservation in the country from the ruin that

ROGER Q. MILLS

To the Texas Alliance—His Views of the Sub-Treasury Bill.

The most prominent feature of this policy is the entire absorption of the private business of the people by the government. The Alliance tell us that our farmers cannot support themselves and those dependent on them without the Government will take these products and lend them money on them. But if that be true how much better will he be next year than he is now? He will have to borrow again, and as he is not able to make his income meet his out-go without borrowing—he must get worse year by year, and sink at last into bankruptcy. When the Government begins to take charge of the cotton, wheat, corn, oats, and tobacco, it will go on, and bacon, pork, beef, butter, cheese, lard, hay and all other farm products will demand of the Government to take their surplus and advance them 80 per cent. on it. And in periods of manufacturing and mining depression, iron, steel, wool and cotton goods will demand to be deposited and taken care of and money loaned to their owners and so will coal and ores and lumber. If the policy is adopted it must apply to all, and the power of those interested in these products will compel the Government to extend its paternal care to them. How much money will it take to make the 80 per cent. advance on the five articles provided for by the bill? Its friends say it will require enough Treasury notes to about double our present circulation. The amount of money in the United States to-day, outside the Treasury, is about \$1,400,000,000. Will it put this amount of paper money in circulation? Say that it will increase the circulation one-half of that amount, the first effect would be suspension of specie payments. Gold and silver would quickly leave the channels of circulation, perhaps leave the country, and the business of the country would be floating on a vascillating volume of paper money. All prices would rise in proportion to the increase, and then as the bill provides for the destruction of the money when it is paid back to the Government, there would be a contraction equal to the expansion, and prices of all farm products would fall in company with all other property. This measure provides for an annual expansion and an annual contraction of the currency. That itself would bring incalculable disaster to the country, and no class of our citizens would feel it more severely than our farmers. When the business of the country is on a vascillating paper circulation is exposed all the time to the perils of speculation and gambling in the products of labor, in which game the working people of the country are always losers.

The policy which the sub-treasury system will inaugurate will look up and keep out of market the products necessary to feed the human family, and of course, it will bring with it distress and suffering among all the poorer classes of people who live by their daily toil, and must receive their daily supplies from the market places. Why Southern farmers should go into it I cannot comprehend. They buy their bacon and flour from the North-west, and if the producers are enabled to lock it up and hold it for higher prices it will be at the expense of the cotton grower. How is he to be benefited? When he locks up his cotton against whom is he contending? All his crop is sold. Two-thirds of it goes to Europe, and the other to cotton manufacturers in the United States. If the cotton grower expects to sell at the market price, and tries to force the manufacturer to give him more than the market price, the manufacturer can close his mill and turn his working people in the street and wait until the grower is ready to sell. He can stand the strian longer than the farmer can. His employees will drink the cup of suffering to the dregs but it will not come near his lips. In the meantime the cotton grower will be paying the warehouse combination price for his bacon, lard and flour, and if he holds his cotton for the year provided for by the bill he can put two crops on the market at once, sell them at half price, pay interest, insurance and other charges and close up the transaction a heavy loser. Let us look at it from the position of the consumer of farm products. What are they to do while farm products are locked up in the sub-treasury? What are they to do for daily subsistence? What have they to deposit upon which to draw 80 per cent. of its value with which to purchase their daily supplies? They are entitled to equal considerations

with the rest. As Democrats, we all believe with Mr. Jefferson, in "equal and exact justice to all." Our whole system of free Government is founded on that cardinal principle, and the Democratic party was organized at the beginning to secure it. All the battles it has fought and all the victories it has won have been to preserve it. The Democratic party has never favored class legislation and it never will. When any measure is proposed for their adoption it must impose its burdens and bestow its benefits alike on all. I am thoroughly convinced that the sub-treasury scheme will injure farmers and all voters, but I am presenting it to you in the light in which its advocates present it, as a measure beneficial to the depositors of the farm products, but injurious to those who have to buy and consume them. There is another objection to the proposed scheme that I am afraid was not considered by my Democratic friends in Milan county. It will require ten or a dozen officers at each of the sub-treasuries to receive and care for the products deposited, return them to the depositors, and make settlement for advances, interest, insurance and other charges, or sell them at auction and account for proceeds of sale, to render accounts to the government, to receive its money, keep books, make returns, and perform necessary in conducting so large a business. The bill only provides for one such officer, but that is manifestly insufficient and the Government, if the bill is passed, will provide force enough to execute its provisions. Under the Constitution they must be appointed by the President or by those under his authority. Have, my Democratic friends, considered what would be the effect of filling the Southern States with Republican office holders dispensing hundreds of millions of money? Do you want to return to the period of reconstruction again? Have the Democrats of Milan county forgotten the throes and convulsions through which we passed during that time? The Republicans in the Senate and House are holding night-caucuses to agree upon a system of Federal control over our ballot boxes, in order that they may take control of our electors, and by Republican returning boards, appointed by Harrison, have Republicans placed in office, instead of Democrats who have been elected by the people. Ever since they seized the Administration and both branches of Congress they have been busy devising ways and means to overturn the Southern State governments and put them again in the control of a mercenary board of adventurers worse than the locusts and lice of Egypt. To pass either of these bills and inaugurate the sub-treasury system would be to prepare the way and make the paths straight for the restoration of that control. It would bring to the South a period of corruption and oppression that by contrast would make the former period of reconstruction respectable. If all the houses provided for by this bill could be built without cost to the Government, and if all the offices necessary to carry it into effect, could be filled with Democrats, and if the Government had a thousand millions of gold and silver to lend the farmers without interest, and without inflating the currency the measure would then be full of evil and destitute of any compensating good. The throwing into the circulation of the thousand millions of gold and silver would raise prices very greatly, and while the products the farmer has to sell would greatly increase in price, so would that which he had to buy. So that exchanges would be lifted upon a higher plane, but their relative value to each other would be just the same.

The relief which our farmers need is the relief for which Cleveland fought and fell. That relief was to give them more markets and a greater demand for their products; that greater demand would raise their prices and put into their pockets more than a thousand million of dollars annually, not of borrowed money, but of money that belonged to them, and which did not have to be repaid to any one. While opening the markets of the world to their surplus products would increase the value of what they had to sell it would at the same time decrease the value of the things they had to buy. This policy would begin a redistribution of the wealth of the country; and the wealth that is now piled up in castles would be distributed in the pockets of the producers. The only way in which Congress can emancipate our farmers is to reduce, greatly reduce, taxation on all manufactures and other things which are imported and which we have to buy, and thus let

in five or six hundred millions of foreign products that are now kept out. When these come in an equal amount of cotton, wheat, corn and other things would go out to pay for them and that would make an increased demand, which would increase the value of the entire crop many hundred million dollars. In 1881 we expected \$730,000,000 worth of agricultural products. That is the largest amount we have ever exported in any one year from the beginning of our Government. The greatly increased demand for foreign products made high prices. If we take the prices of corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, cotton and tobacco for the year 1881 and apply them to the same products of the year 1889 we will see that the crop of 1889 would have been worth \$1,570,000,000 more than it was. Why did we not have the prices of 1881? Because there was not the same demand for export as in 1881. We only exported \$532,000,000 worth of agricultural products in 1889, which was about \$8.00 per head of our people, while in 1881 we exported about \$14.00 per head. But why did we not expect a larger surplus in 1889 than in 1881? Because we put high duties on the manufactures of France, Germany, Austria and other countries and in the last ten years they have been retaliating by putting on high duties on our agricultural products. When we reduce the duties on their goods they are ready to reduce the duties on our agricultural products. It was to accomplish this that Cleveland drew the Democratic blade in 1887, and it is to accomplish this that the Democratic party is embattled to-day.

What does the "Original Package" Decision Mean?

As to the time when an original package becomes a broken package so as to deprive it of interstate commerce privileges and make it subject to State laws, Chief Justice Fuller says in his famous opinion:

"This is not the instant when the article enters the country but when the importer has acted upon it that it has become incorporated and mixed up with the mass of property in the country, which happens when the original package is no longer such in his hands."

Under our decision in *Brown vs. Chicago Railway Co.*, the plaintiffs in error had a right to import this liquor into Iowa, and in the view which we have expressed they had the right to sell it, by which act alone it would become mingled in the common property within the State.

It is contended that this means only that liquors must not be meddled with under States laws while the boxes or barrels in which they are shipped are not opened, but the interpretation put upon the decision by the dissenting minority of the court would seem to be that the protection extends to bottles and flasks as long as they are unopened though they may have been taken from the box, barrel or other package in which they were shipped from another State.

The First American Settlement.

Baltimore Herald.

Mr. Stephen B. Weeks, of the Johns Hopkins University, read an interesting paper on Raleigh's Settlements in Virginia and their Historical in the 19th Century" at the meeting of the Maryland Historical Society last night. Mr. Weeks said that the first American settlement was at Roanoke Island, N. C., near Cape Hatteras, and not St. Augustine, Fla., as so often been alleged. It was settled in 1585. The first American child, a girl was born there in 1587. The inhabitants of the island were a race of Indians known as Croatans, and were very hospitable people. Their descendants are recognized today by the State of North Carolina, or at least they were in 1882. They greatly despised the negro and refused to intermarry with them.

Who are "Bosses?"

Charlotte Chronicle.

"The Register believes in the principles of Democracy, and has never voted any other ticket, but it believes the time is past when it is the duty of an honest man to vote for a candidate simply because he happens to be the nominee, if he does not possess the necessary qualifications of character and fitness for the position. No man should be nominated for any office unless he is worthy of it."

"It is simply because he is the nominee of this party, that the candidate does 'possess the necessary qualifications of character and fitness for official position,'"

A BAD HOLE IN THE LAW.

Ex-State Treasurer Archer Cannot Be Convicted of Embezzlement.

BALTIMORE, May 19.—Owing to a defect in the indictment, ex-State Treasurer Archer cannot be convicted of embezzlement. A demurrer had been filed by Archer's lawyer before Judge Stewart of the Criminal Court this morning it was sustained. The defence asserted that penal statutes must be interpreted according to the most natural and obvious import of their language. If the statute is ambiguous and susceptible of two constructions consistent with reason, one of which will acquit and the other convict the defendant that construction which will acquit must be adopted. The statute provides that all persons holding public office who embezzle any funds which they are required by law to pay over to the treasurer shall be punished. It was argued that, interpreting these words intended to apply to the treasurer, because the statute expressly divided public officers into two classes, those who pay over and those who received public money, and punish only those who are required to pay over. The treasurer was necessarily not included in those obliged to pay over to the treasurer, for he could not be obliged to pay to himself.

The defect in the law was so plain that even the logic of Gov. Whyte, who appeared for the State unable to place a different construction upon it, and the Court sustained the demurrer. The State must now depend upon the charge of malfeasance in office, on which Mr. Archer will be tried at Annapolis.

Farmers and Chief.

News and Observer.

We copy the following from the *Youth's Companion*, not only because it is racy and readable, and "points a moral," but also to ask if any of our readers or brethren of the Press can tell us who represented North Carolina in the House of Representatives in 1834, and who was the Congressman from Western North Carolina alluded to.

In short, is the incident fact or fiction?

Doubtless the Hon. T. L. Clingman or Col. J. D. Cameron, of Asheville, could tell.

A skillful touch of ridicule has often defeated unanswerable argument and justice in Parliament and Congress, and made "the worse appear the better reason."

An example of this is given by Oliver Smith, a contemporary in Congress of Clay, Webster and Calhoun. In 1834 a bill was introduced by a member from New York, which was successfully opposed by the Congressman from Western North Carolina, whose arguments against it were sound and rational and apparently fully convinced the House. At the close of his speech, however, he unfortunately said:

"My constituents are opposed to such a policy, to a man—"

His opponent sprang to his feet, exclaiming, That settles the question! The constituents of the gentleman from the mountains of North Carolina are undoubtedly qualified to decide upon a question of national policy.

"They subscribe in each town and village for a single daily copy of the *United States Gazette*, and not having time to read them file them."

"On each Saturday one paper is read aloud to the community. Naturally they fall behind as to news to such an extent that when I visited that section last month, I found all the citizens under arms, drums beating, flags, regiments forming."

"On inquiry as to what had happened, I was told that the British were marching on the Capital. They had just reached War of 1812!"

In the shout of laughter which followed the arguments of the Carolinian were forgotten.

Probably the most effective use of ridicule ever made in a legislative body was a silent gesture of Sir Robert Walpole. He had made a savage attack upon Pitt and his colleagues, denouncing them as ignorant youths, who knew nothing of statecraft.

Pitt rose in a white heat of anger, and began his speech with the words:

"With the greatest reverence for the white hairs of the honorable member—" when Walpole quietly withdrew his wig, and disclosed his red, bald pate.

Pitt's eloquence was quenched in laughter in which he joined heartily, and left the old man in possession of the field.