

A PURE DESPOTISM.

A MAJORITY RULING WITHOUT RESTRAINTS.

An Appeal to the Country—"Constitutions are Made to Restrain Majorities and Protect Minorities."

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 3.—An address to the country explaining the position of the Democratic members of the House has been prepared by ex-speaker Carlisle. The address begins by stating that the present situation in the House of Representatives is so anomalous, and the unprecedented decisions of the Speaker are so full of danger to the integrity of future legislation, that we (meaning the Democratic members of the House,) consider it our duty to submit a brief statement of the facts in order that the propriety of the course we have taken may be fully determined.

After referring to the appointment of the committee on rules by Speaker Reed, and its duties, the address states that although nearly two months have elapsed since the committee on rules was appointed, and it has made no report upon the matters referred to it, except a partial one on Dec. 9, authorizing the Speaker to appoint House committees, and consequently the House has been compelled to conduct its business without any rule or system, except the general parliamentary law as construed by the Speaker. There have been no calendars, (it is stated), no order of business, no fixed time to receive reports from committees, or for the consideration of bills or resolutions, and in fact no regular methods whatever in the proceedings of the House. No measure can get before the House for consideration, unless the Speaker chooses to allow it to be presented, and members have no means of knowing in advance what they are to be called upon to discuss or decide.

This is the first time in our history that a Legislative Assembly or even a public meeting has attempted to transact business for any considerable period without a regular code of rules prescribing the order of its proceedings, and the inconvenience and injustice resulting from such an attempt has been forcibly illustrated in the present instance.

The rulings of the Speaker are referred to in vigorous terms and the address charges that "he has subverted nearly every principle of constitutional parliamentary law heretofore recognized in the House."

The Smith-Jackson contested election case on January 29, and the unprecedented rulings of the Speaker in the battle that followed, are referred to. Speaker Reed himself, the report goes on to state, when in the minority on the floor of the House stated the true philosophy of the constitution when he said:

The constitutional idea of a quorum is not the presence of a majority of all the members of the House, but a majority of the members present and participating in the business of the House. It is not the visible presence but their judgment and votes which the Constitution calls for.

General Garfield, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Conger, Mr. Robeson, and other eminent Republicans have taken the same position, and their arguments have never been answered.

We are not contending for the right of the minority to govern, as the supporters of the Speaker have endeavored to make the country believe; on the contrary, we are denying the right of a minority to eject members from their seats, or to pass laws for the government of the people. Under the constitution a majority of the members of the House constitute a quorum to do business, and we are simply insisting that less than a majority shall not do business. We are contending that the majority shall take the responsibility which properly belongs to them, and shall come to the House of Representatives and vote if they desire to control its proceedings; and we are protesting against their right to carry their measures by counting us, when we do not vote.

The claim of the majority that they have a right to govern the House without attending its sessions and taking part in the conduct of its business is too preposterous to require refutation. It must be evident to any one who understands the position taken by the Democratic minority in the House, that it cannot possibly result in any injury to the country or in any

injustice to the majority. Its only effect will be to compel the Republican majority elected by the people to assume the responsibility imposed upon them.

On the other hand no one can foresee the evils that may result from the inauguration of the practice of counting votes not cast in order to make a quorum. Under it a minority of the members-elect to the House and Senate may pass the most tyrannical laws for the oppression of the people, and most corrupt laws for the spoliation of the public treasury. Whether so intended or not, its direct tendency is to break down the barriers heretofore existing for the protection of the citizen against the encroachments of power, and the spoliation of the treasury by destroying the limitations which the constitution has wisely imposed upon the legislative department.

Constitutions are made to restrain majorities and protect minorities. A majority ruling without restraints upon its power, is a pure despotism and is inconsistent with our system of government.

Yankee in de Woodpile.

Here is a handsome piece of writing in the State Chronicle from the pen of Mr. W. J. Peele:

No, it is not the negro question but the Yankee question that distresses me. He has cost this government a thousand times more than the negro, and is costing it every year as much as it would cost to buy the negro back into slavery. The Yankee is the "Ward of the Nation," not the negro. He is the one that has got to be "protected" and taken care of at public expense. Him and his infant (industries) the law must provide for. It is he who confesses that he can't make a living if left in free competition with the rest of God's creation. It is he who calls his successful rivals in Europe, who can manufacture cheaper than he, "paupers." It is he who has plundered agriculture until land is almost as cheap in North Carolina as it was during the Revolutionary war. And now this educated dollar hunter, this money worshipping disciple of mammon, rolls his eyes toward heaven and tells us he has been called of God to make us do justice to the negro. The Lord didn't call him to stop the increased pauperism and crime at home and to overthrow the rule of corporations there; didn't call him to stop the purchase of voters in "blocks of five" at his own door; didn't tell him to restore his millions of ill-gotten gains in subsidies, pensions, land grabs and tariff bounties; didn't tell him to "go" preach the gospel of peace and justice to the people of the South, but to STAY at the dim distance of a thousand miles and proclaim the unsearchable riches of negro salvation by a Federal election law! What a mission and what a missionary! Dollar hunters have sometimes and for some purposes made good citizens, but did the Lord ever call one to be a missionary?

In view of these facts and in the name of the people of North Carolina, I do most humbly petition the present Congress to drop the consideration of the election law and take up the consideration of the only question at issue before the country: How can we support the Yankee economically enough to prevent starvation in other sections of the country?

Of course we understand that he must be supported at public expense—he has always been; the question is how shall it be done the cheapest. They ought also, as far as possible, to keep down the missionary spirit in him; his fervor comes not from religion, but from the pride of high living, and finds its proper vent in more worldly amusements than missionary work. I fear, too, that there is no moral antiseptic that will disinfect a heart whose avarice has taken a religious turn.

Mr. Hardup—"Why don't you pay more attention to the cooking? You know that you can do first-rate cooking when you try." I know I can, but whenever I get up any particular nice dish you eat it all yourself."—Terre Haute Express.

Employer—"William, Mrs. Spriggins complains that she received only one of all the bundles that she had put up here last night." William—"That's funny, sir. I wrote Mrs. Spriggins on one bundle and put ditto on each of the others."—Lawrence American.

CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORMS.

A Lecture in the Chicago Auditorium by Father Huntington.

"The Church and its Attitude to Social Reforms" was the subject of the economic discussion a few evenings ago at Recital Hall, Auditorium building, Chicago, it being the second of the third series of economic conferences under the auspices of the Economic Club. The Rev. J. O. Huntington, of New York, was the speaker. The hall was crowded, many being unable to gain even standing room.

Father Huntington's argument was for the realization of the prophecy of Christ, for the consummation of a universal brotherhood, a world-wide society, such as that of the church of Christ.

It was a sad commentary on the church, he thought, that the great mass of humanity in all great cities, though they had no special hatred of the church, yet felt that it was a thing apart from them. They felt themselves removed from the church by their condition in society, and thus the mass of the people was lost to the church. And why this decadence of the power of the church over the minds of the people?

The aversion of the masses to the church was, the speaker thought, due in a great measure to the attitude of the church toward the poor. The masses found the preachers of the great churches ready enough to talk of future happiness, but when it came to doling out some of this happiness and peace in this world they were too often dumb. The utterances of the preachers on the social ills of this world were weak and timid. Nor was it because the ministers were hypocrites because this was so, nor yet because the ministers were not awake to the importance of these questions. In most cases the preachers did what they thought the wisest. They were dependent for their success and for the success of the religion they taught upon the wealth of men who made their money out of the existing order of things, and to speak against social evils meant the loss of this patronage and the consequent diminishment of their power for good. At least that was the way many of his brethren looked upon the matter, and he did not know but they were right, for, after all, the speaker thought, the rich needed the preacher more than the poor. And so the masses do not find the way to the great churches, and do you wonder that they are dissatisfied with the hard benches of the mission chapel and the tame eloquence of the third-rate preacher.

Too many of the preachers preach to the poor on Sunday and dine with the rich through the week. Can it be wondered at that the poor fail to reconcile this with the teachings of the Master who dined with the poor and preached to the rich.

The speaker outlined the principles of the two great divisions of the political economists—the individualists and the socialists. Each of these were striving for that one great end, the universal brotherhood of mankind—the church of Jesus Christ. The different reformers advised different methods for arriving at this desideratum, but their principles were the same—the brotherhood of all mankind, the realization of the church of Jesus Christ. Now since such a society already existed it was the duty of social reformers, thought Father Huntington, to enter the society; to go into the church, make it what it should be, and to take the kingdom of heaven by main force.

Not for a Subsidy. Col. John C. Haskell, a prominent South Carolina corporation lawyer, appeared before the Savannah (Ga.) Cotton Exchange Saturday last and made a long and earnest speech in advocacy of an indorsement by the Exchange of the steamship subsidy bill now before Congress, and for instructing the Georgia Representatives in Congress to vote for it. But the members of the Savannah Cotton Exchange are Democrats, and they gave Col. Haskell a black eye by promptly passing a resolution that, in the opinion of the Exchange, it was "injurious to memorialize Congress to grant subsidies to ships." Col. Haskell appeared very much disappointed at the result of the meeting.

No man can jump off his own shadow, nor for that matter off his own age.—Lowell

Real

Estate.

NATT. ATKINSON & SON.,

ASHEVILLE, :: N. :: C.

Dealers in

Real Estate

In all its branches

Refer, by Permission, to all the Banks of Asheville.

For Particulars, Price List, Etc., apply or address us at this place.

THE ASHEVILLE DEMOCRAT,

A Large 8-page Weekly Paper,

— BY —

ROBT. M. FURMAN AND DAVID M. VANCE,

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

THE PAPER FOR THE PEOPLE.

It will be a large, 8-page, weekly paper, devoted to the Social, Industrial and Political interests of Western North Carolina. It will be the earnest endeavor of the editors to make THE DEMOCRAT useful to the great and varied interests of this rapidly growing city and section. No efforts will be spared to make it entirely acceptable because of its usefulness.

DEMOCRATIC IN POLITICS

It will be Democratic in politics—emphatically and reliably so—as its name and the life-time creed of its editors imply.

THE INDUSTRIAL INTERESTS OF THIS SECTION, Agricultural, Mechanical and Mining, will receive special attention. The resources of every county, the various enterprises of all the people, will have constant consideration.

The department for the Home Circle will be complete. As THE DEMOCRAT is already assured a large circulation in the city of Asheville and all the Western Counties, it will be an excellent medium for advertisers. Rates will be reasonable.

Send in your names with the cash at once. Address,

THE ASHEVILLE DEMOCRAT,

FURMAN & VANCE, EDITORS,

Asheville, N. C.

We will thank any one for any name or names of friends residing in any of the States or Territories that we may send specimen copies of THE DEMOCRAT.