Every bottle warranted, but not one returned, is the report regarding Dr. Seth Arnold's Balsam (the best Summer Remedy) from a large number of druggists in the South. This Balsam is warranted to you by King Drug Co. and G. W. Stancill, Hope Mills.

Everybody in Zanesville, O., knows Mrs. Mary Lee, of rural route 8. Sho "My husband, James Lee firmly believes he owes his life to the use of Dr. King's New Discovery. His jungs were so severely affected that consumption seemed inevitable, when a friend recommended New Discovery We tried it, and its use has restored him to perfect health." Dr. King's Dr. King's New Discovery is the King of throat and lung remedies. For coughs and colds it has no equal. The first dose gives relief. Try it! Sold under guar-antee at B. E. Sedberry's Son's drug store. 50c. and \$100. Trial bottle

There are many imitations of De Witt's Carbolized Witch Hazel Salve but just one original. Sold by Arm-

Foley's Kidney Remedy will cur any case of kidney or bladder trouble that is not beyond the reach of medi No medicine can do more. Mc-Duffle Drug Store (O. O. Souders

Pain anywhere stopped in 20 min utes sure with one of Dr. Shoop's Pink Pain Tablets. The formula is on the 25-cent box. Ask your Doctor or Druggist about this formula! Stops womanly pains, headache, pains any where. Write Dr. Shoop, Racine, Wis for free trial, to prove value of his Headache, or Pink Pain Tablets. Sold

PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

Q. K. NIMOCKS

Attorney and Counsellor-nt-Law.
Rooms 1 and 8 K. of P. Building.
PAYRITRVILLE, N. C.

H. McD. Robinson, John G. Phaw. (Notary Publi ROBINSON & SHAW, Attorneys-at-Law, Offices on second floor National Bank

H. S. AVERITT Attorney-at-Law, (Notary Public). Office-125 Donaldso

Street, Fayetteville, N. C. V. C. BULLARD, Attorney and Counsellor

at Law, Notary Public, Surveyor, Office K. of P. Building, FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

DR. WM. S. JORDAN. Physician and Surgeon. Office in Palace Pharmacy Hours: 9 to 12 and 3 to 5.

Dr. E. L. HUNTER, Dentist. North-east Corner Market Square, Favetteville, N. C.

Dr. A. S. CROMARTIE,

DENTIST, Over Shuford, Rogers & Company.

J. M. LILLY, M. D. Practice limited to diseases of the eye, ear, nore and throat. Office in Highsmith Building, 115 Green street. Hours 9 to 1 and 2 to 5. Phone No.

G. B. Patterson, D. D. S. J. H. Judd, D. D. S.

Drs. Patterson & Judd, Offices 2191/4 Hay Street, over Dunn & Co.'s Store, 'Phone 55.

E. J. S. SCOFIELD, M. D., Offers his professional services to the citizens of Fayetteville and surrounding country. Office with Dr. J. H. Marsh, 249 Hay Street, 'Phone 77; Residence, St. Luke's Hospital, 'Phone

MacKETHAN Beal Estate. TRUST CO Market Square,

PAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

Real Estate bought and sold.
Loans negotiated and guaranteed
Reats and interest collected.
Titles statified, conveyances made.
nearance promiums taken and loaned he

E. B. MacKETHAN, Att'Y.

Real Estate: 1000 Monroe Place, Ardlussa; \$1800 Culbreth Place, 160 acres, with improvements, near Hope Mills; \$600 New 4 room cottage, Canal street; \$600 fine 4 room cottage, corner Mechanic & McKay streets; \$300 fine lot, Arsenal Avenue, highest point; \$50 to \$150 several remaining lots Fairground Park; \$50

to \$75 Choice lots Normal Annex;

- Tilghman lot, corner Green &

Rowan streets, best vacant lot in For Rent: 2 Currie Stores in Brick Row.





MR. BRYAN'S GREAT SPEECH ON the THE TRUST QUESTION.

He Flays Taft and the Republican Party.

magnates

regulate as it will foreign corpora-tions doing business within its limits,

make it necessary for a manufactur

ing or trading corporation engaged in

interstate commerce to take out a federal license before it shall be permit-

ted to control as much as twenty-five percent of the product in which it

deals, the license to protect the pub-lic from watered stock and to prohibit

more than fifty per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and, third, a law

compelling such licensed corporations

to sell to all purchasers in all parts

of the country on the same terms, af

Here is a plain, candid statement of

the party's position. There is no quib-

private monopoly is indefensible and

intolerable. It is had-had in prin-

ciple, and bad in practice. No apology

can be offered for it, and no people should endure it. Our party's post

tion is entirely in harmony with the position of Jefferson. With a knowl-

edge of human nature which few men

have enqualled and none surpassed

and with extraordinary foresight, he

expressed unalterable opposition to

very form of private monopoly. The

student of history will find that upon

this subject, as upon other subjects

upon the side of the whole people and

against those who seek to make a pri-

vate use of government, or strive to

secure special privileges at the ex-

pense of the public.

I have, in discussing the tariff ques

tion, presented one of our remedies.

namely, the removal of the tariff from

imports which compete with trust made goods. This, we believe, would

greatly lessen the extortion practiced

by the trusts and bring about the dis-

solution of many monopolistic com-bines. But we are not satisfied mere-

bling, no evasion, no ambiguity.

control by such corporation of

By telegraph to the Observer.

Indianapolis, Ind., Aug. 25,-Mr. Bryan delivered his keynote speech on the Trust situation to-day in connection with the notification speech of his running mate, John W. Kern, of the latter's nomination for vice-president Mr. Bryan flays Mr. Taft and Republican leaders who have blocked the enforcement of the existing anti-trust laws, and the Republican platform which, he declares, is luke-warm on the subject of private monopolies. Mr. Kern's speech was in effect an answer to Mr. Sherman's. Sherman said: "The people do rule." Mr. Kern gave many instances showing where the will of the people has been thwarted by a Republican Congress. Measure after measure advocated by the people of all parties, many of them advocated by the President, have failed to pass. He also discussed the tariff and the Democratic remedy for curbing the

Following is the full text of the speech delivered by Mr. Bryan to-day on the occasion of the notification of Mr. Kern, the Vice-Presidential nomi-

trust evil.

The Trust Question.

Nowhere does the Republican party show its indifference to real reform nore than in its treatment of the trust question. Here is the Republican latform

"The Republican party passed the Sherman anti-trust law over Democratic opposition and enforced it after ocratic dereliction. It has been wholesome instrument for good in e hands of a wise and fearless adninistration. But experience has shown hat its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better attained y such amendments as will give to the federal government greater supervision and control over, and secure greater publicity in, the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, having power and opportunity to affect monopolies." Sherman anti-trust law was

passed eighteen years ago; it has a defensible and intolerable, the Demoriminal clause which provides a peni cratic party favors its extermination. tentiary punishment for those who It pledges itself to the vigorous enonspire together in restraint of trade. forcement of the criminal law against Ever since the enactment of the law trust magnates and officials. It is imwith the exception of four years, the possible for the Republican party to Republican party has controlled the executive department of the governenforce the present criminal law against trust officials; these officials ment, and during two years of the four, it controlled the house of repreare intimately connected with the Republican party in the present cam sentatives. Instead of Democratic paign. Take, for instance, the chair-man of the Republican speaker's comdereliction, the Democratic party has een urging, year after year, the strict mittee, Mr. Dupont, of Delaware. He enforcement of that law, and the Reis the defendant in a suit which the publican party has been explaining government brought and is now prose year after year why it was impossible cuting. Mr. Dupont is charged with o enforce it. Instead of being a wholesome instrument for good," I violation of the anti-trust law. Why should he be put on the executive comhas been almost useless, so far as the mittee and then be given control of protection of the public is concerned the speaking part of the campaign? or the trusts have grown in number If you talk to a Republican leader in strength, and in arrogance, at the about penitentiary punishment for of-fenders, he favors fining the corporavery time when the Republican party was boasting of its enforcement of tion on the ground that it is impossi-ble to convict individuals, but when The steel trust was formed immediately after the election of 1900 you urge fines you are told that fines and a prominent Republican said, in are unjust to innocent stockholders. a speech soon after, that it might have We favor both fine and imprisonment, prevented a Republican victory if it but we think it is better to prevent had been formed before the election. monopolies than to first authorize Most of the trusts have never been urhed and those that have bee prosecuted have not had their busi-Mr. Taft favors control of trusts inness seriously interrupted. The Pres-ident has done something toward the stead of extermination, but after years of experience the people have learned nforcement of the law, but not near that the trusts control the govern y enough, and the Republican leaders have thwarted him at every point. Fi nally the President became so exasper

form of the administration as "a wise

and fearless one," was composed large

y of the senators and members of

Congress who boldly opposed every

effort to free the people from the

clutches of the favor-seeking corpora

The Republican platform says that

experience has shown that the defect

lyeness of the anti-trust law could b

strengthened by amendments which

greater supervision and control over

agement of those interstate commercial

corporations which have the power

and opportunity to affect monopolies

That is all. No pointing out of reme

dies: no outlining of a plan for more

effective legislation-simply a genera

statement that promises nothing in

particular. And Mr. Taft's speech o

platform. He gives no evidence of

having studied the question or of com-

prehending the iniquities of a mone

poly. You look in vain in his notif

cation speech for any sign of indigus

tion at what the trusts have been do

ing or for evidence of zeal in their

years, been the intimate official com

panion of the President, but he has

caught none of the fire which the

president manifested in his message

If, in the presence of an around

people, and in the heat of a campaign, the Republican party contents itself

with a colorless platform on this sub-

ject, what can we expect in the way

of activity when the exigencies of the campaign are passed? If, when Mr.

Taft is appealing to the Roosevelt Re-

publicans, his discussion of the sub-

ject is so lifeless and his manner so

apologetic and apathetic, what reason

have we to expect either vigor in the enforcement of the law or earnestness

in the search for additional remedies?
In his speech delivered about a year

ago announcing his candidacy Mr. Taft suggested that the present law

be so amended as to permit "reasonable" restraint of trade. Such an

amendment would be as absurd as an

mendment to the law against bur-

glary limiting the law to cases in which more than two burglars en-

ore than half they found. In his no-

Scation speech he suggests national corporation—a remedy which would

out adding to the power of Congress

to prevent monopolies, it would de-prive the states of the power to pro-

Now, let me contrast the Democratic

atform with the Republican plat-

conditions worse because, with-

of last January.

He has, for several

tions.

will

ment. Our platform does not stop with the enforcement of the law; it demands ated that he sent to Congress a mes the enactment of such additional legsage which shocked the Republican eaders by the fierceness of its denun islation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. ciation of the predatory interests. The very convention that spoke in its plat

The Democratic party does not con tent itself with a definition of the wrong or with a denunciation of it. It proceeds to outline remedies. The first is a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations. No one can object to this remedy unless he is in sympathy with the trusts, rather than with the people who are victimized by the trusts. There is no easier way of stifling competition than to make one board of digive the federal government rectors serve for a number of competing corporations. It is not necessary and greater publicity as to, the manfor corporations to enter into an agree ment for the restraint of trade if the corporations can, without violating the law, reach the same end by electing the same directors.

The second remedy is one upon which I desire to dwell at some length We believe it to be a simple, complete acceptance is even weaker than the

and easily enforced remedy. As stated in the platform it is: "A license system which will, with out abridging the right of each state to create corporations, or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce to take out a federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as twenty five per cent of the product in which deals, the license to protect the public from watered stock and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than fifty per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States."

It will be noticed, in the first place, that care was taken by those who drew the platform to provide that there should be no abridgment of the right of a state to create corporations, or of its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits. This plan, therefore, does not in the least infringe upon the right of the states to protect their own people. It simply provides for the by Congre vested in it to regulate interstate commerce. As long as a corporation confines itself to the state in which it is created, Congress can not interfere with it; but when the corporation engages in interstate comme gress is the only power that can regu-

tered the house at one time or took In proposing the exercise of this power, the Democratic platform is not sserting a new doctrine. In January, 1896, a Republican House of Repre sentatives adopted a resolution calling upon Hon. Judson Harmon, then atorney general of the United States now the Democratic candidate for governor in Ohlo, to report what step Nowhere is the difference in If any, had been taken to enforce the the temper of the parties more notice-able; nowhere is the difference in the method of dealing with questions more law of the United States against trusts, combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce, and what further legislation was, in his opinion, needed to protect the peo

of day of February he submitted a re-ply, in which he described the steps lals, which were being taken to enforce the law, and recommended the enact-ment of further legislation. I call against guilty and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be special attention to the following words: necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the Unit-

ed States. Among the additional rem-edies, we specify three: First, a law ship from one state to another, in preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations; sec-ond, a license system which will, without, the designs of such (state) organizations, articles produced, owned or controlled by them or any of their out abridging the right of each state nembers or agents." to create corporations, or its right to His recommendation embodies the

very idea which our plan now proposes to carry out. We want to make it unlawful for a corporation to use the instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the carrying out of a monop olistic purpose. Surely no party can consistently claim to be opposed private monopolies which will permit the interstate railroads to be used to carry out the designs of a monopoly or which will permit the interstate telegraph lines to be used to increase the power of a private monopoly; or, to make the case stronger, no party can consistently claim to be opposed to the trusts which will allow the mails of the United States to be used ter making due allowance for cost of by the trusts as an agency for the extermination of competition. Congress has already exercised this power to ex-terminate lotteries. Why not exercise it to make private monopolies impossible?

If it is conceded that Congress has

the power to prevent the shipment of goods from one state to another when such shipment is a part of a conspiracy against trade and commerce then the only question is as to the means to be employed to prevent such ship-ment. The license system presents an easy way of regulating such corporations as need federal regulation. law can prohibit the doing of a thing and impose a penalty for the violation of government, the great founder of the law, but experience has shown the Democratic party took his position that it is very difficult to gather up evidence from all sections of the United States and prosecute a great corpo ration; so difficult is it, that although the Sherman antitrus, law has been in force for eighteen years, no trust magnate has been sent to the penitentiary for violating the law, although in a few cases the court has found corporations guilty of a violation of the law. In the enforcement of a penalty, the government must seek the defendant; by the use of the license system, the corporation is compelled to seek the government.

ly with the lessening of extortion or A trust can best be defined as a with the dissolution of some of the corporation which controls so large a proportion of the total quantity of any Because the private monopoly is in article used in this country as to be able to regulate the price and terms of sale, and as the proportion controll ed determines the power of the trust for harm, it has seemed best to use proportionate control as the basis of this plan, and twenty-five per cent has been fixed arbitrarily as the propor tion at which, the line should be drawn. A corporation which controls less than wenty-five per cent of the product in Take, for instance, the chairwhich it deals, may, in extpaordinary cases, exert a perceptible influence in controlling the price of the product and the terms of sale, but as a rule a corporation must control more than that percentage of the total product, before it can exert a hurtful influence on trade. Under this plan, the small corporations are left entirely free and unhampered. This is not a discrimination against the larger corporation, but a recognition of the fact that rules are necessary in the case of corporations controlling a large percentage of the product which are not necessary in the case of smaller corpora-tions. Probably not one per cent of the corporations engaged in interstate commerce would be required to take out a license under this plan-possibly them to prey upon the public and not one-half of one per cent—and yet then try to punish them for doing so. what a protection the remaining ninety-nine per cent would find in the law requiring a license in the case of the larger ones!

The license, however, would not prevent the growth of the corporations licensed. It would simply bring them under the eye of the federal government and compel them to deal with the public in such a way as to afford the public the protection necessary. of the restrictions suggested is that such licensed corporations compelled to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making due allowance for cost of transportation. Mr. Taft attacks this restriction as "utterly im-practicable." He says: "If it can e shown that in order to drive out competition, a corporation owning a arge part of the plant producing an article is selling in one part of the country, where it has competitors, at a low and unprofitable price, and in another part of the country, where it has none, at an exorbitant price, this is evidence that it is attempting an unlawful monopoly and justifies conviction under the anti-trust law."

If such an act is now unlawful, why is he so frightened at a plan which gives to the small competitor this very protection? The trouble with the that does present law is

the evils restrain which it is aimed. The plan propos ed in the Democratic platform brings the corporation under the surveillance of the government when it has reached the danger point, and thereafter subjects it to federal scrutiny. The present law simply prohibits it in an indefinite sort of way, and then leaves the officers of the law to scour the country and hunt up violations of the law's provisions. Mr. Taft is unduly alarmed at this proposal, or else he entirely fails to comprehend the details of the plan. He says:

"To supervise the business of corpo-

rations in such a way as to fix the price of commodities and compel the sale at such price is as absurd and so cialistic a plank as was ever inserted in a Democratic political platform." And yet this sentence is found in the same paragraph with the sentence above quoted in which he declares that it is even now a violation of the more of the risks of trade. He is con-Sherman anti-trust law for a corporavinced that there are no good trusts tion to attempt to destroy a competi tor by selling at a low and unprofitable price where it has competition and at an exorbitant price where it has no competition. In what respec is our plan more socialistic than the plan which Mr. Taft endorses? Mere-ly in the fact that ours can be enforc-ed. According to Mr. Taft's logic, a plan is not socialistic which is not effective, but the same would be socialistic if made effective. Why should a corporation supplying twenty mil-lions of people—for a corporation controlling twenty-five per cent of the total product supplies onefourth, or more, of our population—should such a corporation be permitted to sell at one price in one part of the country and at another price in another part?

for such discrimination? Prices are

not made as a matter of favor; when

of one section at the people of another section at another people of another section at another price—the dat of transportation beprice—the dat of transportation—there is

big corporation sells to the

eorporation sells to the people section at one price and the

reason for it, and in almost every case the reason is to be found in the effort to destroy a competitor. One of the most familiar methods of the trust is to under-sell a small competitor in the small competitor's territory-the price being maintained elsewhere-un-

"Congress may make it unlawful to til the small competitor is driven to bankruptcy and then price is raised carrying out, or attempting to carry That has been done over and over again. It is open and notorious; and yet, with the Republican party in com-plete power at Washington, what effort has been made to prevent this This remedy, although vehemently deounced by Mr. Taft, will appeal to the average man as not only very salu ary, but very necessary.

Fifty per cent is fixed as the maxium limit. When a corporation controls fifty per cent of the total product, it supplies forty millions of people with that product. Is that not enough? Mr. Taft's objection to this limitation can hardly be characterized as statesmanlike. He says:

"A corporation controlling forty-five r fifty per cent of the product, may well known methods, frequently ef fect a monopoly and stamp out cometition in a part of a country as comoletely as if it controlled sixty or sev nty per cent thereof."

Why, then, does he not propose

wer limit? If the control of forty ive per cent may constitute a monor ly, why does he not suggest that as maximum? It can not be because of any disinclination to amend his platform for he has already made a patchwork quilt of the convention's platform by promiscuous amendments And to what "well known" methods oes he refer? To the underselling of competitors in one section while the orice is maintained elsewhere? And yet this is the very thing which we opose to remedy, but he proceeds to enounce our remedy as absurd and ocialistic. The trouble with Secretary Taft is that he spends so much me trying to discover excuses for in action in trust matters that he has none left for the consideration of effective remedies. He spends more ime uttering warnings against reme dies proposed than he does in point ng out the evils to be remedied or it uggesting remedies. He says:
"The combination of capital in large

plants to manufacture goods with the greatest economy is just as necessary as the assembling of the parts of machine to the economical and more rapid manufacture of what in old times was made by hand. And he adds that:

"The government should not inter ere with one any more than the other when such aggregations of capital are egitimate and are properly controll ed, for they are the natural results of nodern enterprise and are beneficial o the public."

No one proposes to interfere with roduction on a large scale. No one bjects to production on a scale sufficiently large to enable the producer to tilize by-products and take advantage of all the economies that large produc ion makes possible. It is just here that the trust magnates attempt to confuse the public mind, and Mr. Taff has unconsciously adopted their lan-

Let the issue be made plain; let the distinction be accurately drawn; let the respective positions of the parties be fully understood. The Democratic party does not oppose all corpora tions; on the contrary, it recognizes that the corporation can render an im portant service to the public. Democratic party wants to employ ev ery instrumentality that can be ployed for the advancement of the common good; but the Democratic party draws the line at the private monopoly, and declares that a private monopoly can not be justified on either economic or political grounds. omic standpoint, a mo

nopoly is objectionable. The moment corporation secures a practical mo nopoly in the production or sale o any article, certain evils appear which outweigh any good that can come from large production or control. Wherev er private monopolies exist, certain is resistible tendencies manifest then selves. First, 11 raises prices-this is the first thing thought of for the in creasing of profits. Then, in proportion as it becomes the only purchaser of the raw material, it reduces the price of the raw material, and the produce of that raw material, having no other market, must accept the price offered. In this way, too, the profits of the cor-poration are increased. Third, a reduction in the quality of the product affords an opportunity for increasing profits. Fourth, reduction in wages follows wherever conditions will pe mit.

for when a number of independent pro ducers stand ready to supply him with what he needs, he can choose between them and buy from the one who offer the best product at the lowest price He is also protected in quality becaus those who compete for the opportu nity to sell to him must show either advantage in price or advantage in quality. Competition protects the man who produces raw material, for when there are a number of bidders for that which is being sold, he can accep the highest price offered. tion also helps the wage-earner, for his skill is the finished product which he offers upon the market, and where a number of independent industries are endeavoring to secure the highest skill, the skilled laborer has the best assurance of obtaining a fair recom pense; when there is but one employe the employe must take the price offer ed, because he will lose the advantage of his experience if he must go out to find a different kind of employment. The business of the country have felt the pressure of the trusts. The retailer has been compelled to enter into contracts which restrict his management of his own affairs, he has found the terms of sale and paymen changed to his disadvantage and he has been forced to carry more and

and that his only safety is in the Democratic plan which lays the axe at the root of the tree. The traveling men naturally take especial interest in the trust question cause the more complete the mono poly secured by a corporation the less they are needed. We have no more Intelligent class than the represent tives of commerce, and their retire ment from the road would mean a se rious loss to the country while a few promoters would be the only persons benefitted, they gaining by the capital

elimination of competition. Mr. Taft either misunderstands o misrepresents the Democratic position in regard to the extermination of the principle of private monopoly. In his What reason can a corporation have

"Mr. Roosevelt would compel the trusts to conduct their business in a lawful manner and secure the benefits of their operation and the main tenance of the prosperity of the coune is try of which they are an importan

part: while Mr. Bryan would extirpate and destroy the entire business in order to stamp out the evils which they have practiced."

Here is a confession by Mr. Taft that he regards the trusts as neces-sary to the nation's prosperity, for he declares that they play an important part in the maintenance of prosperity, and he charges that I would "extir-

pate and destroy" business in extirpating and destroying the principle of private monopoly. Surely, his study of the trust question has been very superficial, if he sees danger in the restoration of a reign of competition. Sup Let us take an illustration: pose the Democrats succeed in the enactment of a law in harmony with the Democratic platform-a law requiring every corporation to take ou federal license before it is permit ted to control twenty-five per cent of

the business in which it is engaged Would this "extirpate and destroy" the business of the country? As already stated, but a very small per cent of the corporations would be affected by the aw and those affected would be the ones that have been giving the officers of the law so much trouble during the last 18 years. As the licensed corporation increased its business from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, it would be under the watchful eye of the government, would be compelled to make such reports as the government re-quired, would be prohibited from watering its stock, and would be required to sell to all customers upon the same terms, due allowance being made for cost of transportation. Would it "ex-tirpate and destroy" business to require these licensed corporations to do business on an honest basis and to be reasonable in their business methods? Would not the benefit accruing to the ninety-nine small corporations thus protected from conscienceless methods be enough to offset any evil effects that might follow from such res traint of a few big corporations. Is business so dependent upon dis-honesty and unfairness that it would of our governmental methods as will be "extirpated and destroyed" if morals were introduced into it? When the licensed corporation reached a point where it controlled one-half of the business in which it was engaged, it would according to the Democratic plan, have to stop expanding. Would "extirpate and destroy" business to

plan could not injuriously affect corporations that might hereafter seek to establish a monopoly. But possibly Mr. Taft thinks that I would "extirpate and destroy" busi-ness to apply the plan to existing monopolies. Let us see: Suppose we have a corporation now controlling seventy-five per cent. of the output of the article in which it deals, and through this control, regulating the price and the terms of sale. How land. would the Democratic plan affect it A date would be fixed at which the law would take effect, and on or be fore that date the corporations would The be required to apply for a license. evidence would show that it controlled a larger proportion of the product than the law permitted, and it would be compelled to sell off enough of its plants to reduce its output to fifty per cent of the total product. It could then comply with the law, obtain its license, and proceed to carry on its usiness in accordance with the law. master. Would it "extirpate and destroy" business to compel such a corporation to dispose of enough of its plants to reduce its production to fifty per cent? The people would still need the ar ticle which it produced, and the plants which it was compelled to sell would become independent plants competing

with it. This competition would reduce prices, and the reduced prices would increase the demand for the ar-ticle, and this increased demand would timulate the building of more factories and give a larger employment to The restoration of competition in that industry, instead of "extirpating and destroying" the industry would revive and enlarge it. A part of the benefit would go to the consumers in the form of a cheaper product and better product, part would go to the producer of raw material in the form of a better price, and part would go to the wage earners in the form of better wages. The only persons to better wages. lose would be the trust magnates, who would no longer be able to collect dividends on watered stock by controll ing the market. When the analyzed it will be seen that Mr. Taft must either be in darkness as to th

into business would "extirpate and destroy" business. have quoted and re-quoted Mr Taft's language because I want to impress upon the minds of those who lisen to me the absurdity of the object ion which he raises to the Democrat plan of exterminating monopolies. He fails to distinguish between the onest business that makes a country prosperous, and the brigandage prac ilced by private monopolies. The neo ple have been robbed by the trusts to the extent of hundreds of millions a year, and if Mr. Taft is not yet con cious of what is going on, and not yet aroused to the iniquity of the trusts how can the country hope for relief through his election?

remedy and its effect, or he must ar-

gue that the introduction of morals

The Democratic party is the de fender of competition and the only great party which is seeking to re store competition. Mr. Taft has, in the discussion of this question, employed harsh words instead of argument. The word "socialistic" is hurl ed at the Democratic party and the Democratic platform. Now, as a matter of fact, it is Mr. Taft's party and not the Democratic party which has given encouragement to socialism. While professing to abhor socialism the Republican party has gone half way toward socialism in endorsing its fundamental principle. The socialist bases his contention on the theory that competition is bad, and that eco nomic advance is to be found in mo nopoly. The socialist, however, wants the public to have the benefit of the monopoly and, therefore, favors government ownership and operation of all the means of production and dis-

The Republican party has gone al most as far as the socialist party in the economic defense of the monopoly, but it permits the benefits of monop oly to be enjoyed by a comparatively few men, who have secured a domi-nant influence in the government. I beg to call Mr. Taft's attention to the fact that the Republican party has stimulated the growth of socialism in two ways: First, by the endorsement that it has given to the theory that trusts are a natural and necessary outgrowth of our economic conditions and, second, by permitting the deve opment of abuses which have been charged against individualism. will examine the vote published in the World Almanac, he will find that in 1900 the Republicans polled 7,208,244 votes and that the socialists polled but 85,991; in the same almanac, he will find that in 1904 the Republicans

cast 7,625,489 votes and the socialists 402,286. Notwithstanding the fact that the Republicans have boasted of their last national victory, their par ty polled but 417,000 more votes that year than four years before. This scarcely more than covered the nat ural increase in the Republican por tion of the population, while the so cialist vote increased more than thre hundred per cent, and the increase in votes was almost as great as the in crease in Republican votes.

The Republican leaders have been in the habit of sneering at the socialists, while blindly indifferent to the causes that have contributed to the growth of socialism. crats recognize that socialists are hon estly seeking a remedy for the "know abuses" admitted by Secretary Taft Democrats dissent from the remedy proposed by the socialists, believing that socialists are mistaken and that the Democratic remedy is better, bu it is time for thoughtful people to recognize that individualism can only b retained and defended by remedial legislation which will remove the abuses which have been allowed to fasten themselves upon the country. The Democratic party, believing in individualism, addresses itself earnestly to these abuses, and instead of ridiculing and maligning the socialists, in vites them, as it does Republicans, to examine the Democratic platform and the remedies proposed therein. It submits its plans to the honest citizen ship of the country, without regard to section or party.

In my notification speech I called attention to three demands made by our party. It asks, first, that the government shall be taken out of the hands of special interests and restored to the people as a whole; it asks second, for honesty in elections and publicity in regard to campaign funds, that the people may freely choose rep resentatives in sympathy with them and pledged to guard their interests; it asks, third, for such a modification make the senate an elective body, and place the control of the house of rep resentatives in the hands of a major ity of its members. A few days ago, in discussing the tariff question, I dwelt upon the fourth demand made by our party, namely, that taxation be just, that the revenue laws be made put this limitation upon the greed for the purpose of raising revenue of a few corporations? Surely our and not for the enrichment of a few at the expense of the many, and that the tariff law be supplemented by an income tax which will more nearly equalize the government's burdens. To day I present another demand made in our party platform-the demand that the grip of the trusts be broken, that competition be restored and that the loor of opportunity be opened to the

business men and the toilers of the Industrial Independence is neces sary to political independence. The free exercise of the rights of citizen ship is impossible when a few men control the industries in which mil-lions are employed. God forbid that we should compel the wage-earners of the nation to address their petitions o trust magnates, and ask for their daily bread. Already we have seen how prone the monopolist is to make employment depend upon the willing ness of the employe to prostitute his ballot to the service of his corporate

This question should be settled now: ve can not afford to bequeath it as a legacy of woe to a succeeding generation. The conscience of the people is already awakened and the conscience s the most potent force of which man has knowledge. Where law makes one righteous, conscience controls an hun dred; where one is kept from wrong doing by fear of prison doors, a thousand are restrained by those invisible which conscience rears us-barriers which are stronger than walls of granite. It is upon the con science that human institutions rest and without a stirring of the con science no great reform is possible To a national conscience already aroused we appeal, pledge that a Democ Democratic vie will mean the ringing out of ndustrial despotism and the ringing be built upon its merits, and in which men will succeed, not in proportion to the coercion they may be able to practice, but in proportion to their in dustry, their ability and their fidelity.

AS TO THE BALTIMORE SUN. The anti-Bryan papers seek to make

"dog fall" of the circumstance that while the New York World has declared for Bryan the Baltimore Sun has declared for Taft. The point is far from being well

taken: Both the Sun and the World have been, to all intents and purposes. Republican papers for twelve years past; therefore, the account stands to this effect, viz: that the Democratic cause has secured a recruit in the World's accession and has lost nothing in the Sun's "standing pat." Besides, the influence of the World is ten to twenty times that of the Sun.

The excellent Norfolk Virginian-P. lot has this to say concerning the Sun's dodging from pillow to post in the past, as the Bryan Democrats were made to appear to be "paramounting," or to be neglecting to "paramount this, that, or the other doctrine: "The Maryland Democrats have on

efficient method in their reach of el fectively replying to anything that the Baltimore Sun may say in behalf of Taft; that is, to turn back to the columns of the Sun Itself within the past welve months and there find ample refutation of all that it freely utters now. There is nothing which Taft advocates which the Sun has not earnest ly antagonized-whether it be Protec tion. Paternalism, Imperialism, or h erference with the systems of su frage in the Southern States-and it would not be a bad idea for the Demo cratic committee of Maryland to make up a campaign book containing ex tracts from the Sun's editorials in the recent past scoring all the policies for which Mr. Taft and the Republican party are standing to-day. There is no better way to answer a man than out of his own mouth."

Served as coffee, the new coffee substitute known to grocers everywhere as Dr. Shoop's Health Coffee, will trick even a coffee expert. Not a grain o real coffee in it either. Pure healthful toasted grains, malt, nuts, etc., have been so cleverly blended as to give t wonderfully satisfying coffee taste and flavor. And it is "made in a minute," too. No tedious 20 to 30 minutes boil ng. L. C. Wooten.

DeWitt's Little Early Risers, safe easy, pleasant, sure, little liver pills. Sold by Armfield Drug Co.

FAYETTEVILLE MARBLE AND GRANITE WORKS Strictly First-class Work.

DAILY EDITION. \$6.00 Per Annum, in Advance.

> ('all at my yard or write for prices Respectfully, E. L. REMSBURG, Proprietor

CRIMSON CLOVER

BIG BOSTON LETTUCE.

OTHER

Seasonable Seeds.

H. R. Horne & Sons VIOLET

AMMONIA SO REFESHING FOR THE TOILET AND BATH

15 AND 25 CTS. VIOLET WITCH-HAZEL

SHAVING 25 CENTS. B. E. SEDBERRY'S SON.

DELIGHTFUL AFTER

OUR AIM

IS TO GIVE THE BEST POSSIBLE SERVICE

AND BEST IN QUALITY

OF GOODS.

WE SOLICIT YOUR ORDERS.

4. J. COOK & CO. HUGGISTS AND PHARMACISTS Next P. O. 'Phone 14'.

GO TO THE

WIDE - AWAKE [RUG STORE!

YOU'LL GET WHAT THE DOCTOR ORDERS

ON THE BUSY CORNER.

KING DRUG COMPANY.

McDuffie Drug Store.

MacKethan's

On The Square.

WILL DRIVE AWAY

MOSQUITOES. Price 25c.

MacKETHAN & CO. Druggists

NEW GOODS!

We have just received a well selected assortment of

HAIR BRUSHES **AND COMBS** which we are selling at small profit. Other new goods in

TOOTH BRUSHES WHISK BROOMS, BATH MITTS, SPONGES, ETC.

Armfield's

Hotel LaFayette Building. Prescriptions Filled only by Reg-Istered Druggist