THE CAUCASIAN.

VOL. XVIII. RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1900. NO. 15.

State Library

SENATOR BUTLER'S SPEECH ON

Manhood Suffrage in North Carolina and the Proposed Constitutional Amendment.

THE GRANDFATHER CLAUSE OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT CLEARLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

He Quotes Abundant and Conclusive Legal Authority to Show That Section 5 is Not Only Unconstitutional, But That It Will Fall, Leaving The Remainder of the Amendment to Stand. He Discusses Judge Brown's Proposed Amendment and Shows That the Court Would Unquestionably Ignore any Attempt of the Legislature to Instruct It How to Decide This or any Other Question. He Brands the Charge of Negro Domination as a Slander on the State.--Other Features of the Amendment Discussed.--He Says That the Proposed Amendment is Not Only Unconstitutional and Dangerous to the Liberties of Fifty Thousand White Men in North Carolina, But That It is Dishonest in its Method and Puts the South in a False Position.

(Continued from last week.)

REPLY TO SENATOR M'ENERY.

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. McEnery) based his whole contention, as I understood him, upon the claim that section 5 did not discriminate against former slaves because it did not exclude them suffrage; but, on the other hand, included another class who had not been in servitude. His contention, if I understood him, was that section 4, limiting to an educational qualification and applying it to all races alike, was, of course, constitutional (which everybody admits), but that when section 5 comes along and confers a still wider suffrage on a certain class none of whom were slaves, that this inclusion, not being exclusion, is not in violation of the fifteenth amendment. I have heard one or two other persons make the same argument; not in this body, however. Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator, candor forces me to say that a thinner and more transparent subterfuge, a weaker and more untenable argument, was never advanced by any lawyer in the court house, even in the most desperate case to defend. I take it that the distinguished Senator would not have the courage to seriously make that argument before the Supreme Court of the United States.

But the Senator cites an authority which he claims supports that position. It is as follows: McPherson vs. Blacker (110 U. S., page 1). He quotes the following:

"The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State. There is no color for the contention that, under the amendment, every male inhabitant of the State, being a citizen of the United States, has, from the time of his majority, a right to vote for Presidential electors."

He quotes next from The State vs. Wilkshank et al. (92 U. S. Reports page 542) as follows:

"From this it appears that the right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship; but that exemption from discrimination in the exercise of that right on account of race, etc., is; but it must be expressly proved."

The only point that I could see that he attempted to make by this citation was that he repeated the words "expressly averred."

But, Mr. President, the Senator's own authority contains sufficient language with which to answer his contention. Is not the inclusion of a class into certain privileges which are denied to another class as much a discrimination as the direct exclusion of the said class? When there is a discrimination in favor of one class there is necessarily at the same time a discrimination against another class; and is not this discrimination "expressly averred" in section 5? The authority he cites is an authority against his contention.

Of course the Federal government does not confer the right to vote on anyone. The States confer that right; but the fifteenth amendment says that when a State proceeds to confer that right upon its citizens it shall not abridge the suffrage rights of those who have been in slavery. Abridgement there can mean but one thing, and that is that the States shall not confer less suffrage privileges upon the class of former slaves than upon its other citizens. But if there was any doubt about this question, the Supreme Court, in one terse sentence, interpreting the fifteenth amendment, in the case of the United States vs. Reese, has settled it. That sentence is as follows:

"If citizens of one race having certain qualifications are permitted by law to vote, those of another having the same qualifications must be."

As we see that it makes no difference whether the discrimination is by depriving directly the suffrage privileges of another former slave or indirectly by enlarging to the former class; yet it is an abridgement within the meaning of the fifteenth amendment. Can anything be clearer? But does not put beyond all question the unconstitutionality of section 5? Then nothing can (for those who still doubt) except to have the court to call that section by name and apply the plain words to it.

But, Mr. President, I do not consider it necessary to analyze the argument of the Senator from Louisiana, even if it is stronger than it is, because the people will remember that while the Senator was delivering the speech I interrupted him and read the following extract from the New Orleans Times-Democrat of Friday, March 18, 1898, in which the Senator strongly expressed the same view that I now hold. The letter is as follows:

Washington, D. C., March 17, 1898.

To the Times-Democrat:

In answer, I say that section 5 is grossly unconstitutional. I have submitted the same to some of the ablest Democrats of the Senate, who are able constitutional lawyers. They all concur in my opinion, that if adopted, the effect will be to lose our representation in Congress and in the electoral vote of the State. S. D. McENERY.

The Senate will remember that when I asked the Senator if he did not write that letter and if he was not then of the opinion that the amendment was "grossly unconstitutional" he replied:

Yes, sir, when the constitutional convention was in session I was telegraphed to know what was my opinion of this section 5. I replied to that telegram that in my opinion it was unconstitutional. I then received another telegram, after its adoption, to know if, when it was attacked, I would defend it in the Senate of the United States. To that telegram I replied that I would.

So, Mr. President, I take it that the Senator's speech was simply delivered in response to that pledge to attempt to defend the "grossly unconstitutional" thing if this State should unwisely adopt it.

REPLY TO SENATOR MONEY.

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Money), if I remember correctly, cited only one authority in support of his contention that section 5 is constitutional, and that was the Mississippi case in which the Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of the Mississippi suffrage amendment; but the decision of the court in that case is not in the least in point, but applies to an entirely different constitutional provision. What does the suffrage provision of the Mississippi constitution provide?

I happen not to have an official copy of the constitution of Mississippi, and this extract is taken from a magazine article, but it provides that—

On and after January 1, 1892, every elector shall, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, be able to read and write any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or to give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

This provision, as is readily seen, creates no privileged class. It does not confer the right to vote upon one class and deny it to another, but it provides an educational qualification which applies to all classes alike. It is similar to section 4 of the proposed amendment in North Carolina, which everybody admits is constitutional. To make the Mississippi suffrage provision like the North Carolina amendment it would be necessary to add another section following the section I have just read, which would exempt a class—that is, those who voted or whose fathers and grandfathers voted in 1867 or before— from the provisions of the Mississippi constitution. But the Mississippi constitution contains no such provision. The court, in passing upon the suffrage provision of the Mississippi constitution, stated that it was clearly constitutional unless the State court should so construe that provision or unless its provisions should be administered in a way to violate the fifteenth amendment by denying the former slaves and their descendants the right to vote as conferred upon otehr citizens. In short, as the court said in Williams vs. Mississippi, in passing upon the same provision, there was nothing unconstitutional in the terms of the Mississippi suffrage provision nor was there anything unconstitutional in its legal effect. The court did not say, however, that it might be construed so as to make it unconstitutional and that it might be administered "with an evil eye and an unequal hand" so as to make it unconstitutional, but the court went on further to say that the case as it was presented to the court did not show that either had been done; therefore the court upheld its constitutionality.

But how different with the proposed amendment in North Carolina, where the Mississippi educational provision is qualified by section 5. In this case the unconstitutionality of the "grandfather" section is apparent from its terms when interpreted according to the rules I have referred to—that is, in the light of the history of the times and in view of the immediate and necessary effect. So the Mississippi cases instead of being authority to support section 5, are strong and direct authority the other way. Mr. President, section 5 of the proposed amendment can not be so construed or interpreted as to make it constitutional. It can not be administered so as to make it constitutional. It is unconstitutional as it stands on its face and by its necessary effect, by every rule of construction that the court has ever followed.

REPLY TO SENATOR MORGAN.

When the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Morgan) delivered his speech on this question, I sat near him and paid the closest attention. On account of his reputation as a constitutional lawyer I was very anxious to hear him and curious to know what kind of argument he could advance or what hitherto undiscovered opinion of the Supreme Court he could adduce to maintain the constitutionality of such a thinly veiled subterfuge as section 5. But for once I was doomed to disappointment when listening to the Senator from Alabama. He did not attempt seriously to discuss and argue the constitutionality of section 5. Clearly he is too wise and too good a lawyer to put himself on record with argument that would not bear the test of analysis and comparison with decided cases.

So he contented himself with expressing an opinion that the Mississippi cases applied to section 5 and then devoting all of the remainder of his speech to a discussion of the dangers of reconstruction and using high sounding phrases about the magnitude of the difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the African. The same is true in this respect of the speeches of the other two Senators. What legal argument they essayed to put forth seems to indicate that they are influenced more by their desires and hopes than by their judgment. Their speeches would no doubt be fitting in a campaign where "nigger" was to be the slogan and race prejudice must be aroused in order to prevent the calm and deliberate consideration of argument and to banish reason and to enthrone in its stead passion and prejudice; and, whether so intended or not, this will be the chief use to which their speeches will be put in the coming campaign in North Carolina. But I submit that such a discussion of the difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the African does ont seem fitting in the United States Senate when a great legal and constitutional question is under consideration, and surely, their authors could not expect such speeches to be listened to with much patience should they attempt to deliver them before the greatest and ablest court in the world while this constitutional question was being considered for adjudication.

WHAT THE LAW JOURNALS AND GREAT CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYERS SAY.

Mr. President, the adoption of this novel scheme of attempting to evade the fifteenth amendment in Louisiana and the proposed attempt in North Carolina has attracted a great deal of attention from the legal profession and the law journals. I have on my desk the Harvard Law Review of December, 1899, which contains an able and thoughtful article by Amasa M. Eton on this question, to which I have already referred. After reviewing the whole question at length from a legal standpoint, he contends that the court must necessarily declare section 5 unconstitutional. He himself expresses doubt as to the wisdom of the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, but calls attention to the fact that this has nothing whatever to do with the constitutionality of the proposed suffrage amendment.

A number of other law journals have discussed it, and so far as I have seen not a single one has attempted to uphold its constitutionality. I have a copy of the current number of Law Notes, with a comment upon the speech delivered by my colleague, in which the editor takes the same position. he editor also cites the opinion of Mr. William D. Guthrie, of the New York bar, as a good constitutional authority.

Mr. Guthrie was one of the distinguished lawyers associated with Mr. Choate in arguing the income tax cases before the Supreme Court, and is recognized as one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in the United States. In his law lectures on the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, he refers to and discusses the constitutional amendment of Louisiana, and the proposed one in North Carolina is like it. He declares, commenting upon section 5, the "grandfather clause," that it is a travesty of constitutional justice." I do not put my hand just now upon the extract from Mr. Guthrie's lectures, in which he declared the proposed constitutional amendment is a travesty of constitutional justice, but I will ask permission to put it in my remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

This travesty of constitutional justice ought to be brought to the test in the Federal courts at the earliest possible moment. If such a provision can be sustained as within the power of the States to regulate the qualification of voters, the result ought to be the diminution of Louisiana's representation in Congress and in the electoral college in proportion to the excluded negro vote.

Ex-Senator Edmunds, who is recognized as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, living constitutional lawyers, has declared section 5 of the Louisiana amendment unconstitutional, and he is also of the opinion that section 5 would fall and that the remainder of the amendment would stand. But I will discuss that feature of the question in a few minutes.

In this connection I also call attention to the recent action of the Georgia legislature in voting down a similar amendment by the overwhelming majority of 137 to 3. In the debate the members took the position that section 5 was not only unconstitutional, but that it was an unmanly subterfuge, was unjust and was not necessary. I have condensed the debate on this question before the Geofgia legislature, as published in the Atlanta papers, and will ask permission to put it into the Record as part of my remarks.

I ask permission to put the extracts from that debate in my remarks because I think the Senate and the country ought to see the argument, the legal opinions, and the doubts expressed that influenced the Georgia legislature in repudiating this dangerous unconstitutional, and unmanly scheme.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT DISCUSSED BY THE GEORGIA LEGISLATURE.

The Atlanta (Ga) Constitution of November 29, 1899, giving a report of the legislative proceedings said:

"The only voice raised in defense of the measure was that of its author, who made an able, though ineffective argument, while half a dozen leading members of the House took the floor in protest against the passage of the bill, which they pronounced an open and admitted discrimination against one class of citizens in the State. After the previous question had been called, shutting off debate on the issue, an effort was made to lay the bill on the table, partly out of deference to its author and in view of the stubborn opposition with which it met, as well as the certainty that it would meet defeat if put on its passage. The main line of opposition to the Hardwick bill brought out in debate was against the grandfather clause.

"Mr. Copeland, of Walker, addressed the chair. He said: 'If I properly understand this measure, it is radical, unjust, and unfair. I am in favor of no amendment to the contsitution or change in the law that does not meet with the approval of the qualified voters of the State, and I am satisfied that the people of Georgia would not and never have given their approval to so radical a change as this. No one appreciates more than I the deplorable condition of the ballot in our State today, but I submit that this measure is not the proper one to work the change so much needed. I wish to remind the House that for every one who sells his vote there is one who buys it, and the wrong in one case is as great as in the other.' Mr. Copeland proceeded to make an able presentation of the reasons against the passage of the measure, and was once interupted by loud applause.

"Mr. Harrison, of Quitman, declared the proposed measure harsher in every respect than any reform bill ever enacted into law in any of the Southern States except Louisiana. He said: 'In Mississippi some educational qualification is imposed by recent enactment,

(Continued on 4th page.)

A FOLLOWER OF GOVERNOR VANCE

Points Out The Dangers Behind The Constitutional Amendment.

HE SHOWS HOW THE POOR AND HONEST

Illiterate White Voter Will Be Robbed of His Right to Vote, and Put on a Plane Lower Than the Town Negro and "Spider-Legged" Dude -- True Democrats Against Ring Rule--He Stands For Manhood Suffrage and the Rule of the People.

The Caucasian clips the following extract from a recent speech from Hon. D. M. Luther, a democratic lawyer of Asheville. Mr. Luther is President of the Zeb Vance Clubs of Buncombe county, and is one of the most prominent and active Democrats in western North Carolina. In his speech he said:

"The question that is now before the people of North Carolina, is one in which all citizens, without regard to race, color or previous condition of servitude, feel the greatest interest of any question that has come before the people of this State since the declaration of independence at the city of Charlotte on the 20th day of May, 1775. It is a question which involves the freedom of every citizen of the State. The right of suffrage which is bequeathed to us by our forefathers has been invaded, and a strong effort is being made, and will be made until our next election, to rob us of the privilege of casting our votes as freemen, and to filch from us the rights which cost the blood of so many of our noble ancestors.

TAXATION WITHOU REPRESENTATION.

"Our forefathers declared that taxation without representation was tyranny but Lord North and his administration declared that the edict must be consummated which lost to England the American colonies and laid the foundation of the greatest government now on the face of the globe. Now we who have inherited the blessing of this after the lapse of one hundred and thirty years, declare the same truth—that taxation without representation is tyranny, and we are willing to make any sacrifice in order to defeat the amendment now proposed to the State constitution, and to perpetuate the rights of free suffrage guaranteed to every citizen by the constituion of the United States.

WOULD DISFRANCHISE VEERANS.

"I see before me tonight many veterans who went forth in the dark days of 1860 and 1861, to figh for those principles that you believed to be right and just and in the defense of your homes and firesides, and for your own Sunny South, and we were willing to lay down your lives, and many of you today on account of pour patriotism at that time are unable to "read and write any section of the constitution of North Carolina," as is prescribed in article fourth of the proposed amendment, and therefore, if such amendment is carried, will be disfranchised and placed upon the level of a convict felon. I call on you young men, the sons of these veterans, to remember whose sons you are and whose inheritance you possess, to go to the ballot box and cast your votes to defeat the measure that would bring shame and disgrace on your fathers and your neighbors and your own native State.

BOOK EDUCATION NOT EVERYTHING.

"They tell you no white man will be disfranchised under this amendment, but if section 5 is declared unconstitutional by our national Supreme Court then the white man and the negro are placed upon the same plane of an educational qualification, and in our humble opinion, in western North Carolina there will be at least three white men disfranchised to one negro. And again, the man who is a freeholder, and who owns anywhere from $4,000 to $10,000 worth of property, and pays taxes on the same, but who is unable to read and write any section of the constitution, will be disfranchised; while the 'spider-legged dude,' who does not own a dollar's worth of property in the world, and is indebted for the suit of clothes that he wears, and owes his landlady a board bill, but who can read and write, will be protected in his right to vote. The 'hoary-handed son of a toil,' who earns his living by the sweat of his brow, and who pays his honest debts, is robbed of his vote solely because of his lack of book education, while the educated negro and dude will be allowed to vote over him.

A FOLLOWER OF VANCE.

"I believe in the grand principles of Democracy as laid down by Jefferson advocated by Jackson, Tilden, Bryan and Vance; in the motto of universal suffrage to all and special privileges to none. If there is any Democrat here to-night who can show me by one word or sentence ever uttered or written by our great statesman, hero and patriot, Zebulon B. Vance, advocating the disfranchisement of any citizen of North Carolina, I will then support the amendment. Although the lips of Vance are now forever silent, his teachings of universal suffrage will go ringing down the grooves of time, awaking thrills of patriotical devotion in the breast of every true son of the Old North State.

"But, my friends, I don't believe in the Democracy of Benjamin R. Tillman and his associates, who advocate contraction of suffrage to a limited few, and the placing of the power of the ballot in the hands of a Bourbon aristocracy.

TRUE DEMOCRACY.

"I ask you tonight, my friends, what Democracy means? If its true meaning isn't a government of the people and for the people, conferring the greatest good upon the greatest number of its citizens? And I contend tonight if this constitutional amendment is adopted, that we will not have a Democratic form of government in North Carolina, because the franchise will be limited to a minority of the qualified voters of the State, and that the clicks and rings of each of the political parties will manipulate and control the affairs of the State and county absolutely independently of the votes of our people. May that hide from me the day that condition shall envelope my own native State. If it comes, the freedam and liberty which our forefathers fought bled and died for, and which they bequeathed to us, their children—the rich inheritance of political freedom—will have become as 'soundling brass and a tinkling cymbal,' and we will be owned and controlled by political tricksters and charlatans."

MAKING WAR IMPOSSIBLE.

Revolution Wrought by the Magazine Rifle, Smokeless Powder and Artillery.

The invention of the magazine rifle was the beginning of the end of war. The modern rifle is not only more rapid but it has greater precision and wider range. It has a range from three to four miles, and this increases its effectiveness immensely. In the last great war it was necessary to sight the rifle high so that it had no effectiveness between the muzzle and the point where it approached the ground again; the modern rifle missile proceeds at the same distance from the ground for more than a mile, and will kill or wound any living thing it strikes in its course. At a near range it will go through a file of soldiers. The rifle of to-morrow will be forty times as effective as the Chassepot of the Franco-Prussian War. With this rifle a soldier can carry five hundred and seventy-five cartridges where he carried only eighty-four with the old style.

The invention of smokeless powder is equally important. It demolishes the screen behind which human beings have fought and died. Every soldier in the fighting-line will see with frightful distinctness the havoic being made in the ranks by the shot and shell of the enemy, causing an immense strain upon the nerve and morale of the army. An army on the march, without hearing anything, will be apprised of the proximity of the enemy by seeing men drop, killed and wounded. There will be nothing along the whole line of the horizon to show whence the death-dealing missiles come.

The artillery branch of the service has made even greater advance. The French gun of to-day is one hundred and sixteen times as effective as that in use twenty years ago against the Germans. By the use of range-finders a great saving in time and in ammunition has been effected. While the range has increased, the explosive power of the projectiles has enormously developed. It is estimated that if a force of ten thousand men, advancing to an attack, had to traverse a distance of one and one-half miles under the fire of a single battery, the bursting of shells thrown by that battery would scatter two hundred and seventy-five thousand bullets in fragments over the line of advance.—Argonaut.

Bound to Depart.

San Francisco Wave: A youthful Stockton man rushed to catch a river boat for San Francisco, but was about two minutes late. The steamer was six feet out as he reached the dock. He swung his grip aboard and, jumping, caught a rope and a post and held fast. Every one imagined he had fallen in. The captain, peering over the side, saw his intrepid passenger. "Here, you," he shouted, "by jiminy crickets, don't you ever do that again!" The passenger had hauled himself aboard by this time, and, turning a look of scorn at the captain, said: "What do you think I'm going to do—jump back and try it over?"

A few years ago the Koreans came to Washington in the quaintest of Oriental garbs, from which they never deviated. This winter the Korean Minister is making the afternoon social rounds in a Prince Albert and striped trousers.

TREATY REPORTED

To the Senate—Pension Bills in the House.

SENATE.

Sixty-seventh day.—The Senate committee onappropriation authorized a favorable report on the House bill, providing that the revenues collected from Porto Rico be expended in that island. The bill was amended so as to include the money collected to January 1, 1900. The clause of the bill authorizing the refunding of future revenue collections was stricken out.

Sixty-ninth Day.—The Senate committee on foreign relations reported the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to the Senate with an amendment reserving the right to defend the canal in case of war. The amendment merely places a limitation upon the restrictions in article 2, and is as follows: Insert at the end of section 5 of article 2, the following: "It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections numered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defence of the United States and the maintenance of public order."

The conclusion to report the treaty with this amendment was reached after a session of the committee, in which Senator Morgan very strenuously opposed the amendment. He was, however, the only Senator in opposition, Senators Bacon and Daniel, the other Democratic members of the committee, voting with the Republican members for the amendment, and then for a resolution to report.

Seventieth Day.—While the Senate had diplomatic and consular appropriation bills under consideration a lively debate was precipitated by an amendment proposed by Mr. Hoar of Massachusetts, proposing to give Former Queen Liliuokalani of Hawaii $20,000 and an annuity of $10,000. The amendment was tabled finally without division. The pending bill was passed with a few minor amendments.

The remainder of the session was devoted to eulogies of the late Monroe L. Hayward, who as elected Senator from Nebraska but died before the opening of the present session of Congress.

HOUSE.

Sixty-seventh day.—The death of Representative Harmer, of Pennsylvania, "the Father of the House," cast a deep gloom over the House. Although he was known to be in feeble health, his death came as a shock to his colleagues, by whom he was universally, beloved. Mr. Harmer was the oldest member of the House, both in length of service and of continuous service, and was, therefore, entitled to the distinction of the Father of the House. As such it was his duty to swear in the incoming Speaker at the opening of each Congress, and this was the occasion of his only appearance in the Houes this season.

Sixty-ninth Day.—The first day pension session of the House provided for under the new rule proved a success. There was comparatively little friction, and 97 bills were favorably acted upon in committee of the whole and subsequently passed by the House. The only incident was a brisk exchange between Mr. Loud, of California, and Mr. Sulloway, of New Hampshire, upon the general policy of special pension legislation, in which the former attacked and the latter defended the system.

When it was moved that the House go into committee of the whole to consider private pension bills, Mr. Talbert, of South Carolina, true to his announced plan, made the point of no quorum. The Speaker was unable to count more than 116 members present and the doors were closed and a call of the House ordered. The presence of 218 members resulted and the committee began its proceedings.

Mr. Loud, in his remarks, asserted that 95 per cent. of the special bills passed by Congress should never have been favorably considered. All of them had been rejected by the Pension office.

Seventieth Day.—The hour agreed to take up the bill providing a government for Hawaii of April 3, the final vote to be taken of April 5, at 4 p. m.

Consideration of the Wise-Youn election contest was resumed and occupied the remainder of the session.

THE BLACK WALNUT.

Out of Fashion in This Country, but Europe Is Eager For It.

The great size often reached by this tree, the richness of the dark-brown wood, the unique beauty of the grain, sometimes found in burls, knots, feathers, and in the curl of the roots, all conspire to make this the most choice and high-priced of all our native woods says a writer in the Berea Quarterly.

Twenty-five years ago walnut was extensively used in the manufacture of fine furniture and finishings in this country, but manufacturers adroitly drew attention to the beauty of darkly stained quartered oak, and the use of the rarer wood has greatly declined. But all this time the search for fine black walnut logs has gone on systematically, thought quietly, the trade attracting little attention, though the volume of lumber handled has been large. Though found to some extent in the Atlantic States from Massachusetts southward, the great source of supply has been the central portions of the Mississippi valley. The walnut is at home in the rich alluvial bottom lands of the Western streams and in the stony limestone soils of the hills and mountains, and in such localities the buyers have left few trees unsurveyed. Throughout Eastern Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas, as well as the States along the Ohio and its tributaries, may be seen a few logs at this little station, a car or two at that, with carefully hewn sides and painted ends, ready for the market.

If you ask where the market is you will find that the great bulk of this rare lumber goes to Europe.

While we have been led into an enthusiastic admiration for fine oak, stained according to the degree of antiquity it is supposed to represent, our European cousins have been paying fancy prices for the rich black walnut that we have allowed to go "out of fashion."

The Boston Journal puts it in this way: "Congressman eject Roberts will return to his families."

KENTUCKY IS AGAIN

Dangerously Near the Verge of Civil Conflict.

BOTH PARTIES GROW BELLIGERENT.

Taylor and Beckham Each Order Out the Militia—State House Grounds Again Surrounded With Troops.

Frankfort, Ky., Special.—The situation here has reached a point of excitement almost approaching that of the stirring times immediately following the assassination of Goebel. The reinstatement of the military power in complete control of the State executive building and the refusal of the military authorities to allow the local police and civil officers to enter the building for the purpose of arresting Secretary of State Caleb Powers and Capt. John W. Davis, charged with being accessories to the Goebel assassination, and the probability of a conflict between the civil and military authorities has made the situation look serious. Saturday morning City Marshal Richardson applied at the executive building and demanded to be admitted for the purpose of arresting Powers and Davis, but was turned back and the warrants were then turned over to Sheriff Suter. The latter also presented himself at the executive building and demanded admittance. He was referred by the officer in charge to Col. Morrow, and the latter being found, said: "I am sorry, Mr. Sheriff, but it is against Gov. Taylor's orders to let any one into the building."

Sheriff Suter then held a consultation with County Attorney Polsgrove, Commonwealth Attorney Franklin and other officials. Meantime the police force had been doubled and a detail guarded each of the entrances to the State House grounds to prevent the men wanted from escaping. At the conference between the officials it was decided that the sheriff should summon a large reserve force of deputies, to be called into use in the event it was decided to attempt to enter the building by force to make the arrests, and in pursuance of this, the sheriff swore in 50 men, who were stationed in the neighborhood of the sheriff's office during the afternoon. Sheriff Suter made another attempt to get an audience with Gov. Taylor in the afternoon but was unsuccessful. The streets were fairly blocked with people in the vicinity of the State House, but there was no open demonstration, though it was evident that the populace was on the side of the civil authorities. At 3 o'clock Sheriff Suter, having failed to get any sort of understanding with the military authorities as to the arrest of the parties, submitted the question to Democratic Gov. Beckham to decide to what extent the civil officers should go to gain admittance to the building for the purpose of making the arrests.

It is said that Democratic Gov. Beckham will not give an answer to Sheriff Suter's request for instructions till sometime later in the week and since the escape of Powers and Davis he may decide that the changed conditions of affairs does not necessitate the giving of instructions on his part. The Triplett resolution authorizing the expenditure of $100,000 in arming and equipping a State guard under Gov. Beckham and Adjt. Gen. Castleman, will come up in the house Tuesday, and it is said that Gov. Beckham has determined to wait until after the passage of the measure, when, if men wanted by civil officers were still barricaded in the State house, he would call on Adjt. Gen. Castleman and authorize him to muster in enough men to take the prisoners. Since the escape of Powers and Davis, however, the conditions have changed, and what will be done now depends altogether upon their future movements. The events of the day served to show very forcibly that the State guard as at present organized does not unanimously recognize Taylor as governor. Lieut. Sparks refused to muster in the London company in response to a telegram from Gov. Taylor ordering him to bring the company here, and the Lexington companies also refused. Maj. Robert Kennedy of one of the Lexington companies, came here and personally tendered to Gov. Beckham the services of the Third battalion of the Second regiment. He also stated that 50 men are guarding the company's armory and will recognize only Beckham as governor.

No Chromos With Cigarettes.

Washington, D. C., Special.—Commissioner Wilson of the internal revenue has decided to proceed against the manufacturers of tobacco and cigarettes who violate section 10 of the act of July 24, 1897. This section prohibits placing in or connecting with packages of smoking tobacco and fine cut chewing and cigarettes and article or thing whatsoever other than the manufacturer's wrappers and labels, and excludes all gifts, prizes, premiums, etc., or orders for the same. To-day the commissioner sent telegraphic instructions to collectors of internal revenue that this act must be strictly observed.

British Losses.

London, By Cable.—The latest official figures of casualties in South Africa show that the British total in killed, wounded and missing is 14,636 to which about 70 are addable. According to the latest official figures, of 565 officers and 7,108 men wounded, only 247 died. And of a total of 2,900 deaths only about 800 were due to disease.

Queen's Visit Ended.

London, By Cable.—Queen Victoria brought her visit to London to a close Saturday evening and returned to Windsor after an inspection of two battalions of the guards. Throughout the day vast crowds gathered outside Buckingham palace and along the advertised route to the railroad station, and when the royal carriage finally started for Hyde park, on its way to Paddington, the enthusiasm broke out into cheers, which almost was unbroken until the train departed.

NORTH STATE ITEMS.

The Course of Events From Murphy to Manteo.

The iron mines calling for more men the wonderful development of the gold ly fields and mineral properties in nearby counties, and the great number of cotton mill employes added to the consuming population in western North Carolina the coming year, all give promise of a greatly increased demand for farm products, especially the small by-products, such as poultry, fruits, garden truck, milk, butter, etc. Our farmers who increase the size of their poultry yards and extend the boundaries of their orchards and gardens this spring will make no mistake. So-called small farming is sure to be profitable in western North Carolina.

A correspondent writing to the Atlanta Journal from Charlotte says: Yesterday afternoon a Mecklenburg farmer sold to a Charlotte buyer 20 bales of cotton of the crop of 1875 which he had stored in a barn ever since. He received 9 cents per pound for the staple, the total aggregating $720. This transaction furnishes a basis for an interesting calculation on the cotton time. If the farmer has marketed his 20 bales as soon as ginned in 1875 he would have received 17 cents per pound for it, or about $1,360, as the price in 1875 ranged from 13 1-16 to 17 1-2 cents; had he received his $1,136 at 6 per cent. interest and saved the proceeds he would now have something like $3,500 as the net result of marketing 20 bales of cotton. Thus it is seen that in this case it did not pay to "hold cotton," even though no loss had been sustained in weight, which, however, would amount to considerable in 25 years. The farmer's actual loss is about $2,900.

Adjutant General Royster goes to Washington this week to unite with other National Guard officers in securing the amendment of the militia law of 1898, which will give to the entire National Guard of the country $2,000,000 a year in ordinance and quartermaster's stores. This will give North Carolina about $50,000. If the amendment is adopted the Guard in this State will be put in the very best shape. This state ought to have about 4,000 Guardsmen and naval militia, always ready for a State of national call.

Rutherford and Cleveland counties are enjoying a small mining boom which promises large results. J. W. Johnston, of Washington, N. C., acting for a Pennsylvania company, is working the old Monarch gold mine, five miles south of Rutherford. A Mr. Herron, of Trenton, N. J., is trying to secure control of the Allen mine, the old Leod's gold mine. The Hoosier gold mine is working and the monazite operation are increasing.

Judge Walter Clark's fine brick hotel at Halifax was burned Tuesday morning at about 2:30 o'clock and the building and most of the contents are total losses. The hotel was a splendid three-story brick structure, and cost $14,000 to build. It is said that Judge Clark did not have a dollar of insurance on it. The house was leased by Mrs. M. A. Slater, who conducted it.

Miss Mollie Little, of Madge, Mecklenburg county, took laudanum a few days ago and died. Disappointment in love, or rather unrequited love, was the cause. A young man who had forsaken her married some one else an hour after her death. She knew the wedding was to be and decided to die.

The Sloan Clothing Company, of Statesville, with a capital of $7,500 was granted articles of incorporation yesterday. The incorporators are J. L. Sloan, B. H. Adams, R. L. Ponton and J. J. Shelton.

There is a plan on foot to organize a Western North Carolina league consisting of teams from Charlotte, Concord, Statesville and Salisbury. It is the purpose of the promoters when the teams are organized and the league formed to give each city represented two games of ball each week.

The mining interests in Greenville and the adjoining counties is assuming large proportions. A large capitalist named Durges has bought the old Yancy mine and Major J. T. Yancy's home place of 1300 acres at a big price and is putting in the most approved mining machinery.—Oxford Leader.

Last week Mr. J. W. Ingold, manager of the Cumberland county dispensary, paid over $1,200 each to the city of Fayetteville and the county of Cumberland. It was only last January that he made a similar payment.—Fayetteville Observer.

The News says that the machinery for the new coffin factory at Charlotte has arrived and the factory will soon be in operation.

The pine lumber men of Eastern North Carolina have a harvest. One who lately had a little saw mill now owns 14 such mills, all of which are in operation, and it is said his net income is now more than $50 a day. One man lately bought a timber tract for $12,000, sold it for $16,000, and in ten days it was resold for $28,000.

Mr. Will B. Snow and Mr. Homer Wheeler have bought the basket works of Capt. W. H. Snow at High Point, and formed a stock company with a capital of $10,000. The officers of the company will be Mr. W. B. Snow president; Mr. E. A. Snow, vice president and Mr. Homer Wheeler, secretary and treasurer.

The last of the rail for the Cheraw-Columbia link of the Seaboard Air Line is being carried down, and the track laying will be completed in a day or two. Regular trains will likely be running through to Columbia within the next two weeks.

Wilmington is discussing the practicability of organizing a shirt and collar factory with a capital stock of $25,000 or $50,000; commencing business with $20,000 or $25,000 and drawing on stockholders for balance as occasion would demand.

The Greensboro Record says that while trying a case in a magistrate's court Spencer B. Adams and John A. Barringer, counsel on opposite sides nearly came to blows and had to be separated by Constable Weatherly.

E. B. Cline, Esq., of Hickory, is a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Judge in the Tenth judicial district.

Mr. W. A. Foil, of Concord, has bought the Sparkling Catawba Spring this year and will conduct it in first class style.