



Everything



BY AL FAIRBROTHER SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00 A YEAR, SINGLE COPIES 5 CENTS SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1917. ON SALE AT THE NEWS STANDS AND ON TRAINS ESTABLISHED MAY, 1902.

AUCTION GAME A LOSING ONE

Did you ever get interested in an auction and undertake to outbid the other fellow? If you didn't you missed something of life—a feeling that you experience no other place. Yesterday when the commissioners were selling the old buildings on the land recently purchased by them we had a glimpse at the unknown in man. There were several bidders and the price ran around three hundred dollars. Presently two men "got at it" and raised each other five dollars at a time. The price which each man had mentally agreed was the limit had passed and the crowd was looking to the two men as though they were in a contest for supremacy. And they ran up the bid to three one five, and the other man said three nine seven, but the auctioneer said "four hundred." The other man tried to correct it, saying he said three ninety-seven, but before he could make the correction the other fellow said four hundred and one. This took the property, and the three ninety-seven man thus made four dollars for the county unintentionally because of a mistake of the auctioneer.

Naturally in buying a building which was worth five or six hundred dollars the matter of five dollars or ten dollars should cut no ice, but the man bidding will often go a few dollars one at a time, and drop out. He doesn't figure on the real worth of what he buys, but what he thought he would give and get a bargain. And just what a bargain is in such a deal there is no way to tell. Simply a rough estimate and a matter of judgment. That is why the auctioneer who understands his business can often squeeze much juice out of a lump. That is why the man who has pride and does not propose to be bluffed should keep away from all such games. He is liable to get reckless and make it a personal matter with his opponent.

Once upon a time—say, forty years ago—we hunted ourselves in a little town in Iowa and had at our person something like thirty-five dollars, and it happened that we attended a school entertainment. It was proposed by some traveling faker to present to the prettiest woman in the bunch a beautiful oil painting worth perhaps two dollars and a half, and the voting was to be done at twenty-five cents a vote. We were a stranger in a strange land, but a dead game sport, and it happened that a woman not at all pretty, but who was the school teacher, was placed in nomination as one of the pretty girls. The boys of the village were naturally partial to their sweethearts, and the voting began. The school teacher loomed up with quite a number of votes and it struck us that we should chip in and help her out. Accordingly we invested a dollar, which placed her second best, and then one of her friends who had placed her in nomination came across, and the voting was between a really pretty girl and the school teacher who was only passing fair.

And it got exciting, the campaign did, and every time our favorite fell a little behind we would go another dollar. And finally it was apparent that the town was not going to let a stranger "run things" and it pooled its issue and ran its favorite several votes ahead of the girl we were backing. That was when the pride or the unknown quality which shows itself in a man at an auction sale came out. We simply purchased "at one shot five dollars' worth of tickets, which put our candidate again in the lead, and it took some time for the pool to get enough money to get ahead of us.

The three or four boys who had put the school teacher in nomination had early gone home and we were left alone to show the white flag or make good. To make a long story short, we got that picture. We can see it now. Quite a heavy frame, and it cost us twenty-five dollars, leaving just about enough in our pocket to want to get out of town. But we were a bloomin' hero for a few minutes. Not only a bloomin' hero, but naturally a detested interloper viewed from the natives' standpoint. We carried that picture under one arm and walked home beside that girl teacher and made her good night, and went back to the boarding house and wondered until late into the night why it was that man was such a fool. The next day we took a stage coach for Mount Pleasant, a larger town, and the next week we had forgotten all about the school teacher, the picture, and only recalled the fact that our purse was much lighter than it has been; but never to this sad hour have we regretted that we made good. Strange how a little incident forty years ago will come upon you and you recall, with distinctness, the entire incident, see the faces, live again the few hours of excitement, and then perhaps disappear forever from your mind the incident. However, let us admonish you: If you go to an auction, keep your eye on the main chance and don't make it a personal fight with the other fellow who wants to outbid you. Figure before you start just how far you are going, and when you get there gracefully side-step.

The old buildings must be removed within thirty days, which suggests that work on the new court house is going along pretty soon.

SUMMERS CASE NOT FORGOTTEN

The Hickory Times-Mercury has the following to say about the Summers case, one of the foul blots on the fair pages of North Carolina history:

It is reasonable to suppose that the courts of North Carolina found out whether Dr. J. W. Summers of Charlotte, who had his sentence of manslaughter revoked and changed to a fine of \$1,000, was able to pay the sum before the change was made. It looks just about as bad for the courts to have that change as it does for Dr. Summers, who compromised his honor and the sacredness of his professional oath for the paltry sum of \$1,000. It looks like a case of breaking the law at so much per infraction.

The Summers case was simply a case where lawyers helped out, and where a Governor didn't have the backbone to stand up and insist that a doctor who had violated his professional oath, who was found guilty of manslaughter, be punished. Dr. Summers got off very light with a three years' sentence. It was manifested up to the Governor to either let the sentence stand or set him free. The blunder the Governor made—and the position is indefensible, no matter about Summers' guilt or innocence—was in saying that a man guilty of crime could pay for it. That a thousand dollars in money would "meet the purposes of the law" and reach out and take the thousand for the state. If a thousand dollars in gold will let one offender off, it certainly should let other offenders off. And doubtless there are many men in the penitentiary today, there for manslaughter, who would gladly make arrangements to pay their way out.

The people of North Carolina have become so accustomed to seeing the law played with that the Summers case, while exciting their indignation, didn't cause much noise. The celebrated Winston murderers who were saved from the gallows by the gallant Craig still remain a blot upon our books. Hundreds of cases of pardons by several governors have really been the limit. That is why North Carolina should have a Board of Pardons; why one man, who of necessity must play politics, should not be allowed to set aside the judgment of judges and juries. The Summers case is absolutely indefensible. Not but what he might have been deserving of executive clemency—we do not know about that—but we do know that no man should be let loose only because he can raise a thousand dollars. Suppose he could not have raised the thousand; then three years of servitude would have been his fate. Three hundred and thirty-three dollars a year to escape from the penitentiary is cheap business. But when the poor devil hasn't the coin he must take his medicine lest the "purposes of the law will not be met." To laugh—yes; and yet it is no laughing matter.

Weeding Them Out.

The government is rapidly weeding out the newspapers which have claimed that under the Constitution guaranteeing free speech they could print all kinds of seditious utterances and flaunt treason in the faces of all their readers.

This war is teaching a few of the smart Alecks who thought they had a right to indiscriminately shoot off their mouths that the President has charge of things, and that anything considered as giving aid or comfort to the enemy is treason—and the so-called free speech may be just that.

The pro-German papers which tore their hair and said wonderful things before the war have for the most part come into camp, but a few of the so-called socialistic and anarchistic sheets kept up the black flag, and they have been called. Happy day when Congress was given the right to make any laws it wanted to make in times of war.

Once in a while the city that is in distress declares martial law, and in such an event an offensive citizen is shot on sight and no questions ever asked. When Mayor Schmitz of San Francisco declared martial law, although most always a man must be found guilty, a half hundred men who were looting houses were shot without warning, and up to this hour no investigation has been asked. We are under martial law, so to speak, and the newspaper which thinks it can say what it wants to say will find out that it is mistaken—as will the misguided citizen who talks too much.

The Married Man Given Preference.

President Wilson has made it plain that the married man will be given preference over the single man. And this is as it should be. If a man is mated and he is trying to live the life of a good citizen, he should not be torn from his home and made to fight until there were no single men left. And the single man who is the support of a dependent mother or sister should also be one among the last taken. It may not be necessary to make the second call, and it may be necessary to make a dozen calls. But in this first go-round, where the number of soldiers needed is essentially small compared with the ten million we can furnish if necessary, the man with a wife; no matter whether the wife is dependent on the husband for support or not, should be given preference, and we are glad President Wilson has so ruled.

NO PEACE YET THE ALLIES SAY

President Wilson's reply to the Pope's proposal for peace rings clear and strong; says in a few words, without embellishment, that the United States is in a war to finish with the German kaiser. It is made plain that the allies do not propose to enter into any agreement with the misguided rulers of Germany; that until a free Germany is established and the military machine which has so long dominated and which has so long dreamed of world conquest is crushed there will be no acceptance of peace terms, because already we have been made to understand that Germany's most sacred obligations are regarded by those who make them as mere "scraps of paper."

The President again states the object of this war, and says concerning it:

The object of this war is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible government, which, having secretly planned to dominate the world, proceeded to carry the plan out without regard either to the sacred obligations of treaty or the long established practices and long cherished principles of international action and honor; which chose its own time for the war; delivered its blow fiercely and suddenly; stopped at no barrier either of law or of mercy; swept a whole continent within the tide of blood—not the blood of soldiers only, but the blood of innocent women and children also, and of the helpless poor; and now stands balked but not defeated, the enemy of four-fifths of the world. This power is not the German people; it is the ruthless master of the German people.

This again makes clear the cause for which America entered the war; makes plain to all that the "ruthless masters of the German people" must be brought low; in a word, that militarism has no place on the globe's surface, and that America is enlisted to tear it, root and branch, from civilization.

Concluding his strong and fearless paper, the President says:

The test, therefore, of every plan of peace is this: Is it based upon the faith of all the peoples involved or merely upon the word of an ambiguous and intriguing government on the one hand and of a group of free peoples on the other? This is a test which goes to the root of the matter, and it is the test which must be applied.

The purposes of the United States in this war are known to the whole world—to every people to whom the truth has been permitted to come. They do not need to be stated again. We seek no material advantage of any kind. We believe that the intolerable wrongs done in this war by the furious and brutal power of the imperial German government ought to be repaired, but not at the expense of the sovereignty of any people—rather a vindication of those that are weak and of those that are strong.

Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to endure, unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidence of the will and purpose of the German people themselves as the other peoples of the world would be justified in accepting. Without such guarantees, treaties of settlement, agreements for disarmament, covenants to set up arbitration in the place of force, territorial adjustments, reconstitutions of small nations, if made with the German government, no man, no nation could now depend on. We must await some new evidence of the purposes of the great peoples of the central powers. God grant it may be given soon and in a way to restore the confidence of all peoples everywhere in the faith of nations and the possibility of a covenanted peace.

It is gratifying to note that the President makes it clear that this government is not going at any time to demand punitive damages; it is not going to ask for the dismemberment of the German empire; it is not going to demand any unfair settlement in the matter of commerce; it is going to protect the misguided people who have blindly followed the insane leaders who have been blinded by the dream of conquest, and let them establish a democracy and govern themselves. That is the whole story, and the Pope will now understand that when he wants to submit a peace proposition the "furious and brutal power"

IS CHARACTER WORTH WHILE?

The Kinston Free Press is wanting to know something about the too frequent happening of men notoriously corrupt proving a good character in court. It asks:

After all, isn't the proving of character on the witness stand more easily accomplished than it should be? Is it not akin to the "to whom it may concern" brand of recommendation?

The trouble is that "good character" is not well enough defined. What might constitute a "bad character" in one man's opinion might be considered all right in another man's opinion. The Free Press was talking about gambling. On that subject there are more varieties of opinion than Heinz made pickles. It has always been our opinion that the whole bloomin' plan of life is a gamble, pure and simple, and, while the law will draw the line at any game of chance, it is forced to, we don't endorse all that some people endorse. When it comes to a gambler like John Oakhurst, the chief of the Outcasts of Poker Flat, then we think he should be driven from the community as John was driven from the community; but we think there is no harm in a few angelic women sitting down at a Pink Tea and playing a game of bridge for the grand prize or the booby prize. Naturally if a house and lot constituted the stake it would be no greater wrong than to play for a mouse-colored pair of gloves, but the law would say it was. Some of the Superior Court judges in this state—two passed beyond and good men they were—held that a game of whist for a prize was as much gambling as a game of poker in a nigger bar room with a one-cent ante and a five-cent limit. We never agreed with that kind of reasoning. We never believed in our philosophy that a nigger who played craps for a few cents should be sent to the roads, but the law holds that such should be the case, and judges and juries have sent them on to pay the penalty.

The great American game called Poker is universal, and our ablest statesmen play at cards the same as country wenches played at cherry pit in the New Eldorado, and to prove that some of our greatest men didn't have good character within the meaning of the law would be a hard thing to do.

Character is simply according to the standard of a community. It will be recalled that Old Follinsbee's daughter, the lily of Poverty Flat, was very much flattered when she thought of

How I once went down the centre
With the man that shot Sandy McGee—

the same being Truthful James. But were Truthful James to have attempted to pose as a hero because he had shot Sandy McGee, in Kinston for instance, he would be tabooed and his character would be pronounced "bad." It is our opinion that if a man lives in a Christian city and deports himself according to the rules and customs which obtain therein: if he pays his debts and doesn't annoy his neighbors: if he attends to his own business and strives in whatever way he can to make the town better; if he does not do evil things with brass band and megaphone, he has good character. If in the silent watches of the night, in the privacy of his own room, with a friend he plays a little game of cards, simply to kill time, his character, while perhaps breeding a few spots of taint, does not become entirely lost, and perhaps his own parson will take the witness stand and when asked the question, "Do you know the general character of Mr. Smith or Jones?" he will unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly say "Good."

And that ends it. Character witnesses see but few faults in their friends. It is said that the most homely persons in the world are good looking if you love them; and so with character. If the Kinston gambler was a notorious card chump; if he was a shade in the underworld, and if he practiced hypocrisy and double-faced living, his character was "bad," no matter what the witnesses may have thought, and the chances are the jury so understood it.

The question of water metres bobs up once in a while, but it will be a long day when that trick is put onto Greensboro. The water should be furnished free in these bone-dry days.

which has caused all this world sorrow must not be considered.

Germany will still remain Germany, but the mad men who have occupied thrones must be deposed; they must abdicate; they must throw off their royal robes and no longer may they claim a partnership with God to do the devil's work.

It is now plain that until there is universal freedom established; until the German people establish a parliament and make their own laws and become free of the dominating influence of Prussian madness, the war will continue until Germany surrenders and throws herself upon the mercy of the world powers which are to win this war.

While it was understood by all that President Wilson's answer to the Pope would be just about what it is, still it causes a thrill in the American's blood, and he better understand just why we are in this war and why we will win this war.

CHILD LABOR LAW IS TESTED

The Keating-Owen bill, which finally passed Congress and became a law, provides that children under the age of fourteen years cannot work in mills or factories, and those under sixteen years of age cannot work over forty-eight hours. That is, if the product of the mill or factory goes into interstate commerce.

This is where the government comes in to exercise paternal care over the youth of the land, and, regardless of what states may think of the conduct of their factories, Uncle Sam says his nephews must not labor on goods that are to be sent into other states.

The constitutionality of the law is being tested, and perhaps Judge-Boyd will render his decision today, and then the case will go to the Supreme Court of the United States for final settlement. When the constitution is involved it takes the highest tribunal almost always to finally fix it.

The child labor agitators, some of them dreamers of the wildest socialistic schools, others passing the hat of easy money, and still others, well intentioned, have aroused much interest on the subject in this country, and many a sentimental woman has wept for the tender child ground into mincemeat, as the story runs, whereas the tender child has learned a lesson in life's hard school that has been worth his while, because it made a man of him.

The child labor law passed by the government was an unnecessary law, because in these days of civilization states control and govern their affairs in a manner highly satisfactory. The law as passed is plainly a law not governing commerce, but governing the factory that makes commerce. This was argued by the lawyers appearing "agin" the government, and was made as plain as A B C. But yet it may be that Congress has a right under the elastic, flexible and misunderstood constitution, to make such a law.

In arguing for the government Professor Pound, dean of the Harvard law school, a writer of prominence and a well known so-called authority, admitted that in some sections of the country there was a demand for this law because it interfered with adult labor; that because children did the work in one state their product, made cheaper, came in competition with adult labor in another state, and this was one of the reasons why the government had come into North Carolina and made a law prohibiting children from assisting support their parents in mills and factories where every condition was the best and where no such pictures as the north paints exist. In other words, it is a labor union law—a law put over by politicians playing to the galleries, and the "blood" of the tender kid was overlooked because the tender kid was interfering in a way with the Saturday envelope of the bearded man in another part of the country. That was argued, and that is why Uncle Sam should not be allowed to interfere. In one section of the country conditions are unlike conditions in another section. Child labor, where the human sweat shop is allowed to exist, is wrong; wrong not only to thus crush and grind a child to death, but wrong to allow an adult to be killed by inches. But states should have the right to govern their own factories, to say how many hours a person should work, and what should be the sanitary condition of the factory. And states do this.

The Keating-Owen bill may or may not be "constitutional"; that is a matter of opinion and the court of last resort will pass upon it; but no matter what it is the Keating-Owen bill is certainly one that protects certain manufacturers or factory operators and crucifies others. It is plainly class legislation because it says that a factory can operate and employ nothing but children, and if it closes for thirty days before it ships its product there will be no objection. As was argued by the lawyers, this means that a canning factory can put up its perishable fruit all summer and close thirty days, discharge its children and ship its product, and then resume operations at the old stand with the same crowd of kids. The cotton, the coal mine, the quarry cannot do this; it must operate the year around, and suffer the penalty of dismissing child labor and let the other fellow in another line get away with the goods. So strict is the Keating-Owen law that if one child happens to be a water carrier, Commerce comes in and says the goods produced in the mill, although no child may have had a part in their production, are tainted for thirty days; blood of childhood drips from them and the manufacturer must wait thirty days until the blood congeals and then he can ship his product to the four corners of the earth and be within the law.

Plainly such a law is vicious; such a law should never have been passed, and the hope is that the highest court in the land will say, as it has sometimes said, that laws playing favorites cannot be passed.

The street car company hasn't yet put on its new cars, but it will in a short time.