

Twenty-One Pardons Granted.

Governor Bickett this week in one day granted twenty-one pardons, and so far as we can see he did his duty, and all law-abiding citizens will applaud him for what he did.

Quite in contrast with his unpardonable action in letting the unspeakable Summers buy immunity and freedom because he had a thousand dollars, this more recent act of the Governor was based upon substantial reasons.

He has been making a survey of the prison and the prisoners and he finds that there are many people within the Walled City who should never have been sent for the long periods which they have already been confined.

He finds, for instance, we pick out a few of the cases, cases where youth did things for which it should have been reasonably punished. The list we choose is as follows:

Joseph Williams, sentenced from Martin county in 1903. This prisoner was only twelve years old when he was sentenced to the state's prison for burning a store.

George Johnson, from Nash county, 1902. This prisoner was convicted of burglary when he was fifteen years old, and has been in prison just fifteen years on a thirty-year sentence.

Melissa Clegg, from Cumberland county, 1901. This prisoner was sentenced for twenty years for murder in second degree. She was sixteen years old when convicted and has been in prison sixteen years.

William Smart, from Cleveland county, 1898. This prisoner was sentenced for burglary for life. He has served nineteen years. He has a good prison record, and the authorities of Cleveland county write that in their opinion he had been punished enough.

George Turner, from Orange county, 1904. This prisoner was sentenced for five years for the larceny of a cow and fifteen for burglary. He has served thirteen and one-half years.

Elwell Overton, from Pasquotank county, 1901. This prisoner was convicted of burglary when he was eleven years old and sentenced for twenty years.

John Perry, from New Hanover county, 1899. This prisoner was convicted of burglary when he was thirteen years old. He is now forty. He has served twenty-seven years for this offense.

There were others, cases of which we know nothing, but we know that no matter what the circumstances in the above quoted cases, there was no justice and no justification in inflicting upon youth such punishment.

Think of a little boy but twelve years of age being sent to prison for fifteen years because he was convicted of a criminal assault.

Think of a jury was it, what sort of a judge that could think of thus blighting a child's life for committing any kind of a crime?

Think of the eleven-year-old boy from the eastern part of the state convicted of burglary when but eleven years old, hustled off to the penitentiary, for twenty years forgotten, and remaining there until Bickett happened to investigate his case.

All men, we hope, will applaud the Governor for turning loose these unfortunate victims of circumstance—these children, at least, now full-grown men—and giving them their freedom. Of course their chance now for usefulness is destroyed.

And if the Chamber of Commerce would get real busy now we might get an aviation signal corps located in our "very midst."

And the City Planner again gets it in the neck. Why the City Planner?

Why Write About It?

Almost every day we receive a communication from some reader with a grouch—some fellow who wants us to jump on this or jump on that—and the letter is never signed by the writer. Naturally the letter goes into the waste basket, and naturally it should go there.

Nearly every day the newspaper man gets unsigned communications of some sort or the other, all of which go into the waste basket without any attention being paid to them.

In the mail this morning we received a red-hot letter, one full of ginger and somewhat to the point concerning the Chamber of Commerce on depot matters, which we would print if it was signed by the real writer; but because we do not print it the writer, and we half suspect who he is, will from this on insist that we, too, are in league with the devil and signed his frame-up to crucify the South Side.

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Why should a subscriber of a newspaper expect the editor to take up his battle and fight it, when the editor doesn't even know whose battle he is fighting? Why should a citizen expect to creep in in the dark, send his poisoned letter broadcast without giving up his name, when the editor, who is responsible, prints his name every day?

Ran Amuck.

The scheme to appeal to the poor man and the grandstand and put over about a seventy per cent. tax on people of wealth finally met a crushing defeat in the Senate, and the LaFollette crowd can now go hide its face in shame.

In rapid succession the Senate rejected, by a vote of 57 to 12, the Hollis amendment restoring the pre-war basis for computing war profits; another of the LaFollette amendments, for a sixty per cent. war profits tax, by a vote of 50 to 18, and a second Hollis amendment, proposing a fifty per cent. war profits levy, by a vote of 52 to 18.

The best showing the "maximalists" made throughout their fight was in the vote on the LaFollette seventy per cent. amendment, when they mustered twenty votes.

This is as it should be. All of us are in favor of taxing the rich man as much as the poor man is taxed, but no more. Let each man pay his just proportion of taxation, and that will be a square deal.

On the same principle it could be claimed that the skilled laborer should give up all his wages except a dollar a day because there are men in the world who work for a dollar a day.

Equal taxation is the only thing. So much on the dollar. If a laboring man has but a dollar a day he spends but a dollar, and the tax should be so fixed that he would pay his share equally with the man who has a million.

John's Last Bitter Reflection. John Barleycorn is in desperate straits. He reaches, like a drowning man, for any straw in sight. He doesn't care much what he claims, just so he claims something to make himself believe.

Prohibition is held responsible by some dealers for the newest wave of high prices of meats. They maintain that closing down distilleries has caused the prices of beef to soar above the figures of civil war days.

In other words, there were a few hundred distilleries in the country and a great many million cattle. John would have us believe that all the beef cattle that had hitherto been slaughtered were fattened at one of his old stands, now happily out of business.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

That Russia is still upside down and downside up is manifest, but that she is getting saner and that there is hope that eventually she will prove a wonderful source of strength to the allies seems certain.

The Treacherous Kaiser.

The attempt of the kaiser in his recent utterances to place justification of his unspeakable conduct on England, his insistence that he went to war solely to defend Germany and not to war upon the world, all falls to the ground in the light of recent evidence.

Treacherous, cunning and unscrupulous as he is known to be, utterly conscienceless in his dealings with all mankind, the German emperor stands alone today, facing an outraged world.

The Herald today is enabled to throw a new light on this man, to prove conclusively that even before he drenched the world in blood he was the same malignant schemer that he is today.

Mr. Herman Bernstein, the Herald's special correspondent in Petrograd, has obtained for first publication in the Herald some historic documents that are of vast importance in shedding light on the true kaiser, in revealing him as he stood while deliberately scheming his world war.

The telegraphic correspondence between the two rulers was conducted in the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907 and shows that the kaiser made every endeavor to form an alliance of three great European powers against England during the Russo-Japanese war.

In other words, the dream of the kaiser for many years has been complete domination of the world. To know that he was held up at Belgium, where the hand of God first appeared against him, is the gratifying part of it.

The American Bar Association took time to pass resolutions endorsing the President and denouncing the kaiser. Mr. Elihu Root, who has been to Russia and who is the biggest man in the legal profession in this country, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

The American Bar Association declares its absolute and unqualified loyalty to the government of the United States. We are convinced that the future freedom and security of our country depend upon the defeat of German military power in the present war.

We approve the entrance of the United States into the war before it was too late to find success through the united action of the democratic powers. We urge the most vigorous possible prosecution of the war with all the strength of man and materials and money which the country can supply.

We stand for the speedy dispatch of the American army, however raised, to the battle front in Europe, where the armed enemies of our country can be found and fought, and where our own territory can be best defended.

The lawyers are all doing what they can to assist in giving moral strength to the prosecution of the war; the merchant is doing his bit; the manufacturer is putting up his excess profits and letting his labor go to the front; outside of the organized anarchists, masquerading under the names of freedom parties and workmen's parties, the whole country is a unit.

As They Fall In. In offering the eleven-billion-dollar bond bill which will be passed this week it looked strange to see Claude Kitchen standing up and telling the people that we must have the money and that this was but a starter.

Money by the billion and men by the million—what else could the allies hope for, what else is needed?

If we are to have a new depot, why not also have a new railroad at the same time and make it a union station? Just about the time we get the new depot there will be another railroad with a station about a mile out, and then there will be an anvil chorus for ten years about a union station.

The Red Cross workers know no time for rest. The millions of needed garments are being supplied by the willing workers who give of their time freely and cheerfully.

Some of the large distillers in the United States evidently accept the prohibition clause of the food control law as a "war" measure in the broadest and most comprehensive sense.

And if we don't have a fair—well, the moving pictures are still with us.

The Way It Is.

If you are renting a room and a man comes down with an iron safe or two and a half carload of baggage you feel that he isn't going to skip in the night and leave you with your rent unpaid. You feel that he is a fixture; that he is substantial; that he is there.

And if you happen to look over a town and see at one time a four hundred thousand dollar hotel going up; see an investment of seven hundred thousand dollars in a new public building; know for a fact that a great life insurance company is going to spend right away from two hundred and fifty to six hundred thousand dollars in erecting a building on a principal street; have the assurance that a big national bank is going to build something better than most any other bank building in the state; have it as a fact that a new big passenger depot is contemplated and not far away, and you look around and see churches galore, and homes as many and as pretty as you ever saw in a plot as large as this city, why, man, you know it is there.

Let the City Planner also tell us what to do with the old buildings that are being torn down. Some of the buyers are going to rebuild, and certainly that will mar the beauty of the landscape.

Having Their Fun. The towns with cantonments are having their fun. They are feeding thousands of new people; they are living at a mining camp rate; but one of these fine mornings when there is no cantonment and the relapse and collapse comes the town that today disports itself in high feather will be wearing a face long enough to eat oats out of an old-fashioned drum churn.

True, Greensboro sought a cantonment. She figured the dirty dollars that would come her way if she got one and she wanted one. But she didn't get it, and really and in fact the second sober thought makes us all glad that we didn't get it.

But why should he? The Statesville Landmark makes the proposition that Uncle Sam may think he has some special privileges. Maybe he has, but why should he have? The Landmark says:

Taking note of the fact that the government has ordered the International Paper Company to furnish print paper for the government Bulletin at 2 1-2 cents a pound the Greensboro Record wants to know why the same rate can't be fixed for newspapers generally.

The point is that if Uncle Sam, through his trade commission, finds that there is a fair profit in paper at 2 1-2 cents, and makes the mills furnish it to him at that, why not make the mills furnish paper to all consumers at that price? If Uncle Sam comes in and makes the mills furnish paper below cost to them, then naturally the publisher must pay the freight—make up for that deficit—and that is making it unreasonably hard on the publisher.

Funny old world, eh? Uncle Sam urgings people to can all they can—and no cans in sight because Uncle Sam has used up all the tin for other purposes. How can you can if you can't?

Some of the large distillers in the United States evidently accept the prohibition clause of the food control law as a "war" measure in the broadest and most comprehensive sense.

And if we don't have a fair—well, the moving pictures are still with us.