

# The Hickory Press.

PROTECTION! INDUSTRY! ENTERPRISE! PROSPERITY!

VOLUME 29.

HICKORY, NORTH CAROLINA, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1897.

NUMBER 15

## WASHINGTON LETTER.

From our Regular Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, April 12th, 1897.—President McKinley returned from his little outing much improved. The weather was more or less disagreeable during the entire time he spent on the Dolphin, but he got what he went after and what he needed most—rest. He was at his desk today looking fresher than for several weeks.

Jerry Simpson made an attempt to prove that he was a bigger man than the entire House, but he only proved himself a monkey. He thought, or rather he thought that he thought, that he could compel Speaker Reed to appoint the Committees and the House to go ahead with miscellaneous business, although a majority had decided that the legislation of the extra session should be confined to passing the left over appropriation bill's and the tariff bill, both of which the House has done. Jerry made the point of "no quorum" to prevent the House adjourning from Saturday to Wednesday, but Speaker Reed had no difficulty in counting a quorum, and Jerry found himself down while the House adjourned. Whether he intends to get himself knocked down every time the House meets just for the notoriety there is in it, is yet to be seen. It is evident that Speaker Reed regards Jerry merely as an "amusing little cuss."

Secretary Alger, under whose direction the \$200,000 appropriated last week by Congress, will be spent for the relief of sufferers by the floods in the Mississippi valley, lost no time in putting the machinery of the War Department to work in order that prompt relief might be extended, wherever needed. It may be a hard thing to say, but it is strictly true that the Cleveland administration was responsible for much of the damage done by the Mississippi river floods, by its policy of delay in spending money appropriated by Congress to strengthen and raise up the levees along the Mississippi river at those points where U. S. Engineer officers had reported the necessity of such work. Reports are on file in the War Department from Engineer officers, made after Congress had appropriated the money, urging that contracts be made and the work pushed on these levees, but it was the Cleveland-Carlisle policy to hold back appropriations as long as possible, and these floods came before the strengthening of the levees had been completed. A number of the breaks are at the points reported weak by the Engineers and ordered to be strengthened by Congress. For all the damage done by these particular breaks, the Cleveland administration is clearly responsible.

President McKinley's announced policy of reinstating all ex-Union soldiers who were dismissed from office by the democrats for no other reason than their politics, is being carried out in all of the government departments as fast as the heads of the departments can get around to the cases. In the cases of the chiefs of divisions, the democrats are being given better treatment than they gave republicans. They are allowed to remain in office, in a lower position, instead of being dismissed, as so many republicans were under the last administration.

A republican Senator speaking of the talk in regard to the appointment of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy being likely to make trouble, said: "Roosevelt may make trouble in the Navy Department, but if he does it will be in the interests of a better administration of its affairs, just as he has made trouble for the law breakers of New York city who had long enjoyed police protection. I notice that in all the trouble stirred up by Roosevelt, he has always had the support of those who believed in showing up and reforming wrong doing wherever found, and I am willing to stand behind all the trouble he makes in the Navy Department."

Mr. Cleveland's order reducing the number of Pension agencies, which was to go into effect on the 1st of next September, will never go into effect. Pension Commissioner Evans has ascertained by investigation that instead of saving money, as Mr. Cleveland claimed, it would cost more to support the consolidated agencies. He said on the subject: "While I have

no authority to speak for the President, I have excellent reasons for believing that the order will go into effect, and that the eighteen pension agencies will remain as they are." Commissioner Evans also says that Mr. Cleveland's order placing Pension Examining surgeons under the civil service rules will be revoked, except in the cases of examiners who receive \$300 a year or less.

No date has yet been fixed for the reporting of the Dingley tariff bill to the Senate by the Finance Committee.

Ex-Senator Voorhees, of Ind., died suddenly Saturday morning at his Washington House.

### A REVIEW OF THE SITUATION.

From the fact that the "Times" of last week devoted two columns of its valuable space to a reply to our communication of the same week we infer that we did put up some sort of an argument. We will not follow the gentleman into abusive personalities, as we have neither talent nor inclination for any such thing. The justice of our cause does not require it, and we have no mayoralty bee buzzing in our bonnet to make us lose our head.

We are glad to have the acknowledgment of the "Times" that "good men are found on both sides of this question." This is a decided improvement over his "kindling hell fire" locals of the week before. We suppose, too, that, having disclaimed his title to omniscience in this particular line, he also will recede from the position that no one on the opposite side can discuss this question on its merits, or will at least show us the "local freight that runs on schedule time." The trouble with the prohibition crowd is, they have had everything their own way so long that they have become spoiled and think there is only one side to this question. But we assure them that we have nothing to fear and everything to gain, from a full free and fair discussion of this question, and we heartily welcome and invite it. It is purely a business question, a matter of dollars and cents to this town; but we are not afraid to discuss it from any stand point. The financial benefit to the town is so palpable as to be evident to every one. With some thing like \$2000 of revenue, derived from license, flowing into our treasury yearly, we can lower our present high taxes, increase the number of electric lights and pay for running them, pave and macadamize our side walks and thoroughfares, increase our fire extinguishing facilities, give employment on public works to idle labor, and put this town into so prosperous a condition as to attract many strangers and men of means to come and cast in their lot with us. The national, State, and County Governments derive revenue from license, and many of our strongest "local prohibitionists" are the most eager in supporting parties, which in these departments of government, uphold such a policy. If this policy is so bad and license money is to be despised, why do they wish to keep it out of Hickory and foist it upon their country men in the State and nation? Almost all the public improvements which have been made in Hickory were made with license money. With it—the town hall was built, the cemeteries and Park bought, streets opened out, paved, and macadamized; and Hickory is to-day what she is through revenue derived from license.

Now if the Saloons were to run the town as the Editor of the "Times" would have you believe; if all the horrors that exists in the lively imagination of the Editor of the "Times" were going to come to pass and our town was to become "rum soaked," "red-nosed" and "debauched," we would oppose license as strongly as we now favor it. But we know and have enough confidence in the men who will

run our town government to relieve us of any such fears. We will not have low license and indecent holes but the thing will be conducted openly and above board. We are not in favor of "a slosh" any more than those who oppose us. We, as all sensible and right thinking men, are opposed to intemperance in all its loathsome forms. But we have good reason to believe that our mayor and the men who will compose our Board of Aldermen will not allow the places to become nuisances to any of our fellow citizens, and will not allow them to be run in the interest of intemperance. We have such confidence, and why? First, because it is our intention to put up men who will not flinch; and secondly, because when a dealer pays down \$800 or \$1000 license, knowing that if he violates the law regulating his business, if he has only run a week he will forfeit his license, he cannot afford to break the law even though he were so disposed. It is a pure matter of business with him to follow it to the letter. Then, every dealer must be a man of good moral character, and of several applicants, the Board has the right to choose between them. It has also the right to regulate the number and even to select the places of sale, and the whole thing will be under police surveillance, which is better than if it were outside where there can be no such control. The law by permitting license does not encourage intemperance but by throwing safe guards around and hedging it in on every side seeks to discourage it, while at the same time allowing men without violating law to procure that which is often an actual necessity.

The "Times," realizing that our position holds, if our promise stands—that it is the abuse and not the use of intoxicants that is wrong—seeks to break down that promise and calls to its aid H. Newell Martin M. D., F. R. S. of Johns Hopkins, who deposes and says that he believes that even the moderate use of intoxicants is hurtful. Well, in this latter part of the 19th century there are many learned men "who are wise above that which is written." There are not wanting men who deny the Creation and Fall, who deny the Resurrection from the Dead and reject almost all the fundamentals of the Christian Faith, and yet pose as Theologians and Higher Critics. So in the realm of science it is not surprising that the advanced thought of our day has ascertained that even the moderate use of God's gifts is hurtful and wrong—all which goes to prove that the "Children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." But in opposition to the Royal Academician, this intellectual light, this man of great fame and many titles, we place the "Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things, visible and invisible." Who is not the creator of evil, and Who yet expressly declares that He is the author of wine, saying in the 104 Psalm; "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle and herbs for the service of man XXX And wine that maketh glad the heart of man." Here He makes Himself the Author of wine as well as of the grass, and the herb, and the bread, and the oil; and it is such wine too as "maketh glad the heart of man," evidently intoxicating. We suppose it will not be contended even by the enthusiastic editor of the "Times" that any other than God is the author of the laws of fermentation, though we have heard prohibitionists, in their intemperate zeal, ascribe this work to the devil. And it still remains undisputed and indisputable that God did include wine in almost all His promises of temporal blessings to the Jews and considered it a punishment to deprive

them of it. It is also true that wine was used in His worship, and the "drink offering" as well as the "meat offering" was declared to be a "sweet savour unto the Lord." The best portion of the wine, as well as the first fruits, was reserved by God for the Priests and Levites, their sons and daughters who were commanded to use it as a beverage. And once a year, at the festival of the first fruits [see Deut. 14 chap.], all the Jews were commanded to go up to Jerusalem, bringing their tithes of corn and wine and oil, and those who lived too far away were commanded to sell these, "and to bestow that money for whatsoever their soul lusted after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink; and to eat their before the Lord and to rejoice" in the general festivity, and now we will quote a few verses from the Bible to show that God did consider wine a blessing and promise it as such, sneers to the contrary notwithstanding. In Deut., the 33 chapter we find these words: "Israel shall dwell in safety alone, the fountains of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine." Isaiah, 25th chapter: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wine on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines well refined." And again in Jeremiah: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, every bottle shall be filled with wine." Passages might be multiplied but he who will not hear these will not hear though many more be quoted. From the above passages we infer that wine and strong drink were staple products of God's chosen people; that they were considered as among the necessities and comforts of life; and that God sanctioned and even at times commanded their use. This being so we are driven to the conclusion that "every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving;" and "what God hath cleansed" we dare not call "common or unclean." Now to escape from this evident conclusion, Mr. Huffham is driven to the last resort of extreme prohibition fanaticism and folly, and calls to his assistance the two wine theory—a theory that has been exploded a thousand times, a theory so untenable that no scholar of respectable attainments would care to acknowledge that he holds it a theory in utter contradiction of all common sense and reason, and finally a theory which no one without a preconceived opinion, could possibly arrive at. Oh ye wise men, no doubt you think wisdom shall die with you! If this theory be true, then only Doctors of Divinity and Theologians can understand the Bible, and it is a dangerous book, and Rome was wise and right in withholding it from the laity. But there is no indication of such a distinction in the Bible. The wines of the Bible made people drunk from the days of Noah and Lot to the days of the apostles; and woes and warnings are pronounced against the drunkenness that they caused. Why, the very word wine means "the fermented juice of the grape," and it is only in a very loose sense that certain species of vinegar may be called wine at all. And, as if to guard against just such perversion, we have the words "strong drink," "strong wine" and "liquors" favorably mentioned. The very fact that prohibitionists have to resort to such extremities for an argument shows the shallowness of their course. The apostles on the day of Pentecost were thought by some to be drunk on "new wine," and surely if there was any non-intoxicating, it was the new. But there is not one scintilla of evidence in all Scripture to sustain so flimsy a theory. For fear however

that the editor of the "Times" may ridicule "the rites and ceremonies of ancient Israel," we turn to the New Testament. There we find Christ following the usual custom of the Jews, who maliciously called Him "a gluttonous man and a wine-biber,"—that is intemperate in eating and drinking. And not only this but we find him, as his very first recorded miracle, making wine out of water for the enjoyment of the guests at the marriage feast in Galilee, and the Governor of the feast was astonished at its quality. Here again God through Christ was the direct author of wine. And again just before His crucifixion we see Him consecrating it anew to religious services. We find Christ in another place endorsing the general opinion that old wine is better than new. And we know that in the New Testament too the wine was intoxicating. We read of it fermenting and breaking bottles. Warnings were made against its excessive use. The Corinthian Christians were reproved for getting drunk on it, but they were not told that it was wrong to use it moderately. Christ after contrasting his own course in eating and drinking and John the Baptist's abstinence, complains, with the Jews at their not being satisfied with either; and in justification of his course says "but wisdom is justified of her children," which means that it is a matter of no moral consequence whether one eats bread and drinks wine or whether one abstains.

Now we will say for the "Times's" benefit that there is no question between us and Solomon. You cannot, however, take Solomon and say that he is more or less right than any other prophet or writer of Holy Writ; for all alike are absolutely true, and "all spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Solomon does, indeed say "wine is a mocker etc," but he also said "eat thy bread with joy and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works." The very fact that in the first instance he speaks of being "deceived" goes to show that it is a warning against excessive use and not against all use; for the Bible cannot be contradictory, and to understand dark passages, you must compare scripture with scripture.

Toward the close of his remarkable production the "Times" branches off into a lofty, and eloquent tirade against the evils of intemperance, in all of which we agree with him. We are not here to uphold intemperance. We recognize it as a great, a monstrous evil, worthy of a place in the black catalogue of crime to which St Paul assigns it. But temperance and prohibition are two very different things. As a moral measure, prohibition is a confession of weakness on the part of the church. It is a reflection on the power of the Word, which is sharper than any two edged sword, to say that you can't save a man from the sin of intemperance as long as he can get anything on which he can get drunk.

There remains now only one more question to put to the "Times" and we are done. It is a question in theology and on a point brought out by him—a question too which we have never seen explained, and we promise if he answers it satisfactorily, we will be bound by the conclusion. The question is simply this, Why was Adam tempted? Why didn't God Who certainly knew of the temptation, remove it? That is what you would have done, is it not? Such a course, at least, would accord with your present policy. But we have said enough to show that prohibition is neither in the Bible, of the Bible, nor from the Bible, and is indefensible from either a moral or a business point of view.

C. H. L.