

The Hickory Press.

PROTECTION! INDUSTRY! ENTERPRISE! PROSPERITY!

VOLUME 29.

HICKORY, NORTH CAROLINA, THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1897.

NUMBER 16

WASHINGTON LETTER.

From our Regular Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, April 19th, 1897.—President McKinley is not taking sides either for or against any of the proposed amendments to the Dingley tariff bill. All he has asked of Senators is that they will act upon the bill as speedily as possible. He believes that when the bill is passed and the amendments adopted by the Senate have been acted upon by a conference committee that the bill will be as good a measure as it possibly can be made under existing circumstances.

The much talked about amendments to the Dingley tariff bill, which Western Senators have asked for, turn out to be very different from the predictions made by those who have been hoping for a breach in the republican ranks in the Senate wide enough to defeat the tariff bill. The amendments deal mostly with the wool schedule, and are largely devoted to so classifying wool that some of the frauds known to have been perpetrated under the classification of the McKinley tariff, will be avoided. It is also claimed by the Western Senators that these amendments are intended to equalize the protection given to the wool manufacturer and wool grower.

The regular semi weekly row between the followers of Representative Bayley, of Texas, and those of Representative McMillin, of Tenn., the rival would-be democratic leaders, has become a feature of the short meetings of the House, which draws full galleries and which has crowded Jerry Simpson's little Populist circus to the wall. In this rivalry a local paper, which poses as Bryan's mouth piece, has sought to convey the impression in its daily diatribes against Bailly that McMillin was the personal representative of Mr. Bryan. One of these editorials was denounced on the floor of the House as "an infamous and malicious lie" by Mr. Bailey, who added by way of emphasis: "I denounce every man who has helped to circulate it as an infamous and malicious liar." The editorial in question said in effect that the leadership of Mr. Bailey was the leadership of Mr. Reed.

Not wishing to keep the new Senators out of the privileges belonging to members of the committee any longer, the Republican Caucus Committee charged with conferring with the democratic committee on the subject, reported to the caucus in favor of accepting the last democratic proposition for filling the committee vacancies. This programme gives the republicans all vacancies, including chairmanships, that were made by the retirement of republicans, and gives one place on the Appropriation Committee that was filled by a democrat to a republican, while the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will get one additional democrat. This arrangement is not altogether desirable but it is the best the republicans can do until they get a majority in the Senate. It allows them to retain the Chairmanship of all the most important committees, but on some of these committees they will be in the minority.

The opinion of a gentleman, who has recently spent a long period in Japan, on the intentions of that country towards Hawaii is interesting, in view of recent rumors concerning the sending of warships to Hawaii by Japan, and of the statement of the Japanese minister to the U. S. that his country has no improper designs on Hawaii. This gentleman is Mr. W. B. Edminster, now in Washington, and he says: "It is my opinion, based upon a long intercourse with the Japanese, that it is their ultimate aim to swoop down on Hawaii, capture the island, and through force of arms set up a government of their own. It is the common talk in the streets of Japan's capital, that Japan is entitled to plant her flag in Hawaii for the reason that the Japanese outnumber any other nationality on the islands." It will be remembered that Congress has explicitly declared that the U. S. would not countenance any interference with the government of Hawaii by any foreign government, and many believe that it is that declaration alone which has caused Japan to keep her hands off Hawaii up to this time.

Judge Day, of Canton, Ohio, who is going to Cuba as a special U. S. Consul to cooperate with Consul General Lee in making an investigation of the

charges concerning the cause of the death of Dr. Ruiz, is in Washington for the purpose of conferring with President McKinley and making a study of all documents in the Department of State that are likely to assist him in the investigation. While Judge Day's official mission to Cuba will be confined to the Ruiz investigation, he will not close his eyes to what goes on around him, and it is certain that President McKinley will get the benefit of everything he learns over there.

The Election Question Continued.

In the article of last week's "Times" replying to our "second epistle," we see the desperation of a drowning man catching at the last straw. Taking up our argument from a business standpoint, he vainly attempts to overthrow it by a reference to the published statement of some of our business men when he very well knows that not even all the dry men could be induced to sign that paper; that some signed it who failed in business here during the dry regime, and finally that others signed it, who, like himself, had not been here six years, and knew nothing of the condition of the town under license, unless, indeed, they were aware that the license money lasted two or more years after the town went dry. "The accumulation of costs, in criminal actions" did not then overbalance the revenue, and we have no reason to believe that it will do so now.

After this attempt at refutation from a business point of view, he returns to his argument from a Biblical source. And it is here that he makes some of his most egregious blunders. With a great flourish of trumpets, he refers to the words of Solomon where he says, "Look not upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its color to the cup." And then, in effect, he proudly exclaims, "There we have you! Solomon says it is wrong even to look upon it!" But the end of this verse, in which he gives "his reasons, faithful and conclusive," in reality furnishes a clear and lucid explanation of his meaning, the only rational one which can be given to reconcile it with other well-known passages in which he speaks well of wine and strong drink. The explanation lies in the words, "at the end," which refer evidently to the long use, the excessive use, in other words, the abuse. It is not at the beginning but after "tarrying long at the wine cup" that it "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." It is the look of inordinate desire that is rebuked, as in the case of the woman, where it is said, "He that looketh after a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." It is not the wine that is evil, any more than the woman in the latter case; but it is in the one case the look of lust and in the other the desire to drink to intoxication that is condemned. Else, how can you reconcile Solomon with Solomon? For he says (Prov. 9:5) "Come eat of my bread and drink of my wine which I have mingled," and again, in Prov. 31:6, "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts." Solomon cannot be contradictory either to himself or to any other inspired writer, and you must compare the few passages in which he apparently speaks in a condemnatory manner of wine with the context in which they stand and with the many passages in the Sacred Writings in which it is spoken of favorably; and you must interpret according to the general tenor of Scripture. In Judges, the 9th chapter, we have a beautiful parable, known as the parable of Jotham. In it we are told that the trees, on one occasion, desired a king, and casting about for one fell upon the vine, which refused, giving this answer: "Shall I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man and go to be promoted over the trees?" Note carefully that we have wine here described in prophetic parable as cheering not only man but the Most High God also. Again, Isaac in blessing Jacob (Gen. 27:28) prayed as follows: "God give thee of the dew of heaven and the fatness of the earth and plenty of corn and wine." And Jacob, in his turn, as he departed to "sleep with his fathers," blessed Judah saying, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a law giver from between his feet until Shiloh come." Continuing, he says "His eyes shall be red with wine and his teeth white with milk," showing at once both the in-

toxicating property and the abundance of the wine with which he should be blessed.

Now we think that we have clearly shown that all the wine spoken of in the Bible was intoxicating. The Bible was written in the plain every day language of the people, so that all might read and understand. It employs the ordinary, accepted usage of words and is, in all respects, a model book for common people. It is not for the learned and great only, to read and understand, but the poor, humble and ignorant man can also glean from its pages the words of Immortal Life. In almost all cases, you can take the first meaning that would occur to a person of ordinary intelligence. When it speaks of bread, it means that ordinary bread, which we call "the staff of life;" when it speaks of serpents, it means common snakes; when it speaks of fish, it means fish; and lastly, when it speaks of wine, it means that, which by common consent, is called by that name. When, in ordinary conversation, a person speaks of wine, we understand at once that he means the fermented juice of grapes or berries, not acids or vinegars. But if the two wine theory is true, how is the man of small attainments to tell on opening his Bible and reading about wine, whether it means wine or acid? And when he reads about strong drink, how can he get the idea into his unlearned head that it is weak as water? We cannot see it. There may have been such wines as the Editor speaks of, but they are not mentioned in the Bible, and must have been immensely unpopular in Israel. "The love of money" is declared to be "the root of all evil." According to this theory of part good and part bad, it wasn't our common God-given wealth, known as money, that the apostle spoke of, but a certain peculiar kind of bad money, possibly counterfeit, the love of which he declared to be wrong. How much more sensible and honest it is to take the simple meaning of the words and acknowledge them instead of explaining them away with such mighty effort. And yet Mr. Hufham goes so far in his zeal for prohibition as to declare that he would have no respect for a Bible which taught that intoxicating wine was a blessing. With a rash hand he sweeps away Bible and everything else which stands in the way of his pet theory. And all this in the name of religion and a holy, righteous cause! Behold the intemperate language of this advocate of so-called temperance! It is monstrous. And yet, he goes even further than this and declares that he learns from the Bible that God "created evil," and argues from it that "that fact justifies no man in doing evil." If prohibition zeal leads a man into such blasphemous utterances as this, in the form of the Litany we say, with all due reverence, "From such zeal, Good Lord, deliver us!" In Gen. 1:31, God, Who cannot lie, says, "And God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good." Even the devil and his angels were created good; for we read, Jude 6, "And the angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." And again we learn in Jas. 1:13 that God doesn't even tempt people with evil: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man, but every man when he is tempted is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." A man must truly be hard pressed when, for the sake of an argument, he is driven to accuse the pure, holy, and everlasting God of creating evil. God never created evil "nor does He facilitate or promote it, but the wicked and perverted will of the devil and men is the cause of evil;" and no man is, in anywise, justified in doing evil, and is forever debarred from pleading, as an excuse, that God created it. We have yet to hear that a man on any grounds is justified in doing evil. No one can tempt to that.

Again the "Times" takes up our position that it is distrusting the Word of God, to say that you cannot, by the power of the gospel, keep men from getting drunk, as long as they can get anything to drink. By far-fetched reasoning, peculiar to his method of argument, he infers from this that we hold that "Christians should oppose wrong by none save

spiritual means;" that we "ought not to enact laws against murder" and so on. But before he can place murder, theft, burglary, and all crimes, arising out of "man's inhumanity to man," on a level with the sale of intoxicants, he must first show that, in and of themselves, they are not wrongs against our fellow men; then he must prove that God sanctions these things; that He calls them blessings, commands that they be done, and declares that they are "a sweet savour unto Him." Whenever the "Times" proves this we will accept his reasoning, not before. Now, drunkenness is on a level with some of these crimes, but we have laws against drunkenness, which fact, transgressors will learn to their sorrow. All crimes of man against man are amenable to law. We are not attempting to justify crime of any kind, nor do we claim that the drunkard is justified in getting drunk just because he can get it. One would think some on the other side exonerate him, but he is the violator, not the whiskey, nor the dealer.

The editor of the "Times" may be well up in law, but his theology certainly needs mending. When he says that "in our day the Divine Hand does not abate nuisances," he is advancing another new doctrine. We have been taught that "God prescribes certain limits to evils, which he neither desires nor approves; and definite bounds are assigned, which the wicked cannot transgress, and limits are imposed declaring how long they may endure, and the time, and the mode according to which they shall again be arrested and subjected to punishment;" and that "He so regulates all these things, that they contribute to the glory of his divine name, and to the salvation of his elect, while the wicked are confounded and put to shame."

And now we come to Christ's miracle of turning water into wine—wine which Mr. Hufham and Mr. Peloubet say was not intoxicating. But alcohol is one of the essential properties of wine; and the Governor of the Feast, who was no doubt well acquainted with wines, pronounced it "the best wine." The great commentator Meyer says on this miracle, "We may suppose the words of the governor to have been spoken jocularly in joyous surprise after tasting the wine." He says furthermore that the word translated "when they have well drunk," means, in the original, "when they have become intoxicated," so that they cannot appreciate the goodness of the wine; that intoxication is the essential, though relative, conception. Continuing, he adds, "The man says only in joke, as if it were a general experience, what he certainly may have often observed, and no inference can be drawn from his words that the guests at Cana were already intoxicated, especially since the words 'till now,' after they have been drinking so long at the table stand in antithesis with 'at the beginning.'" Godet, another great commentator says: "This miracle is even charged with immorality. Jesus, it is said, countenanced the intemperance of the guests 'With the same right one might demand,' answers Hegensternberg, 'that God should not grant good vintages because of drunkards.' The presence of Jesus and afterwards the thankful remembrance of his hosts would guarantee the holy use of the gift." So even this was not that "good, harmless, innocent" wine which prohibitionists so highly extol, but was common, ordinary wine, which makes people drunk when they use it to excess. And in making this, we are told Christ "manifested forth his glory."

Again, our prohibition candidate says, "The Christian world has outlawed and stamped with deserved infamy this traffic." If this is so, it seems that that is all that he could desire. But here in this country where prohibitionists are the most rampant of any country in the world, we find the abuse of liquors the worst. How far the intemperate agitation and over zealous discussion of this question is responsible for this state of affairs would be hard to tell. In Norway and Sweden, they have the dispensary system, and a more sober virtuous, Christian people does not exist upon the face of the earth than they. In Germany, they have saloons, but the Germans are among the most industrious, frugal, intelligent and enlightened people on the globe, and

are far freer from intemperance than we of America are. We were told personally by a gentleman who spent three years in German Universities in Berlin and Göttingen that, in all that time, he saw only one man drunk, and he was an American, and yet the Germans are considered the greatest lovers of beer and wine in the world. What a commentary their management of this matter affords over our constant agitation, which owing to its violence and abuse, is continually making matters worse with us. The Germans are the teachers of the world and there are many things that we might, with profit, learn from them. It is greatly to be feared that the unreasonable, unyielding attitude of prohibitionists has hurt the cause of true temperance more than all other causes combined.

The Editor of the "Times," having run out of argument, proceeds to give us in the end a very pathetic story of a noble officer killed—a terrible crime for which we hope the perpetrators received just punishment. But what has that to do with our argument? We are not here to uphold crime, or to condone the perversity and depravity of the human heart "which is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." It is a sad thing that one mortal should take the life of another, but ever since the day when Cain, inspired by malice, slew Abel, his brother, it has been so. If a man, in drunkenness, slays another, the drunkenness, just as the malice in another case, does not excuse but rather aggravates the crime. We oppose intemperance, we hope, as strongly as the "Times." We admit that a saloon run in a loose, haphazard, slipshod way is a nuisance. But it is not such a place that the license men of Hickory propose to allow to run. Our Board of Aldermen will see to it that no rowdying and brawling, and rioting and drunkenness shall be allowed. They cannot afford to allow the places to be run indecently, because, in such case, the town would go dry next year and stay dry for years to come. If the dealer is dishonest and encourages or connives at drunkenness, he may expect to be quickly relieved of his license.

The "Times" finally, in a fit of hysterics, shrieks out a dismal, doleful prophecy, and throws up the sponge. We submit that this is not argument. We are not dealing in prophecies of uninspired writers or Editors of newspapers, and we are not aware that the "Times" is any more gifted with prophetic vision than the rest of us who take a brighter view of things.

C. H. L.

LOSS OF FLESH.

What Medical Authorities Say as to the Danger Line.

Some of the best medical authorities say that if a person loses one third of his weight, that the system will not have power enough left to ever recuperate. This is to say, if a man or woman who weighs 150 pounds in health should, for any cause, be reduced to 100 pounds, they could never recover, but would shortly die. This fixes the danger line at about 33 per cent. Some say the per cent. is a little higher, and some say it is a little lower. But this estimate is probably nearly correct.

Are you losing flesh? If so, do you not know that it is not only foolish but dangerous? You need not continue to lose flesh another day if you will use the proper remedies. Pe ru na is a great flesh producer. It is through the mucous membranes of the body that all the nutrition must be absorbed. If the mucous is healthy, the loss of flesh is rapidly restored. Pe ru na produces healthy mucous membranes. Unhealthy mucous membrane is known as catarrh. Catarrh may be slight or severe. Pe ru na always cures catarrh, wherever located. Catarrh of any of the vital organs leads to loss of flesh. The catarrh may be so slight as to present no other warning, save the loss of flesh. Any one who is losing flesh for no apparent reason can be sure that catarrh is at the bottom of it. Pe ru na is sure to cure such cases.

The Pe ru na Drug Manufacturing Company, of Columbus, Ohio, is sending free for a short time a book on chronic catarrh in all varieties and stages.