

The Lincoln Courier.

VOL V

LINCOLN, N. C., FRIDAY, DEC. 25, 1891.

NO. 34

Professional Cards.

Dr. G. F. Costner,
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON.
Offers his professional services to the citizens of Lincoln and surrounding country. Office at his residence adjoining Lincoln Hotel. All calls promptly attended to.
Apr. 7, 1891

J. W. SAIN, M. D.,
Has located at Lincoln and offers his services as physician to the citizens of Lincoln and surrounding country. Will be found at night at the residence of B. C. Wood.
March 27, 1891

Bartlett Shipp,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
LINCOLN, N. C.
Jan. 9, 1891.

Finley & Wetmore,
ATTYS. AT LAW,
LINCOLN, N. C.
Will practice in Lincoln and surrounding counties. All business put into our hands will be promptly attended to.
April 18, 1890.

Dr. W. A. PRESSLEY,
SURGEON DENTIST.
TERMS—CASH.
OFFICE IN COBB BUILDING, MAIN ST.,
LINCOLN, N. C.
July 11, 1890.

Dr. A. W. Alexander
DENTIST.
LINCOLN, N. C.
Cocaine used for painless extracting teeth. With thirty years experience. Satisfaction given in all operations. Terms cash and moderate.
Jan 28 '91

GO TO BARBER SHOP.
Newly fitted up. Work always neatly done. Customers politely waited upon. Everything pertaining to the barber art is done according to latest styles.
HENRY TAYLOR, Barber.
For Malaria, Liver Trouble, or Indigestion, use **BROWN'S IRON BITTERS**

E. M. ANDREWS,
Carries the LARGEST STOCK of
FURNITURE, PIANOS & ORGANS
to be found in the state.
BABY CARRIAGES AND TRICYCLES.
Buy in Large Quantities Direct from Factories and can and will give you LOW PRICES.
WRITE FOR CATALOGUE AND PRICES.
GOODS EXCHANGED IF NOT SATISFACTORY.
E. M. ANDREWS,
14 and 16 West Trade St. Charlotte, N. C.

CASTORIA
for Infants and Children.
"Castoria" is well adapted to children than I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me."
H. A. ARCHER, M. D.,
111 So. Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
"The use of 'Castoria' is so universal and so meritorious that it is a surprise that it is not more generally known. It is a work of supererogation to endorse it. Few are the intelligent families who do not keep Castoria within easy reach."
CARLOS MARTIN, D. D.,
New York City.
Late Pastor Bloomingdale Reformed Church.
"For several years I have recommended your 'Castoria,' and shall always continue to do so as it has invariably produced beautiful results."
EDWIN F. PARKER, M. D.,
"The Winthrop," 15th Street and 7th Ave.,
New York City.
THE CENTRA COMPANY, 77 MURRAY STREET, NEW YORK.

Annual Report of C. E. Childs, CLERK SUPERIOR COURT.

North Carolina, Lincoln County.
Honorable Chairman and Board County Commissioners, Lincoln Co., N. C.:
As provided by law, I herewith submit the following statement of money in this office due to parties as indicated.

PAGE NO.	CASE.	TO WHOM DUE.	AMT.
504	51 State vs Marsh Logan	E W Ward, Mayor	\$1.90
506	54 State vs J Mace & J Williams	W E Brittain D S	.60
508	57 State vs Henry Loftin	J P Carpenter D S	.50
505	53 " " R M Mundy	J B Shelton S W	5.70
510	59 " " John Crouse	J P Carpenter D S	5.70
507	48 " " Emeline Link	Sally Brown S W	.60
337	68 A J Derr Ex'r vs Nancy Wilkinson, executrix	J W Dellinger D S	1.20
521	77 WP Bynum et al vs R Lackey et al	Parties	181.11
544	41 State vs M J Shelton	F R Mull D S	.90
"	" " " " " "	W P Smith D S	.60
"	" " " " " "	J Turner D W	4.60
559	71 " " Peter Keller	M N Hamrick Shff	1.00
543	49 " vs Joe Sain	G H Lynn S W	.55
552	58 " vs Wake Barnes	S M Ford D S	.10
553	69 " vs A F Childers	J P Carpenter D S	.30
548	48 " vs William Pool	Henderson Sisk S W	2.30
"	" " " " " "	J W McIntosh D S	.75
"	" " " " " "	M J Rowe Shff	.30
"	" " " " " "	F P Mundy S W	1.05
"	" " " " " "	A J Hoover S W	1.05
563	77 " vs Wash Clark and other	J W McIntosh D S	1.20
"	" " " " " "	M H Shuford Shff	1.20
573	93 J B Shelton, wife et al ex parte	Robt McGee 1-28	3.96
"	" " " " " "	Alice McGee 1-28	3.96
"	" " " " " "	E M Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	A L Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	M O Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	T H Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	S A Potts 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	J F Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	J A Caldwell 1-56	1.98
"	" " " " " "	M E Clark 1-56	1.98
578	97 W D Beattie vs Nancy Wilkinson	J M Kids juror	1.00
560	72 State vs Wm Gamble & Matt Pitts	T F Conner D S	1.30
596	36 " vs Jackson Sisk	W S Wehnt S W	4.45
594	34 " vs W W Dixon	J A Peeler D S	.30
606	55 " vs John Lail	Solomon Hoyle D S	1.20
609	60 " vs CD Dellinger et al E Elmore	Charlie Elmore	1.25
"	" " " " " "	Pauline Elmore	1.25
"	" " " " " "	Burt Elmore	1.25
"	" " " " " "	Tur Elmore	1.25
"	" " " " " "	Annie Elmore	1.25
612	65 W H Motz Admr vs W M Reinhardt et al	Thos M Webb Shff	1.20
618	64 R M Roseman Admr vs J F Anthony et al	W T Massey juror	1.00
608	49 State vs James Wise	S A Sain D S	.60
"	" " " " " "	Henry Heavner	1.00
608	59 " vs Emanuel Wilson	M J Rowe Shff	.60
640	39 " vs R M Mundy	John Gabriel D S	.15
"	" " " " " "	W P Detrum D S 1-2	.15
"	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	.15
641	40 State vs Henry F Nixon	John Gabriel	.15
"	" " " " " "	A G Thompson D S	1.00
642	41 State vs Jack Stroup	" " " " " "	1.00
643	42 state vs Joe Cherry	" " " " " "	1.00
647	46 state vs Hoover Pendleton	" " " " " "	1.00
"	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
653	53 state " Philip Bangle	Peter Canipe S W 1-2	2.00
"	" " " " " "	Carrie Canipe S W 1-2	2.45
"	" " " " " "	T J Leonard D S	1.00
"	" " " " " "	R F Leonard D S 1-2	.90
658	61 H Cone & Sons vs Smith Kelly & Co	A G Thompson D S	.30
695	48 state vs Julius Norwood	M N Hamrick Shff	1.00
666	74 Wm Troutman et al vs CM Loftin et al	T L Bandy sur'r	4.00
691	40 state vs Wm Hoke	L T McLean D S 1-2	1.15
705	66 JF Bess admr OB Jenks et al ex parte	G W Blanton juror	1.00
"	" " " " " "	W L Baker juror	1.00
724	36 state vs Dick Norwood	J Y Elliott D S	1.00
"	" " " " " "	J C King D S	.60
"	" " " " " "	S A Sain D S	.60
"	" " " " " "	J B Luckey ex shff	1.00
726	38 state vs Philip Carpenter	J B Luckey ex shff	2.20
727	39 " " Abe Connor	" " " " " "	1.00
"	" " " " " "	J C Hamblet D S	5.10
"	" " " " " "	Peter Cobb S W	2.20
"	" " " " " "	John Helderman S W	1.90
"	" " " " " "	G M Michal S W	1.90
"	" " " " " "	C W Ward S W	1.90
729	42 state vs Peter Hoskins	Moses Heavner S W	2.60
731	46 " vs Jeff Huffstetler	J B Luckey ex sh	1.00
"	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
730	44 " vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
730	43 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	2.00
732	47 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
732	48 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
733	49 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
733	50 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
734	51 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
"	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
735	53 state vs James Stiller	John McCoy S W	2.40
735	53 state vs " " " "	J B Luckey ex shff	1.00
735	53 state vs " " " "	" " " " " "	1.00
737	56 DM Osborne & Co vs WR Edwards	David Johnson SW 1-2	1.08
737	56 DM Osborne & Co vs WR Edwards	G A Warlick	1.15
737	56 DM Osborne & Co vs WR Edwards	D M Osborn & Co	30.46
709	59 state vs J Short & R S Reinhardt	J B Luckey ex shff	1.20
706	55 state vs Rance Reinhardt	W F Starr S W 1-2	2.80
706	55 state vs " " " "	Sid Campbell SW 1-2	2.80
706	55 state vs " " " "	L A Shrum S W 1-2	2.75
706	55 state vs " " " "	J H Auten D W	5.70
727	39 state vs Abe Connor	R M Beal D S	2.10

In the following named cases defendants paid part of cost and of amount so paid, pro rata part is due as follows:
556 64 state vs Dock alias J P Lockman C M Sumner D S .80
556 64 state vs " " " " J W McIntosh D S .15
556 64 state vs " " " " L B Camp D S .30
556 64 state vs " " " " A Nixon shff .50
556 65 state vs J P alias Dock Lockman C M Sumner D S .50
556 65 state vs " " " " L B Camp D S .25
556 65 state vs " " " " A Nixon shff .27
556 65 state vs " " " " J W Laney S W .43
556 65 state vs " " " " Emma Dellinger S W 1.19
556 65 state vs " " " " J W Dellinger S W 1.19
557 66 state vs " " " " L B Camp D S .33
557 66 state vs " " " " C M Sumner D S .36
557 66 state vs " " " " A Nixon shff .70
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins V A McBee ex O S C .62
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins A Nixon shff .33
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins J P Carpenter D S .17
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins C M Sumner D S .40
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins L B Camp D S .08
509 58 state vs Luther Perkins James Binson S W .35
728 40 state vs Vincent Avery A Nixon shff .35
728 40 state vs " " " " H S Sellers D S .35
728 40 state vs " " " " J B Luckey shff .55

728	40 state vs Vincent Avery	J D Hallman S W	1.60
728	40 state vs " " " "	J C Warlick S W	2.15
698	53 state vs John McCorkle	A Nixon shff	1.15
698	53 state vs " " " "	Olle Ballard, S W	1.05
694	45 state vs C W Ward	A G Thompson D S	.07
694	45 state vs " " " "	C M Sumner D S	.05
694	45 state vs " " " "	A Nixon shff	.35
694	45 state vs " " " "	Rena Goodson S W	.83
694	45 state vs " " " "	B F Grigg S W	.20
694	45 state vs " " " "	Press Stroup S W	.70
694	45 state vs " " " "	T M Foster J P	.96
757	37 state vs Cliff Marshall	J C King constable	.75
757	37 state vs " " " "	T W Baxter S W	1.50
757	37 state vs " " " "	P B Bess S W	.51
761	45 state vs William Barker	J B Heine D S	.14
"	" " " " " "	WE Williamson D S	.14
"	" " " " " "	J W McIntosh D S	3.43
761	45 state vs William Barker	A Nixon shff	1.57
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	John P Davis J P	2.57
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	S C Little S W	2.87
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	L C Berger S W	2.87
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	C M Hinkle	2.77
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	C S Hager S W	2.87
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	J W Prim	2.87
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	R S Webb S W	2.87
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	T J Long S W	2.77
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	Henry Abernathy S W	2.82
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	L J Hager S W	2.74
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	J W McIntosh S W	1.41
761	45 state vs Wm Barker	Sidney Nason D W	1.74
762	46 state vs Charles Ward	Frank Helderman S W	1.57
762	46 state vs Charles Ward	B C Ward reg'l	3.72
762	46 state vs " " " "	A C Lumberger S W	1.65
762	46 state vs " " " "	R F Goodson S W	3.31
762	46 state vs " " " "	George Edwards S W	2.62
762	46 state vs " " " "	M M Lumberger S W	3.20
762	46 state vs " " " "	A Nixon shff	1.42
762	46 state vs " " " "	E W Ward D S	.51
762	46 state vs " " " "	A G Thompson D S	.17
762	46 state vs " " " "	M H Shuford shff	.17
767	56 state vs Tol Mauney	A Nixon shff	3.32
767	56 state vs " " " "	J B Luckey ex shff	1.18
767	56 state vs " " " "	Anna McCoy S W	1.66
777	70 J S Serence et al ex parte	A Nixon shff	1.57
777	70 " " " " " "	G L Heavner D S	.87
777	70 " " " " " "	Herman C S C	.22
777	70 " " " " " "	G W Cochrane reg'l	3.72

In the following named cases of the amounts paid on cost a balance is in hands of clerk as follows:
512-61 state vs Robert Jonas Balance 4.87
593-49 " " Jack Henderson " 4.87
560-72 " " William Gamble " 22.09
739-58 R M Roseman admr vs Thos Link et al " .06
760-44 state vs John Hammet " 1.09
766-55 state vs Rance Reinhardt " .25
598-38 state vs James Davis " 4.43
State vs Moses Eaker Balance 237.69

Judgment Docket No. 2.
247 1190 Laura S Withers vs H P Withers Laura S Withers 66.90
261 1210 John W Moore vs W W Noland John W Moore 5.99
254 1222 David Turbyfill vs W H Metz et al J M Hallman D S .50
273 1312 Chas E Emore et al vs M A Sibley et al Chas E. Emore, P. F. Z. & A. Z. Blinger 20.671
273 1313 Chas E Emore et al vs W K Emore, Heirs of H Z Emore 144.861
260 1252 C S Rozzel vs Nancy Wilkinson ex J W Dellinger D S 60 \$238.351

Concluded on next page.

The Schencks Vindicated.

Correspondence of Statesville Landmark.
The indictment against Hon. D. Schenck, D. R. Schenck and Capt. David Schenck, Jr., for the affray in which Evangelist Fife figured, and with which the State is familiar, was called for trial in the Superior Court of Guilford, yesterday, Dec. 14th, Judge Brown presiding. Dr. Schenck entered a submission, and the jury was impaneled as to Judge Schenck and Capt. David Schenck, Col. James E. Boyd, R. B. Gien, Esq., of Winston; Col. Paul B. Means of Concord; Col. L. M. Scott, of Greensboro; John A. Barrieger, Esq., of Greensboro, and Mr. W. P. Bynum, Jr., appeared for the defence, Capt. W. S. Ball, assisting Col. Parker, the solicitor, for the State.
The counsel for the defence called upon Mr. Ball to know whom he represented and he declined to say. The counsel for the defence appealed to the court to compel him to say who he represented, but the court declined upon the ground that it was a matter for the solicitor, whether he would allow Mr. Ball to appear, and notwithstanding all the efforts of the counsel for the defence Mr. Ball declined to announce who were his clients.
The State introduced five witnesses: One George Yates, — Farris, a Connecticut Yankee by the name of Cota — Donnell (a policeman), and one Pritchett. Judge Schenck testified in his own behalf, and Dr. Schenck was also a witness for the defence.
The defendants' counsel were very severe upon Mr. Ball and charged that they had no doubt that the assassin who had struck Judge Schenck with a stick from behind was the same cowardly and pusillanimous wretch who is now attempting to stab his character in a court of justice, and that no honest man would be guilty of any such conduct as his. The remarks of Mr. Glen, of Winston, was eloquent and denunciations in the extreme, creating a great sensation in the crowd. Col. Boyd made a most masterly address, in which he went for Mr. Cota with gloves off. The solicitor, Col. Parker, made a very fine speech and one without passion or feeling. This ended Monday's proceedings.
The trial opened on Tuesday morning with one of the finest efforts ever made at the Greensboro bar, by Col. L. M. Scott, who held out to public indignation the evan gelists and traveling ministers who are going around the country denouncing private citizens and insulting the wives and mothers of our people. He denounced Mr. Cota (the Connecticut Yankee) as the aide-de-camp of Mr. Fife in this business, who had come down here to teach our people in such manners and such customs as he had brought with him. He was very humorous in many parts of his speech and fell at strife in others.
Mr. W. S. Ball replied for the State. He disclaimed any intention to charge the defendants with conspiracy or to charge Judge Schenck with making any statement which he did not believe to be true. He did, however, misquote the testimony, and stated that when Fife approached Judge Schenck he offered his hand and asked his forgiveness. Judge Schenck, who was sitting close by, said in an audible voice, "That is a lie, and you know it." This created some sensation but it was soon quieted.
The defendants' counsel were very severe upon Mr. Ball and charged that they had no doubt that the assassin who had struck Judge Schenck with a stick from behind was the same cowardly and pusillanimous wretch who is now attempting to stab his character in a court of justice, and that no honest man would be guilty of any such

sel had no right to comment upon the conduct of such a dastardly prosecutor. The judge promptly ruled that he declined to make known his opinion in the beginning of the case, he had no right now to give his name and screen him from the comment which the defendants' counsel would have had the right to make upon his conduct and character.
Judge Brown delivered a very fair and impartial charge to the jury. The jury was out about one half hour and returned a verdict of "not guilty," both as to Judge Schenck and Capt. Schenck. This was received with excellent smiles of satisfaction by the court.
The jury was composed of very intelligent men, some three or four from High Point, two or more of them were citizens of Greensboro, and the remainder were farmers from the country around.
One thing was very conspicuous on this occasion, and that was the absence of the men who headed the mob on the 28th of June that passed the resolutions denouncing the conduct of Judge Schenck and his sons. Not more than one or two of them appeared in the court house during the trial.
After dinner the case as to Dr. Schenck was called up and the solicitor prayed judgment. Mr. Ball absented himself. The judge asked Col. Parker if he had any remarks to make. He said none whatever; he had discharged his duty and had nothing more to say. Col. Means, then stated for the defendants, when stated to his Honor that they had some evidence to offer in mitigation of the assault made by Dr. Schenck, when the judge made the following remarks:
"I do not think it necessary for me to go any further into the matter than what has transpired in the trial. I think that Dr. Schenck sincerely and earnestly believed, whether truly or untruly, that his other had been insulted, as developed in the defence, which appeals very strongly to the court. I have not had the advantage of hearing Rev. Mr. Fife's personal version of the matter, as he telegraphed asking to be excused from appearing. I take it, from the statements made upon the stand by the witnesses, that there was some charge made of abusive language having been used concerning Mrs. Schenck, and that this difficulty grew out of that. If there was any evidence that Dr. Schenck attempted to use a pistol upon any one it would present the matter in a very different light to the court. But I take his statement to be true, that he fired it off, not at any one, but as he pulled it out of his pocket when the crowd was pressing very hard upon him. Taking into consideration, Mr. Gask, all the circumstances of the case, you will enter a fine against Dr. Schenck of one penny and the costs."
This ended the case.
There has been a great reaction in Greensboro in public sentiment. Both Judge Schenck and his sons were received with greetings and congratulations by many people upon the street and in their office, while the prosecutors, who had brought this case into court, after solemnly dismissing it before the mayor, were invisible.
This finding of the jury and the judgment of the court is a living commentary upon the injustice of mob law. Here are three persons who have been made the subjects of resolutions of indignation by a wild and crazy crowd, moved by the fanaticism of religious frenzy. No witnesses were examined by the jury; the defendants were not permitted to appear before a self appointed committee, and they were condemned without law or evidence. But when the court came to pass upon this matter two of the defendants were acquitted as innocent, by a jury of fair and honest men or the county of Guilford, and a righteous and honest and fearless judge, as Judge Brown is known to be, says that the offense of Dr. Schenck was so trivial and so nearly justifiable that he deserved only the punishment of one penny as a fine. What a commentary is this upon mob law! and how should these men, who profess to be intelligent men and Christians, feel the rebuke thus administered to them!
Greensboro, N. C., Dec. 15, 1891.