

The Lincoln Courier.

VOL. VI.

LINCOLN, N. C., FRIDAY, OCT. 14, 1892.

NO. 24.

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.
Aug. 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 CORB 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 29 '91

GO TO BARBER SHOP.
Newly fitted up. Work always neatly done. Customers politely waited upon. Everything pertaining to the tonorial art is done according to latest styles.
HENRY TAYLOR, Barber.

J. D. Moore, President. L. L. Jenkins, Cashier.

No. 4377.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF GASTONIA, N. C.

Capital \$50,000
Surplus 2,750
Average Deposits 40,000

COMMENCED BUSINESS AUGUST 1, 1890.

Solicits Accounts of Individuals, Firms and Corporations.

Interest Paid on Time Deposits.

Guarantees to Patrons Every Accommodation Consistent with Conservative Banking.

BANKING HOURS 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.

Dec 11 '91

CASTORIA

for Infants and Children.

"Castoria is so well adapted to children that I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me." H. A. AUSTIN, M. D., 111 So. Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

"The use of 'Castoria' is so universal and so meritorious that 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.

Castoria cures Colic, Constipation, Sour Stomach, Diarrhoea, Eructation, Kills Worms, gives sleep, and promotes digestion. Without injurious medication.

"For several years I have recommended your 'Castoria,' and shall always continue to do so as it has invariably produced beneficial results." EDWIN F. PARKER, M. D., "The Washburn," 128th Street and 7th Ave., New York City.

THE CASTORIA COMPANY, 77 MURRAY STREET, NEW YORK.

SENATOR HILL'S SPEECH.

Opens Campaign in Brooklyn With Masterly Defence for Democracy.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., Sept. 19.—There was a great outpouring of democrats in this city to night. The academy of music could not accommodate the crowd that rushed to secure good positions from which to take in every action of Senator David B. Hill in the delivery of an address that has been awaited anxiously by all democrats.

The Senator spoke substantially as follows:

"I am reminded of the fact that in this edified upon a memorable occasion in 1858 I had the honor of expressing to the intrepid democracy of Kings county the sentiment 'I am a democrat,' and under the existing political situation I know of no more appropriate place or presence than here to declare that I was a democrat before the Chicago convention, and I am a democrat still.

The national democratic convention of 1862 has passed into history with its record, its triumph and its disappointments. The wisdom of its action is not now to be questioned. Its decision will be accepted with loyal acquiescence by every true and patriotic democrat. From this time forward imperative duties are imposed upon us. Factional appeals should now cease, the spirit of resentment should be abandoned, state pride should be subordinated to the general good, real or fancied grievances should be dismissed, personal ambitions should be sacrificed and individual disappointments should be forgotten in this great emergency which demands from us all the exhibition of a widespread and lofty patriotism.

Permit me to repeat what I had the honor of expressing to the Tammany society on the fourth of July last, before the echoes of our National convention had scarcely died away, as follows: 'Our course at the present time is plain. In the approaching struggle the democracy of New York should put a solid front to the common enemy. Loyalty to cordial democratic principles and to regularly nominated candidates is the supreme duty of the hour.' I reiterate these sentiments now. We are entering upon the twenty-seventh Presidential election since the organization of our government. The good citizen who is desirous of discharging his full duty in this crisis, according to his conscience and his judgment, uninfluenced by selfish considerations, will discover two great parties arrayed against each other, struggling for the control of the government and appealing to the people for their suffrages. If I were asked to deny the one fundamental difference between the two parties I should state that one believed in a strict construction of the Federal constitution and the other in a loose one. One party believes that the general government's powers should be confined to those which are specifically granted, and that nothing can be done under the "general welfare" clause except the exercise of those functions which are incidental and necessary to the carrying out of the expressed powers; while the other believes that under that clause the powers of Congress are substantially unrestricted, and limited only by its wise discretion. This radical diversity of views cannot well be reconciled; it cannot be wholly decided by the courts as it involves the spirit more than the letter of the constitution, and by the end it must be determined largely as a matter of policy by the people themselves in their sovereign capacity. Starting out with different views of the constitution, the two parties naturally have enunciated different theories of government, especially upon the all-important subject of federal taxation. A division upon the tariff question was inevitable. The tariff question, concisely stated, what is the position of the two parties upon this question? I desire to state it fairly. That the republican party

advocates that the government has a constitutional as well as a moral right to impose tariff duties for the purpose of encouraging the building up of private industries, by the imposition of duties sufficiently large to prevent foreign competition, irrespective of the question of the needs of the treasury; while the democratic party believes that the government has only a constitutional and moral right to impose such duties as may be necessary to raise sufficient revenue to support the government economically administered. This is the precise issue squarely stated. Both parties cannot be right; one or the other must be wrong. The consideration of this subject leads to an analysis of the true functions of the government. There are some things which must be conceded because they are too plain for argument, and one of them is that the government has no constitutional power to enter into private business directly, and what it cannot, or ought not, to do indirectly. This is the correct theory of government, and it excludes the idea that one citizen may be burdened to foster another citizen's private schemes. A protective tariff is unconstitutional. The Democratic National platform gives forth no uncertain sound upon this subject and correctly states the true position of the party. It denies the constitutional power of the government to impose taxes for other than public purposes. I am aware that a concerted effort is being made by our opponents to make it appear that a new departure has been entered upon and that our party has abandoned its former conservative position upon the tariff question and assumed another and bolder attitude leading absolutely toward free trade. I do not regard it. Some of it might have preferred a little different phraseology, but as a whole it sufficiently expresses our position with reasonable clearness and accuracy. I realize the difficulty of presenting the question of the constitutionality of a protective tariff law to the courts, and in that view it may have been unnecessary, or not desirable, to have challenged its legality. We need not have placed our objections upon that ground while so many fatal objections existed to the system itself but that course was a mere matter of discretion. The fact remains that we have always insisted, and not insisted that no warrant can be found in the constitution for the imposition of tariff duties to aid private industries, but whether such a tariff is constitutional or not, or whether it is practical to have the question properly raised or decided, the system itself is vicious in the extreme, unjust to the people, and contrary to the spirit of our free institutions. Let us examine the point a moment.

When comes the power to protect private industries? What clause of the constitution can be invoked for such a purpose? There is none. It must be conceded by every intelligent citizen that the constitution does not grant any such express power. There is not an elementary law writer any where whose treatise on the constitution is regarded as standard authority, who ventures to affirm the constitutional right of Congress to levy duties for any other direct purpose than for the support of the government. Republican protection, therefore, does not constitutionally exist, but is imposed upon the people by fraud, false pretense, evasion and gross abuse of the taxing power. All the so-called protection for which our opponents have clamored and which they have obtained in recent years, has been secured, not by constitutional sanction, but by the abuse of the conceded taxing power of the government. It is a dangerous exercise of authority. It is a perversion of the powers of government. The democratic position is a safe, logical, conservative and just position. No tariffs, except "for the purpose of revenue only," and then limited to the necessities of the government honestly and economically administered, is a doctrine which appeals to the good

sense and sound judgment of every honest and thoughtful man. With the constantly increasing expenses of the government and the enormous amount of money, annually augmenting, required by the growing pension list, these tariffs which must necessarily be exacted to meet these expenditures will be for many years to come amply sufficient to afford, incidentally, all the protection which the most ardent advocate of the system can reasonably ask. More than this ought not to be conceded to anybody. In the imposition of necessary tariffs there should be exercised a wise discrimination in the amounts exacted and in the articles taxed. What should be placed upon the free list and what should be the most heavily burdened, are questions not free from difficulty, and require the most careful consideration. The Mills bill of 1888 and the separate tariff bill passed by the present democratic House of Representatives indicate in a general way the democratic position. They show: "First, that the necessities of life should be absolutely free. Second, that luxuries should bear the heaviest burdens. Third, that there should be free raw materials for the benefits of our manufacturers. Fourth, that the tariff upon manufactured articles should, as a general rule, be larger where similar articles are manufactured in this country than where they are not. Fifth, that the tariff imposed upon all manufactured articles (other than those which for good reasons are placed on the free list) should equal the difference between the rate of wages paid in this and foreign countries so far as labor enters into the cost of their production.

President Harrison, in his ingenious letter of acceptance, endeavors to place our party in a false attitude, by calling attention to the fact, that while our platform in 1884, re-adopted in 1888 contained an express plank upon this question of the equalization of wages, yet it was omitted in 1892, and asserts that we have changed our position. I beg to differ with him. There has been no change. There was no necessity for the repetition of that plank, as the party's position upon it had been evinced by the Mills bill, which had not been passed before the national conventions of 1884 and 1886 were held. Parties are to be judged as much by their records as their platforms. We stand not only upon our platform of 1892, but upon the Mills bill, which was the latest general democratic legislation upon the tariff subject. That bill was as good an exposition of our principles as an elaborate platform could be. Now, what did the Mills bill disclose upon the question of the qualification of wages? I make the statement, and challenge a contradiction of its truth, that there was not a single manufactured article mentioned in that bill, upon which the duty was reduced, upon which there was not still left sufficient to represent the difference in wages paid in this and foreign countries for the labor involved in its production. I can safely go further, and say, that in many instances the duty permitted to remain exceeded this difference in wages, three, four and five times, therefore our position upon this question is as clear as the noon-day sun and it requires no special plank in the platform to emphasize it. If I were asked to define as concisely as possible the whole democratic party, I should state it substantially as follows: "We favor a tariff for revenue only, limited to the necessities of the government, economically administered, and so adjusted in its application, as far as practicable, as to prevent unequal burdens, encourage productive industries at home, and afford just compensation to labor, but not to create nor foster monopoly. These are the cardinal principles upon which the details of all tariff legislation should be based. Our opponents profess to be much disturbed because we have in our platform denounced "republican protection" as a fraud. What else is it? It is a fraud for these conclusive reasons: First, it is secured by a palpable abuse of the taxing power of the government. Second,

It ensures to the benefit of a few to the expense of the many. Third, it is based upon favoritism of the worst species. Fourth, it tends to create fictitious prosperity to be followed by subsequent business depression. Fifth, it is deceptive in its promises and unsatisfactory in its results. Sixth, its principal beneficiaries constitute a privileged class and their importunities for governmental aid lead to public scandal and demoralization. President Harrison and all the other great and small advocates of this vicious system diligently seek to create the impression that the democratic party has assumed a bolder attitude than formerly and become an advocate of absolute free trade. They will not succeed in their strenuous efforts to place us in a false position. It does not follow that because we are opposed to an unreasonable tariff that we favor free trade and the abolition of all custom houses.

We are opposed to a prohibitory tariff. We are opposed to placing a virtual Chinese wall around the country to hamper and restrict the natural laws of trade. We favor a larger commerce and wider markets than at present exist. We are opposed to any governmental partnership with private interests such as the McKinley bill establishes. We favor legislation for the masses and not for the classes. We favor the protection of labor and not the creation of monopolies. We would encourage and foster labor by relieving it of all necessary burdens. Tariff reform does not mean free trade. Our opponents misrepresent our position now as they have ever done since the famous tariff message of 1887. In that historic message our candidate expressly repudiated the suggestion that he was entering upon any crusade of free trade. The disastrous defeat of 1888 brought a republican Congress into power, and two years later, as a reward to those beneficiaries who had so largely contributed to their success, our opponents passed what is known to the world over as the McKinley tariff bill. The McKinley bill has not ruined the country, nor has it benefited it. It has increased the burdens of the tax-payers and added many of the monopolies of the land. There is no satisfactory evidence that it has increased our property in any degree, or advanced the wages of a single working man. Skilled statisticians capable of juggling with figures, may assume to have more information than we possess, and may figure out a different result, but I can safely assert that it is the general understanding of the people that the McKinley bill has not increased wages either in New York or elsewhere. I know this much, that the democratic party will be entirely content to permit every workingman whose wages have been increased since the passage of the McKinley bill to vote the republican ticket, if our opponents will consent that all those whose wages have not been increased shall vote the democratic ticket, and upon that basis we will carry the country by a million majority.

We should not, however, permit our position to be misunderstood. We are not seeking power upon the "scalp" issue, but with all good citizens we rejoice in the prosperity of the country and trust that it may continue, but we insist that the country has been prosperous, not because of the McKinley law, but in spite of it. There is another issue in this campaign of equal importance to the rights and liberties of every citizen.

The republican party means to be irrevocably committed to the passage of the Federal election bill generally known as the Davenport bill, and although it must be evident to the most patriotic and thoughtful member of that organization that it is a piece of political foolishness, only equalled by its mediocrity, there has appeared for them no escape from its advocacy. It is an impeachment of the good sense of the republican leaders that they should press the consideration of so offensive and unwise at this or any other

time, especially in view of the fact, now apparent to every one, that it absolutely prevents their party receiving a single electoral vote in a third of the States of the Union; and although as partisans we may rejoice at their folly, yet as citizens we deplore their threatened attack upon the free institutions of our country never before so imperiled. The bill has been well described as a "menace to liberty"—the liberty of the North as well as the South; the liberty of the black as well the white, the liberty of every white citizen, no matter to what party he may happen to belong. Whence comes this objectionable scheme for federal interference in our elections, and who are its originators and sponsors? Until recently the author of the measure was supposed to be the eminently respectable Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, who introduced the bill. But not long ago, a gentleman, not unknown to fame, John L. Davenport, of New York city, the chief Federal supervisor of elections, and also a United States commissioner, administrative, polite and amicable person, "as mild-mannered man as ever scuttled a ship or cut a throat," came to Washington and appeared before the committee on immigration in behalf of another project, dear to his heart, to promote "the purity of elections" and I had the honor of examining him, and he stated in answer to my question, to the great surprise of the public, that he was the bold and sole author of the notorious force bill. The borrowed plumage was immediately stripped from the proud person of Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, and the bill has since been styled "the Davenport force bill." Permit me, in this connection, to further state that Mr. Davenport, on this same occasion, with brutal frankness, avowed his purpose to have his bill introduced again when ever "a favorable opportunity" he unblushingly replied, "When the republicans shall again have a majority in both houses of Congress"—an event not likely to occur, I trust for many years to come. In the open and public expression of his intention to press the measure again it must be assumed that he spoke in behalf of his party and reflected its sentiments. The people of the several States will hesitate long before they consent to the adoption of "Davenport's" election methods in their respective localities. I have not the time to-night to enter into any elaborate presentation of the details of this bill. It is sufficient for us to know that the only purpose of the measure is to control for partisan advantage, our elections, State and Federal. The bill is a desperate attempt to prop up the falling fortunes of a once great political party; it was conceived in political animosity, it is argued from the narrowest and worst of motives and is unworthy a place among the statutes of American republic.

The democratic party declares for free, honest and fair elections everywhere. It desires them not merely because they would ensure to its benefit, but upon the unselfish and high ground that they are essential to the preservation of our free institutions. There has been no such condition of affairs at the South as to justify the enactment of the Davenport measure. It is true that the colored people in large numbers are there voting the democratic ticket, but this affords no sufficient reason for taking away from them, or from us, the control of their, or our elections. The colored people were not freed from slavery to become the slaves of the republican party. The South is loyal, honest and capable and if permitted as it should be, it will work out its social and other problems in its own way without injury to the colored race of injustice to the north, or to the republican party, or danger to the elective franchise. In an event the majority of the American people will never approve a measure which threatens their liberties, legalizes unfairness and absolutely guarantees partisan victories to the unscrupulous party that dares to enact it. After a brief discussion of State issues, Senator Hill concluded as follows: I believe that a majority of the people of this country are convinced of the rightfulness

(Continued to last page.)