

SCIENTIFIC APPOINTMENTS.

We learn from the Baltimore Sun that the president in all probability, intends to introduce an innovation in the matter of federal appointments. As a reply to the critics who have assailed his southern policy he has brought pressure to bear upon the district attorney at Boston to the end that William H. Lewis, a colored man, be appointed an assistant district attorney at that place.

The appointee, William H. Lewis, is a Harvard law school graduate. He has one little negro blood, and is so light in color, that no one would suspect him of being a negro unless specially informed of the fact.

The following is the Sun's understanding of the new movement:

The inference to be drawn from the method and character of this appointment is that Lewis represents exactly the proportion of negro to the population and enticement of the northern community which the president is willing to regard as equivalent to the appointment of a full-blooded-black negro to a position in the south. According to such distribution upon scientific principles, the proportion will be one out of ten to a minor position in Boston, appointed not directly by the president and brought not directly in contact with the population; for New York, perhaps one quadron similarly appointed; a mulatto for Indiana, if no objection is raised, and possibly two mulattos for northern states of greater negro population. This scheme of proportion, however, has not been carried as yet beyond the indirect appointment at Boston.

If the strenuous president pushes the reform, it may become necessary for congress to establish an independent bureau for the computation of the proportion on a precise basis, so that no inequalities may creep in.

Meanwhile many northern journals severely criticize the president's policy in regard to negro appointments. The New York Herald ceases to support him for re-nomination next year, calls for the immediate re-opening of the Indiana office, and for the withdrawal of the Crum appointment.

WHY ANY COAL DUTY?

The ways and means committee of the house has decided to report a bill favoring a rebate equal to the duty now imposed on all importations of coal. This whole provision is to be effective for one year only. The senate will probably accept the bill as it stands.

But the question is, why perpetuate a fraud that was engendered by an un-justified provision of the Dingley tariff bill?

The New York Times tells how this thing happened, as follows:

The story of this fraud has been repeatedly told in the Times and other newspapers. It was told again yesterday with circumstances and details in our Washington dispatches. From 1870 to 1897 anthracite coal was on the free list. Then the McKinley tariff imposed a duty. No duty was imposed in the Dingley tariff bill as it was sent from the house to the senate. The finance committee reported the bill to the senate with an amendment which made anthracite dutiable at 75 cents per ton. That was too barefaced. As the bill passed the senate and became a law it contained this paragraph in the free list: "Coal, anthracite, not specially provided for in this act, and coal stores on American vessels." But in the schedule with a vengeance, for that schedule contained this paragraph: "Coal, bituminous, and all coals containing less than 92 per centum of fixed carbon, and shale, 67 cents per ton. Commercially speaking, there is no coal containing more than 92 per centum of fixed carbon. No anthracite is or can be imported which does not contain less than that percentage, and therefore all anthracite is dutiable under the Dingley act at 67 cents per ton.

The apostles of protection in congress are having such a strong public pressure brought upon them that they are willing to grudgingly concede a rebate for a limited time in order to relieve a suffering public from the present intolerable situation into which they have been placed by the Dingley bill.

If in their judgment a limited rebate would benefit the public, and would not destroy the "infant" coal industry, why not make it permanent?

THE SINCERITY OF MITCHELL.

Throughout all the recent labor troubles John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America has made a reputation for acuteness of intellect, sincerity of purpose, and for the possession of undoubted qualities of leadership.

He showed this from the moment he organized the anthracite miners, until he met the coal operators on the forum of public opinion and finally compelled them to accept substantially his own terms of settlement.

We notice in yesterday's Virginian-Pilot that he has made another bid for public respect and confidence in that he has issued a circular letter to the local unions in the anthracite district asking them to devise means by a close co-operation with the management of mines to relieve the present intolerable situation in the coal market.

This action will confirm the American people's high estimate of Mr. Mitchell.

Power gallows, wears longer, Burns.

Champ Clark's Letter

Attention, Antilychers of Boston! Many Minds on the Trust Question Judge Taft on the Supreme Bench

(Special Washington Letter.)

WITHOUT any purpose of being impertinent, I wish to call the attention of the members of the Antilyching society of Boston to the fact that they are not actively engaged in the discharge of their duties. As long as the lynching industry was confined principally to the south they made the welkin ring with their denunciations; but, for some unexplained reason, when the elite of Marion, Mass., turned White Cappers, were acquitted and were given an ovation upon their return home the Boston reformers were strangely silent, thereby and therein once more illustrating the truthfulness of the old saw that "very much depends upon whose ox is gored." It is a pity that the Boston antilychers should have let that golden opportunity escape to point a moral and adorn a tale. They are about to let another one escape them. On Christmas day certain irate citizens of Pittsburg, in bleeding Kansas, where old John Brown's soul is supposed to be forever marching on, battered down the jail doors, took from his cell one Montgomery Godley and publicly put him to death. Godley, whose crime belies his name, had killed a policeman engaged in the discharge of his duties, which is not so diabolical a deed as rape, the ferocious cause of southern lynchings. And Godley was a negro! Only think of that, ye Boston antilychers! Here is a concatenation of events calculated to stir the hearts of reformers—bleeding Kansas lynching a colored man for murder! Up, reformers, and at them! Isn't the outgoing governor of Kansas, Stanley, a Republican? Isn't the incoming governor, Bailey, a Republican? Perhaps these things account for the mystifying inactivity of the Boston Antilyching society. Its crusade is against southern Democratic states.

When Doctors Disagree.

The trust question is certainly one of the most difficult that ever vexed the human mind. Most people are against the trusts. Nearly everybody is suggesting a remedy. No two appear to agree, and the trusts grow apace. Congress appropriates \$500,000 to prosecute the trusts one week, and the next one of the biggest trusts is organized in Chicago. Mr. Attorney General Knox in his Pittsburg speech thought there is already plenty of law to bust the trusts, while President Roosevelt thinks it may be necessary to adopt a constitutional amendment in order to bust them. Not long since Senator John T. Morgan thought they could be regulated and controlled through the taxing power, which Chief Justice Marshall declared is the power to destroy. Now comes Senator Morgan and practically throws up his hands and asserts that both the old parties have acted hypocritically as to the trusts and that it may be necessary to establish a new party to deal with them. The venerable senator from Alabama appears to be in the same frame of mind in which Mme. Pompadour found herself when she exclaimed, "After us the deluge!" only she said it in French. As the new party would be made up of persons who compose the old ones, the senator's latest programme holds out precious little hope to suffering humanity. As he has tabernacled in the flesh considerably more than the palmist's allotment of three score years and ten, he ought to know that hope deferred maketh the heart sick and propose something more practical and expeditious than the formation of a new party.

Mr. H. O. Havemeyer says that the high protective tariff system is the mother of all trusts, and he ought to know something about it, for he is president of one of the largest and worst in the land. On the other hand, President Roosevelt thinks that there is no sort of connection between the tariff and the trusts. Clearly it is a case of many men of many minds, in which even the most eminent doctors disagree. Senator George Graham Vest in an elaborate article practically coincides with Havemeyer as to cause and effect between the tariff and the trusts. The main points of Senator Vest's interview are as follows:

The greatest menace that threatens this country today is in combinations of capital that have monopoly for their object.

The argument of the protectionists that equally great trusts exist in free trade England is false, absolutely.

No monopoly can exist in a great staple of commerce where competition is open to the world.

The first step in an honest attempt to correct the evils from which we suffer is to remove the protection the tariff gives to monopolies and force them into world competition.

The protective tariff is intermutuality of greed. Let any attempt be made to remove the protection afforded one industry and every industry that feeds on protection will cry out in pain.

The accredited author of the Dingley law admitted the rates were unnecessarily high, yet the Dingley rates are now held sacred, and their continuance is demanded by the interests that have glutted on them.

Refusal to reduce the tariff rates leaves congress with but weak weapons with which to fight monopoly.

The act of 1880 represents the limit of constitutional authority of congress to regulate trade between the states.

Revert to the simple subterfuge of selling goods to a second party and disavow

ing knowledge of what became of them after they left the factories will at any time render the so called Sherman law insufficient to cope with trusts.

The attorney general may have resources of which I know nothing, but, as one of the authors of the act, I do not see how he can conduct successful prosecutions under the law.

The difficulty, if not the impossibility, of dealing with trusts through remedial legislation being established, does it not seem reasonable that the wisest course would be to cut off the nourishment that has enabled them to grow to such ungovernable size?

Whatever may be thought as to the soundness of Senator Vest's views, it must be admitted that he states them with great vigor.

Presto, Change!

One of the most important prerogatives of a president of the United States is to appoint federal judges, especially the justices of the supreme court. To the honor of all concerned, the judges of the most powerful tribunal on earth have, as a rule, been men of great capacity and highest character. The history of the legal tender decisions is not pleasant reading. The part played by the supreme court judges in the Hayes-Tilden contest brought the court into disrepute. The decision in the income tax cases is a blot upon our jurisprudence. The recent decisions touching our insular possessions are a discredit to the court. But, taken all in all, life people have been well pleased with their judicial servants on the supreme bench.

The Washington Times states—and, it says, by authority—that in February, when he shall have reached the age of seventy and shall have served ten years, the prerequisites for retiring on full pay, Mr. Justice Shiras will retire and that Hon. William H. Taft, governor general of the Philippines, will be appointed in his stead. 'Tis well. Judge Shiras has been under a cloud ever since he turned that remarkable and historic somersault in the income tax cases, and the sooner he seeks the shades of private life the better. Governor Taft is a man of splendid capacity and great learning in his profession. At the earnest solicitation of President McKinley he resigned a life position on the circuit bench of the United States to accept the hazardous position—hazardous to both life and reputation—of governor general of the Philippines, and it is only fair to state that he has discharged his difficult, delicate and multifarious duties with signal ability.

When the Chinese exclusion bill was being considered by the house committee on foreign affairs, a most remarkable array of distinguished witnesses and advocates appeared to testify or to argue—great lawyers, great editors, senators, governors, preachers, philanthropists, congressmen and one ex-cabinet minister—but the most distinguished in appearance and in hearing was Governor Taft.

When I was a boy down in the hill country of Kentucky, I knew an old rough and ready country doctor who declared that he "judged people by their flesh marks." So do we all, though we may not be conscious of the fact. That was the old doctor's way of stating that he was a physiognomist, though he may never have heard of that high sounding scientific term. Judged by "his flesh marks," Governor Taft is worthy of the high position to which he is called. It is said to have been the intention of President McKinley to appoint him to the first vacancy. President Roosevelt does well so to honor him.

It is a curious and interesting fact that most of the supreme judges are large men physically. It has always been so. Judge Taft is a large man—has a large body, a large head, a large nose of the Julius Caesar pattern. He is a larger man, is taller and will weigh more than Mr. Justice John Marshall Harlan, who is the best known of the judges now on the bench. Of course Governor Taft is a Republican. Otherwise he would not have received the appointment. The chances are that he will make a great reputation as a jurist.

Hot Shot From Protection Paper.

The Washington Post is an independent journal, but one of the staunchest protection advocates in the land. Nevertheless in speaking of what the Republicans will do and will not do during the remainder of the short session it rises to remark:

The pledges of the party as to changes in the Dingley schedules are and probably will be unfulfilled. Schedules which Mr. Dingley said were "purposely made too high" to "leave room for reduction through reciprocal agreements are still "too high." In fact, the tariff as it stands today is not in any fair sense the Dingley tariff, for the reason that the changes for which he provided in accordance with Republican policy and Republican platforms have in no instance been made. It is a tariff that Dingley, were he living today, would be bound to condemn.

"Will this congress, like its latest predecessor, 'stand pat' on such abuses of protection as have created profound dissatisfaction among the trust friends of that doctrine? Will it continue to make capital for the enemy? We think it will.

I desire to call the attention of my readers to the concluding query and answer: "Will it—i. e., this congress—continue to make capital for the enemy? We think it will." This is corroboratory evidence, strong and clear, of the assertions I have heretofore made repeatedly, that the trend is toward De-

mocracy and that Democrats have good reason to be hopeful as to the future. If a Democrat had written the above paragraph, all the whole hog tariff advocates would inflate their lungs and bellow, "Free trade demagoguery!" But they will hardly assail the Post with their billingsgate. It's record is unimpeachable on the tariff question, and it knows—none better—that one of the chief causes of Republican success last November was the promise so frequent and emphatically made by Republicans to revise the Dingley rates downward, and it knows that that promise will not be kept. It evidently knows another thing—to wit, that the failure on the part of Republicans to fulfill that pledge is "making capital for the enemy." So the merry war goes on in the Republican camp. Out of it, let us hope, will come much good to the great body of the people.

The Post takes another fall out of the G. O. P. in an editorial headed "How Is This?" which runs as follows:

Both reason and experience show that there is but one way to maintain parity between different forms of money, and that is by exchanging on: for the other at the will of the holder, but when the test shall come, if any doubt exists whether the secretary of the treasury will follow reason and experience, a panic will be precipitated, as in 1883.—Secretary Shaw. As in 1887? What does that mean? Was it the trouble in the treasury, the security of funds and the doubt as to what course the secretary would take? Was that what caused the panic in 1887?

What, then, becomes of the venerable contention which is so often seen in Republican organs, that the tariff of 1894, by some miraculous force, brought on a panic a year before it was born? Did Secretary Shaw intend to rob the organs of one of the choicest weapons in their arsenal? Does he not understand that the tariff of 1894 reached back about a year and brought on a panic which "cost the country more than our great war in the early sixties?" Have we a secretary who cares more for the truth than for the exigencies of his party's organs? It would seem so, and the Post congratulates him for his independence. Nevertheless we expect to see that exploded fiction repeated and put on the road again in 1904.

I particularly commend that editorial to the careful and prayerful consideration of those palpitating and hysterical patriots, General Charles Henry Grosvenor of Ohio and Hon. Charles B. Landis of Indiana, who seem to be really possessed of the strange hallucination that the panic of 1893 was caused by a law passed in 1894. The chances are, however, that those eminent publicists would not change their opinions though one rose from the dead to testify or though an angel from heaven came down to take the witness stand against them.

Ambassador Clayton Again.

"Unensy lies the head that wears a crown" is an ancient saying frequently quoted with approval. The philosophy of the proverb might well be applied to all persons holding high office. General Powell Clayton, ambassador to Mexico, can make his "alforday" to that fact. In one respect at least the position he now occupies is the most desirable in our diplomatic corps, for it is the only one in which our representative abroad can live in style and save money. His mission is first class, and he ranks with the ambassadors to England, France, Russia, Germany, Austria and Italy, the pay being in each case \$17,500 per annum. This extraordinary rank was conferred upon our representative to Mexico wisely and purely as a commercial measure—to increase our trade with Mexico by flattering the Mexicans. Living is much cheaper in Mexico than in Europe. General Diaz, a really great man, being possessed of power, has sense enough to care little for his trappings. Consequently our ambassador, so it is said, can live in comfort and at the same time save a large portion of his salary. Nevertheless Ambassador Clayton is not happy; he does not repose on a bed of roses. His enemies pester him so!

The trouble with the general appears to be that, not satisfied with the legitimate gains of his position, he has gone into the speculating business in the land of the Montezumas, and, being a high roller in that regard, people object to his performances, claiming that he prostitutes his powers as Ambassador Clayton in order to increase the profits of Plunger Clayton. The result is that they keep the general and a good many other official folks in hot water. Just as he was settling down to enjoy his Christmas turkey Senator Penrose of Pennsylvania filed some new charges against him, calculated to give him a bad case of indigestion.

General Clayton is the last of the carpetbaggers to hold high office. The rest have dropped by the wayside politically—some rich, some poor, some in the south, most back in the north. One of them, ex-Governor Franklin J. Moses of South Carolina, recently was sent to the Massachusetts penitentiary for stealing. They were a bum set, those carpetbaggers.

A Kansas Poet.

The publication of the John J. Ingalls book is serving to revive interest in that brilliant and vitriolic statesman. Few people remember that he was a poet as well as an orator, but he was, and he wrote what some critics contend is the finest sonnet in our vernacular. Here it is:

OPPORTUNITY. Master of human destinies am I? Fame, love and fortune on my footsteps wait.

Cities and fields I walk; I penetrate Deserts and seas remote, and, passing by Hovel and mart and palace, soon or late I knock unbidden once at every gate! If sleeping, wake; if feasting, rise before I turn away. 'Tis the hour of fate. And they who follow me reach every state.

Mortals desire and conquer every foe Save death, but those who doubt or hesitate. Condemned to failure, penury and woe, Seek me in vain and uselessly implore. I answer not, and I return no more!

Champ Clark

Rheumacide

The great rheumatic remedy not only cures every form of rheumatism, but makes radical cures of

Contagious Blood Poison, Serofula, Sores, Boils, Catarrh,

and all diseases arising from impurities in the blood. Endorsed by physicians and prominent people everywhere after thorough trial.

DOES NOT INJURE THE DIGESTIVE ORGANS.

Gentlemen—I take pleasure in bearing testimony to the curative properties of your "RHEUMACIDE." Two bottles cured my son of a bad case. If this will be of any benefit to you in advertising your meritorious remedy, you can use it. Yours truly, W. E. HAND, Steward State Blind Institution.

All Druggists, \$1.00; or prepaid on receipt of price. Bobbitt Chemical Co., Baltimore, Md.

J. E. HOOD DRUGGIST NTON, N. O.

Established 1835. Inc. reposed 1900. ARTOPE, WHITT & CO. MARBLE AND GRANITE MONUMENTS AND AGENTS FOR IRON FENCING. Main Office and Electric Power Plant: MACON, GA. Branch Office and Plant: ROCKY MOUNT, N. C. Slaughter Brothers, Selling Agents for Kinston.

JOB PRINTING

- Letter Heads, Note Heads, Envelopes, Bill Heads, Statements, Circulars, Cards, Booklets, Books, Receipts, Order Blanks, Tags, Labels, Etc.

THE Free Press has on hand a large stock of Stationery of every description. In fact so large that it must be partly disposed of, and to do this, we will do all classes of printing for the next 30 days at prices before unheard of. The price will be made so low that it will pay you to buy now, even if the Stationery is not needed right away. The Free Press has the best equipped plant in the Eastern part of the State and artistic printers.

Get Prices on Anything You Need.