THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

MRS L L POLK, - Proprietor.
CLARENCE H POE, - Editor.
BENJAMIN IRBY, } Corresponding
FRANK E EMERY, } Editors.
J. W. DENMARK, Business Man'g'r.
RALEIGH, N. C.

—SUBSCRIPTION—

Single Subscription One Year.....$1.00
" " Six Months..... 50
Three Months..... 25

"THE INDUSTRIAL AND EDUCASIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR PEOPLE PARAMOUNT TO ALL OTHER CONSIDERASIONS OF STATE POLICY,' is the motto of The Progressive Farmer, and upon this platform it shall rise or fall. On all matters relating specially to the great interests it represents, it will speak with no uncertain voice, but will fearlessly the right defend and impartially the wrong condemn. Serving no master, ruled by no faction, circumscribed by no selfish or narrow policy its aim will be to foster and promote the best interests of the whole people of the State."—*From Col. Polk's Silutatory, Feb. 10, 1886*

EDITORIAL.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

T. B. Parker, Secretary of the State Farmers' Alliance, will speak at Bethel Church, near White Cross, Orange county, Saturday, April 14th, at 1 o'clock p. m. The public invited.

The death of Gen. Joubert, the trusted and well beloved leader of the Boers, is a severe blow to their cause. Joubert was a soldier of unusual ability and the idol of his men. With Cronje captured and Joubert dead the outlook for the Boers is darker than ever.

Farm and Home brings the gratifying information that the Grange is prospering wonderfully with 109 new Granges organized from Oct. 1, 99, to April 1, and 39 old Granges reorganized Last year only about half that number were organized in the same length of time.

Make arrangements at once to attend your County Alliance meeting. The true blue members of the Order must work harder than ever to keep the organization in good trim and the weaker brethren encouraged during the campaign now opening. If we can tide over the next four months without loss, victory is ours.

The prices of paper, type, and other printing materials are steadily advancing. As a natural result, many publishers are raising subscription rates, while others are now sending out statements to subscribers. While we do not wish to press readers at this season of the year, we will say, in the language of a brother editor, that "those of our subscribers who have not paid us anything on subscription this season are hereby reminded that if they should decide to send a little cash along by registered letter or money order we will not think hard of them for it."

THIS WEEK'S PROGRAM.

Our tobacco growing readers, in addition to one or two other articles relating to the Tobacco Association, will find in the article by Mr. W J Groome, of Guilford county, a complete explanation of evry phase and feature of the Jordan plan. Interested persons should preserve Mr. Groome's paper.

From Prof. Gerald McCarthy's exhaustive article on rice culture printed on page 6 North Carolina rice growers can secure about all the information needed on this subject The State Department of Agriculture has recently distributed a large number of sample packages of a promising new variety of Japanese rice, from which good results are confidently expected

We commend to our young men readers the selections from Mr. B k's book published on page 4 The young man seeking success will find in them many suggestions that can be practiced with profit

SWEET POTATO DISEASE.

EDITORS PROGRESSIVE FARMER:—I would like for some friend to explain through the columns of The Farmer what causes sweet potatoes to have a dry scab on them (or dry rot), and what can be done to remedy the disease. Very truly, J J. W.

(Answer by Corresponding Editor Irby, M. S)

The dry rot, or black scab, mentioned above is a fungus growth caused usually by the use of manure on sweet potatoes. Of course there is no remedy for the potatoes already infected but precaution can, and should, be taken to prevent future trouble

Select only healthy potatoes to put in the beds, and then only the best plants should be drawn for planting

Use no manure whatever for fertilizing the potato. If any is used in the hot-bed then do not allow it to come in contact with the potato.

Both Irish and sweet potatoes should be fertilized with a commercial manure and not with a barn-yard manure.

B I.

THE AMENDMENT AND SCHOOLS

"The News and Observer has sounded a loud note in favor of the public schools. It wants a plank in the Democratic platform declaring for a four months school. That is all right, but we must have something better than planks in a platform. We have already a constitutional requirement for that very thing, but the Constitution has been disregarded."

The above paragraph we clip from Charity add Children. And in it Editor Johnson has hit the bull's eye "That is all right, but we must have something better than planks in a platform." That is the sentiment and the sentence that all friends of education in the State of North Carolina should echo and re echo until they do bring about "something better than planks in a platform." Our Constitution declares it the duty of the State to maintain a four months school in every school district in the State. With the Constitution itself disregarded, do politicians expect us to put our faith in and be satisfied with a plank in a party platform? If so, they are merely deceiving themselves The watchword of the friends of education is "something better than planks in a party platform"—and something better than a null and useless section of our Constitution.

The more we study the matter the firmer becomes our conviction that the Constitutional amendment should be amended by the adoption of a provision something like this, as an addition, say, to section 5:

Provided further, That no person becoming twenty-one years of age after January 1, 1908 and residing in a school district in which the State fails to maintain free public schools for an average of four months or more per year for six years preceding his twenty first birthday, shall be denied the right to register or vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to posess the educational qualification prescribed in Section 4 of this article.

The politicians, as well as the people, realize that it is the essence of injustice for the State to require an educational qualification for voting without providing for the poor children of the State all the advuntages needed to enable them to meet the stern demands of the Constitution. The politicians, we say, recognize this, and they are attempting to still the clamor for better educational advantages by making promises—which may be given in good faith, but are certainly entitled to no more respect than the Constitution of our State. Let it be understood that in advocating this amendment to the amendment, we are doing so neither as an advocate nor as an opponent of the amendment as it now stands, but as an unbiased and unmuzzled editor. But it is well enough to face conditions as they are and look before you leap. There is certainly a probability of the adoption of the amendment at the August election. We ask the voter to see that he does not require of his child certain things, without making provision for that child to meet those requirements. Only by the addition of an amendment such as that proposed by us can he be sure that in requiring an educational qualification he is not making an unjust and unreasonable demand of his son or of other men's sons.

Perhaps you hadn't thought of it, but it is nevertheless a fact that the adoption of the amendment (if it be adopted) will make public education unpopular with some who do not now antagonize it. The amendment adopted, the opponent of free schools will argue this way: "As negroes must get their share of the money the more money for public education, the more and better schools for negroes; and the more schools for negroes, the more educated negroes; and the more educated negroes, the more negro voters. Therefore, as I don't want the negro to vote, let the white man educate his own children. I am opposed to longer free school terms." Such a sentiment may become powerful enough to prevent the proper extension of the public school term. If you do not heed this warning now, you may recall it when it is too late. The voters should run no risks in this matter. They should demand this: that wherever the Constitutional requirement for four months public schools is disregarded there shall the Constitutional requirement for an educational test for voters be held of no effect. This is just, fair, reasonable.

If the people want such an amendment to the amendment, let them speak out in no uncertain voice. Let them say to their law makers: "We want something better than planks in a platform!

We learn from good authority that the meeting of the State Dairymen's Association has been indefinitely postponed.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT.

A dispatch in the General News columns of last week's Progressive Farmer told of the formation of the Carnegie Steel Company with a capital stock of $160 000,000. It may be interesting to review the events that led up to the formation of this gigantic organization.

A few weeks ago Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who held most of the stock in the old Carnegie Steel Company and Mr. H C Frick, who has managed the concern for many years, became involved in a dispute. The dispute came about this way. Frick was removed as chairman of the board of directors of the company, and Carnegie attempted to make him surrender his stock at about its par value, $6 000 000 Whereupon Mr. Frick brought suit in the Court of Common Pleas at Pittsburg for the difference between the $6 000 000 offered by Carnegie and the real value of the stock—this value being estimated by Frick at $16 000 000 And in the course of the suit Mr. Frick blurted out some business secrets that startled the country and set many men to thinking on the trust problem that had before been indifferent. Among other things Mr. Frick said:

"The business from 1892 to 1900 was enormously profitable, growing by leaps and bounds, from year to year, until in 1899 the firm actually made on low-priced contracts in net profits after paying all expenses of all kinds, $21 000,000. In November, 1899, Carnegie estimated the net profits for 1900 at $40 000 000 and Frick then estimated them at $42 500,000. Carnegie valued the entire property at over $250,000 000 and avowed his ability in ordinarily prosperous times to sell the property on the London market for £100 000 000, or $500'000 000 "

And all this, it must be remembered, on a capital of but $25 000,000. Such profits are actually beyond the comprehension of the average man. As the Chicago Evening Post well says:

"In order to realize their full import most men would have to take a few days off to think it over. If the plant and business were purchased at that price ($500 000 000) and were paid for in United States gold coin (a preposterous supposition, of course), it would take more than half of all the gold coin in this country and more than three fourths of the total amount in circulation. It may interest silverites to know that if all the silver dollars in the country were gathered together it would not equal the price set, and that the total issue of national bank-notes would be less than half of it."

In fact, by Mr. Frick's revelations the public began to get a fair idea of the methods of the modern trust and of the modern millionaire philanthropist, as Mr. Carnegie is called. So much so, that Mr. Carnegie rushed in before Frick could conclude his disclosures and made a compromise by acknowleding all that Frick claimed and giving him all that he demanded.

And in connection with these disclosures made by Frick there are some other matters that deserve the attention of farmers and all voters.

First—This great trust was undoubtedly paying taxes on but $25 000,000. Do you prefer to continue paying tribute to these over-grown combinations of capital and in addition pay far more than your share of taxes, rather than study for yourself the problem of equalizing these taxes?

Second—That while the profits were growing, as Mr. Frick says, by leaps and bounds, this steel trust was steadily advancing the price of its goods If you are a farmer you realize this. The Secretary of the American Farm Implement Association recently pointed out these advances and said:

"The cost of raw material during the year 1899 made advances unprecedented in the industrial history of the United States. For example, bolts and nuts have advanced 135 per cent; harror discs, 115 per cent; corn planter and other wire, eighty per cent; rake teeth, 110 per cent; bar iron and steel, 126 per cent; cast iron, 100 per cent; plow steel, seventy five per cent; pipe, round and square, 250 per cent; steel wheels, sixty-five per cent; harrow teeth, 125 per cent; steel springs, 250 per cent; malleable iron, eighty five per cent; plow and cultivator beams, per per cent."

This prompts the inquiry: Will you, as a voter and a freeman, continue paying such tribute, or will you commence the study of the trust problem and vote and act as your judgment dictates, regardless of politicians or parties?

Third—This gigantic robber corporation, which held up the American people and took from them the magnificent sum of more than $20 000 000 last year did so, under the protection of our benevolent Uncle Sam. This weak, "infant (!) industry"—mark that—this "infant industry" was protected from competition with the outside world by a heavy protective tariff. Such action is indefensible. No party will attempt to defend it before the people. Query: Is it not time for the people to demand that no trust be given the benefit of a protective tariff? Must the United States government continue a partner in such iniquity and fraud by shielding such robbers of the people?

MUST STAND OR FALL AS A WHOLE.

A correspondent asks: "Are you still of the opinion expressed by you last year that if the courts should declare Section 5 of the grandfather clause of the proposed Constitutional amendment unconstitutional that the whole amendment would be unvalidated—in other words, that all the sections stand or fall together?'

In reply, will say that we still hold that opinion. In fact, we are more firmly convinced of its correctness than at the time our editorial announcing this view was written. As every one knows, if the grandfather clause of the proposed amendment is unconstitutional, it is so because of conflict with the Fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That amendment reads as follows:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The important question is, therefore, "Does Section 5 of the amendment, which contains the grandfather clause, deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote on account of 'race, color, or previous condition of servitude?'" An examination will show conclusively that it does nothing of the kind. On the contrary, this section is for the purpose, not of *denying*, but of *granting*, to a certain class of persons, the right of suffrage denied them by Section 4 Hence, it does not of itself conflict with the Fifteenth amendment. Nor is Section 4 of itself unconstitutional. A moment's thought will convince any right thinking man that it is only by considering the amendment as a whole that it can possibly be considered in conflict with the Fifteenth amendment to our National Constution. Let us repeat for the sake of emphasis: No one will for a moment attempt to maintain that Section 5 or the grandfather clause of itself "denies or abridges" the right of any citizen to vote on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or for any other cause. Therefore it, taken alone, cannot obstruct the operation of the Fifteenth amendment This being so, the court in considering the constitutionality of the grandfather clause, must consider it in its relation to Section 4—in connection with that clause; that is, as one link of a chain, which, being broken, all falls. In other words, it must consider the amendment as a whole, and if Section 5 be unconstitutional, declare it, as a whole, unconstitutional and void.

"But," asks some one, "have you read the arguments of those who hold that the sections would not fall together? And haven't Senators Allen, Edmunds and Pettigrew declared that the grandfather clause may fall without invalidating the other sections? And doesn't the principle laid down by the renowned jurist, Judge Cooley, in his 'Statutes Unconstitutional in part' show that such would be the case?"

Yes, we have read the speeches referred to and the views of all the Senators that have given out opinions regarding the amendment. We have also carefully studied Judge Cooley's views on the subject in hand Excepting examples given to illustrate his points, the principal part of the opinion of Judge Cooley is given in full herewith:

"It will sometimes be found that an act of the legislature is opposed in some of its provisions to the Constitution, while others, standing by themselves, would be unobjectionable. So the forms observed in passing it may be sufficient for some of the purposes sought to be accomplished by it, but insufficient for others. In any such case the portion which conflicts with the Constitution, or in regard to which the necessary conditions have not been observed must be treated as a nullity. Whether the other parts of the statute must also be adjudged void because of the association must depend upon a consideration of the object of the law, and in what manner and to what extent the unconstitutional portion affects the remainder.

"A statute, it has been said, is judicially held to be unconstitutional because it is not within the scope of legislative authority. It may either propose to accomplish something prohibited by the Constitution or to accomplish some lawful and even laudable object by means repugnant to the Constitution of the United States or of the State. A statute may contain some such provisions, and yet the same act, having received the same sanction of all branches of the legislature, and being in the form of law, may contain other useful and salutary provisions not obnoxious to any just constitutional exception. It would be inconsistent with all just principles of constitutional law to adjudge these enactments void because they are associated in the same act, but not connected with or dependent on others which are unconstitutional. * * *

"But if its purpose is to accomplish a single object only and some of its provisions are void, the whole must fail unless sufficient remains to effect the object without the aid of the invalid portion. And if they are so mutually connected with and dependent on each other, as conditions, considerations, or compensations for each other, as to warrant the belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and, if all could not be carried into effect, the legislature would not pass the residue independently; then if some parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional, or connected must fall with them."

The sum and substance of this argument, as the reader will readily see, is this: A section of a statute cannot be declared unconstitutional without annulling the remaining sections, unless that section is independent of, or not connected in subject matter with, other sections. As, Judge Cooley, as a conclusion of the whole matter, after stating it as a general rule that an unconstitutional section may fall leaving constitutional sections standing, gives these notable exceptions: " * * * cases where it is evident that, from a contemplation of the statute and the purpose to be accomplished by it, that it would not have been passed at all *except as an entirety* and that the general purpose of the legislature will be defeated if it shall be held valid as to some cases and void as to others."

A man with half an eye, it occurs to us, can see that this exception amply covers the case of the proposed amendment. If it be passed by the popular vote, it will be passed as an entirety, and with it as a matter of common knowledge that it could not have been passed without a provision exempting illiterate whites now of age, and that to hold it void and Section 4 valid would "defeat the general purpose" of the people.

So that were Section 5 unconstitutional all the sections being to quote Judge Cooley, "connected in subject matter, dependent on each other, operating together for the same purpose" all would stand or fall together.

The arguments to the contrary by Senators Edmunds, Allen and Pettigrew are based upon the mistaken assumption that the sole purpose of the people, should they adopt the amendment, would be the establishment of an educational qualification, whereas, their purpose would be to restrict the right of suffrage to the educated *and* to such illiterates as they consider by long training, etc., qualified to vote intelligently. To make the amendment require a simple educational qualification and exclude these illiterates would "defeat their general purpose."

The view of the case which we have maintained in this article finds confirmation in numerous court reports and legal arguments. From the mass of testimony that might be cited to sustain our contention, we select but one, that of a very recent case parallel with that we are considering. Only about two months ago—on January 28th, 1900, to be exact, Judge Kohlsaat of the United States Circuit Court, in considering the Illinois anti trust law, the ninth section of which exempted a certain class from the provisions of the remaining sections, (just as Section 5 of the amendment exempts a class of voters, whites, from the provisions of Sections 4) handed down this opinion:

"It is urged that, granting the unconstitutionality of said ninth clause yet it may be declared void without affecting the validity of the remaining clauses of said act. If this were so, then by declaring said clause void, the courts would make the act binding upon those classes of persons within the State which the legislature had specially exempted from its provisions. This would be judicial legislation of the most flagrant character. In my opinion the said clause 9 taints the whole act and renders it all void."

This case, as anyone can see, involves the same identical principle as that that the court would have before it in considering the interdependency of sections of the proposed amendment. And the courts would be compelled to declare, as in the case just cited, that by declaring the grandfather clause void, "the courts would make the act binding upon those classes of persons within the State which the legislature has specially exempted from its provisions." And this, in the language of the court itself, would be "judicial legislation of the most flagrant character!" In view of this strong and unmistakable language of the courts and the views of Judge Cooley, we cannot doubt that if the grandfather clause of the proposed amendment is unconstitutional, the whole amendment will be declared void and of no effect.

Keep in mind that the members of the Alliance are your brothers and sisters, entitled to your regard and co-operation in every good work.

SUCCESS OF GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHY.

"The Success of Government Telegraphy in England" is the title of a very valuable and well-written paper in the April Century. The author is Mr. W. S. Harwood and in four pages he condenses the story of government ownership of the telegraph as practiced in Great Britain for thirty years past. This reform, it will be seen, long ago passed the experimental stage and is everywhere recognized as a great success. From Mr. Harwood's excellent article we extract these two paragraphs:

"Since the British Government, in the year 1870, assumed control of all inland telegrams, the business of that department of the general postoffice has grown to enormous proportions. The object of assuming this control was twofold: first, to reduce the exorbitant telegraph tolls of private companies—tolls so high as virtually to be prohibitive for many kinds of business; and, secondly, to safeguard the public against any return to former charges. It matters not what one may think as to the desirability of the introduction of such a system into the United States, the fact is patent that in Great Britain it has proved a signal success. The twofold object was long since attained, and there is no likelihood that the system will be overthrown.

"The report of the Postoffice Department for 1899 gives the latest available figures. This report shows that the people so far appreciate and utilize the system that they sent in 1899 up to the date of the closing of the report, in ordinary telegrams, which are exclusive of press telegrams, cable messages, government, franked, and reduced rate despatches, over three million messages more than during 1898. In 1869, the year before the government assumption, seven million messages were sent; in 1899 nearly ninety million messages. In 1869 the average charge for telegrams was a little over fifty cents, while the charge for the same message to day, inclusive of address, is about fifteen cents. In 1869 there were under three hundred employees, while there are at present over three thousand in the London office alone. Last year, after allowing for a deficit of at least a million dollars in the department devoted to the daily newspapers, the system cleared above all cost of maintenance over one hundred and sixty-five thousand pounds, in round numbers, eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

LITERARY NOTES.

In an article entitled "The Constitution and the Territories," in the American Monthly Review of Reviews for April, Prof. Harry Pratt Judson, of the University of Chicago, defines the powers of Congress in relation to our new possessions, exposing some of the fallacies that have crept into the discussion of the subject, both within and without the halls of Congress.

"Every happy home contains children," and yet with children come anxieties that for years fill mothers' hands and hearts. Recognizing the universal need of such a series of subjects, The Delineator has been publishing articles from the pen of Dr Grace Peckham Murray dealing with The Sick Child. The April article refers to The Fevers of Childhood. All Dr. Murray's work is characterized by careful thoroughness, and her advice is of the practical kind needed by anxious mothers.

The April Century is rich in pictorial illustration, its special art features including a frontispiece engraved by Cole, a full-page plate of H O Tanner's painting, "The Annunciation;" Lovers of travel and adventure will turn to Miss Scidmore's account of "The Greatest Wonder in the Chinese World," the bore of Hang-Chau, a tidal wave that sweeps up the Tsien-tang River thrice every year; to E Talbot Kelly's "Out-of-the-Way-Places in Egypt," with illustrations by the author; and to the first installment of Benjamin Wood's true tale of "The Hardships of a Reptiler" engaged in turtle-hunting, for profit, on the Caribbean coast of Central America.

Fiction these days is adding a host of new characters to its story, drawn from the animal world. We have had Kipling's wood people, Thompson's wild animals, and now Charles G. D. Roberts comes forward with some forest creatures who have the hearts and instincts of men and who win us as no other human and beasts ever have. Mr. Roberts differs from his fellow authors in giving us a novel instead of detached tales, and his "Heart of the Ancient Wood," which appears in the last (April) "New Lippincott" is the fullest and sincerest work devoted to this fascinating theme. His chief character is Old Kroof, the Bear, who becomes part of a deep woods household and protects the mother and daughter who people the remote cabin. There is love, pathos, and tragedy, but the grandeur of the ancient wood pervades all. The plot is unguessable and the characters are real people, even the beasts.