

The LARGEST CIRCULATION of any Halifax County Newspaper Established 1882.

THE COMMONWEALTH

ADVERTISING MEDIUM IN EASTERN CAROLINA

State Library

"EXCELSTOR" IS OUR MOTTO

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$1.00 PER YEAR.

VOL. XXVI

SCOTLAND NECK, N. C., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1915.

NUMBER 37.

Call 1-7-4---It Pays You

New and Fresh Groceries Every Day

But more than usual this week, on account of New Fall Goods rolling in.

The people having decided that the VERY BEST is none too good for them we are getting more orders than ever

Lord Calvert Coffee

than which there is none better

Full stock, Fresh Goods, Prices right and goods delivered promptly.

Both Telephones 1-7-4
Clee Vaughan

The Pocomonias
Virginia Beach, Va.
Three-story Cottage, very wide veranda, directly on ocean, fine table and good service. Near 17th St. Station. For terms address Mrs. A. B. WILLIAMS

Hancock-House Co., Inc
EMBALMER
Roanoke Rapids, N. C.
Day or night service anywhere
W. C. Williams, Licensed Embalmer

J. R. Woolard
Transfer
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Cars for hire. Cars repaired. Prompt attention. Quick service. Telephone—Residence 45. Office 66.

Allen Ailsbrook
House Mover
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
If you are thinking of having a house of any kind moved see me at once. Prices reasonable.

Ashby W. Dunn
Attorney at Law
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Money to loan on approved security.

Dr. T. D. Kitchin
Physician and Surgeon
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Office in Postoffice Building over North End Drug Store. Telephones—Office 10, Residence 34.

Dr. A. D. Morgan
Physician and Surgeon
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Office in building formerly used by Dr. J. P. Wimberley.

Dr. R. L. Savage
Rocky Mount, North Carolina
Will be in Scotland Neck on the third Wednesday of each month at the hotel to treat the diseases of the Eye, Ear, Nose, Throat and fit glasses

Dr. D. F. Keel
Dentist
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Successor Dr. A. C. Livermon
Office up-stairs in the Whitehead Building. Office hours from 9 to 1 and 2 to 5 o'clock. Even 7 to 9 p. m. by appointment.

Willie H. Ailsbrook
Life Insurance
Scotland Neck, North Carolina
Representing the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. of New York.

Hon. Claude Kitchin's Letter on the Nation's Preparedness

Scotland Neck, N. C., Sept. 4th, 1915.
Mr. H. E. C. Bryant,
New York World Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Bryant:—
I am in receipt of your letter. I didn't intend my little hurried talk of three or four minutes, just as I was leaving Washington for North Carolina the other day, with a personal friend, a newspaper man of my State, relative to the big naval and military program, now being agitated throughout the country, to be published, though I did not caution against it. Since, however, my position has been so frequently misrepresented by the press, no doubt, unintentionally, it would seem not improper for me to state my position, rather, my views, with more clearness, in compliance with your request.

I at once wish to say that I have never stated, as appears in the clippings you kindly send, that I would oppose any appropriation exceeding \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 for national defense. I have been voting for the last several years for appropriations in the annual Naval Bill exceeding \$120,000,000 and for nearly \$100,000,000, in the Military Bill; nor did I say that Congress would not vote for increased appropriations for naval and military purposes and that it would take the position which I do. I am confident that the next Congress will vote for larger appropriations and will not take the position as to the naval and military appropriations which I will. In other words, I admit that I will be a minority on the question. Nor have I said, as the press would have it, that the present European War has demonstrated the uselessness of the battleship or dreadnaught. I have said, though, and repeat it now, that it has demonstrated, beyond any doubt, that our Navy was lacking in submarines, destroyers, scout-ships and other auxiliaries, including air craft, far more than in battleships, or dreadnaughts, a view which many members of Congress, including myself, held and expressed long before the European War. While I was a member of the naval committee I insisted that the Navy Department was paying too much attention to and had too much faith in dreadnaughts and paying too little attention to and had too little faith in submarines, torpedo destroyers, etc. I, together with other members of the committee, urged, in vain, an increase in such smaller craft, in order to have a better proportioned and more efficient Navy. The war has certainly demonstrated the wisdom of this position. However, I assert now that the lessons of the present war furnish many good reasons for their probability that the war will demonstrate that the dreadnaught, nine of which we have now under construction and authorized, costing over \$120,000,000 and which the big Navy propagandists insist that the next Congress should largely increase, will not hereafter be the prime weapon of offense or defense in naval warfare, and some reason to believe they will become obsolete after the termination of this war, if not before. A year ago Sir Percy Scott, one of England's ablest and wisest officers, declared that the submarine was the most effective ship for the Navy of the future and advised a cessation in the rapid construction of dreadnaughts and the utilization of the money thus spent in building a larger number of submarines. And this long before the two or three German submarines had played such havoc with the British fleet. Has not the war demonstrated conclusively the correctness of his opinion and the wisdom of his advice? If reports from the British, German and other belligerent ship yards are true, are not England, Germany, and other warring nations now taking his advice? So far, this war has proved that the most dangerous naval weapon of offense, and certainly the surest and most efficacious weapon of defense, is the submarine.

When the real, sea-going submarine, one that can go through the seas and attack an enemy fleet thousands of miles from base, many of which are now being built by Germany, according to reports, (the last Congress authorized the construction of three for our Navy) is put into service in this war, it may, and probably will, revolutionize the war-ship construction policy of the world. The dreadnaught advocate in our country repeatedly asserts that the war has demonstrated the absolute usefulness and necessity of the big dreadnaught or battleship; that the superior battleship fleet of Great Britain and her Allies swept the German fleet and German commerce from the seas. If Great Britain and her Allies had not had a battleship, German commerce and the German fleet would have been swept from the seas exactly like they were Great Britain and her Allies had enough torpedo boats and destroyers and enough submarines to have sent after each battleship, battle-cruiser, and armored cruiser of the entire German Navy, ten torpedo boats and destroyers and three submarines; enough to have destroyed, or driven to harbor, under protection of submarines and mines, as the German fleet was, the combined battleship fleets of the world, if located where the German fleet then was. Great Britain alone had four destroyers and two submarines for each of the big warships of the German Navy.

Now, a more direct reply to your letter: I am opposed to the big Navy and Army program now being agitated with so much energy throughout the country, especially by the jingoes and manufacturers of war equipment and their subtle, ramified, organized and powerful influences. I shall not support in the next Congress the eight, six, or four battleship or

dreadnaught proposition, nor the 500,000 or 250,000 army increase proposition, nor the \$500,000,000 (more than double the annual appropriations heretofore) appropriation proposition for the Army and Navy. Whether Congress will vote for such an immensely increased appropriation depends on the President's attitude. If he insists on the increase, Congress will vote for it. If he does not insist, in my opinion, Congress will not vote for it. This answers your specific questions.

In further answer to your general inquiries, I shall not vote for any increase in the Naval Appropriation Bill for an extra-battleships program. If the Government has any extra money to spend, and must spend it on an extra increase of Naval Construction, then, in my judgment, it should be spent on the increased construction of submarines, torpedo destroyers, scout-ships and other auxiliaries, including air craft, and in enlarging our capacity to manufacture and lay mines—mainly on submarines and mines—(the laying of mines is a function of the Army, and not of the Navy, however) and not on additional dreadnaughts or battleships. If no increase in the Naval Appropriation Bill over the last Bill is made, I think it wiser that every dollar authorized and appropriated for new construction should be for submarines and other smaller craft above mentioned. For the cost of one or two dreadnaughts put into such craft, including the auxiliaries, we would have a better proportioned and more efficient Navy than if put into dreadnaughts, and most certainly more efficient for defense. If this war has not as yet demonstrated the uselessness of the modern dreadnaught, it has surely demonstrated the marvelous usefulness and absolute necessity of the submarine as a weapon of offense and defense. For the cost of one dreadnaught, with the submarines we now have, and those building and authorized, we could build enough to keep the combined battleship fleet of the world hundreds of miles from our shores. We would have the largest submarine fleet in the world, larger than Great Britain's and Germany's combined at the outbreak of the present war. For the cost of a dreadnaught we could build from twenty-five to thirty submarines, as many as Germany had at the beginning of the war. Who, unprejudiced and disinterested, in or outside of the Navy, in the light of the experience of the present war, does not know that twenty-five, or even ten or five, well equipped and well manned submarines, are more efficacious for offense and defense than one, or even four dreadnaughts? The dreadnaught costs \$14,000,000 and upwards; requires a thousand men and officers to man her; a million and a half dollars or more for her annual up-keep including crew; while a submarine costs only from \$400,000 to \$600,000; requires only about twenty-five men and officers to man, and its up-keep is negligible as compared with a battleship. Of all war craft it is by far the cheapest in men and money and most effective protection. Hasn't the submarine in this war fully vindicated itself? Have not three little German submarines, costing each less than half a million dollars, and manned by not over twenty-five men, destroyed nearly 10 per cent. of a big warship fleet of Great Britain, costing over \$75,000,000 and over two thousand lives, and, in addition, destroyed many thousands of tonnage of smaller war craft and merchant vessels? To accomplish what these three submarines, costing a little over a million dollars, with seventy-five men, did, would take, in a naval engagement, more than a dozen battleships and cruisers, costing, according to what we pay, more than \$100,000,000, and from 7,000 to 10,000 officers and men, with the probability, even if successful, of losing many of the vessels and thousands of lives. Did not one little submarine, costing less than half a million dollars, with only twenty-five men, worming itself through thousands of miles of sea, creep into the Dardanelles, send to the bottom five warships of the Allies and disable the others, driving the straggling, crippled, remnant of the Allies' fleet out, while it survived, unharmed and untouched? To accomplish this, it would have taken eight or ten warships, costing from \$60,000,000 to \$100,000,000, and from 7,000 to 10,000 men, with the risk of many ships being destroyed and many lives lost. Germany has her big, magnificent fleet of battleships, cruisers, etc., lying unmolested in her harbor. Great Britain and her Allies have a battleship fleet nearly four times as large and powerful and a torpedo fleet over four times as large. Why don't the Allies go in and destroy the German fleet? You answer, submarines and mines. That answers largely the question of our "defensive preparedness." If a few submarines and mines (and Germany hasn't as many submarines as we have) can protect, and keep unmolested, the German fleet and her harbor and hold at bay for hundreds of miles a fleet four times as big and as powerful, why couldn't submarines and mines protect with equal assurance our fleet and our shores?

But why should we be in such a hurry to make big appropriations for the Army and the Navy? Why should Congress make such a wild rush to tax the people more? Where is the necessity or the wisdom? If there ever was a time in the history of our Government when the Administration, Congress, and the people, could consider with deliberation, and without excitement and without haste, military and naval construction policy it is now. Just stop and give a moment's calm thought to the situation:

1st. Our Navy and Army is stronger, better equipped, with more ammunition and in every respect more efficient today than ever before. We have now under construction and authorized for the Navy more vessels than ever before—50 per cent. more in money and in numbers than ever before; more dreadnaughts under construction than ever before—nine in

(Continued on last page.)

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Saturday, October 9, Designated as "Fire Prevention Day" in North Carolina.

The General Assembly of nineteen hundred and fifteen amended the insurance laws of North Carolina, and, among other things, enacted: "It shall be the duty of the Insurance Commissioner and Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide as far as practicable for the teaching of 'Fire Prevention' in the colleges and schools of the State, and, if the way be open, to arrange for a text-book adapted to such use. Also by adding to said section as section four thousand seven hundred and twenty-one (b) the following: 'The ninth day of October of each and every year shall be set aside and designated as Fire Prevention Day, and the Governor shall issue a proclamation urging the people to a proper observance of the said day, and the Insurance Commissioner shall bring the day and its observance to the attention of the officials of the municipalities of the State, and especially to the firemen, and, where possible, arrange suitable programs to be followed in its observance.'"

Now, Therefore, I, LOCKE CRAIG Governor of North Carolina, in accordance with this statute, do issue this my Proclamation, and I do set aside and designate, Saturday, the 9th day of October, 1915 as Fire Prevention Day and do urge all the people to a proper observance of this day in obedience to the law of North Carolina. I urge the public schools of the State and the municipal officers thereof to give proper and formal recognition of the day and its meaning, and request the citizens generally to give special attention on that day to the condition of their premises, to the end that the waste and loss of property and life by fire may be reduced in this State.

The loss by fire amounts approximately to three million dollars a year in North Carolina. A large per cent of this loss is unnecessary and can be prevented. Human life, too, is needlessly sacrificed.

We should remedy the conditions that entail this enormous expense and loss suffered, not only by those whose property and lives are destroyed, but by all citizens in the high rates of insurance caused by unnecessary fires. The prevention of the needless destruction of the fruits of labor and of human life is a duty dictated by economy and humanity.

Done at our City of Raleigh, this the sixteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifteen, and in the one hundred and fortieth year of our American Independence.

By the Governor:
LOCKE CRAIG,
Governor.

JNO. P. KERR,
Private Secretary.

Insurance Commissioner Young and State Superintendent of Instruction Joyner have addressed letters to citizens and school superintendents respectively, urging them to co-operate for the success of the day.

Albemarle Presbytery

The Nahalah Presbyterian Church and neighborhood had a very pleasant time and a profitable one in entertaining the ministers and elders of Albemarle Presbytery.

There was most excellent preaching Tuesday, Thursday and Friday nights and a lecture with stereoscopic views on Wednesday night by Rev. Chas. L. Crane, from Africa.

The business of the Presbytery was quite satisfactory, and the reports of many evangelistic meetings were most cheering.

Rev. Lewis Collins, of Henderson, remained over and preached Sunday morning and night.

The following ministers attended Presbytery:

Rev. Chas. L. Crane from Africa
Rev. W. D. Morton, D.D. of Rocky Mount; J. N. H. Summerell D. D. of Newbern; R. A. White, of Henderson; S. K. Phillips, of Oxford; H. B. Searight, of Washington; J. B. Black, Elizabeth City; J. S. Kennison of Stokesville; J. M. Millard, Littleton; G. B. Hanrahan, Kinston; A. G. Harris, Greenville, H. F. M. Roanoke Rapids; R. E. Henderlite, Behaven, H. M. Shields, Townsville, H. N. Mc Diarmid, Goldsboro J. H. Jarvis, Washington; elders, George Howard, Tarboro, S. K. Fountain, Rocky Mount; L. H. Fountain, Leggett; J. H. Bullock, Townsville,

Chickens and Eggs Wanted

Old Rubber, Brass Other Junk

Highest Prices Paid

See me first when you have anything to sell—I may want to buy it.

Fresh Fish Daily

E. A. ALLSBROOK
The Junk Man

CASTORIA

For Infants and Children

In Use For Over 30 Years

Always bears the Signature of *Chas. H. Fletcher*

New Ice House

—AT—
Womack's Grist Mill

We have equipped a storage for ICE and have received our first shipment.

Ice will be delivered from wagon any hour and anywhere in town.

Prompt attention given to every order for Ice and your patronage will be highly appreciated.

Full supply of Ice will be kept through the entire year—summer and winter.

Call 1-5-4.
WOMACK'S ICE HOUSE
S. H. ALEXANDER, Mgr.

NYAL'S FAMILY REMEDIES

TRY THEIR "LIVER STIMULANT" Its Great

North End Drug Store, Watch the Yellow Packages

Wood's Special Grass and Clover Seed Mixtures

sown early in the fall yield full crops of hay or grazing the following year.

There is no question but that our Special Grass and Clover Mixtures yield much better crops of hay, and the meadows or pastures will keep in good, productive condition very much longer than where only two or three varieties of grass or clover are sown.

Our Descriptive Fall Catalog gives full information in regard to these mixtures and all other Grass and Clover Seeds, Seed Wheat, Oats, Rye, Barley, etc. for Fall sowing. Catalog mailed free on request. Write for it and prices on any seeds you require.

T. W. WOOD & SONS, SEEDSMEN, - Richmond, Va.