

THE DAILY ARGUS.

GOLDSBORO, N. C., JAN. 23, 1891.

GOLDSBORO MARKETS.

Corrected Daily by B. M. Privett
Wholesale Provision and Grain
Dealers.

Cotton	8 @ 84
Pork	11 15
C. H. Sides	2 1/2
Sugar (granulated)	6 1/2
" (brown)"	5 1/2 @ 84
Meat	1 45
Bacon	4 50 @ 5 50
Corn	75
Hams	90 @ 1 00
Salt	1 25 @ 1 50
Hay	80 @ 1 00
Cement	2 50 @ 5 00
Cotton Seed	10 1/2
Molasses	26 @ 30
Bees Wax	30
Rock Lime	1 50 @ 1 50
Eggs	18 @ 20
Oats	7 1/2 @ 15
Bran	1 25

NEWS AND COMMENT.

Numerous Events and Happenings
Clipped From Various Sources.

President Harrison, members of his Cabinet and other prominent Government officials honored themselves, at the same time that they showed fitting respect to the memory of an eminent American statesman, when they attended the funeral of Mr. Bancroft. It was very appropriate that such official recognition should be accorded to one who had served his country so ably and so faithfully.

The House Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic has declared in favor of prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia. It is evident that the temperance advocates have managed to get control of the Committee to the extent of persuading it to adopt a temperance tract as its report. The Congressional Record may be in great demand by the temperance folks, but their rejoicing will not be long-lived. The report will be carefully hung up to dry.—N. Y. Star.

Governor Hill of New York, in a message to the Legislature of 1890, suggested that the State should proceed to construct through each county two highways intersecting each other about the middle of the county, the roads thus constructed to form part of a general system. The Governor of Alabama, about the same time, was urging on the Legislature of that State the necessity of good roads. "Every township in the State," said Governor Seay, "should have good schools and good roads, but every township should build its own roads and support its own schools." This is good old Democratic doctrine, and it is sound but the Democratic party seems to have slipped by it in some way. Schools supported by the State are now the order of the day, and this being so there is no reason why the State should not take a hand in the building of good roads which are as fundamentally important to the people as good schools.—Atlanta Constitution.

The Washington correspondent of the Baltimore Sun reports that Mr. Dorsey, chairman of the House Committee on Coinage, to which the Senate silver bill has been referred, says he has sounded every Republican member of that committee and that all of them, as he is, are opposed to free silver, but will agree to a bill providing for limiting the coinage to the silver product of this country. There should be no compromise on this question. There is no room for compromise. Real money knows nothing of State lines—nothing of the boundaries which the various countries establish for themselves. Let us have free coinage or nothing. To provide for coining only the silver produced in this country would be to discredit silver—to brand it as spurious money. For years we have tried the experiment of coining only so many millions of dollars each month. That experiment has failed to bring silver up to a parity with gold.—Richmond Dispatch.

From Washington City.

WASHINGTON Jan. 21.—The situation in the Senate is a novel one for that body. The Democrats spent the whole day arguing the motion to correct the Journal of the 20th and, if the old usage of the Senate are to be observed, they can keep this up until March 4th. The Republicans are striving to prevent an adjournment, hoping by a long, continuous session to break the Democrats down, but of this there is little hope, as the Democrats feel confident of their ability by skillful management of long power and relays of Senators to stave off the closure rule and thereby prevent the Force bill coming to a final vote.

The tactics adopted by the Democrats this morning was a great surprise to the Republicans and was a masterful piece of parliamentary maneuvering. The feeling is deepening on the Republican side that there is but one key to the situation and that key is in the possession of the Vice-President. This means, that to break the deadlock otherwise than by an ignominious defeat on the cloture resolution and the Election bill, the Vice President must come to the rescue by a ruling, which will destroy in a measure some of these honored traditions of the Senate as to the rights of individual Senators opposed to the rights of the majority. It is not possible now to predict what form this ruling will take, supposing that it is called for and that the Vice President is willing to undertake his part.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 21.—Senator Vest testified before the Silver Pool committee that Senator Cameron had told him he had bought and sold silver after the vote in the Senate and that he thought he had a perfect right to do so, because it was after the vote and therefore could not influence his action.

NORTH CAROLINA—WAYNE COUNTY,
SUPERIOR COURT.

A Levy & Bros., an Levy Bros. & Co., Plaintiffs, vs.

I. Fuchtler and A. Kern, trading as Fuchtler & Kern and J. B. Lowenberg and Max Pincus.

This is an action in which the plaintiffs seek to recover from the defendants for wrongfully converting goods, wares and merchandise from them to the value of \$786 25, which the defendants, Fuchtler & Kern, fraudulently obtained from the plaintiffs during the fall season of 1890, as they allege. Warrant of attachment issued by C. F. Herring Esq., Clerk of the Superior Court of Wayne County, North Carolina, returnable at the Court House in Goldsboro, Wayne County, North Carolina, on the 6th Monday, before the 1st Monday in March 1891. CHAS. F. HERRING,
Clerk Superior Court of Wayne Co.
January 1st, 1891.

vs.

I. Fuchtler and A. Kern, trading as Fuchtler & Kern and J. B. Lowenberg and Max Pincus.

Seven hundred and eighty six dollars and twenty-five cents, which the plaintiffs seek to recover from the defendants for wrongfully converting goods, wares and merchandise to the value of \$786 25 which the defendants, Fuchtler & Kern, fraudulently obtained from the plaintiffs during the fall season of 1890, as they allege. Warrant of attachment issued by C. F. Herring Esq., Clerk of the Superior Court of Wayne County, North Carolina, returnable at the Court House in Goldsboro, Wayne County, North Carolina, on the 6th Monday, before the 1st Monday in March 1891. CHAS. F. HERRING, (Solic.)
Clerk Superior Court Wayne Co.
January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.

W. T. Stein & Son, Plaintiffs.

January 1st, 1891.

vs.