

The order was declined on these terms, the Steel Company refusing to make any price...

"I made one more effort. Some friends of mine were interested in a railroad project in Central America, and I broached the subject to the representative of the Steel Company who had come here to close the matter with me. I told him that my friends had made some inquiry of me as to the cost of construction in that country, and I should like to know at what price he would sell me steel rails delivered at tide water for shipment to Honduras. He promptly quoted me \$20 per ton."

"Allowing a liberal amount for cost of delivery at tide water, which in this particular case would have been very small, American citizens paid to this American industry \$32,000 in excess of what foreigners would have been compelled to pay. And \$32,000 would have put up a very handsome library filled with standard books on protection."

"And this was a very small transaction—only 50 miles of railroad! Payments were cash, and we neither needed nor asked any concessions in the matter of time. Because we were Americans, interested in the development of a small section of our country, involving faith and sacrifices, we were compelled to pay out as a bonus, an excess of \$500 per mile."

A gentleman who is well known in this country, and is one of the officers and owners of a great railroad system, which runs partially in the United States and partially in Canada, who will back up and prove his statement, which I am now to repeat, if it be challenged, informs me that last year his railroad (crossing and recrossing the national boundary line), bought quantities of rails from the American producers. For such of them as were delivered at Canadian stations, he paid on Canadian soil, it paid \$21 per ton. For such portion, as were delivered at American points, to be laid on American soil, it paid \$28 per ton. These were the same rails, turned out of the same establishment, on the same day and shipped from the mill in care of the same make. I am informed also, though not by one of the officials of the road, that the New York Central, which extends up into Canada, has had the same experience. No wonder the Canadian Pacific, having this advantage of 23-1-2 per cent. in the cost of a most material part of its plant, is under-estimating American roads!"

This is protection for American industries with a vengeance. Thus the tariff and the trust under its shelter rob the shipping public. Our Republican friends know all this as well as we do, and have known it for these many years. They have had the power to remedy it for years. Why have they not remedied the power? Are you fools enough to expect abuses like these to be remedied by the friends of the abuse? And per contra, if they be not the friends of the abuse, why have they not remedied it? Who believes that if duty on rails were reduced 50 per cent., or 75 per cent., American producers of steel rails would sell one ton less of them per year, when it is remembered that they have been for years selling in the world's market in competition with Germany, Great Britain and everybody else?"

"But I can tell you what they would do; they would sell them cheaper. The state of affairs I have described concerning steel rails exists also with regard to steel nails, barbed wire, agricultural implements, structural steel for bridges, and houses, boots and shoes, sewing machines, phonographs, and a great many other things too numerous to mention at this time. In all of these things the American producer is meeting the world's prices in the world's markets, and extorting from the American consumer in the American market. Thus it is the some of our manufacturers are protected from foreign competition in the American market by the tariff, and from domestic competition with one another by the unhindered formation of trusts. All of which is in logical pursuance of the Republican policy of enriching special interests at the cost of consumers and other producers. The means used in each case are the same—strangling competition. Does it result in prosperity for anybody? Yes; indeed it does. For whom? For the few who profit by the abuse. For whom most, comparatively speaking? Who gets the largest measure of prosperity under this system? Is it not he who can get the schedules of the law fixed most nearly to suit his purposes? Who can do that? I answer, the man or the corporation with the strongest and best paid lobby at Washington. In other words, the man or corporation or combination of corporations which is the greatest and most successful corruptionist. It looks little whether the corruption takes place directly at the seat of government at the time of the enactment of the law, or whether it takes place indirectly, beforehand, as it generally does, by contributions to campaign funds to be returned later by "friends of the system," who stand up on present legislation. What sort of prosperity do you want? Prosperity that comes to honest men, as a result of thrift, energy, foresight, frugality, industry, improved business methods, new inventions, and the natural resources of a great country? Or the prosperity which is law-bought and achieved by corrupting influences organized upon a scale of magnitude hitherto unprecedented in the world, and to be accounted for only by the magnitude of the profit to be reaped?"

What can the Federal government do? What is the extent of its jurisdiction? I answer, first, it can remove so much of the tariff shelter as enables American corporations by combination to get from the American people more than a reasonable profit. To show that this is a palatable remedy, when the great anthracite coal strike was on, and the cries for relief from the victims in the large cities were insistent and insurgent, and Congress wanted to deprive the anthracite coal combination, so far as legislation went, of its power of extortion, it placed anthracite coal permanently upon the free list and all other coals on the free list for one year. Remember, it was a Republican House and a Republican Senate which did this. Remember, in addition, that it stopped extortion to a marked degree. I answer, second, that the United States government has the same power, with regard to trusts engaged in inter-State commerce, as the several States have with regard to those doing business entirely within the State.

The Federal government can, if it chooses, forbid corporations doing an inter-State business from owning above a fixed percentage of the stock of their corporations. It could, if it chose, forbid purely holding companies, like the shipping trust swindle, from entering one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

In summary resume, fellow-citizens, the trusts bind in their grasp the producer of the raw material, bind also the laboring man, and in protected countries, though they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

I have stated how the trusts injure the farmer, and the producer of raw materials, by fixing the price of his material to a certain extent, and restricting competition of buyers. I will stop on this point only far enough to add that the sugar trust and the tobacco trust are shining instances of this object, in regulating the price of raw sugar and of leaf tobacco.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

Trusts, in short, injured the laboring man by raising the cost of his living at one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

Trusts, in short, injured the laboring man by raising the cost of his living at one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

In summary resume, fellow-citizens, the trusts bind in their grasp the producer of the raw material, bind also the laboring man, and in protected countries, though they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

I have stated how the trusts injure the farmer, and the producer of raw materials, by fixing the price of his material to a certain extent, and restricting competition of buyers. I will stop on this point only far enough to add that the sugar trust and the tobacco trust are shining instances of this object, in regulating the price of raw sugar and of leaf tobacco.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

Trusts, in short, injured the laboring man by raising the cost of his living at one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

Trusts, in short, injured the laboring man by raising the cost of his living at one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

In summary resume, fellow-citizens, the trusts bind in their grasp the producer of the raw material, bind also the laboring man, and in protected countries, though they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

I have stated how the trusts injure the farmer, and the producer of raw materials, by fixing the price of his material to a certain extent, and restricting competition of buyers. I will stop on this point only far enough to add that the sugar trust and the tobacco trust are shining instances of this object, in regulating the price of raw sugar and of leaf tobacco.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

Trusts, in short, injured the laboring man by raising the cost of his living at one end, and by reducing his wages, or preventing him from getting higher wages, at the other end of the industrial line.

But the usual harm to labor is this: hard times come; wages are reduced; hard times disappear; prosperity returns; labor wants back its rightful share of it; demands it; is refused; strikes—what happens? Success, even though the demands be perfectly fair, it trusts occupy the field? If each constituent company were doing business in competition, and if the rate of wages demanded left a fair profit on production, some of the companies would, out of selfish motives, if no other, comply, and their compliance would ultimately force compliance on others. When all are combined, however, when they cannot do so (elsewhere), rob the consumer of the finished products by charging extortionate prices. How can there, then, be any "good trusts?" Good monarchs there ever. When a common interest, to cheapen production at the expense of labor, as well as to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, labor must ultimately surrender, or else there may be a final resort to law-breaking, and possibly before a satisfactory conclusion to revolution, government ownership. All of which, may God forbid, as an overturning of our dearest institutions, founded upon the cherished principles of individuality.

But I would mention another way in which a combination of corporations can work a gain in a way in which none of the constituent corporations acting singly so easily can, namely, by reducing the amount labor gets for its share in the controlling and intimidating labor. How? You laboring men know. If you are working for a sugar refinery, or a steel plant, when there are many sugar refineries, and many steel plants in the country, each independent of the other, and each competing with the other, you can, when served with a notice of wage reduction, hope for employment in a competing company in the same or another town. Moreover, your own company will hesitate to cut wages, lest it lose permanently to a competitor some of its best labor. Not so if all refineries or all steel plants are banded together against you. If then you strike for higher wages, I need not tell you how much more nearly helpless you are, or if, as is often the case, you strike against a causeless reduction of wages, you are nearly as helpless.

Another thing, a combination of many plants can and often does shut down one or several of them, leaving laborers in the place where the works have been dismantled, helpless members of the great army of the unemployed. That is a familiar way of reducing labor cost without incurring the risk of a strike. It is also a way of punishing localities which are not trust-subservient.

A GASTON FAMILY REUNION. A Dinner Party in Honor of the Birthday of Mr. J. H. Craig—Assessment of Property—Personal. Correspondence of The Observer. Gastonia, Sept. 30.—A congenial party of older people—members of a remarkably long-lived family—was handsomely entertained at a dinner given yesterday by Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Craig. The event was complimentary to their father, Mr. Jno. H. Craig, in recognition of the completion soon of his 75th year, and was the occasion of a happy reunion of the brothers and sisters of the guest of honor, with their husbands, wives and widows. The only living aunt, Mrs. Margaret Craig, now in her 83rd year, was too feeble to be present, and was represented by her daughter, Mrs. Jennie Duff, one brother, Thomas Newton Craig, of Removese, was unable to be present.

Following is a list of the guests: Mr. and Mrs. Jno. H. Craig, and Mr. and Mrs. Robt. J. Craig, of Gastonia; Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Brandon, and Mr. and Mrs. William Barnett, of York county; Mr. and Mrs. J. Taylor Glenn, Mrs. Martha Henderson, Mrs. Mattie Craig, and Mrs. Mary James Craig, of Gastonia; Mrs. Jennie Duff, of Tennessee.

The hostess was assisted in entertaining by Mrs. E. W. Mellon, of Charlotte, and Mrs. L. L. Jenkins, of Gastonia.

The sale at the Holland farm, near Lowell, held yesterday and day before by Mr. M. O. Dowd, attracted one of the biggest crowds that ever attended a similar event in Gaston county. Lots and lots of stock, utensils and other farm belongings were sold at auction. The principal items left were a few farm mules and several hogs. The things sold commanded generally a good price, though in many cases the price would take one way and the seller another about the desirability of the price. Everybody is agreed that it was a tremendous day's sale.

From the findings of the new tax register, the register of deeds, Mr. M. A. Carpenter has kindly given out some interesting figures. The total assessed value of real and personal property amounted to \$7,112,360, a gain over last year of \$21,508. The total number of polls listed is 4,872, a gain of 559 over last year.

Dr. Mac Anders is now a resident physician of Gastonia. He came yesterday from Connelly Springs and will hereafter join him in a few days. They will board for the present with Esquire A. R. Anders. Dr. Anders is an old Gastonia boy and as a promising and successful young physician is warmly welcomed back to citizenship with us.

Rev. Luther M. Kuhns, D. D., visitor and lecturer of the Lutheran League of America, will preach at the Gastonia Lutheran church at 11 a. m., Sunday, and at College chapel, in Dallas, that night at 7 o'clock. Rev. C. E. Morgan will preach at Bessemer City at 7:30 Sunday afternoon.

Akron to Youngstown Cut Off. Cleveland, Oct. 1.—It is expected that within thirty days the Baltimore & Ohio's new line from Youngstown to Akron will be in operation. The grading will be finished within a day or two and the advent of Christmas at the latest will see the road ready to be turned over to the operating department. This big improvement will shorten the main line by six miles.

CANNOT SLEEP IN \$10,000 BED. Mr. Thomas Can't Pay for Leasing. But Bed is Too Short. What E. R. Thomas pays for the royal suite in the St. Regis: Charge for suite per day \$125. Meals (served in suite) per day \$50. Service \$10. Valet \$5. Maid \$5. Other servants \$5. Tips, etc. \$10. Cost per day \$200. What cost would be per month \$6,000. What cost would be per year \$72,000. The royal suite at the St. Regis has at last found an occupant. E. R. Thomas, the young millionaire turkman and automobilist, has entered into an arrangement with the management of the hotel whereby he and Mrs. Thomas will occupy the royal apartments, fitted up at a cost of \$100,000, three or four days every week.

But though his millions will enable him to occupy these sumptuous rooms, fate has decreed that Mr. Thomas shall not sleep in the famous \$10,000 bed. The bed is there. Mr. Thomas has looked at it wistfully—and slept in an adjoining room.

Nature made him too long, or, to put it another way, the cabinet maker made the bed too short. A six-foot-four man will not fit a six-foot bed without hanging his feet over the footboard or doubling himself up like a Jack-knife. Therefore, Mr. Thomas is denied the supreme joy of his wealth until he can induce the proprietors to have a splendor made in the couch of royal splendor.

The charge for the suite is \$125 per day, or at the rate of \$45,000 per year, but with the extra charges for meals, servants, tips, etc., should he live in these sumptuous apartments throughout the year, the annual charge on Mr. Thomas would be \$72,000 for his own domestic establishment alone. For entertaining probably another \$50,000 would be expended.

But Mr. Thomas does not intend to make his permanent home at the St. Regis.

"What is the finest suite of hotel rooms in the world compared to a home?" asked the young millionaire yesterday. "We lived for two days in this suite, and expect to spend many more days there, but my contract is only to pay for it when I occupy the rooms. Most of the time I am in New York I shall spend at home. I wouldn't give up my home at 17 West Fifty-seventh street and live all the year round in the St. Regis for anything." And Mrs. Thomas agrees with her husband.

"The St. Regis is convenient and very comfortable, but there is little privacy in a hotel."

The St. Regis suite, which faces Fifth avenue, comprises a reception room, a library, two bed rooms and two bath rooms.

The skill and ingenuity of the world have been drawn upon to furnish the apartments. Mrs. John Jacob Astor is said to have designed the suite. The famous bed in the state chamber is the most luxurious and costly ever made. It is of solid mahogany, inlaid with gold and pearl.

The most harmonious blending of colors prevails throughout the suite. Lace hangings from St. Gall and Valenciennes, Axminster and Brussels carpets were especially woven for this

apartment; priceless Gobelin tapestries, rugs from Persia direct from the looms, and throughout there is the most ingenious arrangement by which the atmosphere in the rooms may be regulated to a scientific nicety. Similarly, there are curtains of which the tone of light in the apartments may be regulated to suit the humor of the moment. The water is especially distilled. And from the solid silver pipes and fountains in the Italian marble bath rooms there are fountains from which may be drawn any variety of perfume desired for the bath.

To serve the meals in the suite, a corps of 21 attendants is called into use.

BEST REMEDY FOR CONSTIPATION. "The finest remedy for Constipation I ever used is Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy," says Mr. H. Jordan & Co. of Frankville, N. Y. "They cure gently and without any unpleasant effect and leave the bowels in a perfectly natural condition." Sold by H. Jordan & Co.

Brass Goods. Umbrella Stand, Jardinieres, Ferneries, Candlesticks, Vases, Etc. THE ART SHOP. W. I. VAN NESS & CO. 19 North Tryon St.

BLACKSMITHS. can buy their tools from us and not pay an exorbitant price for them either. We handle everything at all needed by them from tools to forges. We would be glad to fit up your shop as a whole or in part.

Allen Hardware Co. Wholesale and Retail.

MECKLENBURG'S BIG FAIR. Charlotte, October 25th, 26th, 27th and 28th. Always a Success--Bigger and Better this Year than Ever. Greater attractions and more features of amusement than were ever brought together at a county fair. \$3,000--PURSES--\$3,000. Eclipsing any prizes ever offered in North Carolina. Trotting, Pacing and Running Races Each Day of the Fair. No long intervals during races--there will be something continually doing on the track. Barney H. Demarest's Attractions. Including MISS LILLIAN SHAFFER, champion lady Equette of the world, and MISS LOTTIE JEWELL, the sensational young Equestrienne direct from the Paris Hippodrome, will positively appear daily in their daring performance. Nothing like it ever exhibited in the South. The Greatest High Schooled Horse in the World with twenty different gaits and tricks, also his beautiful markings, being of three different colors--Bay, Black and White. Cupid was shown at Madison Square Garden at the Horse Show, April 26 and 27, and was pronounced by press and the public to be the Greatest High Schooled Horse ever shown in New York. He was shown by Miss Shaffer, who will show him here. A GREAT SPECIAL FAST RACE. OZETTE. Record 2:15 1-2; GREGWOOD, Record 2:17, will be driven by the Ladies Great Jumping Contest in Front of the Grand Stand. YELLOWSTONE, 7 ft. 5 in.; KING FULL, Record, 7 ft. 1 3-4 in. Grand Riding Tournament. Participated in by over 50 Knights, appearing also in magnificent street pageant. One of the Best Carnival Companies. Has been engaged, adding many good shows to the "pike" attractions. The Eruption of Mount Pelee. Layton's \$5,000 attraction will be given positively every night. A glittering, incomparable fire works display--a spectacle worth coming miles to witness. Seats will be provided for 5,000 people. MARVELOUS HIGH DIVE FEATURE. WONDERFUL SLACK WIRE PERFORMANCES. Numerous Free Exhibitions every day of the Fair. Bands of Music. Street Parades. Dr. R. J. BREVARD, President. W. S. ORR, Secretary. REDUCED RATES ON ALL THE RAILROADS.