

# The State Chronicle.

ESTABLISHED 1877.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS, Editor.

RALEIGH, N. C., SEPT. 14, 1888.

THERE SCARCELY EVER HAPPENED IN the history of this world a sublimer spectacle than the re-nomination of Grover Cleveland by the annual meeting of the Convention. The people of the United States love a brave man, and Cleveland is a brave man; they love an honest man, and God knows he is an honest man; they love a man of good sound judgment, and he is a man of good sound judgment; and they love a man who stands up for principle and does not fear to take the consequences, and such a man is Grover Cleveland. [John G. Thurman in a speech at Columbus, Ohio.]

THE NAME OF ALLEN G. THURMAN is a synonym for all that is wise and great in statesmanship, pure and upright in public life, and amiable and lovable in personal character. [Indianapolis Sentinel.]

## OUR NOMINEES

**FOR PRESIDENT:**  
GROVER CLEVELAND,  
OF NEW YORK.

**FOR VICE-PRESIDENT:**  
ALLEN G. THURMAN,  
OF OHIO.

**FOR GOVERNOR:**  
DANIEL G. FOWLE,  
of Wake.

**FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR:**  
THOMAS M. HOLT,  
of Alamance.

**FOR SECRETARY OF STATE:**  
WM. L. SAUNDERS,  
of Orange.

**FOR TREASURER:**  
DONALD W. BAIN,  
of Wake.

**FOR SUPERINTENDENT PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:**  
SIDNEY M. FINGER,  
of Catawba.

**FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL:**  
THEODORE F. DAVIDSON,  
of Buncombe.

**FOR AUDITOR:**  
G. W. SANDERLIN,  
of Wayne.

For Associate Justice of Supreme Court—to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Thos. S. Adams:  
JOSEPH J. DAVIS,  
of Franklin.

For Associate Justices of the Supreme Court—under amendment to the Constitution:  
JAMES E. SHEPHERD,  
of Beaufort.  
ALPHONSO C. AVERY,  
of Burke.

**FOR ELECTORS—FOR THE STATE AT LARGE:**  
A. M. WADDELL, of New Hanover.  
F. N. STRUDWICK, of Orange.

1st District—G. H. BROWN, Jr., of Beaufort.  
2nd District—J. S. WOODRIF, of Wilson.  
3rd District—C. B. AYCOCK, of Wayne.  
4th District—E. W. POE, Jr., of Johnston.  
5th District—J. M. GIBSON, of Currituck.  
6th District—J. P. JERRETTON, of Stanly.  
7th District—L. C. CALDWELL, of Iredell.  
8th District—T. M. SUGG, of Caldwell.  
9th District—W. T. CHAMBERS, of Haywood.

**FOR CONGRESS:**  
1st District—THOS. G. SKINNER, of Hertford.  
2nd District—F. M. SIMMONS, of Craven.  
3rd District—C. W. WATSON, of Pender.  
4th District—B. H. BURN, of Nash.  
5th District—J. T. MORRISON, of Guilford.  
6th District—A. H. HARRISON, of Robeson.  
7th District—J. S. HENDERSON, of Rowan.  
8th District—W. H. COWLES, of Wilkes.  
9th District—T. D. JOHNSON, of Buncombe.

**THE JOINT DISCUSSION.**  
There will be a joint discussion of the issues of the campaign at the residence of Hon. Daniel G. Fowle and Hon. Oliver H. Dockery, Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor, at the following times and places:  
Lexington, Saturday, September 15.  
Mocksville, Monday, September 17.  
Hickory, Tuesday, September 18.  
Lenoir, Wednesday, September 19.  
Morganton, Thursday, September 20.  
Marion, Friday, September 21.  
Mooreville, Iredell county, Saturday, September 22.  
The local committees will please advertise these appointments by hand-bills and otherwise.

**SPIER WHITAKER,**  
Chm'n. Dem. State Ex. Com.

**Appointments of Hon. G. W. Sanderlin.**  
Hon. George W. Sanderlin, Democratic candidate for State Auditor, will address the people on the issues of the campaign at the following times and places:  
Statesville, Saturday, Sept. 15.  
Williamsburg, Tuesday, Sept. 17.  
Appointment in Wilkes county for September 18 to be made.  
Denver, Friday, Sept. 21.  
Gastonia, Saturday, Sept. 22.  
Hendersonville, Tuesday, Sept. 25.  
Brevard, Wednesday, Sept. 26.  
Franklin, Friday, Sept. 28.  
Murphy, Monday, Oct. 1.  
The local committees are urgently requested to advertise these appointments by hand-bills and otherwise.

**SPIER WHITAKER,**  
Chm'n. Dem. State Ex. Com.

**Appointments of Messrs. Strudwick and Poe.**  
Hon. F. N. Strudwick, Democratic candidate for Presidential Elector for the State at large, will address his fellow-citizens upon the issues of the campaign at the following times and places:  
Holly Springs, Saturday, Sept. 15.  
Franklin, Monday, Sept. 17.  
Pleasant Grove, Tuesday, Sept. 18.  
Kensley, Wednesday, Sept. 19.  
Dunn's, Thursday, Sept. 20.  
1 Auburn, Friday, Sept. 21.  
2 Durham, Saturday, Sept. 22.  
3 Rolesville, Monday, Sept. 24.  
New Light, Tuesday, Sept. 25.  
Hon. E. W. Poe, Jr., Democratic candidate for Presidential Elector from the Fourth District, will speak as follows:  
Pleasant Grove, Sept. 18.  
Kensley, Sept. 19.  
Dunn's, Sept. 20.  
The local committees are urgently requested to advertise these appointments by hand-bills and otherwise.

**SPIER WHITAKER,**  
Chm'n. Dem. State Ex. Com.

**Appointments of Hon. D. Worthington.**  
Hon. D. Worthington will address the people on the issues of the campaign at the following times and places:  
Henderson, Monday, Oct. 15.  
Wilson, Monday, Oct. 23.  
Nasville, Saturday, Nov. 3.  
The local committees are urgently requested to advertise these appointments by hand-bills and otherwise.

**SPIER WHITAKER,**  
Chm'n. Dem. State Ex. Com.

## NOT AN IMAGINARY DANGER.

The Democratic speakers, in discussing the County Government question, have no stronger argument wherewith to support the present system of County Government than this: That if the Republicans get control of the Legislature they will change the plan of electing Judges. The Constitution, Article 4, Section 21 gives the Legislature a right to change. It reads: "The General Assembly may from time to time, provide by law that the Judges of the Superior Courts, chosen at succeeding elections, instead of being elected by the voters of the whole State, as is herein provided, shall be elected by the voters of their respective districts."

Now the whole State elects, then each district will elect its Judge. What does this imply? It is certain that the Second district would elect a negro Judge. We say it is certain because the negroes could elect without the aid of a single white vote, and because in that district they now have a negro Solicitor, and of late years they in variously nominate a negro for Congress in the Second Congressional district—and elect him, too, except when they have a row in their conventions and nominate two negro candidates, as they did in 1886 and as they have again done this year.

No man who knows the desire of the negroes doubts that they would elect a negro Judge in the Second district, and that he would preside over the courts of our State upon the bench honored by the great jurists whose opinions have been quoted in the courts of Queen Victoria. The fear that this thing may come to pass is no imaginary fear. It is as certain as fate that, if the Republicans succeed, this humiliation will be visited upon us.

But, the question is, how does this concern me? I shall be sorry for the white people in the Second district when they have a negro Judge presiding over their courts, charging white juries, and, if they feel so disposed, setting aside the verdict of the white jurors, but I am not my brother's keeper. I must look out for Number 1.

You are going to look out for Number 1 are you, Mr. Voter? Well, let us see if it will not be as humiliating to the white man of Cherokee to have a negro Judge as to the resident of Edgecombe. The Judges rotate and the Judge elected by Western voters presides quite as often in Edgecombe as in Cherokee. And likewise the Judge elected in the Second district it would be the same if he should be a negro presides as often in Buncombe as in Halifax. The people of all sections of North Carolina are one—what affects one, affects the other. Their own interests are therefore protected when they protect the interests of their neighbors.

But, says one, "It is not positively necessary for the Judges to rotate—the Republican legislature that changes the election from State to district may, at the same time, provide that each Judge shall ride his own district, and that there be no rotation."

Well, let us see about that? Can a legislature change the Constitution? The CHRONICLE thinks not. Section 11, Article 4 of the Constitution of North Carolina reads: "Every Judge of the Superior Court shall reside in the district for which he is elected. The Judges shall preside in the courts of their respective districts successively, but no Judge shall hold the Courts in the same district oftener than once in four years, except in case of protracted illness."

The Constitution cannot easily or readily be changed. The negro Judge elected would ride over a part of the districts before there could be a change in the Constitution, and white men who vote the Republican ticket would have the satisfaction of working 1 preferred negro Judges to white Judges. But if the Constitution could readily be changed, we ask the question, would the white voters of Central and Western North Carolina then be ready to place this humiliation upon the good people of the Second District? The CHRONICLE knows the temper and spirit of the Western people. The CHRONICLE can answer for them and say: They are resolved to stand by the white men of Eastern North Carolina and see to it that no negro Judge or negro magistrate has authority over them. This is the sentiment of the West. This writer has recently returned from a trip to Haywood, Henderson and Buncombe, and he thinks he knows the sentiment of the Western people, and that it is as above stated.

The probable evil of negro Judges in North Carolina is not an imaginary danger. Republican success insures their election just as Republican majority in the Second District secures a negro Solicitor, but a negro member of the U. S. House of Representatives. The man who is doubting as to how he will vote in the coming election ought to ponder well the fact that if his vote aids in securing Republican success it is equivalent to voting for a negro Judge to preside over the court at which he himself may be a litigant, witness, or juror. White men of North Carolina, are you prepared for this?

THE DEMOCRATIC County Convention of Cabarrus did well in passing a resolution denouncing Dockery for his slander of Mrs. Cleveland. There was not a vote against it. If submitted to a vote of the State the result would be a unanimous condemnation of Mr. Dockery for his gratuitous slander of a good woman as the sun shines on. In all America Mr. Dockery is the only man who has descended so low as to slander Mrs. Cleveland. The CHRONICLE thanks the Democrats of Cabarrus for their well deserved rebuke of this demagogue. Every gentleman in the State, regardless of party affiliations, will endorse the resolution.

THE CHRONICLE regrets in the fact that the farmers are about to break the backbone of the Cotton Bagging Trust. The head of that trust testified before the Congressional investigating committee that it was made possible ONLY BY REASON OF THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF, and that as the Mills bill would reduce the price they were resolved to make a big pile the present season. And yet there are some people who think farmers are big enough fools to vote for a party that advocates a protective tariff.

Gov. HILL was renominated by acclamation for Governor of New York, and "Jones he pays the freight" for Lieutenant-Governor by acclamation.

## WE SPEAK TO YOUR POCKET-BOOKS.

This is a campaign in which every voter is asking the question, "How much does it cost?" This is the question voters ask themselves when speakers discuss the great National question of Tariff taxation. They ask themselves the same question in regard to State issues.

In March of this year the CHRONICLE, in answer to false charges made by a Radical newspaper, published a full and exhaustive comparison of State Finances under Democratic and under Radical rule. One hundred copies were circulated throughout the State. We were assured by all candid men that our refutation of Republican misstatements was full, convincing and complete.

Recently we have had a number of applications for copies of that comparison of State Finances. To-day we present in full in the form of a supplement to the CHRONICLE. We commend to every reader and to every voter a thoughtful perusal, and a careful comparison of the figures and comments contained in that article. It will be found to be a strong and UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF DEMOCRATIC FINANCING. The figures are all from the books and cannot be disputed.

Read and preserve the supplement.

**"A STRONG PAPER, A VERY STRONG PAPER."**

The above was the comment of Judge Thurman when President Cleveland's letter of acceptance was read to him. The CHRONICLE adopts the sentiments of Judge Thurman as its own, and would impress upon all its readers the importance of a careful perusal of this wise and statesman-like document. As in Mr. Cleveland's message to Congress, Tariff Reform is made THE issue of the campaign. Mr. Cleveland simplifies the campaign. Mr. Cleveland makes the question of the tariff, and makes the question of a reform so clear that even the most illiterate cannot fail to understand and endorse the repeal of the tariff.

Upon the labor question Mr. Cleveland clearly states the position of the Democratic party, and shows that it never has and never will neglect the interest of our working-men. He meets and answers the hollow and untruthful cry that Tariff reduction means a reduction of wages (used as a scare-crow to frighten wage-workers into voting the Republican ticket) of that scare. If the Democratic party had no other reason than self-interest it would protect the interests of the working-men. It is their party, and in looking out for their interest the Democratic party is looking out for its own interest. This is on the same principle that the Republicans foster and protect the interest of men like Carnegie whose profit is 95 cents EVERY SECOND DAY OF THE YEAR. His employees get 95 cents a day on working days only. The Democrats would reduce the price of necessities to help Mr. Carnegie's poorly paid employees; the Republicans would maintain the present high tariff in order that Mr. Carnegie and other lords of wealth may continue to add million to million. In doing this each party is acting selfishly—each is looking after its own interest. It is true that, by the use of money unjustly wrung from the wage-earners by the loss of the Protective Tariff, and threats of loss of work many wage-earners vote the Republican ticket and thus help to fasten the burden indefinitely upon themselves. Mr. Cleveland shows them that in so doing they are injuring themselves, and proves to them that the Democratic party "will promote steady employment of labor, while by cheapening the cost of the necessities of life we increase the purchaser's wages and add to the comfort of his home."

Other topics are touched upon with the President's never-failing clearness, conciseness and ability. He has won the right to be called THE Letter Writer of his age. No public man now living has so statesman-like a style. His letters, even on the most common-place subjects, have an elegance and a strength that make all of them read like State papers.

This latest letter—his letter of acceptance of the Presidential nomination—is one of his best and clearest. The CHRONICLE prints it in full in its supplement. To every reader our advice is, read, and lend it to your neighbor, and then preserve it for your children.

Mr. Henderson of North Carolina said to a New York Star reporter: "The President's letter of acceptance is able and convincing, and is an admirable illustration of the position of the Democratic party on the tariff question. He hits the nail square on the head every time. He also exposes the hollow and hypocrisy of the Republican platform in promising to reduce the whole Internal Revenue system rather than surrender any part of our protective system, if the revenues cannot be all spent as proposed in the platform."

THE RALEIGH Signal says, "Let the paper that made the charge [that Mrs. Cleveland kissed a negro wench] be pilloried in public opinion until it makes the ample amends for its ill-timed article concerning Mrs. Cleveland." Good! But the paper is dead. The question is: What ought to be done to Mr. Dockery who spread the false statement throughout the State? Ought he to be "pilloried in public opinion" a little? It is no excuse for him to say that he read it in a Democratic newspaper, that was, as he knew, given over to sensation. He is a candidate for Governor and to make the slanderous charge without knowing that it was true entitles him to be "pilloried in public opinion."

On the 6th of November "public opinion" will register its verdict against Mr. Dockery in the words: "Pilloried for Slander."

THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF GOOD IN the world, notwithstanding the pessimistic cry that men are all selfish. A few days ago a gentleman, who refuses to give his name, presented to the yellow fever sufferers at Jacksonville. The name of this gentleman is not to be known and when he dies an inscription on his monument ought to read like the one inscribed on the monument of an Earl of Devon, commonly called "the good Earl of Devon." That inscription was: "What I spent, I had; what I left, I lost; what I gave, I have."

## MR. HARRISON'S LETTER.

On the day after Mr. Cleveland's letter of acceptance had been given to the public, Mr. Harrison published his letter. It is well that they thus come together, for the position of the two parties can thus be more easily contrasted. The CHRONICLE has only space to give a synopsis of Mr. Harrison's letter, with comments. We divide our summary and comments into heads, as the best way of giving our readers the points made by Mr. Harrison.

1. The first part of his message is taken up with the tariff. He says that the Democratic party, whatever it pretends, is in favor of the tariff. He says that the Democratic party, and that the Mills bill is only a step in that direction. He charges that the Democratic policy will reduce wages and ruin American commerce and industry. He makes the regulation Republican argument in support of his position.

2. He declares AGAINST the repeal of the Internal Revenue, although he says he endorses his party platform. He says: "WE ARE NOT LIKELY TO BE CALLED UPON, I think, to make the present choice between a SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST and an ENTIRE REPEAL OF THE INTERNAL TAXES. SUCH A CONTINGENCY, in view of the present relation of expenditures to revenue, IS REMOTE."

Mr. Dockery says if the Republicans are elected there will be an IMMEDIATE repeal of the Internal Revenue. Mr. Harrison says: "REMOTE." Col. Waddell says: "His utterance is equivalent to saying they will repeal the Internal Revenue 'the day after Judgment.'" That is "REMOTE," and just as soon as Republicans will do it. Judge Fowle "hit it on the head" when he said that Radical pretense of favoring the repeal of the Internal Revenue reminded him of the little girl who saw a snake's skin in road. She thus soliloquized: "Suppose I was grown and married to Tom (a neighbor's son), and we had a child, and this snake had not shed its skin, and the child should come by, and the snake bite it, and the child should die"—whereupon she was overcome she sat down in the road and cried. Now Mr. Harrison justifies Judge Fowle when he declares the repeal of the internal revenue IS REMOTE. What will the Republican party in North Carolina say to this?

3. He advocates buying bonds as the best way of getting rid of the surplus. The CHRONICLE has so often shown that whenever the government buys a \$1,000 bond it has to pay \$1,250 therefor that we need not again go into argument to convince the dilletant man that this is very poor financing.

4. He takes ground against allowing the importation of laborers under contract—opposes Chinese immigration, but makes no reference to his repeated votes in the Senate in favor of Chinese immigration.

5. He makes a plea for a law to "punish frauds on the ballot," and in this connection refers to "our colored people." This is but another way of stating that he wants Congress to order the counting of the vote in the Southern States by Federal officers.

6. He favors the admission of territories able to bear the burdens into the Union as States. He exempts Utah on account of "the institutions that are repugnant to our civilization."

7. He declares against Trusts.

8. He favors the most "grateful liberality" in the granting of pensions, and praises the soldiers and says he had "a small measure of experience in what they suffered."

9. He wants the Civil Service Law "faithfully and vigorously enforced," and his provisions extended.

The other subjects touched upon are not important or of issue.

Such is Mr. Harrison's letter. His utterance in regard to the Internal Revenue will fall with a crash upon North Carolina Republicans, who have been making a great deal about the Republican platform declaring in favor of the repeal of the Internal Revenue system. With their party voting in Congress AGAINST a repeal, and their candidate for President declaring that such a contingency he calls it a "contingency" to show that he thinks it not probable is "REMOTE," our Republican friends in North Carolina are estopped from making further clamor and false promises. If Mr. Dockery and his colleagues are not "in a hole" on this question the CHRONICLE doesn't know the reason why.

**DR. ROBEY AGAINST THE THIRD PARTY.**

Some days ago Rev. Dr. Robey, a prominent and able Methodist preacher in Goldsboro, spoke in Durham in favor of Prohibition. His speech, incorrectly reported, was published without his consent. As published his speech made him take the ground that the Methodist Church in North Carolina was committed to the Third Party. Such a position did so great violence to the position of the church upon this question that Methodists all over the State hastened to take issue with Dr. Robey. The Spirit of the Age, clearly and strongly answered Dr. Robey's supposed position.

The CHRONICLE is glad to know that Dr. Robey was misrepresented and that he is really AGAINST the Third Party, although strongly in favor of a Prohibition party if the conditions were favorable. The reasons why he cannot vote for Walker and the other Third party men he gives, and every honest Prohibitionist in the South ought to be influenced by the same reasons. Dr. Robey says: "The condition of our State and, indeed, of the entire South, is such, politically, that I cannot vote the Third Party ticket. Now have I ever advised any one else to do so. I sympathize profoundly with the object which the Third Party people have in view, and I wish that I could help them, but I cannot. I possibly could be HELPING ANOTHER RESULT WHICH WOULD BE A GREATER CALAMITY THAN THE PRESENT. This means Radical success.—Editorial Life. I pray another true prohibitionist I have tried, over and over, to find a way around the impassable barrier that hinders the Southern people from rising in their might and sweeping the ruin-curse from their fair land, but I can not find it yet. I can only wait and do my duty as best I may along with the great mass of Southern prohibitionists, while the time comes, as I pray it may, when with safety to the best interests of the way they take Judge Russell's advice to "go into a strike at drunkenness and Democracy." Judge Fowle is out of the city and

## "FOR FISK AND FOWLE."

EDITOR CHRONICLE—I read your most excellent paper with a good deal of interest, and I feel sure you will kindly answer some questions for me. I am a Prohibitionist "all over." I expect to support the National Prohibition ticket, but am sure it is in the interest of the Republican party in North Carolina. Now for the questions:

FIRST—Do you know it to be a fact that Rev. T. Walker is paid for canvassing into Republican money? If so, will you kindly give the proof?

SECOND—Is it not a fact that the Democratic party is in favor of the repeal of the National Prohibition? If so, will you kindly give the proof?

THIRD—Is it not true that Col. O. H. Dockery canvassed against Prohibition in 1881, and that Judge Fowle voted for it? FOURTH—Was Rev. W. T. Walker formerly a Democrat or Republican, and is he not a minister in good standing in the Christian Church?

FIFTH (1) Is it not right for white Prohibitionists to vote for Fowle for Governor and (2) Fisk for President?

Now, you will greatly oblige me by publishing these questions and your answers. I am a member of the National Prohibition party in North Carolina and will never again vote for the National Democratic platform as long as they declare against sumptuary legislation, but who can vote "objectionable" men and to overthrow the system of county government or in favor of negro rule, and who will never support directly or indirectly a man that canvassed against Prohibition. Mr. Fowle, unless some of the party press stop some of the abusive epithets that they apply to honest Prohibitionists they will injure Judge Fowle and drive from the ranks of the men that would otherwise support him.

Yours sincerely,  
FOR FISK AND FOWLE.

The CHRONICLE is very glad to answer the questions of its friend. Those who read this paper have not failed to observe that, while we have been severe on fellows of the Social Equality Steele type who are running the Prohibition party in North Carolina in the interest of Radicalism, we have had no words of denunciation for the honest men who, from super-conscientious motives, joined the Third Party. For an honest man, agreeing or disagreeing with us, we have profound respect for a honest man who allows his excess of zeal to steal away his stock of common sense, we have great pity.

It is the honest man, zealous for the right, who allows his judgment to control his actions, who commands our highest admiration and most profound respect. A man who "allows his judgment to control his actions" is always a man of broad views. He has a wide horizon. He does not make the mistake of thinking that there is but one public question. He is not a "some idea" man. He grasps all the problems that men meet and seeks to aid in their solution. He does not, turning aside from issues of great concern, raise up one and declare that it and it alone is the great controlling question. "A narrow stream is strong," said Egan's Irish school master. "A narrow man, a man with one idea, may accomplish good, but whoever becomes a man of one idea dwells his powers, develops into an enthusiast, and there it ends, but one step from the enthusiast to the fanatic."

Before answering our friend's questions we offer to him and to all like minded the above reflections. The following are our answers:

FIRST—We do NOT know it to be a fact that Walker is paid by Republican money. We have never seen it stated. Certainly the CHRONICLE has never given circulation to such a report.

SECOND—There is difference of opinion upon this question. If the Democratic party in its National platform had desired to declare against Prohibition it would have so declared. It is true that the majority of Northern Democrats are opposed to Prohibition, but the party is NOT COMMITTED AGAINST PROHIBITION. The National Democratic platform of 1888 has no reference whatever to the question of Prohibition. It ignores it just as the Democratic State platform ignores it. It does not recognize it as a political question. It is silent upon it. The National Democratic platform of 1884, which was reaffirmed, did not declare against "sumptuary legislation." But that is a declaration against Prohibition! This writer has heard at least fifty speeches on the Prohibition question, and every Prohibitionist speaker we ever heard took the ground that Prohibition was NOT a sumptuary law. Sumptuary is defined to be "pertaining to, or regulating expense or expenses." Now if Prohibition does this, it is a "sumptuary" law; if not, it is not. Just here comes in the difference of opinion. The very moment that Prohibitionists declare that the Democratic party is against Prohibition they admit that they have always been denying, viz: That a Prohibition law is a sumptuary law. Our friend, in the light of the above, can answer the question he propounds to us for himself.

Now our friend, who calls himself, in an alternative way, "For Fisk and Fowle," would do well to compare the record of the Democratic party with that of the Republican. The Republicans declare, first, for free whiskey; and secondly, declare that it "cordially sympathizes with all wise and well directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality." It is always talking the hypocrite. It pretends to favor the Prohibitionists, while in fact it is their greatest enemy.

THIRD—The CHRONICLE is informed that Col. Dockery, in the campaign of 1881, made speeches against Prohibition, and voted against it. In 1889 he was rewarded for his advocacy of Anti-Prohibition by a nomination by the "Anti-Prohibition Party" for Congressman at-large. He denounced Prohibition and Prohibitionists everywhere, and charged that the Democratic party was the Prohibition party. That was the year, according to Judge Russell, when the vote of the Radicals "was thrown to save the grog shops." The Radical party, in that attitude, could not win, and now in 1888 it is seeking to win by nominating Dockery for Governor and acting as a sort of god father to the Prohibition party. They realize full well that no decent, self-respecting man who voted for Prohibition will vote for Dockery. They expect him to get the Anti vote. They see that Rev. Mr. Walker may get some Democratic votes, and they encourage his candidacy hoping to get enough Democratic votes to elect Dockery. This is the way they take Judge Russell's advice to "go into a strike at drunkenness and Democracy." Judge Fowle is out of the city and

## A BIT OF ROMANCE.

ABOUT ASHEVILLE'S GROWTH AND THE NEW Hotel "Oakland Inn." [Editorial Correspondence.]

OAKLAND INN, NEAR ASHEVILLE, N. C., September 1, 1888.—This is a perfect gem of a hotel built on a beautiful shady elevation just one mile and a half from the Court House in Asheville. It has been built and furnished in the most elegant of modern styles and is perfect in all its equipments. It has been opened not more than three months and is already full, and its patronage comes chiefly from the North and from the Southern States. Less pretentious and smaller, it is still somewhat after the plan of Battery Park.

It is a gem in appearance, and to that there is general agreement. The view from the sky parlor of the Inn is surpassed by few views around Asheville, Connelly's, less than a quarter of a mile distant, being probably better. Since it was opened the visitor to Asheville does not think he has seen the "sights" until he has visited the Inn, as it is commonly called.

Oakland Inn is "sui generis." If I may apply the term to a hotel, it is not like any other hotel or inn I have seen and it is strikingly different from them all in management. The proprietors, Messrs. A. & R. U. Garrett, were induced to make Asheville their home on account of the climate. They bought the beautiful site upon which the Inn is situated, and built a residence there and had a model farm. Last year they conceived the idea of building a hotel which should cater only to the quiet place, where the very best accommodations could be had, and where they would be free from the dissipations of most summer and winter resorts. They have no bar-room connected with the hotel and do not allow drinking at the table. No dancing is allowed, nor card playing. This is a novel way of conducting a hotel, but the Messrs. Garrett believed that such a hotel would get a large number of people who, like themselves, did not care for those things, and who, in fact, wanted a place from which they were excluded. So far their success has demonstrated that they are right. Amid the fact that the Inn is a strictly temperance place the following dialogue between a visitor, who had just arrived and did not know of the temperance proclivities of the House, and the clever clerk is interesting:

New Arrival to clerk: "Where is the bar-room?"  
Clerk: "We have no bar-room, sir."  
New Arrival: "No bar-room? What sort of a hotel is this?" (Lowering his voice): "Please be so kind then as to give me a drink out of your private bottle."

Clerk: "I have no private bottle."  
New Arrival draws a long breath and says: "Well, I guess I will have to take a drink of beer then."  
Clerk: "We have no beer, sir."  
New Arrival: "No beer? This is a hell of a hotel. No whisky, no spirits, no beer. What is a man to drink?"

Spring water was prescribed for him but he didn't take it kindly, and the next day he took up his baggage and "went" to—the place of "spirits" from which he never returned to the Inn. This incident illustrates the temperance practice of the hotel.

But it is not alone in its temperance proclivities that the Inn is unlike other hotels. It is like other first class hotels in that it has a steward, educated in Paris; a head cook from the far-famed Brunswick hotel in New York; and that its fare is the very best the market can afford. It is unlike them in several particulars and it is a very happy difference. Instead of having negro chamber-maids they have young girls who have been educated and trained at the Industrial School near here. These girls deserve and receive the respect of all who are domiciled at the Inn. Their modest deportment, their neatness and their thorough way of doing their work makes this innovation decidedly pleasant. Of the porters the same may be said. They are boys—young, genteel, willing, courteous and useful. Only in the dining room are there negroes and they are waiters. These differences give the Inn the air of a home, and add to the pleasure of abiding here. As still further guarantee of comfort the Messrs. Garrett, assisted by their very clever clerk, Mr. P. Halderman, give their attention to the hotel and are ever ready to supply the wants of all.

There is the fruitful theme for gossip here. I mean that gossip which all men and women (especially women) love to engage in, and which has no malice in it and leaves no sting behind, and damages no one's reputation. It is all "concerning of" a romance of love and courtship and a coming marriage between a fair young maiden of this mountain country and the versatile (I use the word correctly for he can do many things well) steward of the Inn. Their courtship was as romantic a wooing and winning as was ever told of in song or story, and it inspired as much interest among those abiding in the Inn as though it had concerned the mightiest monarchs of the world, and not two unpretending people who have little thought of the pomp and glory of the world, but only of the old-fashioned way of loving and being loved.

The story, I tell it plainly and without embellishment—and this way: When this hotel was opened the Messrs. Garrett thought it would be good plan to secure, as chamber maids, some of the orphan girls who were at school in the Industrial School of Rev. Mr. Pease, not more than an eighth of a mile from the Inn. It was an excellent plan, for these young women are thus given good employment during their vacation, and they do their work with such efficiency as to justify their state to good use. Well, it is a rule of the Inn that no man employed in the hotel shall talk to these good looking chamber maids on the stair-way or in the halls. It is a rule that, like the law of the Medes and Persians, cannot be broken. One day the report came to Mr. Garrett that the steward had been seen more than once talking to one of the good-looking bright-eyed chamber maids, and there was observed an unusual lustre in her eyes, and she was talking in low tones that, to say the least, appeared suspicious to the on-lookers. As soon as the report of these

## ABOUT ASHEVILLE'S GROWTH AND THE NEW Hotel "Oakland Inn."

OAKLAND INN, NEAR ASHEVILLE, N. C., September 1, 1888.—This is a perfect gem of a hotel built on a beautiful shady elevation just one mile and a half from the Court House in Asheville. It has been built and furnished in the most elegant of modern styles and is perfect in all its equipments. It has been opened not more than three months and is already full, and its patronage comes chiefly from the North and from the Southern States. Less pretentious and smaller, it is still somewhat after the plan of Battery Park.

It is a gem in appearance, and to that there is general agreement. The view from the sky parlor of the Inn is surpassed by few views around Asheville, Connelly's, less than a quarter of a mile distant, being probably better. Since it was opened the visitor to Asheville does not think he has seen the "sights" until he has visited the Inn, as it is commonly called.

Oakland Inn is "sui generis." If I may apply the term to a hotel, it is not like any other hotel or inn I have seen and it is strikingly different from them all in management. The proprietors, Messrs. A. & R. U. Garrett, were induced to make Asheville their home on account of the climate. They bought the beautiful site upon which the Inn is situated, and built a residence there and had a model farm. Last year they conceived the idea of building a hotel which should cater only to the quiet place, where the very best accommodations could be had, and where they would be free from the dissipations of most summer and winter resorts. They have no bar-room connected with the hotel and do not allow drinking at the table. No dancing is allowed, nor card playing. This is a novel way of conducting a hotel, but the Messrs. Garrett believed that such a hotel would get a large number of people who, like themselves, did not care for those things, and who, in fact, wanted a place from which they were excluded. So far their success has demonstrated that they are right. Amid the fact that the Inn is a strictly temperance place the following dialogue between a visitor, who had just arrived and did not know of the temperance proclivities of the House, and the clever clerk is interesting:

New Arrival to clerk: "Where is the bar-room?"  
Clerk: "We have no bar-room, sir."  
New Arrival: "No bar-room? What sort of a hotel is this?" (Lowering his voice): "Please be so kind then as to give me a drink out of your private bottle."

Clerk: "I have no private bottle."  
New Arrival draws a long breath and says: "