

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION. CASH IN ADVANCE. One Copy, One Year, \$1.50. One Copy, Six Months, .75. One Copy, Three Months, .50.

J. P. MURRILL, Editor.

Entered at the Post Office in Hickory, North Carolina, as second class matter.

THURSDAY MAY 21, 1888.

Immigration-Catholic.

Our beloved Christian brother of the N. C. Presbyterian, is much exercised about the immigration movement recently inaugurated at Hot Springs. It says the whole movement is of Romish origin, and its purpose is to obtain Protestant money in aid of Catholic immigration to the South. We have a high regard for the Presbyterian, and if it had said these things before the meeting of the convention, most likely prominent members of that Church would not have suggested, and participated in a meeting to send delegates from this town, to said convention, and this writer would hardly have been there. We read notices in several of our exchanges of the "important movement," but none of them said it was the work of Cardinal Gibbons and the Catholic church. One has charitably said "the three Governors present, and the eight others who appointed delegates were kept in the dark as to real purpose of the meeting," and we think all other Protestants entitled to like forgiveness, in case any evil result from their work. Will such be the case? That may depend on the zeal and harmony of Protestant opposition to the apprehended evils. Catholics had as much right to come South, buy lands and become citizens, before the Hot Springs convention as since. Many have done so, and, with few exceptions have proved to be good Democrats, honest debt-paying and peaceable citizens. If "the Catholic church is a political body as well as a religious organization," could it not concentrate its forces at selected points for special political purposes better by itself than through the Immigration Society? It has been said our Presidential elections are decided by the vote within five hundred yards of City Hall in New York. If this be true cannot the Immigration Society do good Protestant service by sending Catholics from that vicinity all over the South where they will be further removed from priestly influence, and finally have their evil tendencies naturalized and dissolved in the great mass of Democratic Americanism by which they will be surrounded? To con-

vert a man the first thing to look after is to see that he does not convert you. Good help in this undertaking is good company and harmonious action on your side, and isolation with love of companionship on his side. If the Catholic church had decided to send its members into the South, it seems best that the South, through the agency of the Immigration society or other aid, should make an effort to sift out the bad and welcome only the best of them. Whether the office to be established in New York by the Southern Immigration Society will be operated by, or in the interest of the Catholic church, is, we take it, an unsettled question, in the solution of which this discussion may prove timely and important. That office will be under the direction of a Board of Directors. These Directors will be selected by the States, cities, towns or associations that contribute \$1000 to the Immigration Society. If Catholic influences predominate, and the worst apprehensions become imminent, the duty of Protestants is plain. We should unite our forces so perfectly against the ends they aim at that we can make it undesirable for them to come among us with such designs. If Catholics are united in their purposes of evil let Protestants unite as one man to oppose them. If Catholics employ Catholics only, let Protestants employ Protestants only. If Protestants know Catholics will be bad neighbors and worse politicians, they are not compelled to sell them farms, rent them homes or hire their time. In conclusion we repeat our admiration of the Presbyterian. We are glad it has spoken out on this question. It has done valuable service in a partial awakening of the Presbyterian church to the dangers of the liquor traffic and now it sounds the alarm against Romanism. Forewarning is forearming. We may not prevent Catholic immigration in the South, but we may disappoint the calculations of its projectors.

The Outlook.

What a difference in the condition of the two great parties at this time. The Republicans are in a dilemma. Most of them consider Mr. Blaine their most available candidate and he remembers his inglorious defeat in 1884, and asks not to be made to represent the same part in the play this year. He is smart. He knows his party cannot win this year and he don't wish to be sacrificed. The party feel much the same way and are casting about for the man whose nomination will best hold together

their demoralized forces and whose defeat will bring the least disaster. In the Democratic camp the statues is entirely different. Their great leader, Cleveland, is acknowledged by all. He has no peer or competitor and among the hosts of his supporters there is neither division nor discord. Cleveland will go into the nominating convention with a unanimity never known before and will be nominated by acclamation. The great leader of men, the wise statesman, the man of destiny, Grover Cleveland will go before the American people with a prestige unknown in our history, and be received with a "well done good and faithful servant" that will sweep away all opposition and insure his reelection by a majority approximating that of Grant over Greely. State after State is falling into line. North, South, East and West his administrative ability and policy have been acknowledged and endorsed by an increase of Democratic majorities and in many instances overcoming opposition majorities. From the cold, bleak hills of Vermont to the Gulf-washed, sunny shores of Texas the Democratic heart is enthused and Cleveland, the people's President, and honest government is the song of every lip and tongue. The original and constant supporter of Cleveland winks a happy, "I told you so," as he sees his doubting brother return to his strengthened allegiance. The weak are encouraged, new converts are made and the great Cleveland flood-tide boom grows higher and higher as it nears the bar of the nominating convention where the formality of naming a President for the next term will be enacted.

Local Option.

Because the editor of this paper has seen fit to vote for local option in this township we have been the object of considerable amount of misrepresentation. A few men, living in town, who pretend to be Republicans, have put themselves to no little trouble to tell other Republicans that we were trying, through the local option movement, to destroy the Republican party. These same men have told Democrats that it was a political move on our part to hurt the Democratic party. Both of these statements are false. We do not believe that the views of any citizens upon the question of local option should interfere with his standing in either the Democratic or republican parties, and it is a question on which every Democrat and Republican may indulge his own views without affecting his party standing. That is our position, and we are not for local option because we believe that liquor is an evil per se. We are for local option in this township because we believe that the business

in this township is an absolute injury to the community and that the men who are engaged in the business here are a lot of desperadoes and swindlers poling in the grab of citizens.—Statesville Mail. Good reason and good sense. We are glad to shake hands with the Mail on this non-political platform of local option. All Christians, and even non-professors who wish well to their neighbors can join in this moral movement. The liquor men leave no lie untold to carry their point. Temperance men, whither Democrats or Republicans, should not go to their enemies, on this issue, for advice, but all pull together, and vote the evil from your doors.

Judge Shepherd Replies, And Proves His Innocence.

WASHINGTON, N. C. MAY, 19 1888.

MR. EDITOR:—I have just received a copy of your paper, containing a communication reflecting upon my conduct as one of the counsel of Wm. Parker, tried for the murder of Gen. Grimes some seven or eight years ago. The same charges were made against me in 1882 before I was elected a judge of the Superior court. They were published shortly before the election and only reached me the day before in Cherokee county, where I was holding court under the appointment of the Governor. I took no notice of the charges after the election, being almost universally advised by prominent friends that my election and the comments of some of the newspapers were a sufficient vindication against such reckless assertions, even now I am loath to appear in the newspapers, but as you seem to think it necessary, I adopt this method of interposing a calm, most emphatic and I trust a dignified denial of these slanderous imputations.

I was employed by the parents of Parker to defend him. He was first tried before Judge Schenck at Fall Term 1880, of Beaufort Superior court, a mistrial was had by reason of the sickness of a juror and the case was removed by the State to Martin county, where it was finally tried before Judge Gilmer at Spring Term 1881. My associates in Beaufort county were Senator Charles F. Warren and Col. I. A. Sugg. After the removal Hon. Jas. Edwin Moore, Hon. J. J. Martin and Wm. Z. Moreton, Jr. were also of counsel for the defence. The prosecution was ably conducted by Messrs. C. W. Grandy, Solicitor, D. G. Fowle, Hon. L. C. Latham, Maj. Thomas Sparrow and George H. Sparrow, Jr. Mr. George A. Sparrow also appeared for the prosecution in Beaufort county. I refer to the above named Judges and all of the counsel. If any of them know of anything I did which was unprofessional I hope that they will say so without hesitation.

I send you for publication statements of all of the counsel who are within reach of me. I have written and telegraphed the Judges and other counsel I have mentioned. If their statements reach you in time for your next issue you will please publish them with communication.

I leave the public to Judge of the spirit and object of this slanderous attack just at this time. If these charges are true, it is rather strange that the intelligent citizens of Beaufort county—my home—should, without any effort or suggestion of mine, have in convention assembled unanimously, endorsed me, for a position on the Supreme Bench.

Jas. E. Sarraman. P. S.—If other papers have published the article reflecting on me, please refer to, they will please

do me the justice to give equal publicity to my response. J. E. S.

GREENSBORO, N. C., May 22, 1888.

Hon. James E. Shepherd. Very Dear Judge:—The case of State vs. Parker, for the murder of Gen. Bryan Grimes, was first before me for trial at Washington, N. C. and just before the case closed a juror was taken sick and a mistrial had.

You appeared as one of Parker's counsel. Your conduct as a lawyer in this trial was unexceptionable, and not only met my approbation but my admiration for the skill, ability and fairness exhibited by you.

I make this statement with pleasure in justice to you. Use it as you think best. I am with high regard, Sincerely your friend,

D. SCHENCK.

ELIZABETH CITY, May 21, 1888.

Hon. Jas. E. Shepherd. I was present and conducted the trial on the part of the State as Solicitor in the Parker case, and am pleased to state that you in no way acted unprofessionally in defending the prisoner, but upon the contrary your conduct was honorable and professional in every respect.

C. W. GRANLY.

WASHINGTON, N. C., May 19, 1888.

I was one of the counsel for the prosecution in the case of the State vs. Wm. Parker for the murder of Gen. Bryan Grimes. I was in the case from beginning to end. It is useless for me to state that Judge Shepherd did nothing whatever unprofessional in the case. His well-known character and unblemished record forbid such a belief upon the part of any one who knew him. From beginning to end I know of nothing unprofessional or dishonorable done by him in the case. I am intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the case and had anything unprofessional been done I feel sure I would have known it.

G. H. BROWN, JR.

WASHINGTON, N. C., May 19, 1888.

I was of counsel for the prosecution of Parker in the first trial of the case in Beaufort county, and am entirely familiar with all of the circumstances from the time of the arrest until the case was removed to Martin county. I am confident that nothing was done by Judge Shepherd as counsel for the defense which was inconsistent with an honorable lawyer discharging his duty to his client.

GEORGE A. SPARROW.

WASHINGTON, N. C., May 19, 1888.

I was one of the counsel for Wm. Parker, charged with the murder of Gen. Bryan Grimes. I was employed a few days after his arrest, and appeared in the trials in Beaufort and Martin counties. In the management of the case I was intimately associated with Judge Shepherd. I know of nothing unprofessional done by him in its conduct.

CHAS. F. WARREN.

I appeared as one of the counsel for Parker on the removal of his case to Martin county, and was associated in the conduct of the case thereafter, and know of nothing in the case done or suggested by Judge Shepherd inconsistent with the highest honor and integrity.

JAS. E. MOORE.

May 21, 1888.

The above is in all respects true and we most heartily concur in the same.

W. Z. MORETON, JOS. J. MARTIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C. May 21, 1888. James E. Shepherd.

I know of no unprofessional conduct on your part in the Parker trial nor do I believe that you were guilty of any.

L. C. LATHAM.