

# The Newberry Herald and News.

ESTABLISHED 1865.

NEWBERRY, S. C., THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1888.

PRICE \$1.50 A YEAR

## IN THE NAME OF THE ALMIGHTY.

A Solemn and Impressive Scene at the White House.

A Republic reporter was talking with Mr. W. C. Connor, mayor of Dallas, Texas, and secretary of the Texas delegation to the recent Convention, on 4th street yesterday afternoon, when a tall, well built, fine looking man in clerical black walked out of the Planter's House and turned southward.

"There's a man you ought to know," said Mr. Connor. "He is the Rev. A. P. Smith, and one of the most prominent clergymen in Texas, and can tell you a very interesting story regarding a recent experience with the President, if he will."

The reporter immediately approached Mr. Smith and said: "I understand that you recently enjoyed a very interesting experience with President Cleveland. Are you willing to relate it for the benefit of the Republic's readers?"

"You are rightly informed, sir. I recently had an experience with the President that was not only extremely interesting, but to me it was one of the most solemn episodes of my life, and an occasion never to be forgotten. I have been for the past three weeks in attendance on the Southern Presbyterian assembly at Baltimore and the Union Conference at Philadelphia. On my return I stopped off at Washington and called on President Cleveland. I was received with a frank courtesy I can never forget. I was immensely surprised at the intimate knowledge of Texas displayed by the President. He possesses wider and more accurate information regarding the State than half of its residents, and I confess I felt considerably chagrined when more than once I was obliged to confess my ignorance in reply to his questions. I also enjoyed the honor of a presentation to Mrs. Cleveland. I have met many charming and beautiful women in my day, but never one more attractive than she. I do not think the newspapers have exaggerated her charms of manner and person an iota—in fact, I do not think the English language affords a term that can over-paint the virtues and attractions of a thoroughly good and beautiful woman. But I am forgetting what I was to tell you about! As I was leaving the White House the President came graciously forward to shake hands with me, and while I still grasped his hand a messenger entered with a telegram, which, with an apology to me, he presented to the President. Mr. Cleveland opened, read it at a glance, and, without the quiver of a muscle in his face, continued his conversation with me. I imagined the dispatch related to some unimportant piece of State business, but, as I was leaving him, he handed it to me with a smile and said:

"Perhaps you will be pleased to be among the first to know this piece of news?"

"I cannot describe to you my feelings when I read on that little slip of paper the announcement of the President's renomination! I could not offer stereotyped congratulations to a man so grandly calm and so wonderfully self-possessed, and as I looked at his strong, commanding and impressive features, I felt the inspiration of the hour and the man's singular and splendid fate, and I knew that he was the creature of a will even stronger than the will of the people, which had called him to the high place he so magnificently fills, and would maintain him there until his mission was ended. Lifting my hands above his head, I blessed him and his Administration, in the name of Almighty God, and gave him cheer for the fight to come. He received my blessing with bowed head and remained an instant in the same position; then, with a gesture and a word, he thanked me and moved away. It was an impressive moment, and I do not believe there was a person in the room who did not feel a solemn conviction that he was looking upon the next President of the United States, beyond the power of mere partisan opposition to make otherwise."

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

## STANFORD'S UNIVERSITY.

Its Objects as Explained by the Senator Himself.

Just before Senator Stanford left Washington city for Europe he expressed himself as follows with respect to the objects and purposes of the Leland Stanford, Jr., University of California: "Generally the objects of the institution are set forth in the articles of endowment, but there are, of course, minute not set forth in them. I may say that I propose that the institution shall have steadily in aim the possibilities of humanity and how to realize them. In this institution I desire that the students shall be made to appreciate the civil consequences of the liquor traffic. There are probably in California to-day more adult males engaged in selling distilled liquors than there are engaged in tilling the soil, and I am satisfied, taking the country at large, that with the waste of time of the number of people engaged in the selling, and the waste consequent by the consumers, there is a loss to the country in general fully equal to 25 per cent of the power of production. I want the education of the students to be such as shall give them a realizing sense of the importance of temperance. I desire every student to have the opportunity practically to learn how to cultivate the soil for every branch of agriculture. Particular attention will be given to cooperation."

I want in this school that one sex shall have equal advantages with the other, and I want particularly that the women shall have open to them every employment suitable to their sex. I believe by doing so that they will be stronger physically and mentally and better fitted for wives and mothers, and I believe that if the vocations of life are thrown open to them, without their engaging in anything unsuitable to their sex, they can add another 25 per cent to the power of production to the country, and this will go far toward realizing the possibility of giving comfort and elegance to all.

As I desire this institution to deal particularly with the welfare of the masses it will be open to the poor as well as the rich, and the price of tuition will be so moderate as to be within the reach of most people. The few very rich can get their education anywhere. They are welcome to this institution if they will come, but the object is more particularly to reach the multitude and the people who have to consider the expenditure of every dollar.

The hope is to care for orphans; they may be sent there, provided for comfortably, and will be looked after. Free scholarships will be provided for meritorious young people who are unable to pay for their education, and such students will be given an opportunity to earn money to help them through their college course. There will be a machine shop and a department to encourage inventions. Religious teachings will be provided for, but sectarianism will be prohibited.

The Question of State Railways.

[Atlanta Constitution.]

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

The remedy for the transportation evils in England has been suggested by several thoughtful students of the problem. It is simply to build competing lines, and a good many of them, and leave them under the control of private ownership. Doubtless, this is the best suggestion that has been made. The only thing that will effectually smash a railway monopoly is competition, and private enterprise may be trusted to build new railways whenever and wherever there is a tempting demand for them. It is almost unnecessary to say that this view of the railway situation across the water is very largely applicable to the transportation question in the United States.

Not satisfied with the ownership of all the telegraph lines in the kingdom, the British government is now seriously considering the expediency of purchasing all the railways.

The points made in favor of the scheme show that under the existing system of private ownership English railways are both expensive and oppressive. Transportation charges are about eighty-five per cent higher than they are in Belgium, where the government owns nearly all of the railways, and about sixty per cent higher than those of Germany, another country where state ownership is the rule. The terminal charges, also, in England are about double those of the other countries mentioned. It is, therefore, claimed that the purchase of the railways by the British government would enable the authorities to prescribe a system of lower and more equal rates, to the manifest advantage of the commerce and industry of the country.

On the other hand, the opponents of the proposed change say that the people would merely be substituting one burden for another. It would cost six billion dollars to buy the railroads, and this sum borrowed at three per cent would increase the annual amount raised by taxation fully one hundred and eighty million dollars. Under the expected reduction in charges the net earnings of the roads would not pay this money into the treasury, nor any considerable part of it. It is also charged that on the continent, under the state system of ownership, there is a strong disinclination to adopt any modern improvements and new inventions. Red tape dominates the whole thing, and the government officials are satisfied to run their railways from generation to generation without attempting to improve them.

## HILL TALKS OF CLEVELAND.

Words Indicative of Democratic Harmony in New York.

Governor Hill, of New York, in his speech at the big Tammany ratification meeting on Tuesday, said of Cleveland, referring to Ingalls' attack on him: "It is true that our candidate comes from the plain people, and we do not attempt to palliate it. A poor boy, the son of a humble clergyman, he fought the battle of life alone, courageously, pluckily, and successfully, retarded by poverty, hardships, and adversity; and it is to the honor of the Democratic party that it delights to elevate such candidates, and that with open arms it welcomes to its places of leadership those who have risen from the ranks of the people by their own exertions and their own abilities."

The time was when the Republican party also sought its candidates from other ranks than those of the millionaires. Monopolists were at least kept in the rear, and were contented with the pecuniary benefit that high taxation have them. Now they seek both the benefits and the honors, and these men are the controlling force in the Republican party to-day.

Then such men as Lincoln and Greely and Sumner and Phillips and Seward and Wilson were there representatives. Then Lincoln [Applause], the man of obscure origin and of unknown antecedents could aspire to the Presidency, even as Cleveland has aspired to it and attained it once and will achieve it again; and all the machinations and efforts of the monopolists who control the Republican party, and the venom and denunciation of their apologists and defenders, will not avail against him.

The most bitter partisan cannot deny that the President is an honest and sincere man. For over three years the country has had the benefit of a wise, economical and successful administration of public affairs, and the Democracy may confidently appeal to the people for the continuance of our party in power. I concede that neither the President nor his administration has escaped criticism. But Jefferson was criticised, Monroe was assailed, and Jackson was abused. History repeats itself. Thomas H. Benton, in one of his famous speeches in the United States Senate, thus describes the attack upon President Jackson, and the predictions made by his opponents concerning his administration of public affairs. Benton said:

Never had a man entered upon the chief magistracy of a country under such appalling predictions of ruin and woe; never had anyone been so pursued with direful prognostications; never had anyone been so beset by a powerful combination of political and moneyed confederates. History has been ransacked to find examples of tyrants sufficiently odious to serve to illustrate him by comparison. Lang has been tortured to find epithets sufficiently strong to paint him in description. Imagination has been exhausted in her effort to deck him with inhuman and revolting attributes—tyrant, despot, usurper, rash, ignorant, imbecile; destroying domestic prosperity; ruining a ll industry, all commerce, all manufactures; delivering up the streets of populous cities to grass and weeds, and the wharves of commercial towns to the encumbrance of decaying vessels; depriving labor of all reward; depriving industry of all employment; destroying the currency; plunging an innocent and happy people from the height of felicity to the depths of misery, want, and despair.

Then, comparing the predictions with the facts, and inquiring whether these calamitous prognostications had been verified by events under Jackson's Democratic rule, he said:

Domestic industry is not paralyzed; confidence is not destroyed; factories are not stopped; workmen are not mendicants for bread and employment; credit is not destroyed; prices are not sunk; grass is not growing in the streets of populous cities; the wharves are not cumbered with decaying vessels; columns of curses, rising from the bosoms of ruined and agonized people, are not ascending against the destroyer of a nation's felicity and prosperity. On the contrary, the reverse of all this is true, and true to a degree that astonishes and bewilders the senses.

The predictions concerning a Democratic administration in 1882, and substantially re-echoed in 1884, are answered and refuted in 1888 as successfully as they were in 1836.

The promises our party made in 1884 have been fulfilled so far as it has been in our power to perform them. The public credit has been maintained; the public debt is lessening; our navy has been strengthened; we are at peace at home and abroad; and there is an earnest effort to reduce taxation.

We favor free trade but not free trade. The Democratic platform, while not in every respect as some of us might desire it, sufficiently expresses the principle of tariff reform to which we are all committed. (Cheers.) If I thought that our platform favored free trade I should not be here to-night. (Free trade cheering and applause.) I believe in an intelligent, fair, and honest revision of the tariff, a revision in the interest of the people and not of monopolies. I believe in protecting labor in every legitimate and proper way, but unnecessary and unjust burdens upon commerce do not afford any assistance or protection to working men. (Cheering and applause.)

Cyrus Field owns an English title, and may be called Sir Cyrus.

The latest "victim of tobacco" is a sad case. He is seventy years old, has smoked for sixty years, and last week he married a woman forty years his senior. Tobacco-smoking affected his brain.

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

[From the Somerville Journal.]

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

## CAN GOULD GO TO HEAVEN.

Questions Discussed in Wall Street—What Tagersoll Says.

New York, June 20.—The reported illness of Jay Gould has been the week's topic for gossip in Wall street. A story told there with much positiveness was that Jay Gould had not only made a special study of the Biblical parable of the camel and the needle's eye, but had consulted with his pastor, the Rev. John R. Paxton, on the subject of a rich man's chance of getting into the Kingdom of Heaven. It was told with a circumstantiality that caused general belief that Mr. Paxton had, in consequence of Gould's anxiety, preached a sermon setting forth that the Bible teaching was not that a Croesus was inadmissible to Paradise. Of course, such a tale faded slowly out when investigated with a view to writing it truthfully. A visit to Dr. Paxton, in whose 421st street Presbyterian Church the Gould family occupy a pew, yielded a prompt denial of the whole story.

"It is true that Mr. Gould and I have had many casual social meetings," said Mr. Paxton, "and our conversation has been to some extent on religious subjects, but surely he never consulted me as to his wealth shutting him out of Heaven. That is preposterous."

"Is Mr. Gould a Christian?"

"It is not for me to either form or express a definite opinion as to any individual's Christianity. Mr. Gould is not a member of any church, and therefore is not an avowed Christian. He is a quiet, retiring gentleman, who would be apt to keep his religious experiences largely to himself, in any event. His wife is a Presbyterian and a good one, contributing of her money and time freely to the church and philanthropic objects."

The sermon preached by Dr. Paxton was general in its nature, and in doctrine was that a rich man could get into Heaven as easily as a poor man if he used his riches properly. But Gould was a listener to this discourse, which did not seem to apply more particularly to his case than that of Russell Sage, J. D. Rockefeller, the Standard Oil chief, or to any other of the score of very wealthy men in the congregation.

Col. Robert G. Ingersoll said: "Jay Gould could not more go to Heaven, if the Bible be true, than could the devil himself, and he knows it. Moreover, Jay Gould never talked with Paxton, or anybody else, on the subject, except by way of diversion, because he is a total unbeliever in orthodox Christianity. I know this for a positive fact, because I have more than once had conversation with him on the subject. Naturally, as I am a conspicuous pagan, people are quick to speak to me on religious subjects. Sometimes they tacitly assent to my unbelief without really agreeing with me, and sometimes they assail me fiercely; but Mr. Gould is what I call a reasonable unbeliever. Just as there are millions of professed Christians who have no absolute views of their own, and do not know why they are Christians at all, so there are unbelievers who have not brought themselves to that profession by any course of reasoning. But Mr. Gould is a calm, deliberate agnostic—that is to say, a man who has thought the whole thing over, and has come to the conclusion that he knows as much as anybody else about a future state, and that is just nothing at all. Mr. Gould is a student. He devotes more time than people imagine to reading, and that on subjects entirely disconnected with finance. Christianity received for many years his careful, searching attention, and the result of it all is that he stands to-day an agnostic."

CLEVELAND'S NEW CHAIR.

It is Made to Order in Boston and is Beautiful and Strong.

BOSTON, MASS., June 2.—It is not often a newspaper man has the honor of filling the Presidential chair, but a Traveller reporter had that privilege yesterday. That is to say, he sat in the new office chair that is soon to be occupied by President Cleveland in the Executive Mansion at Washington. It would hardly be proper to say that the reporter filled it, for it is very large chair, as benefits the 280-pound President of this great nation.

The chair was made to the order of Mr. Cleveland by Messrs White, Holman & Co. of this city. It is a massive and well-built structure of quartered oak and cane, its total weight being sixty-two pounds. The seat and back are square in shape and are made of the very finest quality of cane. The former is twenty-three inches wide between the arms and the latter is thirty-five inches high. The general design of the chair is antique, and the legs, arms and framework are elegantly carved in form and other patterns. The oak is highly polished, and the whole effect is one of great finish and beauty. Aside from its height the remarkable width and elegance of the chair are its distinguishing characteristics. It took a month to complete it, and the cost will, of course, be quite heavy. Some 1,700 feet of the finest cane were used in its construction. The arm-pieces are broad and set on carved spindles. It was made from original designs, and the measurements were furnished by Mr. Cleveland. Boston workmanship has constructed furniture for Kings as well as Presidents.

The latest "victim of tobacco" is a sad case. He is seventy years old, has smoked for sixty years, and last week he married a woman forty years his senior. Tobacco-smoking affected his brain.

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

[From the Somerville Journal.]

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

## RIVES-CHANDLER.

The Marriage of the Author and Millionaire Comes Off Privately and Rather Unexpectantly at the Bride's Ancestral Home.

[Special from New and Courier.]

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., June 14.—Miss Amelia Rives, the authoress of "The Quick and the Dead" and other works that have recently attracted attention in the literary world, was married this afternoon. The groom is Mr. John Armstrong Chandler, of New York, a wealthy grandson of John Jacob Astor.

The anticipation of the time for this event as at first arranged caused a great deal of surprise in social circles. Some weeks ago it was authoritatively announced that the marriage of this couple would take place early in the fall. The sensational stories of newspapers and persecutions from this source determined Mr. Chandler and his fiancée upon an immediate and strictly private marriage. The license was procured from the county clerk here on Monday, and that official was bound to secrecy. The matter, however, leaked out, and for the past three days society about here has been in a flutter of expectancy to learn when the wedding was to come off.

At 2 o'clock this afternoon in the spacious drawing room of Castle Hill, the home of the bride's parents, Amelia Rives and John Armstrong Chandler were married. The persons present were Mrs. Rives, the mother of the fair writer of weird stories, Misses Gertrude and Daisy, her sisters, an uncle, Mr. Wm. Cabell Rives, of Boston, who gave the bride away, Miss Lou Pleasant, of Richmond, and several cousins.

The bride's gown was white silk, cut high in the neck with long sleeves. She wore diamond ornaments. The sisters also wore white and the mother was attired in black.

The ceremony was very simple and was performed by the Rev. Mr. Goodwyn, the rector of the little Episcopal Church three miles away from Castle Hill, where the bride had worshipped since her early childhood. The ring was not omitted in the ceremonies. The only absent link in the happy, bright family circle was the father of the bride, Col. A. G. Rives. This gentleman is in Panama, where he is engaged as general manager of a railroad project. His presence at home on this interesting occasion was almost impossible. A cablegram portrayed the scene to him. After the brief ceremony the guests sat down to a bounteous dinner, many of the dishes of which were prepared in the old ante-bellum Southern style, now almost unknown.

The young married couple will spend their honeymoon beneath the bride's ancestral roof. This is a spot to which the little lady clings with the tenderest affection. After remaining there a few weeks Mr. and Mrs. Chandler will probably sail for Paris, where they will make their future home.

A WONDERFUL BANK.

Which Pays Dividends of 150 Per Cent Per Annum.

The Chemical Bank of New York city is probably the strongest financial institution in this country, and its prosperity and success have been a marvel in business and financial circles. A New York letter gives the following interesting points in reference to this wonderful moneyed institution:

Ten shares of the Chemical Bank were sold the other day on the Stock Exchange at \$3,000 a share, without the bi-monthly dividend of 25 per cent. This is the highest that this stock has yet sold for, and it has long been noted as commanding the highest premium of any bank stock in the world. First National Bank stock commands \$2,000 per share, the Fifth Avenue Bank \$800 per share, the Bank of Ireland \$275 and the Bank of England \$50.

The dividends of the Chemical Bank have for a long time been at the rate of 5 per cent bi-monthly, with an additional dividend of 10 per cent some time during the year or an even 100 per annum. The dividend declared for the first of March and to be continued thereafter is 25 per cent bi-monthly, or 150 per cent per annum. Last year the bank paid \$3,000,000 in dividends, equal to the amount of its capital stock. It is very seldom this valuable stock finds its way to the market, and then only in the settlement of some old estate, and when a sale takes place it attracts great attention. John B. Manning was the purchaser at the sale.

In 1843 or 1844 David Wolfe, the father of Catherine Wolfe, bought 200 shares of Chemical Bank stock at par, or for \$20,000. To-day that same stock at the price commanded, would be worth \$720,000, and has paid more than \$1,000,000 in dividends since the day it was purchased.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

[From the Somerville Journal.]

The unfeeling editors really ought not to talk so much as they do about the red-headed girl and the white horse. It makes the red-headed girl feel bad, and it must make the horse wish that he had never been born.

Heavenly Immigration Conventions.

[From the Chicago News.]

The people in the southern states have become so deeply interested in the subject of attracting settlers from abroad that meetings in that section are called "heavenly immigration conventions."

## GRANT'S LUCK.

How the Hero Narrowly Escaped Selling His Book for \$10,000.

[From the Chicago Times.]