

# The News and Observer.

VOL. LIV. NO. 153.

RALEIGH, N. C. SUNDAY MORNING MARCH 6, 1904

FIVE CENTS.

## Leads all North Carolina Daily Papers in Both News and Circulation

### THE SOUTH GIVES NEGRO JUSTICE

#### Governor Aycock States True Sentiment.

### CAUSE OF BITTERSNESS

#### If there is More Bitterness in the South it Grows Out of Recon- struction and Not the War Be- tween the North and South.

To the Editor: One great benefit ac-  
cruing to the people of both sections  
from the yearly migrations of Northern  
people Southward, is the better un-  
derstanding which each obtains of the  
other. Will you permit a New England  
Yankee, who thinks enough of "the Old  
North State" to educate his son at your  
State University, to offer some kindly  
observations?

One thing that I have noticed is that  
whatever of bitterness remains as a  
result of the Civil War, is on the part  
of the Southern people. I have never  
met a Northern veteran or Northern  
person of any condition, who spoke  
unkindly or unfriendly of the Southern  
people. When all the Southern people  
come to realize the honest desire which  
exists on the part of the Northerners  
to "make friends," I think that the last  
friction between the sections will have  
been eliminated.

I go without saying that the chief  
bone of contention between Yankee and  
Southern is the negro, and the treat-  
ment he is supposed to receive in the  
South. On this important question,  
I think that there is a mutual misun-  
derstanding. The Northern man living  
where the negro is a negligible quantity,  
and by reason of education and environ-  
ment, a law-abiding and useful person,  
can have little just appreciation of the  
conditions obtaining in the "Black Belt"  
of the South, nor of the imminence of  
the black peril.

On the other hand the Southern, whose  
travels have been limited, and whose  
prejudices have been hardened by the  
hats of fortune of war, has I believe en-  
tirely misjudged the Northern attitude  
towards the negro. My observations  
have taught me that the Northern man  
has a far greater aversion to the negro  
than you have in the South. We do  
not care for him as a servant; we would  
not think of walking with him on the  
street; we are uneasy if he chances to  
sit next to us in a street car. The idea  
that the Northern people believe in the  
social equality of the negro is entirely  
a bugaboo, fostered by politicians for  
political purposes. They believe in no  
such thing. I have lived all my life in  
the North and by reason of my profession  
have had ample opportunity to observe  
the customs of all grades of society, and  
I never knew or heard of a negro being  
received as an equal in any house, no  
matter how humble.

Where the Northern differs widely  
from his Southern brother in his atti-  
tude towards the black man is in the  
fact, no matter how much he feels him-  
self the superior of the negro socially,  
he is willing to accord him his rights  
under the law. So it happens in the  
North that the negro, who generally  
votes the Republican ticket, is treated ex-  
actly the same as to the franchise as  
the naturalized Irishman or Italian, who  
generally votes the Democratic ticket.  
While I never saw a black man on a  
jury; no white jury in the North would  
ever think of deciding against a black  
man on account of his color. I am led to  
these remarks by the following editorial  
in the Charlotte Observer, which I sup-  
pose is a respectable and typical ex-  
ponent of Southern opinion:

"We mentioned, Tuesday, a case in  
Rowan Superior Court, in which a  
nigger was the plaintiff and the  
Southern Railway Company defendant,  
in which the nigger won. A  
Salisbury attorney writes that this  
is a mistake—that it was a case of  
a hung jury. This statement is much  
easier of belief than the other, and  
sustains our notion that in a suit  
between the Southern and a black  
man, the average jury is at its wits'  
end as to which to decide against.  
Surrendered to its perplexity and just  
laid down."

While there may be some excuse for  
trying to eliminate the negro from poli-  
tics, there certainly can be none for  
treating him unjustly in the courts, for  
the sake of justice I hope that the Char-  
lotte Observer does not properly repre-  
sent the opinion of the educated and  
thinking people of the South.

Yours very truly,  
WALTER B. FROST,  
Southern Pines, N. C., March 4, 1904.

The suggestion that the Charlotte Ob-  
server is "a typical exponent of Southern  
opinion" in itself shows that Mr. Frost  
does not understand North Carolina con-  
ditions. It is unfortunately true that a jury  
in Boston or in Baltimore may be influenced  
against a negro because of his color, but  
we believe it happens oftener in propor-  
tion to the number of negro inhabitants  
in the New England than in the Southern  
city. To show the true position of the  
negro in the courts of Justice of North

Carolina, we print below an extract from  
a well considered article by Governor  
Aycock, written for a leading Northern  
magazine. There is no man in the State  
so well qualified to speak of how negroes  
fare in courts of justice as the Governor.  
Nobody will suggest that he would mis-  
represent the true situation. He is "a  
typical exponent of Southern opinion" and  
here is what he says:

"Indeed we are more than fair to him.  
We have provided for the insane of the  
negro race a hospital capable of caring  
for every insane negro in the State, while  
there are a few hundred insane of the  
white race for whom provision has not  
been made. In our courts of justice a  
practice of more than twenty years at  
the bar enables me to declare with em-  
phasis that the negro can and does se-  
cure a fair trial. I have appeared for  
hundreds of them in criminal indictments  
and in civil suits and I have yet to find  
a ground for complaint against our courts  
for failure to act fairly toward the negro.  
Indeed, in civil suits between whites and  
negroes the juries incline to favor the  
negro. If the case presents the slightest  
element of oppression on the part of the  
white man toward the negro, the verdict  
is almost certain to be in favor of the  
negro. There is a sense among our white  
people which causes them to look with  
contempt upon the white man who seeks  
to overreach the negro in a business mat-  
ter."

We think Mr. Frost errs in supposing  
that there is more bitterness in the South  
than in the North growing out of the  
war. We do not believe there is as much  
in either section as Mr. Frost thinks  
exists in the South. The mistake of Mr.  
Frost is very natural, for you will hear  
more talk about the war in the South  
in a week than you will hear in the  
North in a month. The reason is that in  
the South the war was brought nearer to  
every man, it touched every neighborhood,  
it brought want and suffering into nearly  
every home, and disaster and poverty  
followed in its wake. In the North, the  
war made larger markets and increased  
general prosperity, there were no battles  
in Northern States, the horrors of war  
were not brought direct to the people in  
their homes, the results of war brought  
no loss, no disaster, and little changed  
conditions. Prosperity smiled on the North  
from 1865 to 1870, while Reconstruction  
blighted the South. The wounded North-  
ern soldier's pension provided all neces-  
sary comforts and medical attendance. The  
wounded Southern soldiers had to work  
land to get bread and meat. Perhaps  
there would be more excuse for bitterness  
in the South than in the North, if it  
existed, not because of war or battle,  
but because of Reconstruction that fol-  
lowed the mighty struggle when brave  
men met brave men in honorable warfare.  
If Mr. Frost will look a little deeper  
he will find that whatever of bitterness  
he sees in the South is due to the hell  
of Reconstruction, conceived in the mal-  
evence of base partisans, and never un-  
derstood or approved by the men who fought  
in the Northern army. The "bitterness"  
that lingers—and there isn't much of it  
now—is due altogether to the feeling of  
resentment to the Reconstruction acts  
which the Southern people believe were  
passed and put into execution to humili-  
ate them in the hour of their defeat and  
poverty. Mr. Frost has evidently not gone  
deep enough to see this, but after he  
has lived in the South longer he will dif-  
ferentiate between the War Between the  
States, participated in on both sides by  
patriotic men, which left no bitterness,  
and the War of Reconstruction precipi-  
tated by men who for political success  
visited the deepest humiliation upon the  
Southern people, after they had returned  
to their homes and in good faith looked  
to the protection of the old flag.

Mr. Frost is mistaken in a political mat-  
ter. He says that the naturalized foreign-  
er in the North "generally votes the  
Democratic ticket." If he will read an  
article by President Roosevelt in the Cos-  
mopolitan Magazine, written shortly after  
the election of 1896, he will see that Mr.  
Roosevelt gave statistics proving that  
Mr. Bryan received a large majority of  
the native American vote and the Republi-  
cans were dependent for their victory  
upon the foreign vote.

Mr. Frost says he never saw a negro on  
the jury in the North. At a late term of  
Wake court a negro was on the jury in  
one of the most important trials ever  
held in the history of the State. Juries  
in North Carolina do not "decide against  
a black man on account of the color of  
his skin," and we feel sure that Mr. Frost  
upon this subject will accept the state-  
ment of the Governor, who speaks always  
truthfully and whose fairness to the ne-  
gro is known of all men, rather than the  
flippant remark of a mugwump journal.

The spirit that actuates Mr. Frost is one  
that is characteristic of broad minded and  
honorable men of both sections. It is  
pleasant to all North Carolinians to wel-  
come as citizens men of his breadth, hon-  
esty and frankness. Such men have help-  
ed the South to develop its resources and  
there is welcome, cordial and sincere, for  
all who come among us. We have touched  
upon the above points suggested by Mr.  
Frost in no spirit of controversy, but to  
give the true Southern sentiment as we  
believe it exists.

### STRIDE TOWARD IMPERIALISM

#### South Dakota Bond Suit Reviewed by B. F. Grady

### THE 1868 LAWS HURT

#### The Carpet Bag Government Was Re- sponsible for the Small Price Which Was Received by the State for the Bonds

(Clinton Democrat.)

To the Editor: That was a remarkable  
decision of the Federal Supreme Court  
which was delivered in the suit of South  
Dakota against North Carolina; and, as I  
suppose some of your readers would like  
to know the reason why anybody  
thinks it remarkable, I ask space to  
present a brief statement of some of the  
fundamental principles on which the thir-  
teen States entered into a Union and  
of the historical evidence that the judg-  
ment of the court is in conflict with the  
compact embodied in the Constitution.

1. In the first Constitution—the Ar-  
ticles of Confederation—it was pro-  
vided that "the United States in Con-  
gress assembled shall be the last resort  
on appeal in all disputes and differences  
now subsisting or that hereafter may  
arise between two or more States." Here  
is a delegation of as ample power as  
Justice Brewer and his four associates  
now claim in suits between States; but  
the judge or the layman who affirms  
that this was a delegation of power to  
compel a State to pay its debts, acknowl-  
edges his ignorance of the spirit of the  
times when the Union was formed, as  
well as of the purposes of the States  
when they entered into it. One of their  
purposes may be inferred from the de-  
claration: "Each State retains its sov-  
ereignty, freedom and independence."

2. When the Constitution of "the more  
perfect Union" was framed, the power  
to decide "controversies between two or  
more States" was transferred from the  
Congress to "the judicial power," with  
no intimation anywhere that the "power"  
was enlarged so as to cover state debts.  
If any reader thinks otherwise, let him  
imagine President Washington sending a  
military force into Massachusetts to com-  
pel her to settle a claim adjudged by a  
Federal court to be due to another State.  
3. But there was inserted in the new  
Constitution a provision that the judicial  
power should extend to controversies  
"between a State and citizen of another  
State." The full significance of which  
seems not to have been realized, as events  
proved. A few years after the adoption  
of this Constitution, Massachusetts was  
sued by a citizen of another state, as we  
are informed in the biographical sketch  
of John Hancock in "The Lives of the  
signers of the Declaration of Independ-  
ence." Hancock was Governor at the  
time, and here is what is said about  
his respect for "the judicial power":  
"He did not, however, in favoring a Con-  
federate Republic, vindicate with less  
scrupulous vigilance the dignity of the  
individual States. In a suit commenced  
against Massachusetts, by the court of  
the United States, in which he was sum-  
moned upon a writ, as Governor, to an-  
swer the prosecution, he resisted the pro-  
cess and maintained inviolate the sov-  
ereignty of the commonwealth—a com-  
monwealth from which President Roose-  
velt appointed Justice Holmes, who sided  
with the majority in the South Dakota  
suit.

This resistance was submitted to by  
President Washington, the Federal Judi-  
ciary, and the Congress; and to avoid  
a similar collision of authority, the  
eleventh amendment was promptly placed  
in the Constitution, denying to the judi-  
cial power the right to entertain "any  
suit in law or equity, commenced or pro-  
secuted against one of the United States  
by citizens of another state, or by citi-  
zens or subjects of any foreign state."  
Such is the history of this "judicial  
power," and its significance is clear to  
any intellectual, fair-minded man, al-  
though he may not be learned in the law.  
But Justice Brewer undertakes to justify  
the decision, making elaborate argument  
to prove that the bonds represent a valid  
debt of North Carolina, as if the eleven-  
th amendment was intended to cover none  
but unjust claims against States!

But the unwarranted stretch of the  
"judicial power" in this case does not  
stop at the decision asked for by South  
Dakota; it gives notice to the benevo-  
lent donors of these bonds (\$10,000) that  
they can sell to some State the remain-  
ing \$250,000 in their hands, and that  
that State can collect the money. It says:  
"It will seem strangely inconsisten-  
ent action," on a like promise made of an  
action—"North Carolina—to an individ-  
ual and by him sold or donated to the  
former"—South Dakota. This is the solu-  
tion of the problem which for many years  
has been puzzling the holders of the  
"special-tax bonds" which the carpet-bag-  
gers, with "the government" standing  
at their backs, attempted to saddle on  
the people of North Carolina; and hence  
we may soon find ourselves in the hands  
of a receiver appointed by the Supreme  
Court at Washington to collect out of  
of principal and interest for thirty-six or  
seventy years.

Thus we find the Supreme Court of

the United States, a body which ought  
to deserve the profoundest respect of  
the people, lending itself as a partner  
to a scheme to play a "cute" trick on  
the foundations of our government and to  
nullify the constitutional rights of the  
members of the Union.

But the pecuniary damage to North  
Carolina and the infraction of the  
moral law may be simply the beginning  
of evils. About 1840 the twenty-six States  
then in the Union had borrowed, princi-  
pally from foreigners, about \$12,000,000,  
and their annual interest on their in-  
debtedness was about \$1,200,000. For re-  
asons which have been alluded to in ob-  
scure corners of libraries, except that  
insolvency overtook the States and that  
Mississippi formally repudiated her debt,  
very few of the bonds were ever paid.  
It will now, therefore, be in order for  
the holders of these old bonds to sell  
them to South Dakota, and have the  
money, with sixty years of interest, col-  
lected by a United States marshal. Then  
some people will grieve over their folly  
in assisting to place the Republican  
party in power in these States. \* \* \*  
I ask space to remind your readers that  
my objection to the decision of the Su-  
preme Court is founded solely on the  
constitutional rights of the State; and to  
go farther now, and inquire into the  
validity of the bonds.

The apologist of the Supreme Court,  
to whose presentation of the subject  
my attention was first invited, tells us  
that these bonds were issued by the  
representatives of the DEMOCRATIC  
PARTY in 1867, and that, therefore, I  
suppose we must infer, the DEMOCRATIC  
PARTY today must regard the payment  
of them as a "dictate of honor." Possi-  
bly this is true, but, like most other  
questions, as to the rights and duties of  
men, this has two sides to it.

Two years after the close of the War  
between the States, when everybody sup-  
posed that North Carolina was a State,  
the people thereof could regulate their  
own affairs, as they had done ever since  
1776, these bonds were issued and placed  
on the market. About the same time,  
the political party which now controls all  
the departments of the Federal govern-  
ment, being then in control, passed, over  
the veto of President Johnson, the "re-  
construction measures," destroying  
North Carolina as a State, subjecting  
her, with South Carolina, to an odious  
military despotism with the headquarters  
of General Canby, the satrap, at Charlot-  
te, and subjecting our people, so far as  
there was any semblance of civil govern-  
ment, to the rule of the "carpet-bag"  
merchants, who came down from the  
North to participate in plundering the  
State, and of the ex-slaves, who had not  
yet been made "citizens" by the Four-  
teenth Amendment. This subjecting was  
accomplished by disfranchising thirty or  
forty thousand of the hereditary citi-  
zens of the State, who were compelled  
to look on in silence while these pets  
of the Republican party held a so-called  
constitutional convention in Raleigh, and  
sessions of their disgraceful legislature  
in 1867-'69-'70, the expenses of which  
General Canby collected out of our peo-  
ple's pockets.

This "carpet-bag" government, support-  
ed by post-commanders in every impor-  
tant town, had colored troops to do their  
bidding—some of your readers remember  
that a squad of them was sent from  
Fayetteville to Clinton to supervise the  
election in 1868, but for prudential re-  
asons, got no nearer than Dollar Branch.  
The state, the money she had received for  
establishing the A. and M. College, the  
money these interlopers collected from the  
people to support the free schools, and,  
in fact, about all the public funds they  
could lay their hands on; and, when  
other sources of supply were exhausted,  
they issued the noted "special-tax bonds,"  
which the state repudiated several years  
ago. Hence the credit of the State was  
so impaired that the bonds issued by  
the Democrats sold for not more than half  
of their face value, and the money the  
State received was "green-backs," worth  
perhaps, about half of their face value.  
So that her bonds went for little, if any,  
more than twenty-five cents on the dollar  
of face value, the Republican party be-  
ing wholly responsible for the loss.

By what right, then, does the author  
of this wrong, acting through five of  
the justices of the Supreme Court, come  
to North Carolina and compel her to  
pay the face value of these bonds, to-  
gether with thirty-seven years of inter-  
est on the face value? I deny the right.  
The State ought to tender to the bond-  
holders the specie value of the amount  
she received for the bonds; but to force  
her to go beyond this is a violation of  
the moral law, as well as the Constitu-  
tion of the Union. B. F. GRADY,  
Clinton, N. C., Feb. 22, 1904.

### Rockefeller's Health Rules.

(New York World.)

I have discovered the best prescrip-  
tion for good health is outdoor exercise  
and eating slowly. Be regular in every-  
thing, but above all things, eat slowly.

"If I have only fifteen minutes to eat  
a luncheon I will eat four or five mouth-  
fuls in that time and carry away a mouth-  
ful with me. Four mouthfuls slowly  
eaten is far better than a hearty meal  
consumed in haste. It takes a person a  
long time to appreciate this fully, but  
the sooner they do it the better it will  
be for their health. I find that when I  
play golf a lot and keep out of doors I  
both eat and sleep better."

"Do you know that I recently read an  
article by a well-known scientific man to  
the effect that cheese is an excellent ar-  
ticle of diet? I wish that I had read  
that article a long time ago. I had been  
afraid that cheese had a tendency to pro-  
duce indigestion, and for that reason  
never touched it. Now I find that its ef-  
fects are directly contrary, and I eat a  
great deal of it and find it agrees with  
me."

"Take my advice, eat cheese, eat slowly  
and have outdoor exercise and you will  
enjoy good health."

It's a case of minority rule in a house  
where there's a baby.

### A HERO OF PISTOL BATTLES

#### Upheld Law in Many Des- perate Encounters.

#### George Pritchard, the New Marshal in the Central District of Indian Territory, Goes There as

#### No Tenderfoot.

(Washington Post.)

Asheville, N. C., March 5.—On Febru-  
ary 18th, George K. Pritchard, of Mitch-  
ell county, N. C., was confirmed by the  
Senate for the position of United States  
marshal for the central district of Indian  
Territory. The nomination was held up  
for several weeks, and some opposition  
developed because Pritchard was not a  
resident of the Territory. This, however,  
soon disappeared. Mr. Pritchard is a  
brother of former Senator Jeter C.  
Pritchard, of North Carolina, now asso-  
ciate justice of the Supreme Court of the  
District of Columbia, who presided over  
the court which tried Maben, the Goffs,  
and Lorenz for frauds on the Post Office  
Department.

It is the general supposition that in  
the discharge of the duties of his new  
position "Sheriff" Pritchard, as he is usu-  
ally called in Western North Carolina,  
is likely to meet a good many crises re-  
quiring resource—that quality known as  
"nerve" and a brave man's contempt for  
death. If this be true, the President  
chose well when he chose Sheriff Pritchard  
for marshal.

In 1888 Mr. Pritchard was elected sheriff  
of Mitchell county, N. C. Mitchell is one  
of the far western counties, where blood  
runs fast and hot; where hip pockets are  
made for pistols, and the inhabitants  
know how to use them. Pritchard was  
the regular Republican candidate, and his  
opponent who then held the office of  
sheriff was an independent Republican.  
Pritchard had not a single blood relative  
in the county, while his opponent was  
a man of large family connection. The  
campaign was a very exciting one.  
Pritchard's opponent lived in a strong  
Republican township, a considerable por-  
tion of the citizens of which were his  
relatives. When the candidates met  
there in joint debate, political sentiment  
was at fever heat. Pritchard in his speech  
attacked the record of the sheriff, and  
the friends of the latter, to the number  
of about forty, drew their pistols on  
the speaker and cocked them, as a sort  
of intimidation that his language ought to  
be milder.

### ONE CHAMPION OF HIS CAUSE.

Pritchard was speaking from the van-  
tage point of a pile of lumber. He paused  
a moment, and then said, addressing  
his opponent: "John, we are in your  
home township. You are the sheriff, and  
it is your duty to protect me from vio-  
lence. But if you will not, I'll protect  
myself." At the same time he drew his  
pistol, and a young man—a Democrat  
by the way—stepped up to his side and  
said: "George, if you die here, I'll die  
with you."

The crowd immediately became quiet,  
and the guns disappeared. This incident  
was described by an eye-witness, who  
said: "It was the most dramatic situa-  
tion that I have ever seen, and I lived for  
a long time in Mitchell county."

During his first term as sheriff of Mit-  
chell, Pritchard killed Avery Parker, his  
personal and political friend. Parker was  
a merchant of Bakersville, the county  
seat; a good fellow when sober and a  
demon when drunk. One Sunday after-  
noon, as people were passing by the  
door of his store, on their way from  
church, Parker, who had been drinking,  
suddenly came out and began shooting  
into the crowd. The town marshal heard  
the firing and hurried to the scene, along  
with the sheriff, the two happening to  
be together. Pritchard sprang into the  
store, ordered Parker to surrender, and  
by way of reply received a bullet  
through his hand. He then shot Parker  
twice, and the latter fell. Parker's son-  
in-law, a man named Young, was one of  
the crowd which had gathered rapidly, and  
he opened fire upon the sheriff, his first  
shot making two holes in Pritchard's  
coat.

### TRIED AND EXONERATED.

A pistol duel ensued, in which  
wounded officer shot Young in the arm,  
breaking it. Pritchard ceased firing only  
when the chambers of his revolver were  
emptied. The sheriff was tried for kill-  
ing Parker. When the evidence was all  
in, Judge James H. Merrimon, of Ashe-  
ville, the judge presiding, ordered that  
the court room be cleared of all persons  
except officers of the court. He instruct-  
ed the jury that the State had not made  
out a case. The jury returned a verdict  
exonerating Pritchard. Young was con-  
victed of or pleaded guilty to an assault  
with a deadly weapon.

During his same term in office the pro-  
hibition forces carried Mitchell county.  
The sheriff went around among the dis-  
tillers and whiskey dealers—many of whom  
were his friends—and told them that the  
law was going to be enforced. They did  
not at first take him seriously, but he  
filled the courts with cases against them,  
and stamped out the traffic. He was  
again elected, and his second term was a  
triumph one. In 1896 Mr. Pritchard's  
third term began, and it was in June of  
the following year that the memorable  
fight occurred around which the inci-  
dents of a novel have been grouped. The  
story is told by one of Pritchard's most

intimate friends. He was a near neigh-  
bor of Pritchard's, one of the first to  
reach him after the fight.

Court was in session at Bakersville,  
and it was reported to the presiding  
judge that one Monroe Garland was an  
outlaw; that he had shot five persons  
from ambush, two of them women.  
Thereupon Judge L. L. Green issued a  
bench warrant for Garland and placed it  
in the hands of the sheriff, and the lat-  
ter went in search of Garland, accompa-  
nyed by Columbus F. Blalock as a special  
deputy. They located Garland at the  
house of a man named Mosely, eleven  
miles from Bakersville, in a wild section  
of county, accessible only by a trail  
through the mountains. They reached the  
place and posted themselves in a patch of  
corn near the house.

### DEADLY CONFLICT WITH AN OUT- LAW.

Day was just breaking over the moun-  
tains when the outlaw issued forth from  
Mosely's house. He passed near where  
the sheriff stood in wait. The latter  
stepped out, laid a hand upon Garland's  
shoulder, and said:

"Hold on, Monroe."  
Garland's hand was in the breast pock-  
et of his coat. He did not start when  
the sheriff addressed him. He did not  
look around to see who it was. He asked  
no questions. He simply whirled around  
and shot Pritchard through the breast.

The sheriff's gun was out in an instant.  
Its sharp tones broke upon the sweet  
peace of a mountain morning. Blalock,  
who was looking on, remembered  
afterward that from time to time little  
clouds of dust flew from Garland's cloth-  
ing. He was being riddled with bullets.

He retreated, and Pritchard followed.  
He climbed a fence, went a few yards  
farther, and fell. Pritchard had not  
strength enough to climb the fence. On  
reaching it he knelt down, poised his pis-  
tol upon a rail, and fired the last shot.  
Again a little cloud of dust flew from  
Garland's prostrate body. Then Blalock  
supported Pritchard to the porch of Mos-  
ely's house. Blalock crossed over the  
fence, where Garland lay, and returned.

"Lum," said the sheriff, "he's killed  
me."

"Well, George," said Blalock, "you  
have killed him."

"That is some comfort," said the sheriff.  
He then gasped, and his limbs stretched  
out in what ever one thought was his  
death agony. Water was thrown in his  
face and restoratives applied. He rather  
remarkably revived, and Blalock rode  
eleven miles over a rough mountain trail  
to Bakersville in less than an hour to  
bring medical aid. On the following day  
Pritchard was carried upon a litter to his  
home in Bakersville. On his recovery  
from his wound, Judge (then Senator)  
Pritchard and others of his friends ob-  
tained a position for him at the Capitol  
in Washington. They felt that his life  
in Mitchell county was altogether too stren-  
uous for safety.

George K. Pritchard goes to South Me-  
Allister as a stranger, it is true, but not  
by any means as a tenderfoot.

### FORTY ACRES AND A MULE.

#### Dr. Whitaker is Illuminating Some Pretty Black Places in Recent History.

To the Editor: To those of us who  
remember the days of reconstruction  
Freedman's Bureau, and "The 40 acres  
and a mule," Dr. R. H. Whitaker's com-  
munication in the News and Observer of  
the 28th of Feb. is but a refreshing  
of our memory, but to our younger peo-  
ple who came on the stage of action since  
1865-70 who have not read that bit of his-  
tory I suggest that they be sure and get  
the paper and read it. What Dr. W.  
says is true, but he could only give a  
few of the outlines, read what he says,  
then ask those who were living in those  
days, as to what our people in North  
Carolina and the South had to endure. It  
is surprising that a man of Dr. Myers'  
intelligence, should cling to that old  
and long since exploded idea that "Old John  
Brown" was a saint, and "that while  
his body lies mouldering in the clay, his  
soul goes marching on." The true  
history puts him down as a fanatic, mur-  
derer and robber. He with his band of  
robbers, not only robbed and killed white  
people but actually killed some negroes  
also. Thanks to Dr. Whitaker for his  
efforts to keep the history correct. As  
these things are called up, some one as  
Dr. W. has done should set them straight.  
If we let such false statements go un-  
challenged, our younger people may be  
led to think they are true. I agree  
with Dr. W. it is strange how some  
people try to pervert the truth.

M. O. SHERRILL,  
Raleigh, Feb. 29, 1904.

### WILL SOLVE LABOR PROBLEM.

#### Mr. Cardle's Cotton, Corn and Peanut Planter Tested and Found Successful.

(Special to News and Observer.)  
Littleton, N. C., March 5.—Mr. H. J.  
Cardle had on exhibition and trial today  
his new patent "cotton, corn and peanut  
planter." The same proved a complete  
success. It opens the row, distributes  
the fertilizer, beds the land, opens the bed  
and sows the seed, and covers them all at  
one time, doing the work with one man  
and two horses of six men and six horses.  
The machine promises to revolutionize  
the cotton industry in this country. It  
is a solution to a great extent of the  
present troublesome labor problem in  
the South.

Ex-Sheriff J. T. Dawson of Halifax  
county, a resident of Littleton, has lost  
three good horses by death supposed to  
be brought on by poisoning by an enemy  
within a month. He was notified Tues-  
day morning by telephone of the death  
of the third horse, one valued at \$165,  
and went immediately to his farm, which  
is about five miles from Halifax to in-  
vestigate.—Littleton News Reporter.