

# THE GASTONIA GAZETTE.

Devoted to the Protection of Home and the Interests of the County.

Vol. XVI.

W. F. HARRIS, Editor and Proprietor.

Gastonia, N. C., July 18, 1895.

(\$2.50 per Annum.) (Cash in Advance.)

No. 29.

## NEW BABY CLEVELAND.

SEE IS NOT WASHINGTON BORN, BUT ALL THE CAPITAL IS TALKING OF HER.

Babies of the White House—The First One a Temporary One—Clark Now—Another Recently Born in West.

St. Louis Republic.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 8.—Probably there is no one subject in Washington to-day which has been so much talked of as the increase in the presidential family at Buzzard's Bay. For the past six months there have been various and sundry rumors current in Washington society as to the coming of a domestic vent, and all manners of news have been given in speculation over the coming heir, and chiefly concerning the well-known parental desire for a boy.

Old Washington politicians, who club together in hotel corridors and on street corners, have been known to prognosticate a third term if the President's next child were only a boy. And it is safe to say that these old Democrats are sorrowfully asking their needs to-day. But with the women of the country, and particularly the women of Washington, who know best the mother and not the father of the little one, the mother comes in for the most attention.

Mrs. Cleveland is interesting to American people for 1,000 reasons. She has proved that an ordinary, simple American girl can do almost anything she sets her mind to. Her great claim is now added to Mrs. Cleveland. All the world loves a good woman and a good mother. The more of a mother she is, the more the world loves her. It is too bad that the new baby is not a boy, since the father and mother would probably have liked a boy. But all of those who have seen Mrs. Cleveland's babies say they are like her, and if this one is like her, there is no need to be sorry that it is a girl. There was a child like Mrs. Cleveland, at least as much as boys like Mrs. Cleveland.

Little Miss Cleveland, No. 3 is undoubtedly born with a golden spoon in her mouth. Perhaps when she is grown up she will be able to run for the presidency or vote for her candidate. The world seems to be moving in that direction. If that happens it will not make so much difference that she is a girl.

There is no doubt that Mr. Cleveland will unlook and receive the first five or six that he catches to-day or tomorrow in imitation of the Oriental custom of releasing prisoners. But Mr. Cleveland has a very small figure on this great day. Mrs. Cleveland is queen of the May. When Mrs. Cleveland was a little girl she called herself Frank. When she was old enough to write a French composition about Eugene Sue, she signed it "Frank Folsom." She was just like all other attractive American girls—like to dance and trot about with her friends. But she was much better looking than Providence lets most girls be.

When 15 she made her first appearance at a social event, she was a sort of fair in Buffalo. Mrs. Frank Folsom was at a hotel, dressed in highland costume, kilt, etc. There was a voting contest for the most beautiful young woman, and 15,000 votes were cast, and Miss Frank Folsom won easily. It is pleasant to think that the great Grover Cleveland, then not great and not dreaming of marrying his friend's little girl, was good-naturedly using his knowledge of politics to make the voting go all her way.

When Mrs. Cleveland was a very young girl she went to the public school in Buffalo. Her picture now hangs in the High School. Hundreds of little girls, with blonde pig-tails hanging down their backs, study that picture and reflect that if they are good they may live to marry Presidents. It is a useful photograph, and inspires many little girls, no doubt.

It may occur many young girls who foolishly pine because they are not asked to Mrs. So-and-So's dance, or because they are not in the fashionable set of their town, to know that Frances Folsom before her marriage was a woman in the best of fashionable woman.

Grover Cleveland calls Mrs. Cleveland "Frankie." He has interesting names for his babies. Very original names, but he would not like to see them in print.

Since Mr. Cleveland's second term Mrs. Cleveland's babies have occupied most of her time. Ruth was born in October, 1893, and Esther, in July, 1895. They are very beautiful and very intelligent children. This is what happens when Mr. Cleveland wants to show one of his babies to a friend: "Frankie," he shouts, "bring Ruth in; here's Mr. —; he wants to see her." Then appears Mrs. Cleveland, in a high state of excitement. "I can't let you see her now; she's going to play on the grass, and she's got a dirty apron."

"Then," says Grover Cleveland, "never mind the apron; bring her in;" and in she comes, a very shy, but very winsome child. Unkind and utterly unfounded rumors have been circulated about Mrs. Cleveland's children. They cannot be so completely contradicted. If the little girl now drawing her first breath at Buzzard's Bay is like her sisters she will be a fine baby and a credit to her family.

It is usual in connection with a happening of this kind, to review the history of presidential children and White House babies generally. The new little Cleveland is the second child ever born to a President during his term of office. Her sister, Esther, was the first. Then, too, the new baby named

my claim to the proud distinction of being a real White House baby. Of the line of genuine White House babies, little Esther is the last. Hereafter the good mothers of these parts, full of a fine prophetic instinct, with a mother's pride, declared with one voice that Mrs. Cleveland should not fail to include in the White House through the present month. Fathers said that the President would, in common pride, incline to make the White House the theater of his third appearance in the role of parent. They all insisted that Gray Gables was an impossibility at this interesting juncture, and that the new infant was morally a second White House start in life. All this argument, however, was set at naught, and Gray Gables was, after all, made the center of July interest.

The President has domestic notions of his own, and he carried them to conclusion his own way, and possesses the resolution at a time like this to turn his back on the White House and go to Gray Gables.

The first White House baby was a girl and made her debut during the reign of Jackson, in 1830. There was the space of 65 years between the first and the last White House baby. The first was the daughter of President Jackson's niece, who was the wife of Andrew Jackson Donelson. This gentleman performed the duty of private secretary to the President. Mrs. Donelson, Jackson's niece, not yet 20, came with her uncle to the White House to reside as his mistress. This was the first White House baby. Baby Donelson grew up and married a Mississippi gentleman, once a Congressman, named Wilcox. General Wilcox has been dead fully 30 years, and Mrs. Wilcox, who was the first to try the White House as a place wherein to be born, has since frayed her time been a clerk in the Treasury.

The first White House baby is an old, gray-haired lady now, and the day Baby Esther was born she was busy at her desk in the Treasury not 100 yards from the baby's cradle. Yet the first baby has witnessed much of the world. Her father, following his term as Jackson's secretary, was at various European courts as Minister. He came home to plunge into politics, and once on for the vice presidency. But whether it came to her as the property of her father or her husband, the fact remains that the war swept away what riches Mrs. Wilcox possessed, and Grant gave her the position she now holds.

Jackson's administration produced two more White House babies, both Donelsons, both offspring of his niece. The second and third were John S. Donelson and Rachel Donelson. The world waited until President Tyler for the next White House baby. This was Robert Tyler Jones, the child of President Tyler's daughter, Mary, whose husband, Captain Jones, was a South Carolinian. This, the fourth White House baby, grew up to be a soldier in the Confederacy. He served as Captain in Armstrong's Brigade and was wounded several times. He is now dead, and his grave is very new. He passed away a broken, shattered man, in bitter poverty, only a few weeks ago.

Robert Tyler Jones came to Washington following the war. His uncle, a son of President Tyler, held a slight position in the Treasury. Paralysis seized him, and the fourth White House baby took his uncle's place, and did the work and divided the small salary with him. About a month ago Postmaster General Wilson gave the fourth White House baby a place as laborer at \$50 a month. Shattered by wounds, weakened by privation, the fourth White House baby only summoned strength enough to work one day. Then he crept home and died. It would seem as if the Tyler family were pursued by ill-luck.

The grave of the old President at Richmond has to-day no more of a stick or stone to mark it than the last resting place of some pauper in a potter field. Neither the State of Virginia, the mother of Presidents, and who believes like a stepmother in this business of tombstones, nor yet the United States has ever betrayed the slightest interest in the last resting place of President Tyler.

Mrs. Letitia Tyler Temple, the daughter of President Tyler, who prevailed at the White House during his term as the first lady of the land, is now an inmate of the Louise House for Aged Women, an institution in this city, built by philanthropy. Her pension of \$8 per month is her patrimony.

The story of Robert Tyler Jones has been briefly mentioned. It is a fact that until Robert Tyler Jones was dismissed from his position a year ago, the curious could find two White House babies, Mrs. Wilcox and Tyler Jones, earning meager salaries in the Treasury, from which they could overlook the great house they were born in. But that house had changed hands many times since their cradle days, and the new tenants were strangers to them.

The fifth baby was Julia Dent Grant, daughter of Colonel Dent, who was born there while her grandfather was President. There is nothing to remark about the fifth White House baby, for the fact that she was christened in the Blue Room, whereas the others had all been christened in the East room, then being on these occasions many invited guests, and the proceedings being marked by a fashion of gentle, loving friends.

The sixth White House baby and the last one to date was Baby Esther. When she was born her father was entitled to remark that of all the chief inaugurates since Washington, in (Cleveland), was the first to become a parent during his term of office.

This it will be seen that the list of genuine White House babies is but a short one. Only six in all, (Baby Esther, the last one of the line; three dead; the two Donelson babies and Tyler Jones, who died in the coils of evil.) Of the others, the first, Gray-haired and old, broods over her death

for the bread she eats; the last baby has life all nestled before her. There is the record. Now would it show that to be born a White House baby is any absolute advantage. The honest baby may live to be as wife, happier and better off.

The Twenty-Ninth Annual Session of the North Carolina Local Ministers' Will be held at Rutherford College, Burke County, N. C., one mile from Connelly Springs depot, August 11-18.

On Wednesday night, the 14th of August; President Will S. Abernethy will deliver the address of welcome to the Conference.

Rev. W. P. Williams, President of the Conference, will respond.

Rev. D. H. Tuttle, of Raleigh, will attend the entire Conference to aid in special work.

J. H. Leith, D. D., of Tennessee, will be present with specially prepared talks. His power as an eloquent speaker is well known.

Rev. Barth Souther, pastor of the Wesleyan colony of Burke county, will deliver an address on the history of the colony—something new to our people.

Dr. J. A. Reagan, of Weaverville College, has consented to deliver a sermon or address on a specially prepared subject.

Rev. A. D. Crumpler, evangelist, will emphasize the doctrine of holiness.

Rev. G. B. DeWeller, D. D., President of Judson College, will preach and enforce the tenets of the highest Christian life.

These and many other speakers are expected to make this Conference of unusual interest.

The Dr. R. L. Abernethy memorial exercises will add much interest to the Conference.

The cheap summer excursion rates on the railroad will make it easy for all persons to attend. The hotels and boarding-houses will accommodate large numbers at low rates.

Wages at Southern Mills. Match News and Observer.

The newspapers have recently contained numerous statements of the raising of the wages of operatives at cotton mills and other manufacturing concerns throughout the North. In mentioning these constant proofs of increasing prosperity, however, it is well to note that the reason those advances in wages are confined mainly to the Northern States is that wages of similar operatives in the South were not reduced during the recent period of industrial depression, except in a few instances.

To speak of advancing wages in the North alone, without mentioning the fact that wages in Southern mills are not being advanced simply because they were not reduced would be unjust to the owners of mills in the South. The wages paid operatives in North Carolina and other Southern States in many industries are relatively greater than those paid in the North, even when recent advances are considered.

It is gratifying to note the returning tide of commercial and industrial activity that is sweeping over the land, North and South, and it is especially gratifying to note the increase of manufacturing enterprises in this State, the cordial relations existing between employers and operatives, the immunity from strikes and kindred disturbances, and the promise of substantial prosperity which the future seems to hold in store for us.

Brown and Satterfield Indicted. News and Observer.

The Supreme Court threw the mantle of protection over Satterfield and Brown when Governor Carr sought to relieve the people of the Assignment Act. Brown or Satterfield had forged, or one of their clerks had forged through a bill that never passed the Legislature. When the Supreme Court decided that they could not go behind the signature of the presiding officers and enquire whether it was fraudulently procured, Brown and Satterfield and their clerks thought they had escaped investigation.

Not so. The Wake Superior court grand jury has found a true bill against them, and the fraud will be investigated, and the guilty parties punished. Men must be taught they cannot so guiltily offend without being punished, even if the parties in the majority of the Supreme court did seek to shield them.

April the Name Both Ways. Freeman's Weekly.

A person with a considerable amount of spare time on his hands has collected the following list of words which may be spelled forward or backward—painted names, as they are called in common language: Anna, bab, bob, did, civic, dad, deed, deified, deved, eoc, eye, ewe, eye, gig, gag, level, madam, moon, oop, pop, pep, pip, pop, pop, redder, refer, repaper, revolver, rotator, see, seese, shals, lat, lit, toot, tot, and tut.

Feet and Fiction in Each Issue. Richmond Times.

The Republican papers are presenting the ridiculous spectacle of carrying prosperity in their news columns and editorially on their editorial pages.

Knight of the Maccabees. The State Commander writes us from Lincoln, Neb., as follows: "After trying other medicines for what seemed to be a very obstinate cough in our two children, we tried Dr. King's New Discovery and at the end of two days the cough entirely left them. We will not be without it hereafter, as our experience proves that it cures where all other remedies fail." Signed P. W. Stevens, State Com.—Why not give this great medicine a trial, as it is guaranteed and tried bottles are free at Curry & Kennedy's Drug Store. Regular size 50c, and \$1.00.

## DON'T INTRUDE

You do not visit your neighbors unless asked to, and do not attend a party or wedding without an invitation; then why should you intrude on the privacy of a storekeeper without an invitation? Buy of the live business man who not only invites you to come and see him every day, but educates and keeps you posted on what is popular in his line of goods. Patronize the man who advertises.

## A STORY OF FRANKLIN PIERCE.

How He Got Spiritual Help and Aided an Unemployed Preacher. Walter Wellman in the Chicago Times-Herald.

Speaking of Franklin Pierce reminds me of a strange story I heard the other day. During the war a Presbyterian preacher in Missouri, who, by the way, was afterward in a Chicago pulpit, fell under the suspicion of the Federal authorities and was arrested as a spy. His name was Palster. Despite his protestations he was bundled off to Fort Warren, Boston. After being kept in confinement some months he was released, but in a pitiable plight. His clothing was worn out, he had no money, and to make matters worse, his family had just arrived in Boston from the West, having been sent on by the military authorities. The poor man knew not what to do, but had recourse to prayer, in which he was joined by his good wife. They had no other place than the street in which to offer up their supplications, but this circumstance turned out to be in their favor, for their sad story was written up in one of the Boston papers, and a hotel-keeper came forward with an offer to keep the minister and his family until they were able to find employment. Accordingly, Mr. Palster took up his residence with the hotel man and began looking for work. For some weeks he continued the search for employment, and with such poor success that he was greatly discouraged.

When the outlook was at its darkest a strange thing occurred. Mr. Palster was one day surprised to hear that a gentleman wished to see him. A very handsome, dignified old man made his appearance, and thus explained the purpose of his call: "I have come to seek for spiritual advice and comfort. As you see, I am well along in years, and falling health reminds me I am not long for this world. My home is in New Hampshire, some distance from here, but there are good reasons why I do not wish to visit the mountains of the group in my own neighborhood. The world has I have been an unbeliever all my life, and had turned to religion only from fear death. It is not my wish to give them satisfaction, and reading in one of the papers an account of your experiences, I resolved to come to you. Will you pray for me?"

The two men instantly knelt, and Rev. Mr. Palster asked the mercy of God for his visitor. The old gentleman was visibly affected. Then two or three chapters of scripture were read, and a general talk about the stranger's doubts and fears followed. Rev. Mr. Palster giving him much comfort. Next day the old gentleman called again, and this time himself asked the grace of God. After thanking the minister for taking an interest in his case, he placed in Rev. Mr. Palster's hand an envelope, saying: "Do not open it until to-morrow. He then went away. Next day the envelope was opened, and in it were found two \$100 bills and a card on which was inscribed the name of Franklin Pierce, ex-President of the United States.

Failure to Erect a Light. Southport Leader.

From observations made by the light-house board, it appears that the second attempt to erect a light-house on the dangerous Diamond Shoals, off Cape Hatteras, N. C., has failed. Just what steps will next be taken to guard the important coastwise traffic against the perils of this place, a veritable graveyard of ships, has not been determined. These shoals lie off Hatteras, about ten miles, and in bad weather when aids to navigation are most necessary, the powerful Hatteras light is unable to cast its warning beams far enough out to sea to guard against disaster to ships. Some years ago the Light-house Bureau obtained a large appropriation from Congress, made a contract with an experienced firm of light-house builders to erect a light-house on these shoals. The plan of construction was to sink vast cylinders of heavy boiler iron clear down through the water and the many feet of shifting sands below to bed rock. These cylinders were to be filled with concrete, and made practically a solid rock, upon which the light-house was to be erected. The constructors took the job at their own risk, but after making several expensive attempts, they threw up the work.

Advertising Hints. A pleasant ad, like a pleasant face, is looked at twice.

The more you pay for space, the more careful you should be in filling it. The business that is not advertised can run along for a time, so can a dog with three legs.

Advertising is a feeder to business. Never stop. Did your business occasionally, but never strive it.

The circular is the risk of the sharp-shooter, which, if well aimed, picks off a struggling soldier occasionally; but the well constructed newspaper advertisement is the rattling gun of publicity that mows all before it.

Washburn's Arctic Remedy. This Remedy is the world for Croup, Whooping Cough, Sore Throat, Fever, Sore, Typhoid, Cholera, Cholera, Cholera, and all kinds of eruptions, and positively cures Pleurisy, or soapy required. It is guaranteed to give perfect satisfaction, or money refunded. Price 25 cents per box. For sale by CURRY & KENNEDY Druggists.

## NO LAWS FOR JUSTICES.

Only Ten Copies of the Laws of 1895 For the 128 Justices in Wake County. News and Observer.

There are eighteen townships in Wake county with at least six justices in each township, not including Raleigh, which has twenty justices. This gives 128 justices in the county. In apportioning the copies of the Laws of 1895 to the several counties the Secretary of State could allow only ten to all these 128 justices in Wake county—that is not enough to put a copy of the laws in nine of the townships in the county. And yet the 128 justices, who will not get a copy of the Laws of 1895, are required to dispense justice and be governed by the laws of 1895. The justices in the other ninety-five counties are in the same condition—appointed to decide cases and not furnished the laws they are expected to enforce.

This is Howman! The 1895 Revenue Act Void. News and Observer.

The discovery of the fact that the Revenue Act of 1895 was not ratified opens the door for further litigation over the Acts of the last General Assembly. At the August term of the Rowan court proceedings will be continued to nullify the provisions of the new law, and it will be decided at the fall term of the Supreme Court. In the meantime all parties subject to the license tax imposed on lawyers, doctors, corporations and boarding-house keepers will be well protected. If declared by the Supreme Court not to be a law, the taxes will be collected under the provisions of the 1893 Act. Secretary of State Edwards estimates that the 1893 law will raise \$100,000 more revenue for State purposes than the 1895 Act, but if this should be true the increased tax imposed in 1895 for public schools will be lost.

Two decisions of the Supreme Court will have a bearing on the case in point. In Scarborough vs. Robinson, where superintendent of Schools Scarborough sought to compel Lieutenant-Governor Robinson to sign the school law, the Supreme Court held that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding officer could not be examined to show that no act was a law until attested by the signatures of the presiding officers of both houses, and that these officers had no right to sign after the adjournment of the legislature. In that case the act was found in the office of the Secretary of State among properly ratified bills, not properly ratified. In the case of Carr v. Cooke, the Supreme Court held that the ratified laws on file in the office of the Secretary of State were conclusive, even though their passage might have been procured by fraud; and although it might be evident that they had never passed either house of the General Assembly, still the courts would be bound by the Acts on file, and that the journals could not be produced in court, and the clerks or presiding