

ARP SCORES DEPEW.

BILL TAKES CHAUNEOY TO TASK FOR HIS UTTERANCES ABOUT THAT BARBARA FROTHIE STORY.

Depew Was Too Old To Be Playing Around His Mother's Knee in These Times.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

Whittier is dead, but his poetic license and legends still live. He was as much a fanatic as old John Brown and no doubt old John imbibed from him his first lessons in hatred of the South and slavery.

NEXT GOVERNOR OF N. C.

SOMETHING OF THE CAREER OF OUR NEXT CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND THE MANNER OF MAN HE IS.

Mr. Aycock as Boy and College Student - His School, His Early Profession, His Future as a Brilliant Career.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

Charles Brantley Aycock was born near Fremont Wayne county North Carolina November 1st, 1859. His father was a farmer a man of prominence and influence in his country and held the office of county clerk from the August term 1883 to the May term in 1881.

THE TERN OF YOUTH.

Flaming Feathers Carried the Man Back to Bayland.

New York Commercial-Advertiser.

The slender, straight in front of a gaudy cream colored suit of a brown when rain drench a block of houses on the street and around the corner on the avenue.

There was something familiar about it and something he could not say what that was. The balance was on the side of the familiar, however and a moment later he was under a spell.

The sun grew warmer too and the air had that sweet earthy odor it gets from the prairie land. He smiled the air greedily. His heart leaped within him his breath was short and there was something too big for his front view in side. He was a boy.

Yes, there they were! The three rings in a tent a mile long a high, an millions of people on the towers and lighted a long hopping turn-up a hoop onto a hesitating white in the clouds and the acrobats and the ringmaster and the Japanese jugglers. He nudged their faces in detail to see if he could recognize any of the clowns. Then he looked at the marbling lions. "Go, but I hope it don't rain," he said.

Next there were all sorts of queer things. There were bumps gray little cows and wolves, and a thing which rolled itself up into a ball. He didn't know what it was. It was kinder like a mud-turtle in some respects but he postmaster said: "You couldn't never be sure."

He would investigate that if the elephant and monkeys didn't take to such sizes. This brought him to the end of the tent. The pink papers with which he was holding the tent were all gone. He had no fear for him; he would have 60 cents and could go in openly and need not carry water for the elephants. He stuck his head in his pockets and stepped back to read the sign with comfortable arrogance. But what was that? "Coolest after show. Clow's comic songs 35 cents admission." Jim Jones had forgotten the sign.

He would investigate that if the elephant and monkeys didn't take to such sizes. This brought him to the end of the tent. The pink papers with which he was holding the tent were all gone. He had no fear for him; he would have 60 cents and could go in openly and need not carry water for the elephants.

WHO CAN BEAT IT?

In accepting the nomination for Governor, Mr. Aycock had the following to say on the proposed amendment which calls for the careful attention of every white man in the state.

"The amendment makes a distinction between a white man and a colored man on the ground that the white man has a knowledge by inheritance which the negro has not. His white man such superior knowledge? Will any man deny it? Will Senator Pittsburg deny it? He said he said in his recent speech to the state that it is absurd to contend that there is any danger of negro domination in North Carolina. In the very nature of things it cannot be. From the earliest dawn of civilization has given the world its history, its philosophy, its laws, its government and its Christianity, and it will continue to do so."

Why, quises the white man superior? Will Senator Butler deny it? As the Caucasian, evidently named in honor of the great race. Will Governor Russell deny it? Surely he will not assert that unlettered white men are no better than "savages." If then it be true that unlettered white men have a knowledge of government superior to that possessed by unlettered negroes, I want to know if Senator Butler and Pritchard and Governor Russell want to see the honor in the hands of the K. Y. Supreme Court to hold that the K. Y. amendment demands a L. I. E. The Democratic party knows the truth-it is certain that the unlettered white man is more capable of government than the negro. It is so certain of it that it has put its opinion in writing—the printed in the Laws of 1899—has challenged any white man in North Carolina to deny it. Republicans professing a special love for the poor and unlettered white man, but at the same time they assert that the law can make no distinction between him and the negro. The Democratic party takes the true, bold ground that a white man is superior to a negro and that the law of man will follow the law of God in recognition of it.

Nowhere else are the principles of sound banking better known and understood or so universally practiced while the word of a Chinese merchant is accepted the world around. The Chinese were the first to coin money and they have long since solved the problem of bank notes and currency. Their interest commerce is well developed and all products that can stand their slow methods of transportation are well distributed.

Yet this, the greatest country in the world, is without any of the modern means of transportation and exchange. Its immense traffic is still headed in the most primitive manner—strings of camels that reach from the city gate to the horizon carry the tons of coal for the people's fuel. Four mules for western provinces laden with dried fruits, silks and rugs, return with salt fish and oak woods. Heavy carts groan beneath cases of fragrant wines. Turbans are dragged along the canals and rivers by dozens of straining men.

The traveling merchant may make his trip by camel, horse or sedan chair. If he would like to give up the pack mule he can buy a horse. Then he would save only 10 cents. He wanted to hear those clowns most almost as bad as to see the elephants and he wanted the pink lemmons and the baby elephant had to be fed. Jim Jones would brag if he didn't. He might go into the tent after the show and see the animals and go to the concert, but most of the show would be closed. He stepped to think.

He thought he had to kick his toes into the ground and he looked to see what sort of hole the brass tips were making. He had on snapper patent leather shoes and was old in the city had a college diploma and a good position. He pulled some money from his pocket and studied it idly. It was a \$10 bill. He could give it to be just a boy and would be happy with the two bits and a dime and let the concert go and father would be well. He'd get to the street doorway. Just as he'd get to the doorway he heard the lady's boy and take him too.

Manila, May 8.—The belief is growing that Aguinaldo was killed by the Igorottis. There is no proof that he has been alive since Maj. Peyton U. March of the Thirty-third regiment abandoned the chase after the Filipino leader in the Quezon mountains although an insurgent officer who recently surrendered to General Young says that the luxuriant general Tinto believes him dead.

THE FRENCH BELL GONG.

From an Mountain Heights Like an Atlantic Monthly.

Twenty centuries ago...

The general opinion is that it is an easy matter to identify a signature, and there are few people who would not say with positiveness that they could identify their own signatures under almost any conditions. A discussion by some lawyers the other day makes it appear that a person cannot, at all times, be sure of his signature, because of the slowness to which the finger has brought his art.

One of the lawyers said that no man could safely go upon the witness stand and swear that a signature shown him was his signature. He claimed that in the identification of a signature a person was largely influenced in his decision by the quality of the paper upon which the signature was written and by what preceded or followed the signature. If the name was written on a blank leaf of paper, like that in common use, the lawyer claimed that a witness could not swear with any degree of positiveness that the signature was or was not his own.

In support of his argument, the lawyer said that handwriting experts claim that no person can write his name twice exactly alike, and that in any litigation where signatures are in dispute and two signatures appear that are exactly alike, the experts will pronounce one of them a forgery. It may be true that the general information of the signatures may be alike, but in the loops of the letters and the distances between them will not be the same, distinctions which can be determined only by a system of close measurements. In support of this theory the experts take the name of a farmer who is in the habit of giving from his own farm to some of his neighbors a piece of land every morning. They say that not once in a hundred times will he write in exactly the same tracks.

Another lawyer told of an experience he had in the trial of a case in Tolland county 25 or 30 years ago. A note was in dispute, and a question was raised as to the genuineness of the signature. George E. Howell was called as a handwriting expert. He testified that the signature on the note was a genuine signature. For the purpose of testing his ability as a handwriting expert while on the witness stand he was given a piece of paper and asked to write his name three times. A blank sheet was left between the signatures. Mr. Howell did not know for what purpose he was asked to write his name, and after the paper had been handed to the lawyer who examined him it was given by the lawyer to an expert with the pen. The expert wrote the name of Mr. Howell on the paper three times, and after that Mr. Howell was recalled to the witness stand, and the judge, consulting the two signatures, pronounced the one on the paper to be a genuine signature. He said that he had pointed out the differences between the two signatures. He said that he had pointed out one of the signs of the pen on having the 'y' written by himself as he wrote. The three signatures were written by the pen expert.

Reference was made during the examination to a trial which occurred at Washington, where a will was on trial and the witness on hand was Mr. Howell. He was called as a witness to testify at the trial of the will was in the handwriting of the testator. It was proved, however, that the entire will had been traced. One of the relatives of the deceased had found many of the letters of the deceased. Words had not into the will were taken from the different letters and by a chemical process reproduced in the document, which made the will, John Sherman's name was signed as one of the witnesses of the will, and it was also proved that the signature had been taken from a signature which Mr. Sherman had placed to an article in General Grant's "Memoirs of the War."

The conclusion which the lawyers came to was that the discussion ended was that it is not possible for any person to identify signatures as many people imagine.

Thursday afternoon about 4 o'clock Mr. W. H. Hood as sheriff of Chester county was instantly killed by lightning at his farm three miles east of Chester. Mr. Hood was just mounting his horse to return home when he and his horse were both instantly killed. His death is a severe shock to the whole community, as Mr. Hood was beloved by every one. He leaves a son Mr. Daniel A. Hood, who resides in Charlotte.

THE FRENCH BELL GONG.

From an Mountain Heights Like an Atlantic Monthly.

Twenty centuries ago...

The general opinion is that it is an easy matter to identify a signature, and there are few people who would not say with positiveness that they could identify their own signatures under almost any conditions. A discussion by some lawyers the other day makes it appear that a person cannot, at all times, be sure of his signature, because of the slowness to which the finger has brought his art.

One of the lawyers said that no man could safely go upon the witness stand and swear that a signature shown him was his signature. He claimed that in the identification of a signature a person was largely influenced in his decision by the quality of the paper upon which the signature was written and by what preceded or followed the signature. If the name was written on a blank leaf of paper, like that in common use, the lawyer claimed that a witness could not swear with any degree of positiveness that the signature was or was not his own.

In support of his argument, the lawyer said that handwriting experts claim that no person can write his name twice exactly alike, and that in any litigation where signatures are in dispute and two signatures appear that are exactly alike, the experts will pronounce one of them a forgery. It may be true that the general information of the signatures may be alike, but in the loops of the letters and the distances between them will not be the same, distinctions which can be determined only by a system of close measurements. In support of this theory the experts take the name of a farmer who is in the habit of giving from his own farm to some of his neighbors a piece of land every morning. They say that not once in a hundred times will he write in exactly the same tracks.

Another lawyer told of an experience he had in the trial of a case in Tolland county 25 or 30 years ago. A note was in dispute, and a question was raised as to the genuineness of the signature. George E. Howell was called as a handwriting expert. He testified that the signature on the note was a genuine signature. For the purpose of testing his ability as a handwriting expert while on the witness stand he was given a piece of paper and asked to write his name three times. A blank sheet was left between the signatures. Mr. Howell did not know for what purpose he was asked to write his name, and after the paper had been handed to the lawyer who examined him it was given by the lawyer to an expert with the pen. The expert wrote the name of Mr. Howell on the paper three times, and after that Mr. Howell was recalled to the witness stand, and the judge, consulting the two signatures, pronounced the one on the paper to be a genuine signature. He said that he had pointed out the differences between the two signatures. He said that he had pointed out one of the signs of the pen on having the 'y' written by himself as he wrote. The three signatures were written by the pen expert.

Reference was made during the examination to a trial which occurred at Washington, where a will was on trial and the witness on hand was Mr. Howell. He was called as a witness to testify at the trial of the will was in the handwriting of the testator. It was proved, however, that the entire will had been traced. One of the relatives of the deceased had found many of the letters of the deceased. Words had not into the will were taken from the different letters and by a chemical process reproduced in the document, which made the will, John Sherman's name was signed as one of the witnesses of the will, and it was also proved that the signature had been taken from a signature which Mr. Sherman had placed to an article in General Grant's "Memoirs of the War."

The conclusion which the lawyers came to was that the discussion ended was that it is not possible for any person to identify signatures as many people imagine.

Thursday afternoon about 4 o'clock Mr. W. H. Hood as sheriff of Chester county was instantly killed by lightning at his farm three miles east of Chester. Mr. Hood was just mounting his horse to return home when he and his horse were both instantly killed. His death is a severe shock to the whole community, as Mr. Hood was beloved by every one. He leaves a son Mr. Daniel A. Hood, who resides in Charlotte.

THE FRENCH BELL GONG.

From an Mountain Heights Like an Atlantic Monthly.

Twenty centuries ago...

The general opinion is that it is an easy matter to identify a signature, and there are few people who would not say with positiveness that they could identify their own signatures under almost any conditions. A discussion by some lawyers the other day makes it appear that a person cannot, at all times, be sure of his signature, because of the slowness to which the finger has brought his art.

One of the lawyers said that no man could safely go upon the witness stand and swear that a signature shown him was his signature. He claimed that in the identification of a signature a person was largely influenced in his decision by the quality of the paper upon which the signature was written and by what preceded or followed the signature. If the name was written on a blank leaf of paper, like that in common use, the lawyer claimed that a witness could not swear with any degree of positiveness that the signature was or was not his own.

In support of his argument, the lawyer said that handwriting experts claim that no person can write his name twice exactly alike, and that in any litigation where signatures are in dispute and two signatures appear that are exactly alike, the experts will pronounce one of them a forgery. It may be true that the general information of the signatures may be alike, but in the loops of the letters and the distances between them will not be the same, distinctions which can be determined only by a system of close measurements. In support of this theory the experts take the name of a farmer who is in the habit of giving from his own farm to some of his neighbors a piece of land every morning. They say that not once in a hundred times will he write in exactly the same tracks.

Another lawyer told of an experience he had in the trial of a case in Tolland county 25 or 30 years ago. A note was in dispute, and a question was raised as to the genuineness of the signature. George E. Howell was called as a handwriting expert. He testified that the signature on the note was a genuine signature. For the purpose of testing his ability as a handwriting expert while on the witness stand he was given a piece of paper and asked to write his name three times. A blank sheet was left between the signatures. Mr. Howell did not know for what purpose he was asked to write his name, and after the paper had been handed to the lawyer who examined him it was given by the lawyer to an expert with the pen. The expert wrote the name of Mr. Howell on the paper three times, and after that Mr. Howell was recalled to the witness stand, and the judge, consulting the two signatures, pronounced the one on the paper to be a genuine signature. He said that he had pointed out the differences between the two signatures. He said that he had pointed out one of the signs of the pen on having the 'y' written by himself as he wrote. The three signatures were written by the pen expert.

Reference was made during the examination to a trial which occurred at Washington, where a will was on trial and the witness on hand was Mr. Howell. He was called as a witness to testify at the trial of the will was in the handwriting of the testator. It was proved, however, that the entire will had been traced. One of the relatives of the deceased had found many of the letters of the deceased. Words had not into the will were taken from the different letters and by a chemical process reproduced in the document, which made the will, John Sherman's name was signed as one of the witnesses of the will, and it was also proved that the signature had been taken from a signature which Mr. Sherman had placed to an article in General Grant's "Memoirs of the War."

The conclusion which the lawyers came to was that the discussion ended was that it is not possible for any person to identify signatures as many people imagine.

Thursday afternoon about 4 o'clock Mr. W. H. Hood as sheriff of Chester county was instantly killed by lightning at his farm three miles east of Chester. Mr. Hood was just mounting his horse to return home when he and his horse were both instantly killed. His death is a severe shock to the whole community, as Mr. Hood was beloved by every one. He leaves a son Mr. Daniel A. Hood, who resides in Charlotte.

THE FRENCH BELL GONG.

From an Mountain Heights Like an Atlantic Monthly.

Twenty centuries ago...

The general opinion is that it is an easy matter to identify a signature, and there are few people who would not say with positiveness that they could identify their own signatures under almost any conditions. A discussion by some lawyers the other day makes it appear that a person cannot, at all times, be sure of his signature, because of the slowness to which the finger has brought his art.

One of the lawyers said that no man could safely go upon the witness stand and swear that a signature shown him was his signature. He claimed that in the identification of a signature a person was largely influenced in his decision by the quality of the paper upon which the signature was written and by what preceded or followed the signature. If the name was written on a blank leaf of paper, like that in common use, the lawyer claimed that a witness could not swear with any degree of positiveness that the signature was or was not his own.

In support of his argument, the lawyer said that handwriting experts claim that no person can write his name twice exactly alike, and that in any litigation where signatures are in dispute and two signatures appear that are exactly alike, the experts will pronounce one of them a forgery. It may be true that the general information of the signatures may be alike, but in the loops of the letters and the distances between them will not be the same, distinctions which can be determined only by a system of close measurements. In support of this theory the experts take the name of a farmer who is in the habit of giving from his own farm to some of his neighbors a piece of land every morning. They say that not once in a hundred times will he write in exactly the same tracks.

Another lawyer told of an experience he had in the trial of a case in Tolland county 25 or 30 years ago. A note was in dispute, and a question was raised as to the genuineness of the signature. George E. Howell was called as a handwriting expert. He testified that the signature on the note was a genuine signature. For the purpose of testing his ability as a handwriting expert while on the witness stand he was given a piece of paper and asked to write his name three times. A blank sheet was left between the signatures. Mr. Howell did not know for what purpose he was asked to write his name, and after the paper had been handed to the lawyer who examined him it was given by the lawyer to an expert with the pen. The expert wrote the name of Mr. Howell on the paper three times, and after that Mr. Howell was recalled to the witness stand, and the judge, consulting the two signatures, pronounced the one on the paper to be a genuine signature. He said that he had pointed out the differences between the two signatures. He said that he had pointed out one of the signs of the pen on having the 'y' written by himself as he wrote. The three signatures were written by the pen expert.

Reference was made during the examination to a trial which occurred at Washington, where a will was on trial and the witness on hand was Mr. Howell. He was called as a witness to testify at the trial of the will was in the handwriting of the testator. It was proved, however, that the entire will had been traced. One of the relatives of the deceased had found many of the letters of the deceased. Words had not into the will were taken from the different letters and by a chemical process reproduced in the document, which made the will, John Sherman's name was signed as one of the witnesses of the will, and it was also proved that the signature had been taken from a signature which Mr. Sherman had placed to an article in General Grant's "Memoirs of the War."

The conclusion which the lawyers came to was that the discussion ended was that it is not possible for any person to identify signatures as many people imagine.

Thursday afternoon about 4 o'clock Mr. W. H. Hood as sheriff of Chester county was instantly killed by lightning at his farm three miles east of Chester. Mr. Hood was just mounting his horse to return home when he and his horse were both instantly killed. His death is a severe shock to the whole community, as Mr. Hood was beloved by every one. He leaves a son Mr. Daniel A. Hood, who resides in Charlotte.