

THE ELKIN TRIBUNE

AND REMFRO RECORD

Published Every Thursday by
ELK PRINTING COMPANY, Inc.
Elkin, N. C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1933

Entered at the post office at Elkin, N. C., as
second-class matter.

C. S. FOSTER.....President
H. F. LAFFOON.....Secretary-Treasurer

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, PER YEAR
In the State, \$1.50 Out of the State, \$2.00

What, for instance, would the Technocrats do with Huey Long?

Remember when General Haig announced that "our backs are to the wall?" But it wasn't a tariff wall—not then.

Rothwell Brown says "out in Iowa the cold was so intense the thermometer dropped as low as a farmer's hopes for relief from Congress."

Truth is just about as necessary as salt, but too much truth, like too much salt, sometimes plays the devil with things.

Whatever the European nations decide to do about the gold standard, the "gold-digger" will continue to get hern in the usual way.

If you ask us the greatest criticism against this last lame duck congress is not so much because of the lame ducks, for Huey Long is not one of them.

Bet Huey Long would like to conduct a filibuster on behalf of his friend Overton, who is charged with fraud in the same election that sent Huey to the Senate.

A man knows what he wants and spends his time trying to get it; a woman knows she wants something and spends her time trying to find out what it is.

It is estimated that it will take the inaugural parade two hours to pass the reviewing stand, but just think of the wait if all the office-seekers were tacked on.

What if Mr. Roosevelt on his recent fishing trip, had landed himself a great big kingfish? Then he'd have two on his hands without knowing what to do with either.

Frank Nitti, Capone's friend is to be awarded a rebate of \$250,000 on his income tax, which is funny when it is remembered that by rights he had no business with the assessed income to begin with.

Headline says "Twenty-Five Cherry Pies Stolen From Senate Restaurant." Maybe Sergeant Barry was right after all. Maybe, too, the theft should be charged to the advance guard of the pie brigade.

The Revolt Talk

The pending conferences as to foreign debts will be in the spotlight soon, but in the meantime we have pressing problems here at home that should occupy the time and thought of our statesmen. The banks and railroads have been given attention, and that is timely and right, but only jerky stabs have been made toward the restoration of prosperity for the unemployed and the farmers.

We will not have restoration of trade until there is restoration of the purchasing power of millions of people who have not that power now. Farm conditions are anything but satisfactory; farm products are selling for less than cost of production, and everyone knows that this is intolerable and impossible.

We hear much about revolts among the agriculturists, and while we do not encourage such revolts, we can all understand the promptings toward it. Men with their backs to the wall are concerned only in fighting their way out, ruthlessly and without regard to established law, if necessary.

When suggestion is made that the government through artificial means may raise the price of farm products, it is faced with the protest that the cost to consumers in the cities and towns will be increased. The thirty millions on our farms are dependent largely upon city consumption of their products to live, and it requires no intricate figuring to establish the fact that those living in the city are largely dependent upon the success of their friends on the farm, for their own sakes. A cut-throat array of farm against city and city against farm can only end in the ruin of both.

Beyond a little charity and government relief appropriations, nothing has been done for labor, and the workers are bordering close to the revolt stage. William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, in the official organ of the American Chamber of Commerce, says that unless something is done, the workers will fight for their rights, and the ground for his impatience is that "we gave government every opportunity to produce a remedy; we gave management every opportunity to produce a remedy; we gave finance every opportunity. Finally, after three years of suffering, we, the organized workers, declare to the world 'enough'; we shall use our might to compel the plain remedies withheld by those whose misfeasance caused our woe."

President Green was not talking about a resort to violence nor turning on our form of government, but he means that government and business must make themselves more responsive to human needs and human misery.

The Commission's Recommendations

If our legislators hoist the iniquitous general sales tax to the shoulders of our people, it cannot be said that they were not warned. The press of the state is practically unanimously against it, and the humble country weekly, along with its big city brother, have each spoken their mind about it.

The report of the budget-committee, under commission to study the state's needs and a way to meet them, included no recommendation for a general sales tax. In this connection The Charlotte Observer says:

"The budget commission, scanning the whole horizon and seeking for every available source of revenue, had one definite and determined objective in mind—that was to balance the budget.

"It was necessary, according to the budget department's figures, that this Legislature provide \$10,000,000 above the revenues of the last biennium to accomplish this balancing.

"It recommended that, in order to provide this \$10,000,000 with which to bring the budget into adjustment be set down at \$3,000,000 which would involve a salary cut of 15 per cent upon all State employes.

"It provided further that \$1,150,000 be secured through a refunding of bond maturities.

"It recommended that \$2,000,000 be transferred from the highway revenues and then it appears not to have specifically recommended any source from which to secure the remainder, which is \$3,850,000, to replace the property tax of 15 cents which the Legislature was known to be committed to take off.

"In other words, all that is necessary to secure in the way of new funds is this equivalent of the amount hitherto provided through the property tax.

"In view of these recommendations, it seems to be no insurmountable task for the Legislature to get together sufficient revenues, if it were disposed to follow the leading of these best minds, in order to balance the budget and, at the same time, lay no onerous new taxes upon the people."

But instead of working its broom into dusty corners in search of hidden taxables that would turn in the necessary \$3,800,000 replacement for the promised 15-cent property levy abolishment, the legislature is seriously considering the general sales tax levy, which it is calculated would bring in from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000. The change in school plans, of course, will necessarily demand variance from the recommendation of the budget committee which did not have this change in mind as it considered the state's finances. But whatever the cause, the burdensome sales tax, which in the main is to be collected from those least able to bear it, should not be imposed until every other possible source of taxation has been explored.

The Repeal Measure

We are now to have the same opportunity to vote out prohibition that we had to vote it in. In the minds of those who have their finger on the pulse of our people there is little doubt that the voting out process will succeed. Regardless of how we feel about it here in North Carolina, the indications are that the necessary three-fourths of the states will approve the repealer.

But thirsty ones face many impatient days yet before the oasis in the desert is reached. The time-limit for ratification by three-fourths of the states is seven years, but there will be a definite yes or no, long before that time. Congress will provide the machinery for calling conventions, and legislatures of the various states will have to act.

In the Senate, as was to have been expected, Robert R. Reynolds, junior senator, who had been elected on his own wet platform, voted an emphatic aye, while Senator Josiah W. Bailey voiced his approval only because the platform of his party called for repeal.

When North Carolina comes to make her decision about repeal, there will be many surprises one way and another. There is no discounting the fact that public sentiment in this state as expressed at the polls last November, indicate an about-face on the liquor question, but when it comes to make final decision for repeal, hesitating ones may feel the urge to free their shoulders of the responsibility of bringing liquor back to the open.

Carter Glass, one of the outstanding members of the Senate, voted against the measure, for the good and sufficient reason that his colleagues failed to provide the Federal government with police powers over the sale of liquors with specific outlaw of the saloon. His party platform may not have been so explicit, but from every stump Democratic leaders pledged themselves against the return of the saloon, and if the party intent is anti-saloon, it would seem that there is no inconsistency in putting it down in black and white.

Whiskery Methods

The Senate Committee investigating charges of fraud against the Huey P. Long machine, have unearthed political tactics that are noteworthy chiefly because they are so hoary with age.

For instance all candidates for congress from one congressional district had entered the race merely as dummies in order that they might name election commissioners favorable to the Long faction. All of them withdrew before election day.

It is also interesting to note the type of men who offered themselves for this important post. One of them was a grass cutter on the Mississippi levees, another was an insect exterminator, and another a lawyer, accustomed to drawing \$99 per month from his city as a meat inspector.

That Senator Long has built his machine from the ground up, is apparent from the fact that he has a reserve of grass cutters, insect exterminators and sorry lawyers who inspect meats for their main support, and collect an occasional fee from their professional activities.

Into Harness Again

By Albert T. Reid



Yadkin County Superior Court

Criminal Term—Hon. Michael Schenck, Judge Presiding

This calendar should not be a guide for the witnesses to go by. They are required to appear on the day they are summoned.

All cases not appearing on this calendar, defendants and witnesses required to attend court until case is disposed of.

TRIAL DOCKET

Monday, February 27, 1933

- No. 1. State vs. M. G. Ray
- No. 2. State vs. Delmer Southard
- No. 3. State vs. C. A. Lineback
- No. 4. State vs. C. A. Lineback
- No. 5. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 6. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 7. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 8. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 9. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 10. State vs. Rob Hutchens
- No. 11. State vs. Rob Hutchens et al
- No. 12. State vs. Jim Kirk
- No. 13. State vs. Jim Kirk
- No. 14. State vs. Weldon Chappel et al
- No. 15. State vs. Guy McCreary
- No. 16. State vs. Bloom Shore
- No. 17. State vs. Elmer McBride
- No. 18. State vs. Graybill Prevette
- No. 19. State vs. Raymond Holcomb
- No. 20. State vs. John Martin
- No. 21. State vs. B. A. Salmons
- No. 22. State vs. Curtis Reavis
- No. 23. State vs. James Crater et al
- No. 24. State vs. Lee Plowman et al
- No. 25. State vs. Dewey Southard
- No. 26. State vs. Linnie White et al
- No. 27. State vs. Dulan Williams et al
- No. 28. State vs. Wesley Dobbins
- No. 29. State vs. Wesley Dobbins
- No. 30. State vs. Dave Jester et al
- No. 31. State vs. Jack Reed
- No. 32. State vs. Ray Craver
- No. 33. State vs. Henry Caudle
- No. 34. State vs. Henry Caudle
- No. 35. State vs. Ellis Spillman et al
- No. 36. State vs. Ellis Spillman

Tuesday, February 28, 1933

- No. 37. State vs. Lee Plowman
- No. 38. State vs. Odell Davis
- No. 39. State vs. Burrus Sale
- No. 40. State vs. Edgar Reavis et al
- No. 41. State vs. Ted Rhoads
- No. 42. State vs. Kipp Jarvis
- No. 43. State vs. Kipp Jarvis
- No. 44. State vs. Grover Glenn
- No. 45. State vs. Anderson Miller
- No. 46. State vs. Carl Cooper et al
- No. 47. State vs. Mrs. Minnie Wishon
- No. 48. State vs. J. A. Clampet
- No. 49. State vs. Felix Edwards
- No. 50. State vs. Roy Holcomb
- No. 51. State vs. Fred King et al
- No. 52. State vs. E. L. Pinnix
- No. 53. State vs. W. S. Alexander et al
- No. 54. State vs. Willis Dixon et al
- No. 55. State vs. Preacher Cheek et al
- No. 56. State vs. Ellis Parks
- No. 57. State vs. Vance Hutchens et al
- No. 58. State vs. Raymond Pinnix
- No. 59. State vs. W. H. Hobson

Wednesday, March 1, 1933

- No. 60. State vs. N. P. Bryant
- No. 61. State vs. Rance Parker
- No. 62. State vs. Early Adams et al
- No. 63. State vs. Larry Lyall et al
- No. 64. State vs. Harrison Pinnix
- No. 65. State vs. B. A. Salmons
- No. 66. State vs. Jim McKnight
- No. 67. State vs. L. H. Williams
- No. 68. State vs. Frank Hutchens et al
- No. 69. State vs. Dallas Bauguess et al
- No. 70. State vs. George Gough et al
- No. 71. State vs. Melvin Tucker et al
- No. 72. State vs. John Clampet
- No. 73. State vs. Frank Martin
- No. 74. State vs. M. W. Evans
- No. 75. State vs. Jim Miller
- No. 76. State vs. Chap Hobson et al
- No. 77. State vs. Charlie Martin

Thursday, March 2, 1933

- No. 78. State vs. Luke Stokes
- No. 79. State vs. Reece Hutchens et al
- No. 80. State vs. Reece Hutchens
- No. 81. State vs. Jean Taylor et al
- No. 82. State vs. Clement Chappel
- No. 83. State vs. Ted Johnson et al
- No. 84. State vs. O. L. Shaw
- No. 85. State vs. Theodore Jordon
- No. 86. State vs. Harry H. Barker
- No. 87. State vs. Harry H. Barker
- No. 88. State vs. S. T. Whitaker
- No. 89. State vs. Harvey Martin
- No. 90. State vs. James McKnight et al
- No. 91. State vs. Clifford Carter
- No. 92. State vs. Mrs. Frank Howell
- No. 93. State vs. L. F. Sink
- No. 94. State vs. Tommie Coram
- No. 95. State vs. Bill Taylor
- No. 96. State vs. Claude Ingram
- No. 97. State vs. Ernest Young et al

WARRANT DOCKET

Friday, March 3, 1933

- No. 103. State vs. Lloyd Taylor
- No. 104. State vs. Gilmer Casstevens et al
- No. 105. State vs. Jack Vestal
- No. 106. State vs. B. R. Crater
- No. 107. State vs. Gorrell Glenn
- No. 108. State vs. H. E. Swaim
- No. 109. State vs. Thad Swaim
- No. 110. State vs. Van D. Matthews
- No. 111. State vs. W. H. Shermer
- No. 112. State vs. Elbert Collins et al
- No. 113. State vs. H. G. Johnson
- No. 114. State vs. Will Williams
- No. 115. State vs. Buck Nicks
- No. 116. State vs. F. P. Michael
- No. 117. State vs. Jack Gentry
- No. 118. State vs. George Bauger
- No. 119. State vs. Reuben Brown
- No. 120. State vs. W. O. Shore
- No. 121. State vs. Dillard Dezern
- No. 122. State vs. Buford Brown
- No. 123. State vs. Lucy Lindsay et al
- No. 124. State vs. Alonzo Plowman
- No. 125. State vs. W. B. Holleman
- No. 126. State vs. Joe Brooks
- No. 127. State vs. Ervin Prim
- No. 128. State vs. E. J. C. Myers

Attend Elkin's Half-Dollar Days
\$ Event Friday and Saturday \$