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siffic factiowte fifit stil maing in chproct conviry.


Rajeligh, Jume 17.-The regu lar wing of the Wake county the "insurgents", the insurgents" denominate them gheld a significant rally the courthouse, but when th uncpmportably filled, with a
number of ladies arriving, too that it was declared necessary meeting was adjourned to the Acadenyy of Music, which was well filled with large numbers in
the galleries. Sohtor Jpnes, in a sensational
speect, declored the Wate wake campaign wa for judge aport of Frank Daniel by Editor Josephus Daniels charged that Daniels fought fo two primaries in opposition to the party plan of organization in order that he might have hi brother nominated in the judiprimary rather than fight th good men of the Wake organiza tion as he is doing now, without endangering his brother' chances. He said the organiza tion insisted that Frank Daniels
must take his chances along with ther county officers in one and Daniels would sacrifice the De mocracy of Wake county and North Carolina to save his brother. Mr. Jones reviewed the sensa last month, charging that the reason J. W. Bailey pursued the course he did in not allowing some one who could to call th meetings to order, was thit he knew ihat when order had been
obtained in either the Academy or courthouse, there were those with having paid $\$ 50$, $\$ 25$ and $\$ 15$ for primary votes as manaThis, toos after Bailey had, ew days before, issued his letter to the Wake Democracy brandAssialike meriting the condemnation.
He quoted Editor Daniels a ten years ago, denouncing Baile as not worthy of advising the saying to do, and declared that way redeemed himself.
He ttacked
methods of abuse and misrepr sentation that he charged the Raleigh morning paper with condueting; charged that the man
who been writing sensational campaign articles for that pa per the past week signed
Payer', spent Monday night in the police station, and had not paid even his poll tax fo
years and could not vote.
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was to have the name of Jose phas Cariels put on the commis sion to build Raleigh's auditorium, thereby having his name sipners on the cornerstone of this, beprain cbullding f He did Dani he said, because Editor Daniels had threatened to fight and kill the -measure, but that after his name was added to the
The liguors were never more alive and awake than they are to-
day. They are laying their plans to capture are laying their plans summer and nominate for the summer and nominate for the
Legislature men whowe pledged to restore "local self-govern-
ment" to the peem which they declares prohibitiot which the This s
ment" ment" sounds better tham corn
whiskey and that is why they employ it. They car nothing employ it. They card nothing

$\qquad$ the prohibition law and give cor-
rupt commurities right to vote liquorbate unlet the protection of lawt.A A sithe case now stands liquor is briaded as an
outlaw-exactly as it should be-and if prohibition is should be and if prohibition is allowed t
stand for a few years it will come entrenched forever. This is what the liquor peopte. fear
and what they will ever succeed is to throw dust in the eyes of real issue under the taking cry for local self-government many may be deceived. The majority of the people of this State do not want liquor sold by law. They have said so, and they meant
exactly what they said. But the majority often fail to make themselves felt in the primaries and allow the minority to shape the liquor folks are determine to do; and they are shrewds po liticians with plenty of money. We do not hesitate to say that
no voter should feel bound to support a candidate for offic who favors the repeal of the did attend the primary that nominated such a candidate. There is a law that is higher than ny party law and that is the our earnest protest a man were ominated who stands for the is name off the ticket with posi tive pleasure. That, we believe ought to be the politics of ever friend of temperance of ever
party-Charity and Children. "Bigger forthwith whooping up "Bigger and Better Raleigh," because of this forward move parpose to kill unless the maesure ple, which was not done.
$\qquad$ Editor Daniels, J. W. Bailey an Dr. Sykes for unfair campaign methods "misrepresentation and falsehoods," swung in the Guilharp criticism, statement for by the News and Observer in comparison with the Wake county home. Brewer figured the Guil
ford statement down as showing that only six and three-tenths ents each of 36 inmates and the ing each of 36 inmates and that
only 57 cents per year was spent in clothing them. He charged
that the real figures as to management of the Guilford hom
had been juggled to suit th
News and Observer, or else the good people of Guilford wer
feeding their afflicted poor o fishworm and grubworm gruel. provided for what they are re As for be spending. As for him and the present proposed to see to it that th and he knew the people of th The speaking continued to ne
midnight, all county officers an egislative candidates havi legislative
their say,

Newman Replies.
Goes After "List Taker" With Giloves uff, and Rips Him up the Back Intruthfulness of StatementFacts and Figures with Plenty of Backıng.
the last issue of the Courie here appeared the following: "That Newman has again bustdinto print. He seems to be new Daniel arisen to pass on the denocratic party of the County, his last pronouncement (whatever that is) havirg been Th the Builet in of the 19th inst. This man grows more mendadisregard of the truth as I wil prove below. It do not as I wil prove below. I do not denounce of my own opinion or jucigement, but the very proof to which he points denounces him as utterly
acking in truth in his statemen touching the matter of the tax ceipt or W. C. Craven
So we are utterly lacking in truth in our statement about the tax of W. C. Craven are we? If
you will follow us for a few minutes we think that we can the truthfulness of our state ment. "List taker" you came very near being correct when tax was $\$ 3.29$, the receipt showing that it was $\$ 3.28$, but that does not help your case any as
we will show later. We merely made a mistake $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ dates, it be ing the 1907 recej pt that wa \$4.39. We wish to say in the beginning that we have not got
the 1910 receipt, it having not been paid, but what have the by the Sheriff and if there by the Sheriff and if there i
any mistake it is from tha source. You say that W. C Craven has not listed in Frank
linville township since 1906, now isten:
Mr.
Mr. Cravens initials is J. W. C., and at others J. W. or W J., for instance the tax reccipt for 1096-7 are written W. C
while that for 1909 is signe Wesley J. Craven and no doub the 1910 neceipt is signed the
same way, at any rate you can find out by calling at the you can office and asking for same. In a former communication "lis taker" said that we were trying to mislead the voters into the belief that the tax had been recently raised. Now listen to "list taker" is trying to prove
906 was $\$ 3.28$, for $1907 \$ 4.39$ or $1909 \$ 5.11$, and for 1910 it is 6.81. Does not that show a de ince 1906? Does not that prove the falsity of the democratic promises of former campaign tax? Now "list taker" call a the Bulletin office any time dur ing the next ten days and you from which the above figure were taken except the receip or 1910, which can be seen a the Sheriffs office if his office is open and he has the nerve to
produce it. The above stateproduce it. The above state may be seen by the original re ceipts. and anyone who says tha ime figures are juggled just who cares to see the original re ceipts can see same at the Bulle-
tin office any time during the next ten days.
The above dates is for the yea
thetax was collected, and in each
instance it was for the year pre-
Our Releigh Letter. vious that the tax was collected. and after all we were correct when we stated that the tax for
1906 was $\$ 4.39$, the $\$ 3.28$ being 1906 was $\$ 4.39$, the
amount due for 1905.
We agree with "list taker', and see if our statenents are correct, for anyone who searches the whole truth and nothing but the truth. That is what is hort ing "list taker" so bad for he shows by his actions that he loes
not wish for the facts: as stated to stand, and after making thi the second attempt to prove our statements false will either have
to back water or fish up some to back water or fish
thing besides theories.
cused him of juggling that we ac cused him of juggling figures to the gall and effrontery to manu facture facts and print them facture facts and print them
claiming that the record will prove them true. Yes, " i taker", we accused you of juggl
ing figures and that or you are toally ignoran of the situation, for know ye no that W. C. Craven, and W esley J. Craven is the same man? Now
hike you back to the Regis ter of Deeds offices and look up the re cords and see if our sta cement are not correct, and if you find
them to be correct have the manhood in you to come out in print
and say so. Will you do it? and say so. Will you do it? In
our last letter to the Bulletin w our last letter to the: Bulletin w tax collected for $19(16$ and then copprre it with the aniount col-
lected far 1909 . W hy dit not do it while you were senich-
ing the records so dill ing the records sto dillgently?
The democratte officers, were elected last election by che skin of their teeth, and the democratic
pie chasers ("list take:" is one) are trying by ever $y$ means con ceivable to discredi $i$ all tru
statements that vrill work to the donkey pacty in the com ing election. 'ien years ag in Rande iph (ounty of obout wh hundred voters.
Where is that naioriry to-day? To-day Randolph County is as and two serre votes would turn the tide ir o a billiant Republi-
can majority. Does not that how conce usiveiy that the trend is toward the Ryublican party? Recent ev ents coupled with all ocratic office hulders will work ond r s in the coming election a Randoub County will rol majority.
Being tha "list taker" is so uotes ther i so freely we would ike for him to explain the followCom nissioners Proceedings for Com ais
June.
"R.
ote Nu. $25, \$ 26.60$. R. L. C trane, PART payment , ,
NUMBER $23, \$ 550.00$."
UMBER 23, $\$ 550.00$."
(By the way, who is this
(By the way, who is this R. L. of the board of county of the board of county com ion of the law for members of he board to trade among them Now "list taker" what we wan youto explain is this: Ifthe demo cratic party in Randolph County without raising the tax, issueing bonds, or borrowing money, as they claim they would during the last campaign, why are all those notes outstanding? How
many more than TWENTY THREE notes are now outstand
was heard from him and

