

# NOTICE!

## To The Tax Payers of Stokes County.

I will meet the tax payers of Stokes county for the purpose of collecting the 1914 taxes at the following times and places:

Pinnacle,	Monday,	November 23rd,	1914.
King,	Tuesday,	" 24th,	"
Germanton,	Wednesday,	" 25th,	"
Walnut Cove,	Thursday,	" 26th,	"
Pine Hall,	Friday,	" 27th,	"
Francisco,	Monday,	" 30th,	"
J. H. Wright's Store,	Tuesday,	December 1st,	" 9 to 12 a. m.
Westfield,	Tuesday,	" 1st,	" 1 to 4 p. m.
W. R. Mitchell's "	Wednesday,	" 2nd,	"
Capella,	Thursday,	" 3rd,	"
Wilson's Store,	Friday,	" 4th,	"
Danbury,	Monday,	" 7th,	"
Dillard,	Tuesday,	" 8th,	"
Sandy Ridge,	Wednesday,	" 9th,	"
Lawsonville,	Thursday,	" 10th,	"

I hope the people will meet me at the above times and places and pay their taxes. Money will be much needed to pay State taxes, and to meet the current expenses of the county. I will remain at the above places from 10 a. m. to 3 p. m. except Wright's Store and Westfield, at Wright's Store from 9 a. m. to 12 m., Westfield from 1 p. m. to 4 p. m.

This November 11, 1914.

W. C. SLATE, Sheriff.

## The People Should Know

And take advantage of the biggest SUIT SALE ever heard of in this part of the State, now going on at BOYLES BROS. COMPANY. The lot consists of hundreds of fine SUITS bought at a special price from the Clearing Houses. Many samples in the lot for men and boys.

BOYLES BROS.,

Winston-Salem, N. C.

### Mr. Kurfees Writes.

The recent Stokes county trial held in Greensboro before Judge Devin wherein Danbury and Walnut Cove were plaintiffs and Meadows township Highway Commissioners defendants, was quite amusing.

But says some one, "Are you not mistaken about Danbury and Walnut Cove being the plaintiffs in that case?" Oh, no, I am not at all mistaken. Of course it looked better to the Court to have two of Meadows township's citizens named as plaintiffs, and such was done, but to every one acquainted with the facts, and especially those who heard the proceedings, it was quite evident who furnished the power behind the throne. Why Judge Jones used the names Walnut Cove and Danbury one hundred and seventy-nine times, more or less, in his argument before the Court. It was he who gave us a new interpretation of our road law. He said in substance that when our road law provided that the Township Commissioners should build and improve such roads as in their judgment would bring the greatest good to the greatest number of citizens in the township, that it did not mean that at all, but on the contrary it meant the balance of the county, and especially Danbury and Sauratown townships.

You see a learned (?) lawyer comes in good at a time like that—he can show you that a thing does not mean what it says. His interpretation of our statute reminded me of the dutchman when the preacher who believed in "sprinkling" for baptism was arguing the case. He told the Dutchman that when the Bible said "into the water" it did not mean "into" at all, but "at" or "close by" the water. Whereupon the Dutchman remarked,

### Mr. Phillips had Stomach Trouble for More than Five Years.



Mr. W. R. Phillips, Jr., 139 Moreland Ave., Atlanta, Georgia, writes: "I had the catarrh and stomach trouble for more than five years, and I faithfully tried all the medicines I saw advertised, and found they all failed to cure me. I then heard of Peruna. I purchased six bottles, and after their use I soon discovered that I was well, safe and sound. I now weigh two hundred and ten pounds, and have never been sick since I took Peruna. It surely is the best medicine for colds, stomach trouble and catarrh that I ever heard of."

"Vell, vell, Mr. Preacher, I was so glad dot 'into' does not mean 'into,' because dot passage vat says 'into the lake of fire' will not mean 'into' but chuss 'close by,' chuss 'close enough to keep gumfortable and varm.'"

We poor ignorant fellows in Meadows township voted the bond issue thinking that the statute meant what it said, and that the building of roads in our township would be our business and not that of Danbury and Walnut Cove, but we were mistaken. However, the boys in Greensboro did not get what they went after. They went down there with a bill of complaint, the statements in which I, like Judge Bynum said in his argument, am surprised that men would swear to. In addition to this they had a number of affidavits, the statements in which, like those in complaint, go to show how far men will go to carry their points when in desperation.

All of the above statements were made. What for? For nothing but to injure the reputation of W. R. Petree, Y. S. Smith, and George Lewis just because they had not seen fit to build a certain three miles of road in one corner of our township. But notwithstanding the long complaint made out by Danbury and Walnut Cove (in the name of Messrs. Neal and Morefield) and the affidavits of a few others, what does a great majority of Meadows township citizens say concerning Messrs. Petree, Smith and Lewis? Their complaint says three hundred and sixteen votes were cast in the bond election; two hundred and forty-eight of these say upon oath that the services of these three men above referred to have been perfectly satisfactory in every particular. A pretty good majority, two hundred and forty-eight out of three hundred and sixteen; and I have heard of perhaps a dozen others who regret being away from home, thus being deprived of the opportunity of signing. In fact I fully believe if we could have had three days more we could have made it unanimous, hardly excepting the men who signed the complaint. Then they, with a clear conscience, could have carried back the document to Danbury and Walnut Cove and said, "Here, father, is your child, do with it as you choose."

Not only did we present the Court with two hundred and forty-eight names who boldly disputed the charges in the complaint, but we also exhibited a good map showing conclusively to the Court the fallacy of the statements in the complaint.

In the light of the above, what was the decision of the Court? Without attempting to quote

his language, Judge Devin said in substance that no reflection should be cast upon the defendants. Not one word of proof had been given that would condemn a single act by our Board of Commissioners. And, indeed, the Court said every act that had been performed by them up to the present would stand, and not one word of reflection should be cast against them in the decree. He (the Court) said as these men had only two weeks more to serve he supposed they would hardly contemplate making further contracts and he would, therefore let that part of the injunction stand, dissolving every other paragraph in the document.

What must have been the feeling of men who had resorted to such drastic measures to injure a set of men and only get as a sop the promise that the remainder of the money (about two thousand dollars) would be left for distribution by their successors? The bird they got was hardly worth the shot, for the lashing of their consciences will no doubt make them miserable.

But now a word about the successors to Petree, Smith and Lewis. Who are they to be? Messrs. Gordon, Johnson and Newsome were elected by sixty-six majority, but I am told the canvassing board refused to seat them. Upon what ground did they throw out their election and give it to others? Because of their ballot being an illegal one, I am told. The ballot was of legal size and was properly headed, bearing the names of Messrs. Gordon, Johnson and Newsome in legal style. But they decided that it was illegal because the law says that candidates for township offices shall be placed upon the same ballot, while our ticket for road commissioners had thereon no other names.

Now, Query, when the law says that all candidates for township officers shall be placed upon the same ballot, does it mean that the Democrats and Republicans shall have all their candidates of both parties mixed up on the same ballot? I don't believe there is a lawyer in Danbury who will take such a position. Query, again: if the law will allow separate tickets for Democrats and Republicans, would it not at the same time allow either of them to run candidates for part of the offices in the township without forcing them to have a full ticket? Surely, no one would deny that. I therefore respectfully submit this proposition: If the Democrats in Meadows township had seen fit to run a set of Road Commissioners and not run a candidate for constable or magistrate would it have invalidated their ticket? If not, our ticket for Road Commissioners was valid, because it was neither a Democratic or Republican, but a Citizen's ticket having as their candidates one Republican, one Democrat and one Progressive. We did not have any candidate for constable or magistrate and therefore placed none on the ballot. Certainly in the light of the law a citizen's party would have the same privileges accorded the Democratic or Republican.

I do not wish to cast reflection upon the canvassing board—supposing they were ignorant of the proper construction of the law—but after they reflect upon the matter in the light of the above facts I believe they will decide that the "recall" is in order, and that Messrs. Gordon, Johnson and Newsome should have certificates of election. Messrs. Wall and Moran, whom I learn have been awarded certificates, are not to blame. However, after their eyes are opened to the facts in the case, I can hardly believe their consciences will let them take that which, by every principle of justice, belongs to others. The canvassing board is to blame, only because they did not have able council to pass

upon the matter if at all in doubt, before making a decision. Rumor has it that Mr. N. O. Petree was sent for but refused to serve them, notwithstanding that the election of his own brother-in-law was at stake. Many a time has Geo. W. Newsome stood over the ballot box and guarded the interest of Mr. Petree when he was a candidate for office. Many other citizens in Meadows township, of no relation by blood or marriage, would have fought for his rights; but the shoe is now on the other foot.

I understand he made the pitiful excuse, when asked for advice, that he had already made enemies enough in Meadows township. How has he made enemies in Meadows township? Has he done so by standing by our interests—the interests of those with whom he was born and raised? Certainly not. If he has made enemies at all it is because he has taken a stand against the home of his youth and against those whom he could always trust in every campaign of his life. He and other speakers have gone up and down Stokes county abusing the Democratic party for such crimes as the "Halifax Steal" and others of like nature, and now, when the election of three citizens in his home township is at stake, and seeing that the will of a large majority of said township is about to be thwarted, he and every other Republican in Danbury sits idly by and allows it to be done.

You Republicans in Danbury who have made such great ado about the cheating of negroes in Halifax and other counties must remember that sixty-six majority of honest white men in Meadows township say that they want the services of Messrs. Gordon, Johnson and Newsome for Highway Commissioners. Will the majority be respected, or will it not?

I have loved to believe that the leaders in both the Democratic and Republican parties in old Stokes were the guardians of fair elections. Is it possible I am deceived? If I am, away with the boast of a Republican form of government. An Oligarchy and not a Democracy will be our fate.

JNO. W. KURFEES.  
Germanton, Nov. 30, 1914.

### Notice—Sale of Real Estate

By virtue of a decree of the Superior Court of Stokes county, rendered on the 19th day of Sept. 1914, in the Special Proceeding entitled "J. F. Newsome, et al. ex parte," appointing the undersigned a commissioner to make sale of the lands hereinafter set forth, I will sell at a public auction, to the highest bidder for cash, upon the premises at King, Stokes county, N. C., on Saturday, Dec. 5th, 1914 at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. the following lands formerly belonging to John W. Newsome, deceased.

First Tract, beginning at a black gum, J. W. Newsome's and Grabs' corner, runs East 68 26-56 yards to a rock, thence North 106 yards to a rock, thence West 68 26-56 yards to a post oak, thence South 106 yards to the beginning.

Second Tract, beginning at a stake, Keiger's corner, runs East with Grabs' line, crossing a branch 8 chains and 41 links to a post oak, thence South on Lloyd's line 4 chains and 77 links to a black gum, thence West crossing branch 8 chains and 41 links to a stake, in Keiger's line, thence North with his line 4 chains and 77 links to the beginning, containing 5 1-2 acres, more or less less one-half of one acre sold to L. A. Rutledge and wife. The land will be sold in two separate lots and also as a whole to see in which way it will bring the best price.

This the 12th day of Nov. 1914.  
C. D. SLATE, Com'r.  
N. O. Petree, Atty. for Com'r.

### For Sale At A Bargain.

A ninety-five acre farm with a new three-room cottage and feed barn in an excellent neighborhood. It is situated on a good road near church and public school house, R. F. D. route and telephone connection. We will sell this place cheap. If interested let us hear at once.

Also have a number of small lots and small portions of land for sale near Oak Ridge Institute. Write us.  
11 Nov 4  
DONNELL BROS. LUMBER CO.  
Oak Ridge, N. C.