

THE SENTINEL IS A NEWS-PAPER SEEKING TO REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE PIEDMONT SECTION OF NORTH CAROLINA.

FIFTY-SEVENTH YEAR

TESTIMONY IN JONES-FLYNT CASE IS HEARD

Evidence Was Presented Before Referee F. C. Robbins In Case Involving Title to Sheriff's Office.

Brief History of the Jones-Flynt Case.

November 8, 1910—County election.
November 11—Controversy at court house before the county board canvassers as to the votes for the two candidates for sheriff in Middle Fork townships. Flynt declared the winner by board according to official returns as made to the board.
January 20, 1911—Permission granted to D. A. Jones by Attorney General Bickett to bring suit in the name of the state to try the title of the office of sheriff of Forsyth county, bond having been filed to indemnify the state.
February 3—Summons served in the action, entitled State of North Carolina on the Relation of D. A. Jones vs. George W. Flynt.
February 3—Complaint, consisting of five typewritten pages, filed by Messrs. Lindsay Patterson, R. C. Strudwick, A. E. Holton and W. P. Mum, counsel for the relator, asking that he recover the possession of the office of sheriff of Forsyth county.
February 27—Petition to have relator appear before the clerk of the court to be examined under Sections 865 and 866 of the Revised of 1905 in order issued to Coroner W. N. Dalton to notify the relator to be present before the clerk of the superior court on March 7th.
March 7—Examination of adverse party before R. E. Transou, clerk of the superior court, the stenographic notes covering 47 typewritten pages.
March 24—Answer of the defendant, covering 7 typewritten pages, filed by Messrs. C. B. Watson, G. H. Hastings, A. H. Eller and E. B. Bess, counsel for George W. Flynt.
May term of court—Case referred to Hon. F. C. Robbins, as referee, to find the facts.
July 11—Hearing of evidence started before the referee.

Hearing of evidence before F. C. Robbins, of Lexington, appointed as referee in the case of the State of North Carolina on the Relation of D. A. Jones vs. G. W. Flynt. May term of Superior Court, begun in the county court room at ten o'clock with about a hundred citizens present. The public interest has been maintained in the case. It promised to be the most complex actions heard in this county in a long time when it started in the Superior Court, but greatly simplified by the recent reference in which all controversies were waived except those votes in precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and in Broadway township, where there was a difference of 43 votes as to the vote for sheriff. Middle Fork township the relator had 196, while the official returns as made to the county canvassing board give him 186 votes. In Broadway township the official returns give 433 and Flynt 214, while the returns claim that he actually received 443 votes in this township at the

election. The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

Mr. G. W. May also told of the controversy before the canvassing board, corroborating Mr. Reynolds's testimony. On cross-examination, witness stated that he contributed \$10 for the purpose of bringing the suit. "You are a candidate for county jailer if Jones succeeds, aren't you?" asked Mr. Watson. "Don't know about that. I would like to have the place, all right," answered the witness. Messrs. C. C. and E. C. Tavis were examined by the counsel for the relator, but nothing new was brought out in their evidence. **Afternoon Session.** The hearing reconvened at 2:30 o'clock. Mr. A. P. Brown was examined and Mr. Cicero Jones, who testified yesterday, was recalled to the stand, but nothing new was brought out in their testimony. Mr. S. F. Cude was called to the stand and the tally sheet claimed to be that kept by the late Dr. E. N. Teague was handed to him for the purpose of having him identify it. The witness stated that he thought the document handed him was the sheet in question; that it looked like it; but that he was not positive as he only looked at the vote on the sheet for sheriff which gave Jones 443 and Flynt 214. The tally sheet was offered in evidence by the relator and counsel for the defense objected on the ground that it could not either contradict or sustain the official returns. H. W. Masten, registrar of deeds presented the poll books from precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and Broadway township. They showed 254 votes cast in the Middle Fork precinct No. 1, and 668 in Broadway township. Witness stated that the books were handed to him by the registrars about the 10th of last November and that since then they had been in his safe. The books were offered in evidence and counsel for the defense objected to Mr. Masten's testimony and the introduction of the books as irrelevant, immaterial and incompetent. State Senator H. R. Starbuck, Mr. J. E. Savage and others were examined. **Testimony for Defense.** Mr. W. T. Wilson was the first witness called for the defense. He said he was secretary of the county election board and as such he did not send out any of the short election return sheets, as the one exhibited by John Reynolds. He did not know where Reynolds got the return blank which he (Reynolds) claimed to be the correct vote of Broadway. Other witnesses examined were R. E. Transou, C. L. Holland, Z. T. Bynum, and J. H. Shamel. Their testimony related almost entirely to the work of the canvassing board. **Thursday's Session.** The morning was consumed in hearing evidence for the defense. One vote as shown by the tally sheet was

The Western Sentinel.

WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA, FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 14, 1911.

NUMBER 71

THE SENTINEL SEEKS TO GIVE THE FACTS FROM WHICH PEOPLE CAN DRAW THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS—A PAPER FOR THE HOME CIRCLE

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

Mr. G. W. May also told of the controversy before the canvassing board, corroborating Mr. Reynolds's testimony. On cross-examination, witness stated that he contributed \$10 for the purpose of bringing the suit. "You are a candidate for county jailer if Jones succeeds, aren't you?" asked Mr. Watson. "Don't know about that. I would like to have the place, all right," answered the witness. Messrs. C. C. and E. C. Tavis were examined by the counsel for the relator, but nothing new was brought out in their evidence. **Afternoon Session.** The hearing reconvened at 2:30 o'clock. Mr. A. P. Brown was examined and Mr. Cicero Jones, who testified yesterday, was recalled to the stand, but nothing new was brought out in their testimony. Mr. S. F. Cude was called to the stand and the tally sheet claimed to be that kept by the late Dr. E. N. Teague was handed to him for the purpose of having him identify it. The witness stated that he thought the document handed him was the sheet in question; that it looked like it; but that he was not positive as he only looked at the vote on the sheet for sheriff which gave Jones 443 and Flynt 214. The tally sheet was offered in evidence by the relator and counsel for the defense objected on the ground that it could not either contradict or sustain the official returns. H. W. Masten, registrar of deeds presented the poll books from precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and Broadway township. They showed 254 votes cast in the Middle Fork precinct No. 1, and 668 in Broadway township. Witness stated that the books were handed to him by the registrars about the 10th of last November and that since then they had been in his safe. The books were offered in evidence and counsel for the defense objected to Mr. Masten's testimony and the introduction of the books as irrelevant, immaterial and incompetent. State Senator H. R. Starbuck, Mr. J. E. Savage and others were examined. **Testimony for Defense.** Mr. W. T. Wilson was the first witness called for the defense. He said he was secretary of the county election board and as such he did not send out any of the short election return sheets, as the one exhibited by John Reynolds. He did not know where Reynolds got the return blank which he (Reynolds) claimed to be the correct vote of Broadway. Other witnesses examined were R. E. Transou, C. L. Holland, Z. T. Bynum, and J. H. Shamel. Their testimony related almost entirely to the work of the canvassing board. **Thursday's Session.** The morning was consumed in hearing evidence for the defense. One vote as shown by the tally sheet was

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

Mr. G. W. May also told of the controversy before the canvassing board, corroborating Mr. Reynolds's testimony. On cross-examination, witness stated that he contributed \$10 for the purpose of bringing the suit. "You are a candidate for county jailer if Jones succeeds, aren't you?" asked Mr. Watson. "Don't know about that. I would like to have the place, all right," answered the witness. Messrs. C. C. and E. C. Tavis were examined by the counsel for the relator, but nothing new was brought out in their evidence. **Afternoon Session.** The hearing reconvened at 2:30 o'clock. Mr. A. P. Brown was examined and Mr. Cicero Jones, who testified yesterday, was recalled to the stand, but nothing new was brought out in their testimony. Mr. S. F. Cude was called to the stand and the tally sheet claimed to be that kept by the late Dr. E. N. Teague was handed to him for the purpose of having him identify it. The witness stated that he thought the document handed him was the sheet in question; that it looked like it; but that he was not positive as he only looked at the vote on the sheet for sheriff which gave Jones 443 and Flynt 214. The tally sheet was offered in evidence by the relator and counsel for the defense objected on the ground that it could not either contradict or sustain the official returns. H. W. Masten, registrar of deeds presented the poll books from precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and Broadway township. They showed 254 votes cast in the Middle Fork precinct No. 1, and 668 in Broadway township. Witness stated that the books were handed to him by the registrars about the 10th of last November and that since then they had been in his safe. The books were offered in evidence and counsel for the defense objected to Mr. Masten's testimony and the introduction of the books as irrelevant, immaterial and incompetent. State Senator H. R. Starbuck, Mr. J. E. Savage and others were examined. **Testimony for Defense.** Mr. W. T. Wilson was the first witness called for the defense. He said he was secretary of the county election board and as such he did not send out any of the short election return sheets, as the one exhibited by John Reynolds. He did not know where Reynolds got the return blank which he (Reynolds) claimed to be the correct vote of Broadway. Other witnesses examined were R. E. Transou, C. L. Holland, Z. T. Bynum, and J. H. Shamel. Their testimony related almost entirely to the work of the canvassing board. **Thursday's Session.** The morning was consumed in hearing evidence for the defense. One vote as shown by the tally sheet was

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

Mr. G. W. May also told of the controversy before the canvassing board, corroborating Mr. Reynolds's testimony. On cross-examination, witness stated that he contributed \$10 for the purpose of bringing the suit. "You are a candidate for county jailer if Jones succeeds, aren't you?" asked Mr. Watson. "Don't know about that. I would like to have the place, all right," answered the witness. Messrs. C. C. and E. C. Tavis were examined by the counsel for the relator, but nothing new was brought out in their evidence. **Afternoon Session.** The hearing reconvened at 2:30 o'clock. Mr. A. P. Brown was examined and Mr. Cicero Jones, who testified yesterday, was recalled to the stand, but nothing new was brought out in their testimony. Mr. S. F. Cude was called to the stand and the tally sheet claimed to be that kept by the late Dr. E. N. Teague was handed to him for the purpose of having him identify it. The witness stated that he thought the document handed him was the sheet in question; that it looked like it; but that he was not positive as he only looked at the vote on the sheet for sheriff which gave Jones 443 and Flynt 214. The tally sheet was offered in evidence by the relator and counsel for the defense objected on the ground that it could not either contradict or sustain the official returns. H. W. Masten, registrar of deeds presented the poll books from precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and Broadway township. They showed 254 votes cast in the Middle Fork precinct No. 1, and 668 in Broadway township. Witness stated that the books were handed to him by the registrars about the 10th of last November and that since then they had been in his safe. The books were offered in evidence and counsel for the defense objected to Mr. Masten's testimony and the introduction of the books as irrelevant, immaterial and incompetent. State Senator H. R. Starbuck, Mr. J. E. Savage and others were examined. **Testimony for Defense.** Mr. W. T. Wilson was the first witness called for the defense. He said he was secretary of the county election board and as such he did not send out any of the short election return sheets, as the one exhibited by John Reynolds. He did not know where Reynolds got the return blank which he (Reynolds) claimed to be the correct vote of Broadway. Other witnesses examined were R. E. Transou, C. L. Holland, Z. T. Bynum, and J. H. Shamel. Their testimony related almost entirely to the work of the canvassing board. **Thursday's Session.** The morning was consumed in hearing evidence for the defense. One vote as shown by the tally sheet was

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

Mr. G. W. May also told of the controversy before the canvassing board, corroborating Mr. Reynolds's testimony. On cross-examination, witness stated that he contributed \$10 for the purpose of bringing the suit. "You are a candidate for county jailer if Jones succeeds, aren't you?" asked Mr. Watson. "Don't know about that. I would like to have the place, all right," answered the witness. Messrs. C. C. and E. C. Tavis were examined by the counsel for the relator, but nothing new was brought out in their evidence. **Afternoon Session.** The hearing reconvened at 2:30 o'clock. Mr. A. P. Brown was examined and Mr. Cicero Jones, who testified yesterday, was recalled to the stand, but nothing new was brought out in their testimony. Mr. S. F. Cude was called to the stand and the tally sheet claimed to be that kept by the late Dr. E. N. Teague was handed to him for the purpose of having him identify it. The witness stated that he thought the document handed him was the sheet in question; that it looked like it; but that he was not positive as he only looked at the vote on the sheet for sheriff which gave Jones 443 and Flynt 214. The tally sheet was offered in evidence by the relator and counsel for the defense objected on the ground that it could not either contradict or sustain the official returns. H. W. Masten, registrar of deeds presented the poll books from precinct No. 1, Middle Fork township, and Broadway township. They showed 254 votes cast in the Middle Fork precinct No. 1, and 668 in Broadway township. Witness stated that the books were handed to him by the registrars about the 10th of last November and that since then they had been in his safe. The books were offered in evidence and counsel for the defense objected to Mr. Masten's testimony and the introduction of the books as irrelevant, immaterial and incompetent. State Senator H. R. Starbuck, Mr. J. E. Savage and others were examined. **Testimony for Defense.** Mr. W. T. Wilson was the first witness called for the defense. He said he was secretary of the county election board and as such he did not send out any of the short election return sheets, as the one exhibited by John Reynolds. He did not know where Reynolds got the return blank which he (Reynolds) claimed to be the correct vote of Broadway. Other witnesses examined were R. E. Transou, C. L. Holland, Z. T. Bynum, and J. H. Shamel. Their testimony related almost entirely to the work of the canvassing board. **Thursday's Session.** The morning was consumed in hearing evidence for the defense. One vote as shown by the tally sheet was

The witness identified a number of papers. He was asked to explain the account of a vote mentioned Tuesday and witness explained that the tally men became confused as to one vote and this was made necessary in one instance. The cross-examination was conducted by Hon. C. B. Watson. Mr. Watson asked the witness why he wrote the vote for Jones as being 433 when he knew it was 443, having written the vote that way on a ticket and telephoned it in to Republican headquarters. The witness stated that he thought that on account of the lateness of the hour a mistake had been made in calling the figures and that he had put them down as called. At this point Mr. Watson secured a paper from Mr. W. T. Wilson and asked the witness to see if it was in his (Reynolds's) handwriting. He stated that it was. The paper was a third record of the returns from Broadway township on county officers. The production of this paper was a surprise and brought on a legal fight, the counsel for the relator desiring to see it. The defense refused to turn the paper over until the proper time, stating that they presented it merely for identification so they could present it when they desired. Hon. A. E. Holton addressed the referee, stating that the counsel for the relator insisted on seeing the paper before the witness was questioned concerning it and also after he had been questioned and had identified the handwriting as his own and renewed the demand for inspection with a view to a re-direct examination of the witness. Counsel for the defense objected to showing the paper on the ground that it had not been offered in evidence but for the purpose of identification. Hon. A. E. Holton and ex-Judge Bynum cited law relative to the matter, but the decision of the referee was reserved until further argument at which time the witness could be recalled if it was decided to allow the counsel for the relator the privilege of looking over the document. This was done in order to save time. Mr. Reynolds also told of being at the meeting of the county board of canvassers and calling their attention to the discrepancy in the vote in Broadway township, stating that he declared at that time that 443 was the correct vote and brought Mr. W. R. Rominger, the registrar in Broadway, into the meeting to prove his assertion. Mr. S. E. Hall, chairman of the Republican executive committee, was examined relative to the controversy before the canvassing board. Witness corroborated the statements relative to this meeting made by Mr. J. F. Reynolds.

BOARD WILL MAKE THE TAX LEVY ON AUGUST 1.

The county commissioners will make the tax levy on the first of August as prescribed by the new revenue act. Much interest is felt in the levy as some change will have to be made if the rate in the rural sections is to remain at \$1 on the \$100 valuation. The state rate this year is increased 2 cents on the \$100 valuation. The state's part is as follows: For pensions, 4 cents; general state fund, 21 cents; general school fund, 20 cents. The last item has heretofore been 18 cents. One citizen suggested today that the county can reduce the general county fund 2 cents on the hundred dollars valuation and still give the county more money on this fund and at the same time leave the \$1 rate on the \$100 valuation in the rural districts as at present on account of the increased valuation this year. The rate for the general county fund per one hundred dollars valuation is now 23 2/3 cents and the reduction on this fund would make it 21 2/3 cents. "Basing the value of all property in the county at \$23,000,000, the amount which would be derived for general county purposes would be \$49,833 at the reduced rate which is more than was collected last year. "The total property will amount to \$23,000,000 this year as there was a gain of \$2,500,000 in real and personal property and there will also be a splendid gain in bank stock and in new corporations. "The new county jail which heretofore consumed much of the general fund has now been paid for in full and only the usual expenses are to be paid from the general fund including the jail expenses, county home expenses, court house expenses, salaries of county officers and superior court costs. The county now has no new liabilities to meet and there is still a balance on the general fund left over from last year. "The road tax last year was 33 2/3 cents on the \$100 valuation and at the same rate would give the county \$76,666, an increase of over \$11,000 over last year."

GIRL HEROINE IN WRECK.

Three Persons Lost in Collision of Steamships on Lake Superior. SAULT STE. MARIE, Mich., July 12.—Second Mate Archie Causey, Steward Albert Clemens and Watchman George Austin of the crew of the steamer John Mitchell, of Chicago, were missing when the steamer William H. Mack, of Cleveland, arrived with the surviving passengers and crew of the Mitchell, which was sunk in a collision with the Mack in a dense fog off Vermillion Point, Lake Superior. Besides her crew of 27, the Mitchell carried the wife and daughter of Steward Clemens, who were listed as kitchen helpers, and seven passengers from Cleveland. All but six of the passengers and most of the crew of the Mitchell climbed safely to the deck of the Mack by means of a ladder from the stern of the Mitchell. Most of them escaped in their night clothes, losing their personal effects. Three men and three women left the Mitchell in a yawl, which soon capsized. Miss Fay Clemens, daughter of the lost steward, proved herself a heroine in the rescue of her fellow passengers in the small boat. Miss Clemens called to the crew of the Mack to throw them a line, and she fastened it to the boat in such a way that the Mack's crew, by pulling on the line, was able to pull the yawl right side up. Among the six, all of whom were saved, was Miss Clemens' mother, whose leg had been broken by the small boat as it was being lowered to the Mitchell's deck.

FAMILY COW ADOPTS LITTER OF LITTLE PIGS

PORTERVILLE, Cal., July 12.—S. J. Lewis is authority for the statement that he has a family cow, Bessie, which has adopted a litter of young pigs and the adoption took place very much against the wishes of the real mother of the youngsters. Mrs. Pig was placed in a small pen in the corner of the pasture in which Bessie is confined, and there she gave birth to seven lusty pigs. When the pigs began to run about Mrs. Pig broke out of her pen to forage. While Mrs. Pig was gone Bessie stroled to the pen, was smitten with the appearance of the babies and finishing the destruction of the pen she drove the pigs into a corner, curled herself about them and contentedly munched her cud while the babies also took their luncheon in the most approved manner. When Mrs. Pig returned there was a battle royal. Finally Bessie drove Mrs. Pig from the pen, discomfited and she has acted as a mother to the youngsters ever since.

ELIZABETH CITY, N. C. July 13.

This city and section were visited by one of the most terrific storms ever known here yesterday afternoon. While reports of damage to vessels out in the sound had reached here yet, watermen are expecting reports of such costly damage and perhaps some fatalities. The wind blew at a terrific pace and trees and telegraph poles throughout the city went down. The large smokestack at the plant of the Dure Lumber Company was blown down and other damage done. This city was in darkness last night, electric lights being put out of commission. Two schooners, the Mary Elizabeth Small and the Ocean Bird in the harbor broke loose and damaged several other vessels. The United States L. S. Steamer Carolina was run into, considerably damaging her rail, mast, etc. The schooner Tranwood was so damaged and was leaking so badly that she had to be beached. Both loose schooners were badly damaged. The corn crop throughout this section was probably damaged to a great extent by the wind.

THE WAUGHOWN MORAVIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL PICNICKED AT FRIEDBURG

Saturday, Rev. Edgar Holton, pastor of the Friedburg church, addressed the gathering. Love-feast was served in the afternoon. Rev. C. E. Crist, in behalf of the school, desires to thank Rev. and Mrs. Holton of the Friedburg church, for their hospitality which added so much to the pleasure of the day.

Invitations will be issued in a few days to the fiftieth birthday celebration of Mr. S. A. James at his home on R. F. D. No. 7, Saturday, July 29th. From 12 to 5 p. m. will be set aside for the parents. The hours for the young people will be 6 to 10 p. m. Several hundred invitations will be issued.

WARE-KRAMER CO. TO GET \$60,000

Jury Returns Verdict For \$20,000, Which Will Be Trebled, Under Sherman Law. PLAINTIFF WAS SUING FOR \$1,200,000. JURORS WERE OUT ALL NIGHT

American Tobacco Company Gives Formal Notice of Appeal But It is Understood This Will Be the End of This Big Suit.

RALEIGH, July 13.—A verdict for \$20,000 damages was returned this morning by the jury in the \$1,200,000 damage suit of the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Co. vs. the American Tobacco Co. after the jury had been out all night. Under the Sherman anti-trust act, under which the suit was brought, this verdict will be trebled, making the judgment for damages that the court will enter against the American Tobacco Co. \$60,000. The American Tobacco Co., through counsel, lodged notice of appeal, but it is understood here that it will be the end of the suit, which was brought on the ground that the American Tobacco Co., through the use of coupons, free goods, inside discounts, and other secret and unlawful means of pushing cigarette sales, persistently invaded the trade of the plaintiff and brought about the failure of the plaintiff, which went into the hands of a receiver in Norfolk in 1909. The trial has been in progress here for four and a half weeks. The suit originally included W. M. Carter as co-defendant through alleged conspiracy with the American Tobacco Co., but a non-suit as to him was taken two weeks ago. The concluding speech by Ex-Governor Aycock was finished yesterday afternoon and after an exhaustive charge of Judge Connor the case was given to the jury. Every phase of the litigation was bitterly contested by the able counsel on both sides during the trial. Objections by counsel were frequent and no point was overlooked in the effort to score an advantage. Mr. C. C. Daniels, of Wilson, was leading counsel for the plaintiff while Mr. Junius Parker, of New York, took the lead in presenting the defense's side of the case. Later—Both Sides May Appeal. The motion for a new trial made by the American Tobacco Company is based on six alleged errors in the charge of Judge Connor and in admission and rejection of evidence. Counsel for the plaintiff express great dissatisfaction at the verdict as allowing inadequate damages and will at five o'clock indicate to the court whether they will join in the motion for a new trial. C. G. Daniels, counsel for the Ware-Kramer Co., explained to the court that his clients owe \$70,000 under the present retainer agreement so that the damages allowed will not even satisfy the creditors and will yield no benefit whatever to the stockholders.

WINSTON MAKES A FINE SHOWING

Figures As to Manufactures of Various Cities Announced by Census Bureau. IN SEVERAL ITEMS WE LEAD STATE. A GOOD GAIN IN FIVE YEARS

In Every Particular This City Shows a Substantial Increase in Manufacturing Lines From 1904 to 1909—The Figures.

WASHINGTON, July 13.—A preliminary statement of the general results of the thirtieth United States census of manufactures of the city of Winston, N. C., was issued by Acting Census Director Falkner. It contains a summary comparing the figures for 1904 and 1909, by city totals, prepared under the direction of William M. Stewart, chief statistician for manufactures, Bureau of the Census. The figures are subject to such revision as may be necessary upon a further examination of the original reports. The summary shows percentages of increases as follows: 78 per cent in cost of materials used; 70 per cent in the number of salaried officials and clerks; 65 per cent in the salaries and wages; 48 per cent in the value of products; 38 per cent in the average number of wage earners; 32 per cent in the value added by manufacture; 21 per cent in the number of establishments; and 2 per cent in the miscellaneous expenses. There were 52 establishments in 1909 as compared with 47 in 1904, an increase of 5 or 11 per cent. The value of products in 1909 was \$1,778,000 and \$1,353,000 in 1904, an increase of \$425,000, or 48 per cent. The average per establishment was approximately \$33,900 in 1909 and about \$241,000 in 1904. The value of products represents their selling value or price at the plants as actually turned out by the factories during the census year, and does not necessarily have any relation to the amount of sales for that year. The value under this head also includes the amount received for work done on materials furnished by others. Further details can be drawn from the tabular summary which follows:

Census—	1909	1904	1904, 1909
Number establishments	52	47	11
Capital invested	\$12,856,000	\$9,212,000	40
Cost of materials used	6,806,000	3,842,000	78
Salaries and wages	2,244,000	1,419,000	65
Miscellaneous expenses	4,907,000	4,821,000	2
Value of products	1,778,000	1,353,000	48
Value added by manufacture (products less cost m't'l)	9,882,000	7,510,000	32
Employees			
Number salaried officials and clerks	675	398	70
Average number wage earners during the year	6,708	4,850	38

As to Capital Invested. In the matter of capital invested the figures announced show that, as against Winston's \$12,856,000, Charlotte has \$9,461,000; Asheville, \$2,887,000; Raleigh, \$2,027,000; Wilmington, \$2,022,000; Greensboro, \$1,696,000. Cost of Materials. In the cost of materials used Winston's figures are \$6,810,000 for 1909; Charlotte shows \$6,832,000; Asheville, \$2,295,000; Raleigh, \$1,276,000; Wilmington, \$1,903,000; Durham, \$9,810,000; Greensboro, \$2,032,000. Salaries and Wages. As compared with the figures for Winston in the table above Charlotte shows \$2,979,000; Asheville, \$489,000; Raleigh, \$558,000; Wilmington, \$553,000; Durham, \$1,339,000; Greensboro, \$469,000. Value of Products. Winston, \$1,778,000; Charlotte, \$1,460,000; Asheville, \$3,550,000; Raleigh, \$2,376,000; Wilmington, \$3,005,000; Durham, \$2,272,000; Greensboro, \$2,032,000. Average Number Wage Earners. As compared with the figures for Winston in the table above, Charlotte shows 4,199; Asheville, 1,934; Raleigh, 1,923; Wilmington, 1,213; Durham, 2,718; Greensboro,