

THE PICKENS SENTINEL.

DEVOTED TO POLITICS, MORALITY, EDUCATION AND TO THE GENERAL INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY.

VOL. V.

PICKENS, S. C., THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1876.

NO. 20.

From Washington.

WASHINGTON, January 10.—In the House to-day, among other bills introduced, was one by Wood, of New York, to repeal in part the act of January 19, 1875, providing for the resumption of specie payment, and to facilitate the resumption of specie payment without contraction of the currency; repealing the stamp duty on checks, and declaring the department of agriculture one of the executive departments. Felton, of Georgia, introduced a bill for the improvement of the Etowah, Coosa and other rivers in Georgia; also, to refund the expenses of Georgia in the Revolution War.

Harris, of Georgia, introduced a bill for the improvement of Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers. Bradford, of Alabama, bill to secure competent jurors, and prevent abuse of the U. S. processes in Alabama; also, to place the heirs of colored soldiers on the same footing in regard to pensions and bounties as the heirs of other soldiers.

Lynch, of Mississippi, introduced a bill for the improvement of the Pascagoula river.

Randall moved to suspend the rules in order to proceed with the consideration of the amnesty bill.

Blaine suggested that the Centennial appropriation bill should be first considered.

Randall insisted on his motion. The rules were suspended by the requisite two third vote.

Randall then demanded the previous question on the passage of the bill.

Blaine. Does the gentleman desire to cut off amendment?

Randall. I desire to have the previous question seconded, then I will allow the half hour which the rules give me for discussion to the other side of the House.

Blaine. The gentleman propose not to allow any amendment.

Randall. I will listen to any amendment.

Blaine. The gentleman knows very well that the previous question cuts off amendment.

Randall. I am quite aware of the effect of it. I have for twelve years learned its effect in adversity under your direction and that of your side of the House. [Murmurs of applause on the Democratic side.] The previous question was seconded by a vote of 159 to 95. Randall continued: As I have one hour for debate, I propose—

Garfield, of Ohio, interrupting.—Under what rule? This bill is not a report from a committee, and, therefore, there is no debate allowed after the previous question being seconded.

Blaine insisted on the same point, and said that the rule as to allowing an hour for debate after the previous question applied only to reports from committees. The previous question in this case cuts off absolutely every moment of debate.

Randall. Does that side of the House object to debate?

Blaine. It does not; nor does this side of the House desire any unreasonable time for debate; although, as Congress has been in session five weeks, and as the session of the House have averaged only about two days per week, it might be considered that an hour or two of debate would not be too much to allow on a bill of this kind.

Randall. I want to know if anybody on that side of the House objects to debate?

Hale, of Maine. No, sir; but we want debate and amendment both.

Garfield. We want consideration of the subject, which means debate and amendment.

Randall. I propose that we give an hour's consideration to it.

Garfield, (sneeringly.) Aye, consideration without amendment.

Blaine. I told the gentleman (Randall) in good faith that it was absolutely impossible for him to pass his bill under that kind of tactics. The vote on the previous question has revealed the fact that considerably more

than one third of the House objects to the bill going through under a gag.

Randall. I do not propose to put it though under a gag, on the contrary, I propose to put it through after debate. If that side of the House objects to debate it will be itself responsible. It is for that side of the House to say whether there shall be debate or not.

Blaine. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that Mr. Benton left on record the saying that the very essence of legislative power is amendment, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania confesses the weakness of his cause when he attempts to deprive the minority of the House of the parliamentary right to offer amendment.

Randall, (tauntingly.) I am glad that you see light, for during many years you were blind to such considerations. [Laughter on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

Blaine, (defiant.) The gentleman will search the Globe for the last twelve years in vain for a case where a bill of this magnitude was attempted to be put through without discussion and amendment. Never, sir. I defy him to give an instance.

Randall. Was not this very bill passed last year, under the previous question on a report from the committee on rules of which you were a member.

Blaine. And to which I objected.

Randall. Never either in or out of the committee did you object to it.

Blaine. Being in the chair and unable to object myself, I got several gentlemen to object. [Laughter at the expense of the late Speaker.] I asked the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Rainey) to object to it, but he, with a delicacy which did honor to his position and his race, said that he would be misunderstood if he did so, although he thought that the bill ought not to go through.

Randall. I say this bill is almost identical with the bill reported last session from the committee on rules without any objection on your part.

Blaine. I differ with the gentleman on that point. I did object to it, although the gentleman does not observe parliamentary rules when he refers to what took place in the committee.

Randall. I repeat that a precisely similar bill came, last session, from the committee on rules, and that neither as a member of the committee, nor as a member of the House, nor as presiding officer, did you object to it; on the contrary, as far as you were able, you facilitated the passage of that bill.

Garfield. I make the point of order that the rules require the gentleman to address the chair, and not to address the gentleman from Maine as you.

Randall (contemptuously.) The gentleman from Ohio is getting very fastidious. [Laughter on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

Banks, of Massachusetts, demanded the yeas and nays, on ordering the main question, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Blaine. I desire to it to be distinctly understood that the effect of ordering the main question is to cut off all debate whatever.

Randall. And I desire to have it equally understood that it is not the purpose of this side of the House to prevent debate, and that if debate is cut off it will be the fault of the other side of the House. This side will accord to the other side of the House all the time that it wants for discussion.

Buchard, of Illinois. I ask whether, under the rules, the minority can have that privilege?

Randall. It can by unanimous consent. [Sneers on the Republican side of the House.] And the objection, if it comes at all, must come from that side.

The main question was ordered: Yeas, 164, nays, 99. A strict party vote.

Randall. I now ask unanimous con-

sent for an hour's debate prior to the vote on the final passage.

Garfield. I join with the gentleman, and add to it the request that, by unanimous consent, amendments may be offered.

Randall. I have not heard anybody object to my suggestion. The speaker is there. Any objection to the request?

Garfield. With the privilege of offering amendments, do I understand?

Randall. The gentleman does not understand any such thing.

Garfield. Then, without the privilege, I object.

Blaine. I desire to say a single word.

Randall. You may have thirty minutes if you like.

Blaine. The indications of the vote are plain that the bill, in its present shape, cannot pass. If it fail to pass I shall immediately, if the Speaker will recognize me for that purpose, move that the rules be suspended and the bill brought before the House for consideration. I shall then move as a substitute the amendment which I endeavored to offer, and the House can choose between them. It is only to have a fair vote. There is no disposition on this side to dodge the question or to evade it; but we must have opportunity to make a record on this question. The gentleman must evidently see that he would save time, and probably create a better feeling and more harmony by allowing that course because this side of the House has the power to enforce that course.

Randall. This bill is exactly the same, word for word almost, as the one which the last Republican House passed without even the yeas and nays. Twice have Republican Houses passed this bill, and twice has it been strangled in the Senate. I do not know what has "come over the spirit of the dream" of the Republican party or the gentleman from Maine.

Blaine. The gentleman will not allow me to state it.

Randall. I asked unanimous consent, and objection was made on that side. I do not know why the gentleman should want to change this bill in any particular from what it was a year ago when he was speaker and his party in the majority.

Blaine. I want the opportunity to tell what has "come over the spirit of my dream."

Randall. I ask unanimous consent that you may have thirty minutes.

Blaine. I do not want to talk except for some particular purpose. I want to talk issue. I want to talk in favor of an amendment, and I do not want to be confronted with the statement that that amendment cannot even have the poor privilege of being voted down, as I suppose it would be voted down. I want it to go on the journal of the House.

Randall. I have permitted the amendment to go on the journal of the House.

Blaine. Not at all.

Randall. It is in the record of the House.

Blaine. But not in the journal.

Randall. The gentleman's object is already accomplished if he wants to go before the country as an obstructionist to amnesty.

Blaine. The gentleman is obstructing amnesty. He is holding down every man in the South, and keeping off amnesty because he will not allow us to vote on excluding Jeff Davis.

Randall. Did you allow the minority of the House to offer amendments to the civil rights bill. [Murmurs of No! no! nor to the force bill either, from the Democratic side, and calls for the regular order from both sides.]

The question was then taken and the bill was rejected—yeas 172, nays 97, not the requisite two thirds in the majority.

Blaine. I now move to reconsider the vote just taken, and I desire to address the House on the subject.

When a man said "look into my heart" it is supposed he had a windy-pain in his stomach.

The Color Line.

The sagacious correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial, whose letter on South Carolina affairs we publish to day, says the Charleston News and Courier, takes it for granted that the whites in this State will organize on "the color line," and on that line carry the next election.

The color line is drawn in South Carolina; but it is drawn by the corrupt Radical leaders, and the line is the black line and not the white line. Elliott, Leslie, Whpper, Nash, Swails and others determined, some time ago, to consolidate the colored vote as the sole means of retaining and augmenting their power. When the Judicial election came on they advocate the election of Whipper on the pure and simple ground that he is a black man. As such they demanded his election; as such he was elected. And his election was the expression of the "determination to draw the black line against the whites, as the surest way of preventing any further co-operation of white Conservatives with black Republicans.

The whites have not drawn the color line; nor do they intend to draw it. They will organize thoroughly as whites; they will have their candidates as their State Convention shall determine. But they will have a platform that should command the confidence of the colored people, and candidates whom the colored people as well as the white people can trust. They will invite the colored people to aid them, and work with them, in securing a just, capable and trustworthy government. And we believe that thousands of the colored people will be found in a line parallel to that of the white Democrats, marching not as Democrats but as honest Republicans, towards the goal of Reform.

There will be no fight on the color line in South Carolina, if the whites can avert it. As we said in the beginning, the black line is drawn against the whites, but that black line is broken, and, in the next canvass, we expect to have a strong force of colored auxiliaries.

NEW YORK, January 4.—Supervising Steamboat Inspector, Addison Low, of this district, has sent his report on the burning of the City Waco, off Galveston, on the night of November 8, last, by which 48 lives were lost, to Washington. After reviewing the testimony he says that the conclusion of the local board of Galveston, to the effect that the fire originated in the ship's cargo from material that would ignite by friction or spontaneous combustion, and that coming in contact with some substance it caused explosion, killing or stunning the passengers so, that if any escaped, there was no chance of saving their lives in such a sea as was then running, was justified in some respects by the testimony. He says that the burning of the foremast under the deck and the length of time it would take to burn is conclusive evidence that the fire originated under the deck and burned for some time before being discovered. He thinks it would have been good judgment on the part of the Captain to have kept the ship under way, standing off and on till he could have crossed the bar in safety, inasmuch as immunity from accident during a long voyage causes the ship's crew to become careless unless kept constantly on the alert, and the setting of the night-watch under these circumstances is dangerous to the safety of passengers. He concludes that Messrs. Mallory & Co., agents of the line, are liable to the penalties of the law for carrying petroleum, and called the attention of the department to the unsatisfactory and indefinite provisions of the law in relation to the transportation of that article.

Trying to do business without advertising is like winking at a pretty girl in the dark; you may know what you are doing, but nobody else does.

Arrest of Distillers.

A sensible man "up a tree," even if he should be a faithful lover and drinker of whiskey, says the Greenville News, looks down upon the illicit distiller with no sympathy, but with a little bit of contempt, that the distiller should subject himself to arrest, and his family to the disgrace which follows the imprisonment of its head as a common felon.

We don't mean to write a moral lecture on whiskey drinking or whiskey distilling, but we simply say that the man who persists in illicit distilling, when he finds the Government is determined to break it up, is playing a game where the chances are five to one against him, and where, if he wins, he loses, in any event.

On Saturday night last a United States mounted force brought in three prisoners, having captured thirteen distilleries, five stills, caps and worms, and fifteen thousand gallons mash and beer, and a quantity of singlings and whiskey. Now look at this thing as you may, besides the punishment of the prisoners and the disgrace of the families, it is an absolute loss to the country of thousands of dollars.

We have no desire in this place, either to oppose whiskey distilling on moral grounds, or to consider the question of the profit, and loss of illicit distilling; but we say here, now, that whiskey frauds have, in the Northwest, and all over the country, drawn down upon the whole business of illicit traffic in whiskey, the power of the Government to suppress it, and the determination of the people at large to sustain the Government in the effort.

We are willing to admit that the enormous tax on whiskey is the cause of all the trouble, just as a high protective tariff invariably creates the smuggler. The temptation is too strong for poor human nature to resist.

We don't condemn a man for what thousands have done before him, and thousands will do after him, but we warn our people of the mountains that the United States Government means to put down illicit distilling, and the man who runs against the Government now, is a fool. He will find no mercy in the courts.

How HENRY CLAY WAS SOLD.

Some time before the introduction of railroads, Gov. Metcalf represented in Congress a district which Nicholas, as county was a part. Mr. Clay was Secretary of State under President Quincy Adams. The two distinguished politicians agreed to travel to Washington in Gov. Metcalf's carriage. While passing through the State of Pennsylvania, Mr. Clay told Gov. Metcalf that he had received intimations that in a certain town they were approaching he would be honored with an ovation by the citizens. Just before coming to the town Governor Metcalf, who had all along been driving, suggested to Mr. Clay that he take the lines and drive, as he himself was tired. Mr. Clay readily consented, whereupon the Governor took the back seat in the carriage. Mr. Clay drove the team successfully into the town, and they were met by a large concourse of people. Gov. Metcalf alighted from the carriage, and being asked whether he was Mr. Clay, answered yes, that he was glad to meet them, etc., and at this the crowd fairly hoisted him upon their shoulders and triumphantly started with him to the place of reception. Looking back at Mr. Clay, who still sat in the carriage somewhat nonplussed, the Governor cried: "Driver, take those horses to the stable and feed them." The merriment of the crowd, when the joke was discovered, can better be imagined than described.—Mr. Clay, himself, as heartily entering into it as the rest.—Carlisle Mercury.

ACTION BROUGHT TO RECOVER.

Proceedings have been instituted to recover from Hardy Solomon the \$81,105 charged on his books against the South Carolina Bank and Trust Company for "legislative expenses," and \$75,000 paid out for "capital stock retired." The complaint alleges that the plaintiff, Thomas C. Dunn, the receiver, duly demand of the defendant, Hardy Solomon, on the 7th of January, 1876, payment of the sum of \$81,107 and of the sum of \$75,000, "but no part thereof has been paid."

The exhibits appended charge legislative expenses to "sundry persons" at times ranging from November 21, 1873, to March 6, 1874—one item, the last, being \$5,000 to "sundry persons," June 24, 1875. Capital stock retired runs from January 13, 1872, to June 24, 1875, when Nos. 40, 50, 57 and 58, amounting to \$35,000 were retired.—On January 23, sundry stock amounting to \$40,000 was disposed of in like manner. The bank suspended July 2, 1875.—Columbia Register.

Jennie June writes that fashion will do a little Centennializing on her own account this year. Novelties in design will revive the favorite modes of the past century. Already we have the long slender waist, buttoned down the back instead of being fastened in front, the restoration of the sleeve closed at the wrist, and the spring will see the reappearance of the "bodice waist" of forty years ago consisting of a plain pointed pelt in front, and a bust part laid full upon the plain lining and connected by a piping across the front. Mrs. Croly also goes on to say that ear rings fifty years old, brass candlesticks, old andirons, high stiffed backed chairs, spindle legged tables, carved bureaux with brass handles, ancient teacaddies, and other things which thousand of families have sold for a song to dealers in second hand furniture, are now worth their weight in gold, and if the old homesteads scattered throughout the country could be transported, with their contents, to the New York auction rooms, they would bring more than brown stone houses and Parisian rosewood and brocatel. This tendency is growing stronger all the time, and will greatly influence the fashions in dress of 1876. Already the ladies are talking of reviving for house wear the dresses of white muslin and dimity, and for the street the cloth pelisses which covered them. High combs, ornaments which have not been the light for generations, are disintombed and worn with peculiar pride and satisfaction.

It will be hard work to find a half dozen Republican journals of standing in the country which support Senator Morton's Mississippi resolution. The latest party journal to oppose it is the Philadelphia Enquirer, which says: "The spirit of Mr. Morton's resolution is repugnant to the idea of a reunited country; it is distasteful to the overwhelming majority of men who desire to let the dead past bury its dead. The war is over—why try to breathe new life into it? The fire is out—why strive to fan the embers into flame? We want brotherly love, fair dealing, the burial of old differences, the equality of all the States, and a union without discord. Mr. Morton mistakes the humor of the American people if he thinks he can do them with any more of his nostrums."

Dr. Russell, of Spartanburg, extracted a mine ball from the arm of Capt. R. L. Bowden on Tuesday, which had been there since the battle of Gettysburg. It was in a well preserved state, and no doubt but the captain feels relieved and somewhat lighter.

Consolation for old maids—"Misfortunes never come singly."

Elevate the working class by keeping your children in it.