

THE CAMPAIGN DATES.

AS ARRANGED BY THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE.

Schedule for the Political Fight in South Carolina—His Discussion Over Weavers and Haskelites—All to be Allowed to Vote.

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 8.—The meeting of the State Democratic Executive Committee last night was an interesting and important one. Besides the fixing of dates for campaign meetings, the question of allowing the men who voted for Weaver in 1892 to vote in the coming campaign was a live one. It excited the warmest talk of the evening.

By instruction of the chairman, Secretary Tompkins read the roll of members. The majority of the regular members were present and telegraphed and had substituted their places. The following was the roll as made up: Abbeville—J. Y. Jones. Aiken—John Gary Evans. Anderson—W. A. Neal. Barnwell—F. M. Nixon, (substitute). Beaufort—Henry D. Elliott. Berkeley—T. W. Standland. Charleston—J. M. Kinloch. Chester—A. E. Cunningham. Chesterfield—S. T. Redfern. Clarendon—J. A. Nettles. Colleton—M. R. Cooper, (substitute). Darlington—T. E. Edge. Edgefield—H. H. Townes. Fairfield—J. M. Kirkland, (substitute).

Florence—R. M. McKewen. Georgetown—Greenlee—J. W. Gray. Hampton—T. J. Russell. Horry—J. P. Derham. Kershaw—T. J. Kirkland. Lancaster—Ira B. Jones. Laurens—J. L. M. Irby. Lexington—J. L. Shuler, (substitute). Marion—J. J. Montgomery. Marlboro—W. D. Evans. Newberry—Dr. Sampson Pope. Oconee—J. R. Earle, (substitute). Orangeburg—J. H. Claffey, (substitute).

Pickens—T. C. Robertson. Richland—C. A. Douglass. Spartanburg—D. L. Bennett. Sumter—Frank Mellette. Union—A. C. Lyles. Williamsburg—Wm. Cooper.

York—D. E. Finley. The chairman announced that a quorum was present and that the committee was ready for business.

Chairman Irby thought that the first business would be the fixing of dates for the campaign meetings. On motion it was resolved that the ensuing Democratic State campaign meetings be held as follows:

Yorkville, Tuesday, June 19th. Chester, Wednesday, June 20th. Lancaster, Thursday, June 21st. Camden, Friday, June 22d. Sumter, Saturday, June 23d. Chesterfield, Tuesday, June 26th. Bennettsville, Wednesday, June 27th. Darlington, Thursday, June 28th. Florence, Friday, June 29th. Marion, Tuesday, July 3d. York, Wednesday, July 4th. Georgetown, Friday, July 6th. Kingstree, Saturday, July 7th. Manning, Tuesday, July 10th. Bonneau's, (Berkeley) Wednesday, July 11th. Charleston, Thursday, July 12th. Columbia, Friday, July 13th. Beaufort, Saturday, July 14th. Hampton, Monday, July 16th. Barnwell, Tuesday, July 17th. Aiken, Wednesday, July 18th. Edgefield, C. H., Thursday, July 19th. Lexington, C. H., Friday, July 20th. Winthrop, Tuesday, July 24th. Columbia, Wednesday, July 25th. Orangeburg, Thursday, July 26th. Newberry, Friday, July 27th. Laurens, Saturday, July 28th. Union, Tuesday, July 31st. Spartanburg, Wednesday, August 1st. Greenville, Thursday, August 2d. Pickens, C. H., Friday, August 3d. Oconee, Monday, August 6th. Anderson, Tuesday, August 7th. Abbeville, Wednesday, August 8th.

Mr. Kirkland, of Kershaw, introduced the following resolution in regard to voting at primary elections:

"Resolved, That in the ensuing Democratic primaries the following pledge shall be exacted by the managers of each voter before he casts his vote: 'I solemnly swear that I am entitled to vote in this primary election and will abide the result of the same.'"

Secretary Tompkins, by request, read the oath enacted at the last primary. It was practically the same as that proposed by Mr. Kirkland, and the latter withdrew his resolution.

Chairman Irby remarked that there was some misunderstanding as to the qualifications of a voter. He then spoke as follows:

"Gentlemen and the Committee: 'There is one question that is being agitated in South Carolina and has been agitated for several months to which I would call your attention. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Democratic party, I do not propose to dodge the question. In its consideration I have not undertaken to influence or dictate to any member of the committee, and I repeat it most emphatically, that I will not dictate to the committee, but to suggest to you, gentlemen, that we march right up to front and take our position upon this question. So far as I am concerned, as the member of this committee from Laurens and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the party of this State, I shall not hesitate (even should it be necessary by a tie vote to give my opinion by my vote) to express my own convictions on this question."

"The question is this, and I am unwilling to evade it, for I see a disposition to dodge it, though I do not use the word dodge in its offensive sense—whether men who participated in the primaries of 1892, in the nomination of State officers and other candidates, who voted in the clubs and sent delegates to the State convention which elected delegates to the national convention at Chicago to nominate a President—whether these men who are known as Third parties, shall be permitted to participate in the general primary to be held in August next. As your chairman I feel it to be my duty to say that we should take some positive, decided, outspoken action on this question. I say, I repeat, that we, as representatives of the Democratic party of South Carolina, are all glad to see that every county is represented here—ought not to dodge that impor-

tant question. If we believe that the men who participated in the primaries of '92 and who voted for Weaver should not be permitted to vote at the approaching primaries we ought to say so. If we believe that they are Democrats within the meaning of the Constitution and rules of the Democratic party, then we ought to say so and permit them to participate. What I wish to emphasize is that we should not evade or dodge the question. We ought to discuss it fully, whether in public or in private, but we should declare whether or not they can participate under our rules. If we do not take such action we lay ourselves open to the charge that we have dodged the question and that this committee was unable to solve it one way or the other. I thought, gentlemen, that it was my duty to say this much to you on this subject which is now open to you for discussion."

Mr. Irby's remarks brought on the hottest discussion of the evening, and made things lively for a good while. Immediately after the Senator had concluded Mr. Mellette, of Sumter, offered a verbal resolution that the men who voted for Weaver in 1892 be excluded from the primary.

The motion had no sooner been made than a half dozen members were on their feet ready to offer some kind of a resolution or to make a speech. Mr. Durham, of Horry, was recognized by the chairman and the following resolution as a substitute to Mr. Mellette's resolution:

"Resolved, That those white men who voted the Weaver ticket in 1892 shall be allowed to vote in the coming primaries."

Dr. Sampson Pope made a strong speech in favor of the substitute. He said that this committee had allowed the Haskelites to vote in 1892 and the men who voted for Weaver had a right to be treated in the same manner. The Democratic party needed white voters and did not want to throw any of them out of the party. (Applause.) The men who voted for Weaver were no worse than who voted for Haskell. (Applause.)

Mr. Kirkland, of Kershaw, offered an amendment to the substitute the words: "Upon taking the oath prescribed by the party." He said that he had no speech to make but thought that this provision was wise and proper.

Mr. T. C. Robertson, of Pickens, thought that the proposed amendment was an insult to the men who voted for Weaver. There were good and true white men in his county who voted for Weaver.

Mr. Townes, of Edgefield, asked the question whether the men who violated their oaths and pledged by voting for Weaver in 1892 would keep their oaths if allowed to vote this year.

Colonel Neal, of Anderson, did not think any more should be required of the men who violated their pledges in 1892. He said that the men who did the same thing in 1890.

Col. P. M. Mixson, acting as the representative from Barnwell, moved to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. Kirkland.

know what Haskell had done, but as for himself, he hoped that his right arm would lose its cunning when he voted for a Republican over a Democrat.

Mr. Douglass concluded with a patriotic appeal for peace and laudatory and pretty remarks about the farmers. He wanted to see the people happy and wanted to see Mr. Nettles's resolution carried.

Dr. Pope spoke of the pangs of Mr. Douglass and of his insinuations against the Weavers. Then Dr. Pope declared that there was a take behind the action of the committee two years ago in allowing Haskelites to return to the party. It was to keep from disrupting the party and to bring about harmony. White men were at work registering negroes. He declared that if any one would show him a Weaverite who had tried to turn negroes he would be in favor of turning him out of the party. The Haskelites had voted negroes against white men, but Weaverite had done so. (Toud applause.)

After this the question was quickly settled. Mr. Mellette's resolution was set down on by almost a unanimous vote and Mr. Nettles's substitute was carried. The Weavers and the Haskelites and all kinds of "ites" will be allowed to vote in the next primary provided they take the oath prescribed by the party.

Dr. Pope said that he had been instructed by the Democrats of his county to vote for the substitute having a membership of less than twenty-five should be disbanded.

Chairman Irby said that it was his impression that no county convention should allow a delegate from a club and a membership of less than twenty-five. It was the business of county conventions, however, to pass upon that question.

On motion of Mr. Douglass the rules of 1892 were adopted as the rules for this year, a few changes being made in and did not want to throw any of them out of the party. (Applause.) The men who voted for Weaver were no worse than who voted for Haskell. (Applause.)

Mr. Kirkland, of Kershaw, offered an amendment to the substitute the words: "Upon taking the oath prescribed by the party." He said that he had no speech to make but thought that this provision was wise and proper.

Mr. T. C. Robertson, of Pickens, thought that the proposed amendment was an insult to the men who voted for Weaver. There were good and true white men in his county who voted for Weaver.

RECREANT DEMOCRATS.

SEVENTY-FIVE OF THEM REFUSE TO RESPECT THEIR PLATFORM.

The State Bank Tax Bill Killed—The Announcement in the House Received With Confusion and Applause.

WASHINGTON, June 6.—Immediately after the routine morning business of the House yesterday Mr. Catchings reported from the committee on rules an order respecting the further consideration of the bill to repeal the State bank tax. It provided for discussion throughout today's session under the five-minute rule, the vote on pending amendments and passage to be taken immediately after assembling of the House tomorrow. I have to print remarks on the bill was granted to all members, the privilege to extend over a period of the ten following days. After a short debate between Messrs. Reed and Catchings the resolution was agreed to—93 to 71.

Mr. Springer presented the substitute of the committee on banking and currency for the original Brawley bill as follows:

"That the operation of Sections 3,412 and 3,413, Revised Statutes, and Section 19, 20 and 21 of the Act to amend existing customs and internal revenue laws, and for other purposes, approved February 8, 1875, and all other sections of said Revised Statutes, and all Acts and parts of Acts imposing a tax of 10 per cent. on the amount of certain notes when used for circulation and paid out, be and are hereby suspended as to any such notes which were originally issued between August 1, 1893, and October 15, 1893, and no such tax shall be collected on the amount of any such notes. Provided, that nothing herein shall suspend the operation of such Acts as to the tax on amount of any such notes paid out and used for circulation after January 1, 1894."

Mr. Cox offered his amendment repealing all the laws and parts of laws which impose a tax on State bank circulation.

Mr. Bowers, Republican, of California, said the bill was intended as a premium upon the violation of the law; it was a notification to the banks having made their pile that the penalty of the law would not be enforced against them for subsequent violations, and a notice to the country that the New York banks, which were the cause of the trouble, were to be run the Government.

Mr. Grow, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said a national bank was just as much a local bank as though it had been chartered by a State.

Mr. Livingston, Democrat, of Georgia, said the 10 per cent. tax law should be repealed, because it was intended as a measure of protection to the national bank system, and that system no longer needed protection.

Mr. Talbert, Democrat, of South Carolina, said that he would vote for the Brawley bill and for the repeal of the 10 per cent. tax for the reason that the latter was in the Democratic platform. For him, he said, party platforms were made not only to get in on, but to stand on after he got in. Gentlemen who came into the House after having been elected on a Democratic platform and repudiated the platform, "repudiating them selves over the face of the earth and not knee-deep anywhere," need not be surprised if the people repudiated them and the Democratic party.

Mr. Q. sign, Republican, of New York, spoke against the proposition to repeal the existing tax on State bank issues.

his belief was that if proper system of State banks was established, by the end of the century the country would do its business upon a volume of currency of less per capita than the volume of currency today.

Speaking of the work accomplished by the State banks in the past, Mr. Harter said the Government never had such a friend nor such an efficient ally as the State banks of 1860. They were stronger than the Government, maintaining gold payments long after the latter had suspended. The national banking system, he said, was based upon the State banks, but unfortunately for the country since the best features of the State banks had not been taken in establishing national banks. In conclusion Mr. Harter pleaded with Republicans, upon patriotic grounds, to vote for the repeal of the tax law, asserting that with the accomplishment of that purpose would disappear the great drawback—the and the free silver craze.

Mr. Bland, of Missouri: "Not a bit of it."

Mr. Harter: "I want to say that no man on the floor of the House gives up so much in voting for this bill as does the gentleman from Missouri. A candidate for the Presidency, [cheers and applause] the moment he votes for this bill his platform disappears from beneath his feet and never comes to appear." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Newlands, Populist, of Nevada, said the disease which was sought to be remedied by the proposed legislation was a world-wide disease, due to falling prices, due to the appreciation of gold. He criticized the bill because it was incompetent to do that which was expected of it.

Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi, and Mr. Wheeler, Democrat, of Alabama, spoke briefly, and at 5.35 o'clock the House adjourned until today at noon.

After some further discussion today a vote was taken on the Cox amendment to repeal the 10 per cent. tax outright. The vote was announced as votes 102, nays 170. The following is the vote in detail on Cox's amendment to repeal the 10 per cent. bank tax law:

Yeas—Alexander, Arnold, Bailey, Bankhead, Bell (Tex.), Black (Ga.), Bland, Boatner, Bower, Branch, Breckenridge (Ky.), Bunn, Cabanis, Campbell, Catchings, Clark (Mo.), Cobb (Ala.), Cockrell, Cooper (Fla.), Cooper (Ga.), Cox, Crain, Cox, Crayford, Culberson, Summing, Davey, Dearmond, Denison, Dinsmore, Edmonds, Ellis (Ky.), English, Claib, Enloe, Esper, Fithian, Fyau, Geary, Gorman, Grady, Hall (Mo.), Harter, Heard, Henderson (N. C.), Hutchenson, Izlar, Jones, Latta, Lawson, Lester, Livingston, Maddox, McGuire, Mallory, Marshall, McCulloch, McDearmon, McLaughlin, McMillin, Melroe, Meredith, Money, Montgomery, Morgan, Moses, Neill, Oates, Ogden, O'Neill, (Mo.), Paschal, Patterson, Layner, Pendleton, (Tex.), Robbins, Russell (Ga.), Sayers, Shell, Snodgrass, Stauffer, Stockdale, Stone (Ky.), Strait, Swanson, Talbert, Tate, Terry, Tracey, Tucker, Turner (Ga.), Turner (Va.), Turpin, Washington, (Va.), Wilson, (Va.), Wilson (W. Va.), Wise, Woodard and the Speaker—102—all Democrats.

Nays—Republicans: Adams (Pa.) Aldrich, Apsey, Babcock, Baker (N. H.), Bartholdi, Belden, Bingham, Blair, Broderick, Broolis, Cannon (Ill.), Chickering, Cook, Hill, Conner, Curtis (Kan.), Dalzell, Daniels, Dingey, Dooliver, Doolittle, Drayer, Ellis (Ore.), Funston, Gillet (N. Y.), Groat, Grow, Hager, Hainer, Harmer, Hartman, Haughen, Heppner, Herrmann, Hicks, Hitt, Hooker (N. Y.), Hopper, (Pa.), Howell, Hubert, Johnson (Ind.), Johnson (N. D.), Kiefer, Lucy, Linton, Loudenstager, Lucas, Mahon, Marsh, Marvin, McCall, McCleary, McKeljohn, Mercer, Murray, Northway, Payne, Perkins, Phillips, Pickler, Rivers, E. D. Porter, Quinn, Ray, Reed, Rubin, Robinson, Scales, Shaw, Smith, Stephenson, Stone (C. W. of Pa.), Stone (W. A. of Pa.), Sweet, Tawney, Taylor (Tenn.), Thomas, Undergraff, Vanvorhis (Ohio), Walker, Wanger, Waugh, Wheeler (Ill.), Wilson (Ohio), Wilson (Wash.), Woodard, Wright (Mass.),—80.

BRAYTON'S REASONS

For Trying to Overthrow the Registration Laws.

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 7.—The following letter was published this morning:

"As I am the one mainly responsible for the institution of the proceedings in the Supreme Court to have the constitutionality of the registration law of the State tested, it may not be amiss to state the reasons which have governed my action."

This law enforced according to its provisions is more harsh, restrictive and obnoxious to fundamental principles than is generally known. It disfranchises every voter who passes one registration period without getting his certificate, regardless of the causes. If absent, sick, crowded out or indifferent he is subjected to the same penalty. It disfranchises every voter not previously registered, and it is contrary to the spirit of the act, if a man is quired, his right to vote abrogated and he is remediless.

The law bases the right of electors to vote, not upon the registration, but equally upon the presentation at the polls of the certificates of registration. It is anomalous and un-American to say that the inalienable and sovereign right of suffrage must be confined to a flimsy piece of paper liable to be lost, destroyed, mislaid or stolen. The putting of the closing day of registration on the first Monday of July is contrary to the spirit and understood meaning of registration and is subversive of the franchise, making registration close before it should, and in other States does, begin, and before the excitement of the campaign and the eagerness of the elector have directed the attention and aroused the interest of the voters, cannot have for its object the purpose inherent in registration as declared essential by the courts and authorities, or abridging suffrage, but it is clearly to deprive voters of the possession and exercise of their constitutional rights.

The making secret the registration records is only destructive of the fundamental rights of voters and is contrary to the principles inherent in registration. A registration to be constitutional must be easy, free, impartial and public, and its purpose should be to provide for the regulation of suffrage and to prevent repeating. Some States have considered the expediency of regulation an illegal restraint and infringement of the right of suffrage. Besides the registration books having been in use twelve years are dilapidated, confused and unreliable.

To these constitutional provisions of the law are added the irritating, expensive and unnecessary exaction of forcing voters to go to the Supervisor's office and the getting of new certificates in case of their loss or the moving from the county precinct or change of residence. Under the operation of this law it is estimated there are one hundred thousand negroes and thirty thousand whites either disfranchised or disqualified from voting. In addition to the constitutional defects of the law, it affords for evasions and partisan manipulation. Heretofore the Republicans have had to encounter and endure these. Those who have not studied the law or practiced its iniquities can not comprehend the advantage to realize those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried by a mere majority in 1892 without it and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the opponent to scotch those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white man will submit to control when the