

**WE BEG TO
ANNOUNCE**



OUR ANNUAL FALL DISPLAY

**Of Millinery and
Dress Goods
FOR FALL AND WINTER**

**THURSDAY
October 1, 1903**

And to invite ALL the ladies and the public generally TO COME and see these lines. We know that you will be pleased.

Thanking you for your patronage and asking you to keep the good work up, we are,

Respectfully,

Lancaster Mercantile Company

EVIDENCE ALL IN.

A Review of the Evidence in the Jim Tillman Case by W. W. Ball.

With the testimony all heard in the case of James H. Tillman and the arguments about to begin, it may be interesting to emphasize some of the points that have made themselves conspicuously plain in the proceedings.

In spite of the injection of politics into the trial, in spite of the dragging in of Senator B. R. Tillman's name, it has been demonstrated sufficiently that men of the former Reform or Tillmanite have had no more sympathy with the shooting of Mr. Gonzales than members of the faction that he was formerly identified with. Look at the example of Mr. Talbird—a reformer and a State senator. It was to be expected that he would tell the truth to the best of his ability, to the best of his recollection, and that is what, without doubt, he did. Adams and Dowling too, were Tillman's friends—close friends. They are among the strongest witnesses for the State. This is no matter for surprise. Politics does not affect the sanctity of an honest man's oath.

What the political views of Mr. Wilson, chief clerk in the office of Comptroller General Jones, maybe I donot know. He was a witness sworn for the defense. He was the only eye-witness sworn for the defense whose testimony was not attacked. His testimony was valuable and only valuable in corroborating the theory of the State, it strengthened the dying declaration of Mr. Gonzales—it placed Tillman from two to two and a half feet only from the outside of the sidewalk and made the direction of his aimed weapon transverse, across the sidewalk, towards the

At the bail hearing, one H. Hall made an affidavit, claiming that he was an eye witness to the shooting and corroborating in "every particular" the account given by Richard Holsonback. Such the record shows. Hall was present at the trial last week. He was present when Lorick was on the stand or immediately after. The defense did not swear him. Why? Was the hard lesson of Lorick's testimony enough? And yet Holsonback and Lorick are the only eye-witnesses, except the prisoner, who in any degree support the defense. Holsonback's character has been attacked. Lorick was not allowed to answer questions imputing that more than once he had been charged with larceny.

The witness Hyatt for the defense swore that he saw a pistol in Mr. Gonzales' hip pocket the day before the shooting and the one thing about the appearance of Mr. Gonzales that he was emphatically sure of was that he did not wear glasses. The defense admits as true that Mr. Gonzales without glasses could not see sufficiently "to walk the streets." Hyatt saw the pistol when Mr. Gonzales was leaning over to spit in a cuspidor—not wearing glasses.

At some distance the prisoner saw Mr. Gonzales approaching and "eyeing him intently." How far away can you tell that a man wearing glasses is "eyeing" you?

Senators Brown, Talbird, Mrs. Melton, Mr. Lide, August Schiedman and others testify that Mr. Gonzales was almost abreast of the two senators and Tillman when the shot was fired. The course of the bullet proves it. Tillman told Spann Dowling at the jail that the bullet would shoot straight.

Clark and others swear that Holsonback gave to them statements about the shooting that

THE OLD RELIABLE



**Absolutely Pure
THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE**

conflict with his bail affidavit and statement on the witness stand. Holsonback declares that when Tillman was about at Gervais street he was at the State house steps and overtook Tillman by the time of the shooting; while Tillman was crossing the street!

Witness White did not know Mr. Gonzales; his testimony as to the "white feather" threat is wholly dependent on that of Holsonback.

Tillman swore in his testimony that he wrote the Wimsboro News and Herald article in 1890 and acknowledged a moment later his own letter of 1892 saying that he did not write it.

Tillman swore that W. H. Newbold told him that he might expect Mr. Gonzales, if he drew his pistol, to draw it from his side coat pocket. Newbold was the trial but was not sworn. his bail affidavit Tillman swore that he knew nothing of Mr. Gonzales' habit of carrying his hands in his coat pockets.

The case for the defense substantially is that Tillman had heard of attacks by Holsonback. That he was expecting an attack. That he believes from the State's editorials that its editor was in a frame of mind to kill him. That he saw Mr. Gonzales on the outside of the sidewalk. That Mr. Gonzales turned to the inside and thrust his hands deeper into his pockets in a way that he interpreted and offensive. That he placed his hand in his pistol when he saw Mr. Gonzales. That the turn by Mr. Gonzales brought him towards Tillman. That Mr. Gonzales' thumb was out when Tillman first saw him and that he plunged his whole hand in his pocket. That he fired because he believed that he was about to be shot.

Why should Editor Gonzales wish to have killed Tillman? Tillman was not in his way. As a candidate for office he had been defeated and discredited. He was in nobody's way. His term of office as lieutenant-governor about to expire would have made him a noble and sacrificed part of the editor of The State. It would have meant, speaking from a purely selfish point of view, at least serious if not permanent interruption to his career as a newspaper editor. Five months previous Tillman's defeat had been effected. Tillman's personality had been dismissed from his paper and from his mind. Tillman's attacks on Gonzales had been wholly harmless. His denunciation from the stump had counted for nothing. Everybody in South Carolina knows this.

If Mr. Gonzales had shot Tillman, if he were in the dock today instead of Tillman, his defense might have been insanity, for any jury would have said that an act