

The Manning Times.

VOL. XXII

MANNING, S. C. WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1908

NO. 20

SHOT BY HIS SON

Judge Hargis, Famous Figure in Kentucky Political Annals.

DIES WITH BOOTS ON.

Beach Hargis, Young Son of the Judge, While Drinking Shoots His Father Five Times in His Own Store.—The Dead Man Was Mixed Up in Many Scrapes and Had Been Tried for Murder.

At Jackson, Ky., former County Judge James Hargis, for many years member of the State Democratic executive committee, accused of complicity in many killings, and prominent figure in the feuds which have disrupted Breathitt County for several years, was shot and killed in his store about 3:30 P. M. Thursday by his son, Beach Hargis. The son fired five shots in rapid succession at his father, who fell dead while his clerks were waiting on customers.

The exact cause of the murder has not been learned, but it is supposed to have been the result of differences which have existed between father and son for some time.

The two men are reported to have had a severe quarrel several nights ago, when the father, it is alleged, was compelled to resort to violence to restrain his son.

Young Hargis, it is said, had been drinking heavily of late. He came into the store Thursday afternoon and was apparently under the influence of liquor. Judge Hargis, it is said, spoke to his son about drinking and a quarrel resulted. Father and son stepped behind a counter when the son, after a minute's conversation, drew a revolver and fired five shots. Four took effect, Judge Hargis falling dead. The young lady stenographer and the customers in the store fled. Young Hargis was arrested and placed in jail. He was raving like a maniac and the officers were compelled to drag him to jail.

Judge Hargis had been for years a prominent figure in Kentucky in political and criminal circles. He has figured in the Courts in the mountains for years on account of the murders of Dr. Cox, Attorney Marcum and "Jim" Cockrell. Judge Hargis was present leader of the Democrats of the 10th district and was regarded as the "boss" of Breathitt County.

For years his sway was not opposed, but some years ago James B. Marcum had the temerity to oppose Hargis in a law case. From that day he was a marked man.

Judge Hargis had been on trial at various times for complicity in the murder of Marcum, "Jim" Cockrell and Dr. Cox, but had been acquitted on all of the charges. He was recently forced to pay a judgment of \$8,000 to Mrs. Marcum in connection with the death of her husband.

Judge Hargis had just disposed of this, the last of these cases in which he had been involved when he paid the judgment of the Court. Mrs. Marcum had sued Judge Hargis and others for \$100,000, alleging that they caused the death of her husband.

The Hargis-Cockrell feud had its inception in a political contest. The Hargises had long been dominant in Breathitt County, where they conducted a general store, were engaged in the lumber business and were generally active. The brothers, James, Alexander and Elbert, were good business men and accumulated a fortune.

THEY WANT FOOD.

MORSE RAN AWAY.

Big Trust Magnate Now a Fugitive From Justice.

Wrecked a Big New York Bank of Which He Was President, and Sailed for Liverpool.

A dispatch from New York says that Charles W. Morse, less than five months ago worth \$20,000,000, head of the Coastwise ship, and the ice trusts, capitalized at \$127,000,000, and in control of a chain of banks, capitalized at \$10,000,000, is a fugitive from justice, having sailed from New York for Liverpool.

When this came to light Receiver Hanna the official of the federal government, who has charge of investigation that the grand jury is making into the bank juggling which led to the failure of the Bank of North America, has attached his Fifth avenue mansion for \$243,321.25 due by Morse to the bank on promissory notes long over due.

Twice Morse has been before the grand jury where he was subjected to grilling examinations. It is known that indictment has been determined upon by the jurors, but it is stated by District Attorney Jerome that he knows of no reason why Morse should flee, fearing criminal prosecution.

Mrs. Morse, who was dragged through the scandals attendant upon the Dodge-Morse divorce case that landed Abe Hummel on Blackwell's Island, is living alone in the mansion at No. 728 Fifth Avenue. This stands in the name of Morse, and is said to be worth \$750,000. It is already mortgaged for a large amount and has been attached in a suit by R. A. C. Smith for \$155,732.36 in a claim for a conditional sale of five hundred shares of National Bank of North America stock and also libeled by the federal government for \$243,321.25.

In the wreck that followed the driving out of Morse from his presidencies and directorates in banks he controlled, his reputation by the management of the re-organized trust, the dropping out of sight of values of the ice trust stock and the wreck of banks that has followed the revelation of banking methods that have been criticised, Morse's fortune is believed to have been swept away in three months.

Reports of Morse's losses followed each other in rapid succession. One of these was that the creditor banks might unite in making him an involuntary bankrupt, thus absorbing the remnants of his fortune. Deputy sheriffs were kept busy serving copies of the attachment in the suit brought by Charles A. Hanna, receiver for the National Bank of North America, in New York, against Morse to recover \$243,321.25.

Copies of the attachment have been served on officers of the 14 banks in which Morse was supposed to have accounts. A deputy sheriff has seized 6,409 shares of stock of the Furnace Valley Copper, said to be owned by Morse. Another levied on stock in the Kingsland Copper Company, said to have been owned by Morse. A deputy sheriff also has served a copy of the attachment of K. A. Wilson, in charge of the Morse resident in 5th avenue.

Starling Story Told by a New York School Teacher.

That many of her pupils come without breakfast to school, that on occasions several have fainted in the class room from want of food, and that repeated appeals to charity organizations brought nothing more than long-delayed replies to the effect that "an investigation would be made" are among statements made by Mrs. C. T. Tower, principal of public school No. 114, at 73 Oliver street, New York.

WORKED SOUTHERN FOR PASSES

Young White Man Arrested at Greenville on New Charge.

J. H. Clark, a young white man, was arrested at Greenville on Thursday, charged with obtaining passes from the Southern Railway by making false representations. Clarke represented himself as being an engineer on the Southern, and in this way secured many passes. When arrested he had two quarterly passes of the New York Central on his person, and of them being made out to different parties.

EIGHTY-FIVE OPERATIONS

Were Performed on Woman Who Finally Succumbed.

At Peoria, Ill., Mrs. Martha Ann Davis, aged 60 years, died Thursday night after an illness of dropsy. During this time Mrs. Davis had been operated on 85 times, and 2,000 pounds of cotton from infected terpounds of water drawn off at different operations. Physicians declare the case to be one of the most singular of its kind in medical history.

He said that he had no right to know from whom he got his information, or what that information was in detail.

Represents Two Houses.

Senator Weston said that it is a penalty that men in public life pay to be misunderstood by some good men and to be misrepresented by some bad men. He had no apologies to make to any member of the senate or to any newspaper man or anybody else for his professional conduct. He had been honored by the people of Richland county for many years and it is for them to say whether his conduct meets with their approval.

He stated that the law firm with which he is connected, Weston & Aycock, represents two of the liquor

GOT VERY HOT.

Members of the Senate Gets Excited Over an Editorial

IN MANNING TIMES.

houses which have claims pending before the dispensary commission, but no man could say, he declared, that his vote or his actions in the senate were influenced by such relations. He said that one of the houses he represents placed their claims in his hands before the commission was established, the New York and Kentucky Distilling company.

Senator Christensen's Criticism.

Rising to a question of personal privilege, Mr. Christensen said: "I too, am an editor and during the sessions of the legislature have occasion to comment on events in the legislature. I have commented in a general way on the situation discussed by the senator from Clarendon in his paper and the senator from Richland, who has just taken his seat."

"It is my belief that the senator from Richland has not acted in any way inconsistent with his ideas of what is right and proper. But I disagree with him and have said so and propose to condemn his course again if I think proper. He represents some of these liquor houses whose claims are being investigated and some of the ex-State dispensary officials who are under indictment and thinks it proper and right as State senator to oppose in the senate the bill to provide the attorney general with funds to prosecute his clients. I disagree with him and have so stated elsewhere and wish to put myself on record here."

SENATOR RAYSON'S STATEMENT.

Senator Rayson said that he regretted that it was necessary for him to raise a question of personal privilege, but he felt compelled, under the circumstances, to enter his protest against the charges contained in the newspaper clipping which had been read.

He said he voted against the Ott's resolution because he considered it unwise, but he had publicly proclaimed from the floor of the senate that he would vote to give to the attorney general any amount of money he needed in the prosecution of cases arising from the investigation of the affairs of the State dispensary.

He thought that the attorney general should be given all the assistance necessary in these matters—in justice to the State and to the men under indictment the charges arising from that investigation should be alredy; the authorities ought to go to the bottom of them.

He said that he had never represented a whiskey house in any claim before the dispensary commission and he does not represent any of the parties who have been indicted as a result of the investigation of the affairs of the dispensary. He said he had been approached by the attorney general who was formerly connected with the State dispensary and although this man who was formerly connected with the State dispensary and although this man was a lifelong personal friend and he has confidence in his integrity he refused to consult with him until after the adjournment of the legislature.

SENATOR SINKLER WARMS UP.

Senator Sinkler also rose to a question of personal privilege and made some very caustic references to the publication in question. He said that he voted against the Ott's resolution because he considered it improper for the senate to pass such a resolution when the act of the general assembly of South Carolina is before a court for interpretation.

"But," he declared, "if any man imputes to me wrong motives for voting as I did on that measure, or charges me with being recreant to my duty to the State, that man hath not a leg to cover his naked indecency and it would be base flatery to call him a dog."

A FURTHER EXPLANATION.

Senator Appelt thought he could clarify the atmosphere to some extent by explaining that this article appeared long before the Ott's resolution was introduced and so far as he knew before that resolution was ever contemplated. No reflection was intended upon any member for having voted against that resolution as it would have been quite impossible to cast such reflections in advance of the introduction of the resolution and before the vote was taken. He had simply been given information contained in that article and got the information from a source which could be relied upon.

RESOLUTION OFFERED.

Immediately upon the senate reconvening at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, Senator Smith of Hampton offered the following resolution:

"Whereas, certain allegations have been made impeaching the honor and actions of members of the senate and house of representatives in regard to legislation upon the whiskey question now before the courts, the general assembly and the people of South Carolina.

"Be it resolved by the senate, that a committee consisting of two senators, to be appointed by the president of the senate, wait upon the author of said charges—the senator from Clarendon—and ask that he appear before the bar of the senate at 3 o'clock, P. M., February 10th instant, and produce the names and evidence in support of said charges."

SENATOR APPELT'S STATEMENT.

Senator Appelt, who had sat with silence under the stream of denunciation heaped upon him, but whose face had grown red and then white, came to his feet quickly when Senator Earle had concluded his remarks. He demanded to know if the senator from Oconee meant to say that he (Appelt) had stated what was a falsehood.

SENATOR APPELT'S STATEMENT.

Senator Earle said that the information contained in that article was false and insulting.

SENATOR APPELT DECLARED THAT A "TEMPEST IN A TEAPOT" HAD BEEN STIRRED UP.

He said that he wrote the article referred to and was alone responsible for its publication. He said that he based that article upon information which he regarded as authentic. No names were given to him by his informants, but he declared that he was satisfied that the statements contained in the article in so far as they related to members of the general assembly were absolutely correct. He said that while he was a member of the senate he was also an editor of a newspaper and felt privileged to criticize persons whenever he had information upon which to base such criticisms.

He said that if anybody was to be expelled from the senate it should be those senators who represent whiskey houses and who would use their official position to defeat the ends of legislation seeking to give to the attorney general funds with which to prosecute the grafters.

He said that Senator Earle had no right to know from whom he got his information, or what that information was in detail.

SENATOR APPELT'S STATEMENT.

With reference to this resolution, Senator Appelt said that he considered it untimely, uncalled for and unnecessary; that if he were required to appear before the bar of the senate he could do so, but that he would only reiterate what he had said at the morning session and no other statement would be made.

He declared that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

He said that he would not maliciously injure any man, and while he wrote the article in question and published it in his newspaper, he felt that no senator not guilty of what was charged in that article had a right to assume that it contained a charge against him. He said that he felt that it was not only his privilege but his duty to give to the public through his newspaper such information as is contained in that article and that he would continue to do so regardless of what action might be taken by the senator from Clarendon.

SIX MILL TAX.

Likely to be Levied for State Purposes This Year.

This Would Be an Increase of a Mill and a Half Over the Tax of Last Year.

The appropriation bill which was presented to the House Friday by the ways and means will carry the levy to five and one-half mills, and perhaps to six mills. The levy for 1907 is four and one-half mills, which was not sufficient to raise the appropriations.

SENATOR CHRISTENSEN'S CRITICISM.