

Constitutional Convention.

A BUSY AND EVENTFUL WEEK.

Dispensary, Divorce, Factories and Suffrage.

THE DISPENSARY QUESTION.

The Legislature is Given Three Months to Solve the Problem—Old Time Bar-rooms Not One of Them.

When the convention reassembled it gave to the vitally important matter of incorporating the dispensary law into the constitution.

A motion to indefinitely postpone Mr. Clayton's substitute was the pending question. This substitute was read as follows:

In the exercise of the police power the general assembly shall have no authority to license the sale of intoxicating liquors or beverages by persons or corporations within this State.

The general assembly may prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and beverages within the State, or may authorize and empower State and county officers, both or either, under the authority and in the name of the State, to buy in any market and sell and retail within the State intoxicating liquors and beverages in such packages and quantities, under such rules and regulations, as it deems expedient.

Mr. Clayton having returned, made a vigorous speech in support of his substitute, covering the points he elaborated last week.

Mr. Rogers said that any one of the three things provided for in the resolution as it stood would produce the results of the dispensary law.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Some question arose in the midst of Mr. Farrow's speech as to what had become of the bill which was introduced a few days ago by Senator Tillman.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Mr. Farrow continued, saying as compared with the liquor question, liquor was something to debase the whole land.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

penary method. He said that he felt that he would not delay his duty unless he should submit this proposition, although he well knew the temper of the convention. It was tabled on motion of Senator Tillman, four noon.

Senator Tillman then offered his amendment as follows: "Provided, That no license shall be granted to sell intoxicating liquors in less quantities than one-half pint or to sell them between sundown and sunrise, or to sell them to be drunk on the premises; and, provided, further, that the general assembly shall not delegate the power to issue licenses to sell the same to any municipal corporation."

It was put to the house, but the vote being closed, a division was demanded. It was known that the amendment was adopted by a vote of 87 to 26, Mr. Clayton being among those voting for it.

The word "intoxicating" was stricken out wherever it occurred in the section as amended, and the word "alcoholic" was substituted. This was done on motion of Senator Tillman.

Mr. Wilson offered an amendment that was in substance the same as Mr. Clayton's. Senator Tillman, he said, had been asked to give an amendment, but he was not prepared to do so.

Mr. Rogers said that any one of the three things provided for in the resolution as it stood would produce the results of the dispensary law.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Some question arose in the midst of Mr. Farrow's speech as to what had become of the bill which was introduced a few days ago by Senator Tillman.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Mr. Farrow continued, saying as compared with the liquor question, liquor was something to debase the whole land.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

The whole section was then adopted as amended and it had the parliamentary clincher put on it by Mr. Henderson. As it passed to a third reading it is as follows:

Section 14. In the exercise of the police power the general assembly shall have the right to prohibit the manufacture and sale and retail of alcoholic liquors or beverages within the State; and, provided, further, that the general assembly shall not delegate the power to issue licenses to sell the same to any municipal corporation."

It was put to the house, but the vote being closed, a division was demanded. It was known that the amendment was adopted by a vote of 87 to 26, Mr. Clayton being among those voting for it.

The word "intoxicating" was stricken out wherever it occurred in the section as amended, and the word "alcoholic" was substituted. This was done on motion of Senator Tillman.

Mr. Wilson offered an amendment that was in substance the same as Mr. Clayton's. Senator Tillman, he said, had been asked to give an amendment, but he was not prepared to do so.

Mr. Rogers said that any one of the three things provided for in the resolution as it stood would produce the results of the dispensary law.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Some question arose in the midst of Mr. Farrow's speech as to what had become of the bill which was introduced a few days ago by Senator Tillman.

Mr. Farrow then got the floor and proceeded to make a vigorous speech, mainly largely in the police powers of a State.

Mr. Farrow continued, saying as compared with the liquor question, liquor was something to debase the whole land.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. Henderson moved to table the Wilson amendment and this was done by an overwhelming vote.

following proviso to be added at the end of the section: "Provided, that nothing in sections 1 and 2 of this article be construed as prohibiting the general assembly from providing for the incorporation of the manufacturing towns of this State, under such restrictions and regulations as shall protect the rights of the citizens and prevent unjust encroachments upon property."

Mr. B. R. Tillman offered this substitute: "Provided, That a class to be known as the manufacturing towns shall be provided by the general assembly, and shall be incorporated wherever the population of such a community shall number 1,000, under such restrictions and regulations as shall protect the rights of the citizens and prevent unjust encroachments upon property."

Mr. Hutson thought that if in the judgment of the convention divorses should not be granted, Mr. Sheppard's amendment should be rejected. The advocates of divorses must show that they are necessary for morality, that they tend to elevate society, they have failed to sustain either of these positions.

Mr. Brazzale did not believe that the time would come when divorses would be necessary. He rather believed that the power to grant divorses should be given to the State, and he was opposed to a divorce law not only on account of morality, but as a matter of economy.

Nearly every session of the Legislature for several years while in the Legislature he has been a strong advocate of the amendment against committing adultery was sufficient justification for the adoption of the amendment.

The debate in regard to granting divorses in South Carolina is one of the most interesting and perhaps the ablest of all in the constitutional convention. The amendment offered by Mr. Henderson, of Aiken, was under consideration, which proposed to grant divorses on the ground of adultery, and that this amendment was strongly opposed.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress. When there is a wrong the law should be allowed to remedy it.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

Mr. Henderson in speaking on the subject said that we ought to bear in mind that the marriage ceremony is a contract between the man and God, and that when the man and God are united by the contract of the man and God, when the contract is broken the innocent party should be allowed to have redress.

charges that they are controlled by employers. If that is so, God help the man. I deny the imputation upon them.

Mr. Henderson said he had examined all the constitutions of States in this Union, and was unable to find where compulsory incorporation was legal.

The question was then called, and Mr. George Tillman's motion to lay all amendments on the table was carried by a vote of 93 to 44, as follows:

Yeas—Aldrich, Ashe, Atkinson, Austin, Barker, Barton, Bates, Behre, Brezazale, Bryce, J. S.; Brice, T. W.; Bust, Byrd, Clayton, Cooper, DeHay, Dennis, Dent, Douglass, Doyle, Elder, Evans, W. D.; Farrow, Field, Fitch, Fraser, Gammie, Garris, Gilliland, Glenn, J. L.; Graham, Gray, Harris, Hay, Haynesworth, Hemphill, Henderson, D. S.; Housar, Howell, Hutson, Jervoy, Johnston, Kennedy, E. J.; Kennedy, J. W.; Klugh, Lee, McDermotte, McGowan, McKagan, McManis, McWhite, Matthews, McWhorter, Nicholson, P. G.; Peake, Pease, Prince, Ragsdale, Read, J. H.; Redfern, Rogers, Russell, Sheppard, Sloan, Smith, A. J.; Smith, J. M.; Small, Smock, Spratt, Stackhouse, Stribling, Sullivan, Taylor, Tillman, G. D.; Timmerman, VonKoltitz, Wells, Whipper, White, A. H.; White, W. E.; Wiggs, Wiggins, 93.

Nays—Alexander, Barr, Bobb, Bowman, Burn, Cante, Carver, Connor, Cunningham, Dudley, Floyd, Gage, Gary, Gooding, Gunter, Hamel, Harrison, Housar, Irb, Johnson, E. J.; Lowman, McCalla, McCaslan, McCowan, Montgomery, J. D.; Moore, Morrison, Rowland, Smith, A. J