

PROHIBITION ADDRESS.

Conference Address to the Voters of South Carolina.

The prohibitionists of South Carolina, in appealing to the Democratic voters to join them in suppressing the liquor traffic in this State, deem it proper and right that they should clearly and unequivocally state their position with reference to the business conducted in the name of the commonwealth, which thereby makes all its citizens responsible in a measure for the continuance of this traffic, which we believe to be a crime against humanity and a means of degradation to the people.

In the first place we have chosen to make this contest at the Democratic primary because we are members of this political organization, which is in virtual control of all the affairs of the State.

We have the right to raise this issue within the party lines because the machinery of the State government has been used to contract and operate a system of liquor selling, which has for its chief object the constant increase of the consumption of liquors by the citizens of the State, mainly with the view of making money out of the business in which the State is engaged. We would violate conscience and prove recreant to duty as good citizens if we did not protest against this iniquitous method of obtaining money through the sensual indulgence and debauchery of our citizenship, and we are making this protest in a fair, manly and consistent way, appealing to the higher instincts of humanity, and pleading for the social, domestic, moral, religious and political elevation of our whole people. By banishing the evils now fastened upon the State in consequence of the system under which the sale of liquor is conducted, we would protect our young manhood, bring relief to wronged and suffering women and children, and inaugurate an era which would eventually rid our homes of the blight following the use of liquor as a beverage. The State is now encouraging this use of liquor on the part of its citizens when it should by every means discourage that which wastes the resources, paralyzes the energies and destroys the manliness of those who should be the shield and protection of our homes. The State is engaged for profit in a business that strips the home of comforts with as much certainty as a cyclone mows down the mighty forest; a business that opens the gates of perdition to lost souls; a business that the genius of hell has never fashioned a more complete method of recruiting its ranks; a business that has borne from time immemorial the badge of disgrace in civilized and Christian communities, and that is now exalted in the sovereign and enlightened commonwealth of South Carolina to the dignity of government service and government protection, so that our youth are taught by the example of the government itself that the manufacture and sale of liquor is an honorable and desirable occupation. Whence came this usurper of governmental authority? Did the citizens of the State decree its introduction as "the best solution of the liquor question?"

Eight years ago the prohibitionists of South Carolina asked the privilege of testing public opinion as to whether licensed saloons should be prohibited within its borders. This request was made of the managers of the Democratic election machinery, who consented that a separate and unofficial box might be placed at each poll where every voter could cast a ballot for or against prohibition. The opponents of the license system were without efficient organization, but the voters voluntarily went to the polls and rolled up a decided majority against the saloons. Political exigencies did not favor a prohibitory law, and although a majority of the House of Representatives passed such a law, enough members were Catterward found to reject the law which they had called in framing and a substitute was discovered in the present dispensary system. "Ye asked for bread and were given a stone; ye asked for a fish and were given a serpent."

Prohibitionists were then placed in an awkward position and many of them knew not what to do. The saloon had been abolished, and this was one of the objects for which they had struggled in the past, yet liquor selling was not stopped. On the contrary, the State had been made to engage in the business under the pretence of controlling the traffic and giving to consumers a commodity that was "chemically pure," at a price that would not admit of profit. This was coupled with the declaration that the system thus inaugurated without the consent of the people was "a step towards prohibition," and many acquiesced in the legislation with the belief that the State would really undertake to minimize the consumption of liquor.

It was a law upon the statute books, and many of the law-abiding and peace-loving citizens, though honestly opposed to liquor selling in any shape, threw the weight of their influence in favor of the execution of the law.

An armed constabulary was furnished with guns to shoot down citizens who violated the liquor law, if in the judgment of the constables it was necessary to enforce their authority, and thus began a long reign of violence and turbulence in the land, for the law breakers were as ready and anxious to shoot as the men "clothed with a little brief authority," who acted upon the theory that their own lives were in constant peril, and their surest defence was to take quick and

deadly aim. The bloody catalogue need not to be dwelt upon, for it is the most shameful record in the history of the State, with the single exception of the reign of the carpet-bagger and the scalawag. Meanwhile the law was contested at every step, and the courts were invoked to compass its destruction, with the result that the main features of the system were sustained by the courts, and the statute was unimpeded in its progress towards prohibition. Dispensers neglected to observe some of the most salutary features of the law and themselves became violators where they were expected to become guardians; minors and drunkards have found it easy enough to procure liquor with or without the connivance of the dispenser; "chemically pure" has become a by-word and to mean the vilest of the vile; the agents of the State have defrauded and defalcated in large numbers, and few have been made to feel the penalties for their misdemeanors; the State board of control has more than once become an exhibition of exceeding offence in the nostrils of the good people of the commonwealth, so that time and again it was necessary to make changes and bring about reformations; scandals almost without number have tracked its pathway; charges of dishonesty have been constant, and the public was made familiar with rebates and the sample room; in a word, the entire system has been permeated with suspicion, distrust and causes of offence in striking contrast with the honorable record of South Carolina glorious past.

Has the system proven "a step towards prohibition"? Not in the sense that originated this phrase, but in another and truer sense the demand for actual and honest prohibition of the liquor traffic has been largely increased by the failures and shortcomings of the dispensary system, which has been "weighed in the balances and found wanting." That is the indictment we bring against it to-day, and to the Democratic voters we turn for a verdict. In its stead we would offer them still further restriction of the liquor traffic, destroying the profit and beverage features of the present system, and limiting the sale of alcoholic liquors to strictly necessary purposes, such as medicinal, mechanical and sacramental uses. This substitution would take away the odium of the State's being engaged in a business that is prostituting the youth of the country, wasting the resources of the poorer classes, bringing disgrace and degradation upon families, impoverishing the homes of our citizens, and withholding bread from the women and children who are cursed with the blight of the drink demon. Prohibition offers an opportunity to work for the elevation of the entire people, the better instruction and training of the young, the creation of incentives to industry, and the moral advancement of the State to keep pace with its material prosperity.

The benefits of a prohibitory law will not be fully realized in a year or even in five years, for the longer such a law is in existence with reasonable chances of enforcement the greater

will be the benefits derived from its presence as a permanent policy of the State. A generation that shall grow up without any knowledge of liquor saloons, whether operated by individuals or the State, will be a population noted for its sobriety, which will be the rule and not the exception among the young men. Once firmly rooted and grounded in the minds of the people, a prohibitory measure will come to be regarded as a necessity. More than a generation has passed since this law was enacted in Maine, and for a long time there was a vigorous fight against its continuance, but at this time both political parties are pledged to its maintenance as the settled policy of the State. The cry of repeal has been frequently raised, and not many years ago one of the political parties made repeal a plank in its platform, with the result that not more than a half dozen members were elected to the House of Representatives, which has over one hundred in its membership, and the fight for repeal was an ignominious failure.

Gen. Neal Dow, who was the apostle of prohibition, a man of upright character and irreproachable veracity, in his testimony before a Canadian commission on the liquor traffic, declared that there was no State in the Union where more liquor was consumed in proportion to population than in Maine, prior to the passage of the prohibitory law. It was then one of the poorest States, and under prohibition it has become one of the most prosperous, largely the result of savings by the people from the discontinuance of the liquor traffic. He said it was quite within the mark to say that not one-twentieth as much liquor is sold clandestinely in that State as was sold by the saloons before this law was passed. Portland, its chief city where Gen. Dow lived and died, had seven distilleries and two breweries, while many cargoes of rum were brought every year from the West Indies, and now liquor is sold there on a very small scale, the quantity not a hundredth part of what it was in the olden time. His estimate was that there is a saving of \$24,000,000 annually, which goes to increase the prosperity of the masses, and he declared that it is far within the truth to say that \$1,000,000 would pay for all the liquor smuggled into Maine and sold in violation of the law. This is the testimony of a man who spent the best years of his life even down to ex-

treme old age in advocating a clause that he knew was beneficial in a moral, religious, industrial and financial sense. A whole generation has grown up there without being witnesses to the effects of liquor, and there are grown men and women who have never seen a drunk man. Is not such a state of affairs worth striving for, even though the attainment of such a result involves sacrifice, toil and endurance on the part of its advocates? Christian men and women can well afford to make the sacrifice and bear the toil, because it is in the direct line of obedience to their Master.

The contest we are entering upon is not child's play. The Prohibition Democrats of South Carolina are not responsible that the issue has to be made on the political hustings. There is no choice left to us except to abandon the field, wherein we would prove recreant to the most solemn obligations that rest upon a Christian people, charged with the moral and religious elevation of those around us. To relinquish the field means the continuation of the liquor traffic under the aegis of our beloved South Carolina, and perpetuates a system that is undermining the public weal and destroying the probity of our public men, a system that sanctions with the broad seal of the State an annulment of the divine injunction, "Woe unto him that gives his neighbor drink, * * * and maketh him drunken also." Every day, and every hour through the day, the State of South Carolina is vouching that which destroys the souls of men, and the servants of God cannot remain indifferent or unconcerned while this law is contained in the statute books. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people," and the hideous enormity of this sin of drunkenness fostered by the State must not longer stain the proud escutcheon of our common mother. We must protest against anomalous perversion of governmental power by which every citizen of the State is made responsible for a traffic that is abominable in the eyes of God. The means of our protest is through the political agency with which we are in part entrusted as citizens of South Carolina and we come now to make an appeal to our fellow-citizens that they will join us in restoring the old commonwealth to a right relation, whereby the liquor traffic will be put under ban, so that our rulers and lawmakers will be spared the necessity of legislating to increase the sin of drunkenness within our borders. To do this effectually we are compelled to make this issue at the Democratic primary, and hence to have representatives of our principles who will contend for them before the people, and "seek to obtain control of the executive and legislative departments of the State government." This is no unworthy aim or object, and we proclaim these purposes, which are not hid in a corner, to our political associates, demanding the right to make the issue at the primary polls, and insisting that fairness and justice requires the recognition of our representatives inside the party lines, where every other issue is settled for the maintenance of good government in this State. We deny that any class of Democrats have peculiar and special privileges accorded to them under the constitution and laws of the party, and we will maintain our right to be heard on the hustings and to cast a free, untrammelled ballot at the polls.

The right of dogs to run at large in the country without being shot, provided they are doing no harm, is discussed in an interesting opinion by the Mississippi Supreme Court in the case of Hodges vs. Causey. Causey shot and killed Hodges's dog, a deerhound, as she was running through corn rows in Causey's field in Sunflower County. For this, Hodges sued Causey. In defense, Causey said that his place was posted, that he had twice warned Hodges to keep his dogs off his (Causey's) place, and that he shot the deerhound as she was running through the corn rows to prevent her from damaging growing cotton which was in the same field. The jury decided in favor of Causey. The Supreme Court, in ordering a new trial, quoted with approval law to the effect that "one is never justified in going to excessive lengths in the defense of himself or his property from assault or injury"; that "the method of defence must bear a certain relation to the character or seriousness of the threatened injury," and that "the fact that a dog is trespassing does not justify his wanton or malicious destruction." The court pointed out that the corn through which the dog was running was fully matured (it was in November), and that at the time she was shot she had done no damage to the cotton. The court said the jury should have been allowed to say whether, in view of all the circumstances, the killing was reasonable.

Getting at the Facts.

Wife (after the honeymoon)—Why did you deceive me about your income? Husband—I didn't, my dear. Wife—Yes, you did. You told me you were getting \$50 a week when you asked me to marry you. Husband—You evidently misunderstood me. I said my position was worth \$50—and so it is—but for some reason best known to the boss he gives me only \$10.—Chicago News.

THE CAMPAIGN.

Candidates Asked to File Their Pledges at Once.

In a short while the campaigners will take the field and the biennial tour of the political orators will be on in full blast. The reorganization of the Democratic party has now been completed, and the State chairman, Wille Jones, is making all arrangements preliminary to the starting of the campaign company on the road. The new county chairman and committee have all been chosen, the new State committee has remodeled the rules and fixed the assessments upon candidates, and it is "up to" the candidates themselves. Col. Jones has asked that all candidates be urged to send to him at once their pledges and the amounts sufficient to pay their assessments. The new rules require that the pledges must be on file and the assessments paid before midnight of June 14, in order to secure recognition as a candidate in the Democratic primary election. This rule applies also to candidates for Congress and solicitor, who must deal direct with the State chairman. Col. Jones will be at the opening meeting at Orangeburg, but he wishes to have every candidate declared as such prior to the day preceding this meeting. One candidate, Mr. Cole L. Blease, who is in the race for lieutenant governor, has already complied with the requirements.

THE NEW RULES.

Here are the new rules as adopted by the State executive committee at its meeting Wednesday night; copies will soon be sent the county executive committees:

The following rules shall govern the membership of the different subordinate Democratic clubs of this State, the qualification of voters at the primary elections held by the party, the conduct of the primary elections to be held on the last Tuesday (the 28th day) of August, A. D. 1900, and the second primary held two weeks later, if one be necessary.

Rule 1. The qualification for membership in any subordinate club of the Democratic party of this State, or for voting at a Democratic primary, shall be as follows, viz: The applicant for membership or voter shall be 21 years of age, or shall become so before the succeeding general election and be a white Democrat, or a negro who voted for Gen. Hampton in 1876, and who has voted the Democratic ticket continuously since. Provided, That no white man shall be excluded from participation in the Democratic primary who shall take the pledge required by the rules of the Democratic party.

The managers at each box at the primary election shall require every voter in a Democratic primary election to pledge himself to abide the result of the primary, and to support the nominees of the party, and to take the following oath and pledge, viz: "I do solemnly swear that I am duly qualified to vote at this election according to the rules of the Democratic party, and that I have not voted before at this election, and pledge myself to support the nominees of this primary."

Rule 2. Every negro applying for membership in a Democratic club, or offering to vote in a Democratic primary election, must produce a written statement of ten reputable men who shall swear that they know of their own knowledge that the applicant or voter voted for Gen. Hampton in 1876, and has voted the Democratic ticket continuously since. The said statement shall be placed in the ballot box by the managers, and returned with the poll lists to the county chairman. The managers of election shall keep a separate list of the names of all negro voters, and return it with the poll list to the county chairman.

No person shall be permitted to vote unless he has been enrolled on a club list at least five days before the said primary election.

The club lists shall be inspected by and certified to by the president and secretary and turned over to the managers to be used as the registry lists.

Rule 3. Each county executive committee of the Democratic party in this State shall meet on or before the first Monday in August of each election year, and shall appoint three managers for each primary election provided for under the Democratic constitution, in accordance with the acts of the general assembly of this State regulating primary elections, the constitution of the Democratic party of this State, and the rules herein set forth. The names of such managers may be published by the chairman of each county executive committee in one or more county papers at least two weeks before the election.

Rule 4. Each voter in said primary shall vote two ballots, on which shall be printed the names of the candidates for each of the offices to be filled, together with the name of the office, the voter striking out the names of those for whom he does not wish to vote. No tickets shall be considered legal except those furnished by the State or county executive committees, said tickets containing the names of each candidate for each office. The tickets to be voted shall be in the following forms, one for—

United States Senator.
Governor.
Lieutenant governor.
Secretary of State.
Comptroller General.
State Treasurer.
Adjutant and Inspector General.
State Superintendent of Education.

Attorney General.
Railroad Commissioner.
The other spaces to suit the different counties—
For Congress, ——— district.
For Solicitor, ——— judicial district.
State Senator.
House of Representatives.
Sheriff.
Judge of Probate.
Clerk of Court.
County Supervisor.
Coroner.
County Superintendent of Education.
Treasurer.
Auditor.

No vote for house of representatives shall be counted unless it contains as many names as the county is entitled to representatives.

The oath each candidate must take is as follows: "As a candidate for the office of ——— in the Democratic primary, to be held on the last Tuesday in August, 1900, I hereby pledge myself to abide the result of such primary and support the nominees thereof, and that I am not, nor will I become the candidate of any faction, either privately or publicly suggested, other than the regular Democratic nomination."

Rule 5. The managers of election shall open the polls at 8 a. m. and shall close them at 4 o'clock p. m. After tabulating the result the managers shall certify the same and forward the ballot box, poll list, and all other papers relating to such election, by one of their number or executive committee-man to the chairman of the respective Democratic county executive committees within 48 hours after the close of the polls.

Rule 6. The county Democratic executive committees shall assemble at their respective court houses on the morning of the second day after the election on or before 12 o'clock m., to tabulate the returns and declare the result of the primary, so far as the same relates to members of the general assembly and county officers, and shall forward immediately to the chairman of the State executive committee at Columbia, S. C., the result of the election in their respective counties for United States Senator, State officers, congressmen and solicitors.

Rule 7. The protests and contests for county officers shall be filed within five days after the election with the chairman of the county executive committee, and said executive committee shall hear and decide protests and contests as to United States Senator, State officers, congressmen and solicitors, and 10 days shall be allowed for filing the same.

Rule 8. Candidates for the general assembly and for county offices shall file with the chairman of the county executive committee a pledge, in writing, to abide the result of the primary and support the nominees thereof. Candidates for other offices shall file such pledge with the chairman of the State executive committee. Provided, That the pledge of such candidates shall be filed on or before the first campaign meeting of the county or State respectively. Candidates for congress and solicitor must file their pledges with the chairman of the State executive committee on the same day as State officers. No vote for any candidate who has not complied with this rule and has not paid his assessment shall be counted.

Rule 9. In the primary elections herein provided for, a majority of the votes cast shall be necessary to nominate candidates. A second primary, when necessary, shall be held two weeks after the first, as provided for under the constitution of the party, and shall be subject to the rules governing the first primary. At said second primary the two highest candidates alone shall run for any one office, but if there are two or more vacancies for any particular office, then double the number of candidates shall run for vacancies to be filled. For instance, in a race for sheriff, the two highest shall run.

Rule 10. In the event of a tie between two candidates in the second primary, the county chairman, if it is a county office and the State chairman, if it is for United States Senator, State officers, congressmen or solicitors, shall order the third primary. The question of a majority vote shall be determined by the number of votes cast for any particular office, and not by the whole number of votes cast in the primary.

Rule 11. Each county executive committee shall furnish the managers at each precinct two ballot boxes, one for State officers and the other for congressman, solicitor and county officers.

American locomotives and cars in Egypt call forth from Lord Cromer, the British Minister and Consul-General in Egypt, the following explanation: He says that while the railway authorities prefer adhering to British locomotives, as the men are acquainted with their peculiarities, when time and cost are considered the British manufacturer cannot compete with the American. The latter offer engines, built on standard American plans, at lower prices and in less time than they can be secured from British or European builders. The British manufacturers, on the other hand, not being in the habit of building engines to standard plans of their own, content themselves with tendering on the designs of the Egyptian railway authorities; with the result that these specially made engines cost much more money and take much more time to build.