

THE DISPENSARY ISSUE.

SENATOR TILLMAN REPLIES TO DR. CROMER.

Denies that He Has or Intends to Appeal to Factionalism—Declares Old Lines Can Not Be Drawn.

Following is the reply of Senator B. R. Tillman to the "open letter" of Dr. George B. Cromer, former president of Newberry college and now mayor of Newberry:

Hon. Geo. B. Cromer. My Dear Sir: As your "open letter" appeared in the Sunday News and Courier and in today's Columbia State, I presume you expect an answer through the same medium.

I desire in the beginning to express my appreciation of your kindly and complimentary allusions to myself. I value them more highly because in the past you have not been my political friend.

I have read your letter carefully and have endeavored to judge your arguments and weigh the points you present as "sane" as may be. It is not always possible for men to agree even though both are actuated by the highest and purest motives, and it is therefore natural that you should misjudge me in some things and disagree with me in others.

Now about the appeal to factionalism: I deny absolutely that I have made such an appeal or intend to make such an appeal, and in justification of the truthfulness of this statement let me remind you of what I said at Edgefield. To quote: "I do not wish to revive factionalism and I am sorry to be compelled to have the appearance of doing so. I am aware that many of the strongest supporters of the dispensary now are men who were and are yet probably Conservatives while some of its most bitter antagonists are former Reformers. It therefore cannot be charged that I am endeavoring to draw the old lines which rent the State in twain." Again: "I want this matter settled entirely apart from my personal and political fortunes. It is a much greater question for the people of South Carolina as to how they shall wisely and best govern the sale of liquor than as to whether I or some one else represents them in the senate. I know there are many men who will vote for me regardless of their former political affiliations and of their present attitude on this question, and it is possible that there will be many who will be aggrieved at my activity in dealing with the question."

When a public man is viciously attacked with slander and abuse and there is every indication of a purpose to press that attack in the next Democratic primary with a view to his overthrow, it seems to me it is perfectly legitimate for him to give notice to his friends and his enemies alike to what is going on and let all hands understand that he is prepared to fight. This is all I have done and so far from expecting to make a plea to the Reformers, as you charge to be my purpose "by implication," I have expressly said that the old lines could not be drawn and I want the issue settled entirely apart from my personal and political fortunes.

When I wrote my letter to Mr. Higgins I merely alluded to the "true inwardness of this movement," which I then realized was being engineered by my inveterate political enemies.

You seem to be aggrieved because I have shifted position from the "sane and judicial attitude of the Higgins letter" and now take the ground that the movement is political and a covert attack upon me. Your assertion is too sweeping, my dear doctor. The "movement" against the dispensary among the people arises from the dissatisfaction with the management and strong belief in corruption which exists; but while the people are fighting the dispensary either to purify or destroy it the leaders are fighting me. You may not be. In fact I know you are not and probably there are many others who have no such feeling or purpose, but look at the numerous evidences of the political purpose and significance of the movement in the minds of the leaders. One of these who attended the prohibition conference in Columbia declared it to be the intention to "hit the State up on edge and spill out not only the dispensary but the entire existing political status." The Darlington News declared that the "dispensary was so intimately interwoven with Senator Tillman's political fortunes that the destruction of the one meant the destruction of the other."

The mass meeting held at Yorkville on the 7th of this month under the leadership of the author of the Brice bill discussed and abused me a great deal more than they discussed the dispensary or prohibition and each and every speaker who opened his mouth in it paid his respects to me in the harshest and most insulting manner. Since it will not be denied that the anti-dispensary forces

are an incongruous and in many respects antagonistic aggregation, ministers of the gospel, doctors of divinity, advocates of high license, the old barroom system in its essence, blind tigers who want free liquor for the money they can make out of it, and yet with this army in motley led by men with all manner of opinions, and marshaling its forces for my destruction, you, my dear doctor, tell me that I must remain quiet, continue the same "calm, judicial, sane attitude assumed in the Higgins letter" and not let the people know what is going on.

I stated in that letter if the legislature did not apply the remedy for the existing evils in the dispensary management that I would help kill the dispensary. More mature thought and a better understanding of the purpose of the anti-dispensary leaders led me to give notice that if that legislature did not apply the remedy I would appeal to the people to elect a legislature that would.

Is there anything wrong in that? Anything immoral or unstatesmanlike? If I had remained steadfast in that position would not all the influences that are possible be brought to bear to keep the legislature from doing anything, especially doing things I suggest. If the legislature now in office could be thus influenced, cajoled, coerced to resist reformation under the specious plea that it was my dictation, that I had quietly fallen in ranks to help kill the dispensary without first appealing from the legislature to the people, do you not see that I would have tied my own hands and surrendered at discretion to my worst enemies?

I had to deal with one "driftwood legislature" once and I appealed to the people to reform it, which they did most effectually by retiring most of those who had proven false to their professions and pledges to private life. The present legislature was not elected on the dispensary issue and is a very conservative body of men and with so much political electricity in the atmosphere and so much thundering against the dispensary it may well pause ere it takes any action. The disclosures at Spartanburg will undoubtedly cause it to do something, but whether it will do anything effectual or not remains to be seen.

I wish to say here and now, as though in parenthesis, the result of this fight as far as I am personally concerned gives me no uneasiness whatever. The office of senator does not belong to me, but it belongs to the people and they will have the right next year to choose my successor and I will bow to their will, whatever it may be, without a murmur. I do not believe that the fall of the dispensary necessarily means my fall. I do not see what association there is or could possibly be between the dispensary question and the position which I have taken upon it and my fitness for the high office which I hold. If my health continues good I shall ask the people to continue me in the place, not because I am the father of the dispensary, but because of my service in Washington. I am not uneasy in the least. So much for that branch of your letter.

Now let us come to the dispensary question and your treatment of it. You quote with great unctiousness from the decision of our supreme court: "That liquor in its nature is dangerous to the morals, good order, health, and safety of the people, and is not to be placed on the same footing with the ordinary commodities of life such as corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, potatoes, etc." I wish I had that decision before me so that I could give its essence in brief form rather than take an isolated sentence. You are too good a lawyer not to know that the State could have nothing to do with the liquor traffic were it not for the exercise of the police power which rests upon the right of the State government to control or forbid any and everything which concerns the morals and health of the people; and right here is where we part company in dealing with this question. The prohibitionists in general and you, by dear doctor, as one of the leaders, are thoroughly imbued with the belief that liquor drinking is dangerous to the morals, good order, health and safety of the people, and you would therefore forbid its sale in any way as a beverage and would limit its use to medicinal, pharmaceutical and mechanical purposes. South Carolina declares in the dispensary law itself.

"The manufacture, sale, barter or exchange, receipt or acceptance for unlawful use, delivery, storing and keeping in possession within this State of any spirituous, malt, vinous, fermented, brewed (whether lager or rice beer) or other liquors, any compound or mixture thereof, by whatever name called or known, which contains alcohol and is used as a beverage, except as is hereafter provided, is hereby prohibited under a penalty of not less than three nor more than 12 months at hard labor in the State penitentiary, or pay a

fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$500 or both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court for each offense. All alcoholic liquors in this State, whether manufactured within this State or elsewhere, not having been tested by the chemist of the South Carolina college and found to be pure and free from poisonous, hurtful and deleterious matters are hereby declared to be of a detrimental character, and their use and consumption are against the morals and good health and safety of the State," etc.

In the judgment of the legislature which enacted the law as a compromise, the dispensary system would bring about the best results. You and your friends make of this question a religious issue while the supporters of the dispensary law consider it a political issue and the people of the State have six times by overwhelming majorities sustained our view. You and your friends have time and time again presented your ideas and pressed them with vigor and ability, but the voters have not seen it as you did.

I would be the last man to lower the ideals of our schools. I would be the last man to throw temptation in the way of anyone young or old. I would be the last man to teach any child that liquor is not dangerous; but it is the duty of a statesman to hobble the devil when he can't be chained, so to speak, or it is his duty to simply say he wants to see him hobbled or chained and then let him loose? The dispensary law properly administered does reduce drunkenness. It does conduce to temperance and good morals, and teaches men the uses of liquor rather than the abuses of it. That the State board of control is under suspicion of corruption with many things pointing to the belief that the suspicion is well grounded, that local dispensers have been debauched, because of the lax administration or mal-administration, proves nothing. Pope long since epitomized the whole subject in that well known couplet:

"About forms of law, let fools contest,
That law which is best administered best."

And our not agreeing on the dispensary question and the liquor question comes from the fundamental difference of opinion as to how it is best to police the liquor traffic. The prohibitionists declare it sinful to drink in moderation wine or whiskey, while a large majority of us cannot see any foundation in morals or religion for any such contention. Everybody recognizes the evils of drunkenness, and how to minimize this or to prevent it, is the whole question. You say prohibit the sale. I say sell by bonded officers under stringent regulations in the day time only and have the law enforced. The profit, which is an incident, and not a purpose in this sale, to go where it is most needed—that is, into the school fund of the State. It would make no difference if it went into the general fund of the treasury and the school fund increased from other sources, but that is a subterfuge. No one drinks any more or patronizes the dispensary because the profits go to the school fund. I can not see any harm or sin in obtaining revenue from a traffic that is irrepressible. The United States supreme court protects each citizen in the right to import for his own use, and no law of the State can prevent it. The poorer and more ignorant classes who can not thus obtain liquor have been and always will be supplied through some local agency no matter what the law against selling liquor may be.

You quote Gov. Hoch, of Kansas, but you do not discuss or explain the official statistics in regard to drinking and the payment of the United States internal revenue license by retail dealers in that State. There are no saloons in South Carolina for the young to see any more than there are in Kansas. God forbid they should ever return. Some of your collaborators in this fight against the dispensary system, your allies and counsellors, are the editors of papers which have always fought the dispensary and are now scheming to get high license after prohibition has failed, as it will fail. There is not a civilized government in Christendom as far as I know that does not derive a revenue from the sale of liquor and prohibition was an unknown thing 60 years ago. The United States government received last year from this source upwards of \$170,000,000. I think there are only three States at this time that cling to prohibition. Iowa and Vermont had it some years ago, but they have abandoned it for local option with the right to vote in saloons if wanted and that is what is hoped for here by your chief sponsors of the press.

One word more and I am through: Let us see about your historical parallel of the great leader who was commanded to go down against the Amalekites. The Hebrews of old, true to the instincts of thrift, slew the abominable tribe but saved the best of the sheep and oxen, as some claimed for "sacrifice" and you go

on to state as an historical fact that "the government of a State was commanded by the moral sense of the people expressed at the ballot box to go down and destroy the liquor traffic. And when called to account it makes the pitiful plea that while it has not destroyed the traffic it has managed it so as to get money for the taxpayers." Your parallel is not a parallel at all.

The people of South Carolina have never instructed its government to prohibit the sale of liquor. In the separate box provided by the Democratic executive committee in the Democratic primary of '92, the vote stood, as I recollect, 35,000 for prohibition, 25,000 against, while 32,000 did not vote on it at all (I quote from memory). That election was a side show and you have no right to magnify its significance. This is a government of majorities and no majority of the people has ever given any such order, while when the question has been passed on since directly positively a half dozen times the people said that the dispensary law was a better and more sane solution. Isn't it about time to stop alluding to that election? The dispensary system does not rest for its support upon the money that it brings in. It rests on the claim of its defenders backed by experience of our people and statistics, as affording more protection against the vice of drunkenness than any other system, prohibition or license either.

If it has done this in spite of maladministration and mismanagement, what would it not do if such men as Dr. Cromer and his friends would give to the enforcement of the law their great moral support? We do not ask endorsement but in a government where a majority rules we have had a right to expect co-operation and assistance and we have not had it. Yet "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" was the command of the Master himself. When the statute has been practically annulled by the board of directors, when the restrictive features have been allowed to drop into disuse, have the prohibitionists lent their assistance by standing up boldly for the law? Had they done so, we would not be now where we are.

You have been kind enough, my dear sir, to remind me of Jefferson's epitaph. You declare "the people do not need advice, but they need an opportunity to vote." Allow me to remind you that one of Jefferson's maxims which was the very embodiment of civil liberty and true Democracy was "Teach the people and trust the people."

You want the people to vote now while they are angered and bewildered. I want them to vote "sane" after they have heard the facts and arguments and I want all of them to vote who have an interest in this matter, and under the Brice act this is not allowed. You mentioned Winthrop and Clemson as among the things which I would be remembered. You left off some others that I presume to add, not from a sense of egotism but simply to keep the record straight:

(1) The emancipation in 1890 of the people from dry rot, caused by only one party and the demonstration that we could have the most free and open discussion of political questions without danger, followed by the inauguration of the State Democratic primary system.

(2) The constitutional convention and its work, largely the result of my untiring and earnest efforts, and my work in that convention in behalf of common schools and the disfranchisement for the time being of the negro majority legally.

(3) Last, the inauguration of the sale of liquor by bonded officers under the dispensary system. I will not say that your vision is clouded by fanaticism, but if it be true that "he who makes two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before is a public benefactor," then is it not equally true that he who conceived a scheme by which drunkenness was reduced, temperance encouraged and decency and good order increased and withal made the demon whiskey contribute to the education of the ignorant masses, need he be ashamed of his work?

B. R. Tillman.
Trenton, S. C., Aug. 14th, 1905.

Soothing and Cooling.

"The salve that heals without a scar is DeWitt's Witch Hazel. No remedy effects such speedy relief. It draws out inflammation, soothes, cools and heals all cuts, burns and bruises. A sure cure for Piles and skin diseases. DeWitt's is the only genuine Witch Hazel Salve. Beware of counterfeits, they are dangerous. Sold by all druggists."

Peculiar Disappearance.

J. D. Runyan, of Rutledge, O., aid the peculiar disappearance of his painful symptoms of indigestion and biliousness to Dr. King's New Life Pills. He says: "They are a perfect remedy for dizziness, sour stomach, headache, constipation, etc." Guaranteed at all druggists, price 25c.

Should Auld Acquaintance be Forgotten we say again— Forget it Not

Uneeded Biscuit

5c

NATIONAL BISCUIT COMPANY

Don't forget

Graham Crackers
Butter Thin Biscuit
Social Tea Biscuit
Lemon Snaps

CAMDEN SHUT OUT.

Sumter Wins in Easy Style Taking the Game in a Whirlwind by a Score of 3 to 0—Dwyer a Puzzle.

From the Daily Item, Aug. 18.

The great Billy Leval came all the way to Sumter to get his bumps and he got them good and hard. He came here for the express purpose of offsetting the work of Dwyer, for the Camden people realized his ability, and sent the best pitcher obtainable to oppose him. The little southpaw, who has had such a wonderfully successful career, was all smiles during the first few innings of the game, for he could not be found; but, alas, like bubbles his smiles were of short duration, and disappeared in the offing accompanied by the hits that were made off his delivery.

On the other hand, Dwyer uncorked some of the most perplexing benders that were ever shot over a plate, and he mixed them up so efficiently that only two players of the Camden team ever made connection with the sphere.

The fans had an opportunity to see James work behind the bat for the first time yesterday, and he surely made good with the crowd. He caught an errorless game, made the few Camden men who reached first hold the sack, and showed his ability to use the willow. He is evidently the man that Sumter has been looking for.

Cantey did spectacular work at third; he took every chance, threw accurately to the bases and is credited with two hits, both of which were clean and well placed.

The star play of the game was a double steal, which was nicely conducted by the heady little Stafford. He had reached first on an error, there was a man on third and two down. Seeing an excellent opportunity for making an extra run, Stafford played for enough off first to entice Leval to throw to Gunter, and while he was playing between the two bases, the runner scored, and Stafford landed safely on the second bag when the ball was thrown home. That way what Billy Earle would say, "Playing the game."

Gunter was making errors yesterday as if his life depended upon having "e 3" all over the score book, and his poor work was largely responsible for two of the runs made by the locals. The brag sticker of the Camden aggregation, whose name heads the batting order, came out of the game with his batting average standing at 0.

Weatherly is a good player at times, and yesterday happened not to be one of those occasions. He took balls that did not belong to him, endeavoring to play to the grandstand by taking difficulty chances, and appeared entirely indifferent to the errors that naturally followed from this style of playing.

Flowers played an excellent field, and took in several hard ones that looked like good hits from the stand. He covered his territory in league

style. The game was one of the best, and decidedly the fastest of the season, being played in an hour and thirty-five minutes.

Camden		Sumter
Mabry	c	James
Gunter	1st b	Holland
Moseley	2nd b	Knox
Weatherley	3rd b	Cantey
Durant, E.	ss	Martin
Ammons	rf	Lawrence
Flowers	cf	Durant, R.
Clyburn	lf	Stafford
Leval	p	Dwyer

Score:
Camden—0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0—0
Sumter—0 0 0 2 0 1 0*—3
Summary: Earned runs, 0. First on balls, off Dwyer 1, off Leval, 1. Left on bases, Camden 2, Sumter 11. Hits, Camden 3, Sumter 6. Errors, Camden 9; Sumter 0. Struck out, by Leval 4; by Dwyer 10. Time of game, 1:35. Umpire, Mr. Mcagen. Scorer, Mr. H. P. Moses.

Fendish Suffering

Is often caused by sores, ulcers and cancers, that eat away your skin. Wm. Bedell, of Flat Rock, Mich., says: "I have used Bucklen's Arnica Salve, for ulcers, sores and cancers. It is the best healing dressing I ever found." Soothes and heals cuts, burns and scalds. 25c. at all druggists; guaranteed.

CAN'T BE SEPARATED.

Some Sumter People Have Learned How to Get Rid of Both.

Backache and kidney ache are twin brothers.

You can't separate them. And you can't get rid of the backache until you cure the kidney ache.

If the kidneys are well and strong, the rest of the system is pretty sure to be in vigorous health.

Doan's Kidney Pills make strong, healthy kidneys.

E. McCloud, farmer, residing on the outskirts of Sumter says: "Both my wife and I used Doan's Kidney Pills procured at Dr. A. J. China's drug store, and obtained a lot of benefit from them. I thought it must be the climate which did not agree with us or the water, for we never had the backache until we moved here some four years ago from Pennsylvania, but we certainly have had it since. The secretions from the kidneys were irregular and much too frequent in action, especially at night when our rest was much disturbed. Since we used Doan's Kidney Pills neither of us has had the backache and the action of the kidneys became natural and normal and our rest is not disturbed at night. Doan's Kidney Pills are the best remedy that ever came into my house."

For sale by all dealers. Price 50 cents. Foster-McBurr Co., Buffalo, N. Y., sole agents for the United States. Remember the name—Doan's—and take no other.