

Watchman and Southron.
Published Every Wednesday.
—BY—
PUBLISHING COMPANY,
SUMTER, S. C.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, August 2, 1891, under Post Office No. 100, at Sumter, S. C., under special authority of Post Office Department, and approved for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 11, 1918. Postage paid at Sumter, S. C., under Post Office No. 100. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 11, 1918. Paid in Advance.
Subscription price, \$1.00 per annum in Advance.
Single Copies, 5 Cents.
Advertisements, as per rates on other page.
The Watchman and Southron will be glad to receive notices of obituary and notices of persons and places of importance.
Copyright, 1908, by The Watchman and Southron Publishing Company, Sumter, S. C.

CONTRACT LAW.

THE NEW LABOR LAW.
The new law which every farmer should know—The Points of Difference from the Old Law.
The new law is the contract law which is now in force in South Carolina. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer.

FEDERAL JUDGE TAKES CHARGE.

ANOTHER SENSATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE DISPENSARY CASE.
Judge Pritchard Assumes Jurisdiction, Declaring the State Forfeited Constitutional Rights When It Engaged in the Liquor Business and Can Be Sued on Dispensary Claims As An Individual—Two Special Masters To Be Appointed To Make Testimony.
Asheville, N. C., Feb. 29.—In the matter of the Fleischmann Company against the dispensary commission of South Carolina, Judge J. C. Pritchard in the United States circuit court today held that the court could assume jurisdiction in this case on the ground that the funds in the hands of the dispensary commissioners is a trust fund held for the creditors of the dispensary.
In substance the judge's decision stated:
"That, as the State of South Carolina has seen fit to engage in the purchase and sale of spirituous liquors, it can not be reasonably contended that in so doing it is performing the functions usually exercised by a State when necessary to preserve its autonomy and maintain its sovereignty.
"The supreme court of that State has decided that the act authorizing the establishment of a dispensary was constitutional. However, it can hardly be assumed that it was contemplated at the time of the adoption of the 11th amendment that a sovereign State would engage in the purchase and sale of spirituous liquors for profit.
"The State, having seen fit to engage in this business, and at the same time to deprive its citizens of the right to engage in such business in competition with the State, thereby placed itself in a position where it could not with consistency, avail itself of the immunity conferred by the 11th amendment in a suit like this one at bar, in which it is sought to collect a debt contracted by the judicially placed in control of such business, with implied if not direct authority to contract such debts. Having deprived its citizens of a right to engage in this particular line of business, reserving the right to monopolize the business through its agents appointed for that purpose, it would be manifestly unjust to permit the State under any circumstances whatsoever to avoid the payment of debts contracted by the purchase of goods from the sale of which it has deprived enormous profits."
The dispensary matter was brought up in court today on an order of Judge Pritchard signed on motion of the Wilson Distilling Company and other creditors citing the dispensary commission to appear and show cause why a receiver should not be appointed for the \$300,000 fund now held by them. Before the hearing in this case Judge Pritchard informally announced his decision in the matter of the jurisdiction of the court in the Fleischmann case, which was also a suit asking for a receiver for the dispensary fund.
The court maintained that the defendants, the dispensary commissioners, were not officers of a court in the strict sense; that they were merely officers to perform a certain specific duty. He said that the sum of \$300,000 was placed in the hands of the dispensary commissioners to settle all just liabilities of the dispensary, and that it was clearly a trust fund.
The judge declared that the suit is not a suit against the State and added: "I have carefully considered this whole matter and had I any doubt I would give the defendants the benefit of that doubt and rule in favor of the State. There is no doubt in my mind, however, and therefore the court takes jurisdiction."
Judge Pritchard said it was his purpose to appoint two special masters to hear evidence and make report on April 6. It is understood that these masters will be appointed next Monday when the defendants make formal answer.
It is understood that the defendants will appeal from the decision of the court.
During the hearing today the Paul Jones Company presented a motion that the court make an order requiring the payment of its claim of \$21,000. Mr. Mordecai, of Charleston, counsel for the Wilson Company, protested, declaring that the claim had been allowed in consideration of valuable information given the dispensary mission by the Paul Jones Company reflecting on other conditions and he made the point that the Paul Jones Company was not a party to the present suit and had not come in and

SCORED BY MR. PATTERSON.

HE CRITIZES PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S APPOINTMENTS.
Says the President is Changing the Constitution to Suit the Situation—Whack at Judge Pritchard.
Washington, March 3.—Representative Patterson of South Carolina has figured out that President Roosevelt has been making steady and effective injections into the judicial department of his policy of construing the constitution to suit the exigencies of the situation. Mr. Patterson late yesterday afternoon disclosed his discoveries in a speech in the house, incidentally he took a little whack at Judge Pritchard.
Referring to a publication issued by the department of justice giving a list of federal judges, Mr. Patterson said: This document shows that since his accession to office in 1904 President Roosevelt has appointed federal judges as follows: Supreme court of the United States, three associate judges, one-third of the membership of that great tribunal; circuit courts in the United States, 17 of the 29 judges or 41.7 per cent; district courts of the United States, 43 of the 80 judges or 53.75 per cent.
Judging these appointments by the character of Judges Pritchard and Jones, we may assume that some of them, at least, hold the opinions of the appointing authority respecting the necessity of changing the constitution by judicial construction in order to meet the exigencies of those corporations which contribute most liberally to the corruption fund of the Republican party.
"And before the present term expires the president will probably have opportunity of packing the courts with enough men of the same class to insure the perpetuation of the so-called 'police' by judicial action, unless we act as our predecessors did in 1803 and deprive some of these unscrupulous and time-serving judges of some or all of their judicial powers. Disregarding the fact that before March 4, 1908, there is a probability of our having seven Roosevelt judges on the supreme court bench, we may by that time have in office for life 17 of the 29 circuit judges and 47 of the 80 district court judges. If Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected, as many of our Republican friends anticipate, we should probably have on the bench by 1913 as Roosevelt's appointees 20 of the 28 circuit court judges and 59 of the 80 district court judges. If this should happen the hands of congress and of every State legislature would surely be tied hard and fast by judicial usurpation."
Mr. Patterson was speaking in favor of his bill to prevent any federal judge from issuing any injunction where the law of any State or the official act of any State official is concerned.—Zach McGhee in the State.

FEATHERSTONE GIVES VIEWS.

Gives Out a Statement in Greenwood Which Leaves No Doubt as to His Candidacy for Governor—Something About Prohibition.
Greenwood, Feb. 27.—Mr. C. C. Featherstone of Laurens, is in Greenwood on professional business. He is assisting the prosecution in the case of the State against C. Wash Hunter, indicted for murder. This case was transferred from Laurens county to Greenwood county.
Mr. Featherstone was asked the question if he had positively made up his mind to run for Governor this year. He replied, "Yes, providence permitting, I shall certainly make the race. My friends from all sections of the state insist that I shall stump the state in the interest of prohibition cause—believing that the time is ripe for the state wide prohibition.
As you know, I have always been a prohibitionist and have been advocating the cause for over twenty years. In 1898 I stumped the state as a candidate for Governor on the prohibition ticket. We then only lacked about three or four thousand votes of being victorious—a change of fifteen hundred or two thousand votes would have changed the result.
Two years later my friends insisted that I should again be their standard leader, but I believed that my old friend—the gallant ex-confederate soldier Col. Hoyt—could come nearer winning than I. For that reason I declined to run and advocated the election of Col. Hoyt—going to Columbia and taking charge of his campaign between the first and second primaries.
The prohibition sentiment, at that time, was not quite strong enough to elect even so good a man as Col. Hoyt. Since that time I have been studying the situation with great care. Four or five months ago, I gave, at an interview on the subject advocating for the present, the enactment of a law making the entire State dry, but permitting counties where prohibition sentiment was weak to vote in the sale of whiskey.
A great majority of my prohibition friends in the state fully endorsed my views.
I stated on the interview that, of course, what I ultimately sought was iron clad, state wide prohibition; and further, that in my judgment the time was not far off when the state would be ready for it; and further that when there was sufficient public sentiment behind it to enable us to enforce it, I would then be in favor of state wide prohibition.
Since giving out that interview, I have been in close touch with prohibitionists throughout the state, endeavoring to ascertain the present strength of the sentiment and making diligent inquiry as to the enforcement of the law in the dry counties. I have also been studying the reports of the dispensary auditor, and to my amazement, I find that the county dispensaries are selling almost as much liquor as did the old dispensary, when it was in full blast. They sold in the last year three million dollars worth of liquor. In addition to this, I find that the dispensary counties are selling tremendous quantities of whiskey to the contiguous dry territory. Laurens is selling to Greenwood, Greenville, Spartanburg and Newberry—thus, to a large extent nullifying and destroying the effect of prohibition in those counties—and like conditions exist elsewhere in the State.
In this State of affairs, I have determined to stump the State this year, advocating straight out State prohibition. The only way to find out the strength of the prohibition sentiment is to submit the question squarely to the people. If a majority of the people are in favor of State prohibition, then, we will give it an honest, fair trial.
The prohibitionists of the State are not fanatics, but—on the contrary, are sensible, practical men.
If the practical workings of a State prohibition law should demonstrate that it is impossible to enforce it in certain counties where the sentiment is weak—then it will be a very easy matter to tack on a local option feature, permitting those counties under the most rigid restrictions, to vote in the sale of whiskey. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."
What we want is to give a general prohibition law an honest, fair trial. I am reliably informed that when the old dispensary law was enacted it was with the view of ultimately reaching prohibition. Hundreds of honest men all over the State who believed in prohibition were under the impression that the dispensary law was a step towards the accomplishment of the

SCHOOLS PRIZES ARE OFFERED.

Announcement of Conditions for Entrance in Contest Made by Miss Mary T. Nance.
Columbia, Feb. 28.—The South Carolina Improvement Association offers 35 prizes to the schools of the State for the most decided material improvement made during a given length of time. Five of the prizes are \$100 each, and 30 are to be \$50 each. Regulations concerning the 35 prizes to be awarded by this association as announced by Miss Nance, the president are as follows:
1. Improvement must be made between January 1 and December 18, 1908.
2. Prizes will be awarded to schools where the most decided material improvements have been made during the time mentioned.
3. Under material improvements are included local taxation, consolidation, new buildings, repairing and painting old ones, libraries, reading rooms or tables, and general better equipment.
4. No school can compete for any of these prizes unless it is a rural school. No town with more than 500 population shall be eligible to the contest.
5. All who wish to enter this contest must send names and descriptions of schools before improvements are made, to the president prior to October 1st.
6. All descriptions, photographs and other evidences showing improvements must be sent in to the president before December 15th. The chairman of the board of trustees of any school that is competing for a prize must approve all descriptions before and after improvements are made.
7. Prizes will be awarded in checks at the annual meeting of the South Carolina Improvement Association, December 31st, 1908. The prizes are to be used for further improvements in the schools receiving them.

KILLING AT LAMAR.

Dispute Over Land Line Results in Tragedy Near Lamar—Shyer Still at Large.
Lamar, March 3.—Robert A. Randal was shot and killed by Dick Parnell this afternoon about 4 o'clock at his place about three miles from Lamar. From what can be gathered it seems that the trouble arose over a land line between the parties. Randal was staking off the line and Parnell, without a word of warning, fired his breach loading shotgun, the contents entering the left side of Randal's head, which produced death instantly.
Mr. Randal was a very industrious farmer and was well liked by the entire community. He was 47 years of age. He leaves a wife and three small children to mourn his untimely death. Parnell is about 50 years of age and has a wife and several children.
It is reported that Parnell has left for parts unknown.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES.

THE NEW LABOR LAW.
The new law which every farmer should know—The Points of Difference from the Old Law.
The new law is the contract law which is now in force in South Carolina. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer. It is a law which is designed to protect the farmer from the unscrupulous practices of the laborer.