

The Watchman and Southron.

The Sumter Watchman was founded in 1850 and the True Southron in 1866. The Watchman and Southron now has the combined circulation and influence of both of the old papers, and is manifestly the best advertising medium in Sumter.

Our old friend, A. C. Jones, of Newberry, the man who leaped into notoriety a few years ago by announcing himself a candidate for the United States senate in opposition to E. R. Tillman, has written all the way from New York to settle the Brunson-Featherstone controversy. He says that Jones knows all about prohibition politics, that Featherstone is all right, that Chris is the candy kid, and that Joel E. Brunson is all wrong, that he has a grouch and don't know where hurts him—or words to that effect.

Mr. Brunson's excellent memory and his letter file have turned the laugh on the Rev. Louis J. Bristow, whose political activities overshadow his religious zeal. A well stocked letter file is as deadly a weapon as the jaw-bone of an ass.

President Taft's pronouncement in favor of a further revision of the tariff is the first move in another bunco campaign, but the country having so recently been treated to an exhibition of tariff revision by and for the trusts the common people who bear the burdens and receive none of the benefits should be slightly suspicious of any revision proposition emanating from Taft and his coterie.

Mr. Belsler's good roads plan seems to have unsuspected elements of popularity and meets with a favorable reception where opposition, or indifference, was anticipated. It is a business proposition and the people who have heard him explain his plan and the ways and means of financing it are giving it serious consideration. When a successful business man makes a business proposition and talks it in terms of dollars and cents he gets an attentive hearing. We are now more hopeful of Sumter county obtaining a complete system of good roads than ever before.

Two years ago there were 2,006 votes cast in the first primary election in Sumter county, and it is reasonable to suppose that the vote this year will be equally as large. The candidates and their friends can figure on this basis, at any rate, and some curious juggling with figures is being done. One McLeod man ventured the guess the other day that his candidate would receive 1,800 votes in Sumter county—we hope so, but don't believe it. A Featherstone supporter says his man will get 1,500 votes in this county—we don't believe that either. A Blease man says that the Mayor of Newberry will receive not less than 500 votes in Sumter—perhaps so, but it is not probable. Two years ago Blease received 543 votes against 1,437 for Ansel in this county; four years ago Blease got 99 votes; Ansel, 278; Brunson, 327; Edwards, 2; Jones, 5; Manning, 1,091; McMahon, 15; Sloan, 23 out of a total of 1,777. With these figures as a basis for a guess it looks like McLeod should receive a safe majority of the votes cast with the balance of the votes divided between Featherstone, Blease and Richards, or Hyatt in the order named.

We have been asked to give the vote for candidates for State Senate four years ago, and for the candidates for the House four and two years ago. The official figures are as follows:

1906—For the Senate: Clifton, 979; Sanders, 782; for the House, Dabbs, 637; Dick, 1342; Dorn, 719; Fraser, 1,082; McElveen, 434; Moses, 345; W. G. Stubbs, 735.

1908—For the House: Cuttino, 829; Dabbs, 1,015; Dick, 1,378; Fraser, 1,621; C. E. Stubbs, 1,063.

The attitude of the average State-wide prohibitionist toward local option would be funny were it not for their deadly and illogical earnestness. As we diagnose their attitude, it is that local option is an excellent thing so long as it results in prohibition, but a covenant with death and an agreement with hell if a majority of the people of any county declare against prohibition.

If our State-wide friends will tell us how they will enforce prohibition in counties that voted against prohibition under the local option law, we will take more stock in their demand for a State-wide law. It is a big job to secure a nominal enforcement of prohibition in counties where a majority voted for it, and if the sole dependence for the enforcement of the law was those who voted for prohibition, there would be even more liquor than there is now in the dry counties. In Sumter county, for instance, the suppression of

blind tigers has been due, as much to the efforts and influences of the law abiding citizens who voted against prohibition in the election last summer, as to the efforts of the uncompromising prohibitionists who voted to abolish the county dispensary. Law is nothing more than crystalized public sentiment, and every law that has not common sense to recommend it and public sentiment to enforce it, cannot be made even nominally effective.

But for the fact that Tammany is no better than the Republican machine, the Democrats of New York would have an opportunity to capture that State as the result of the fight Roosevelt is making on the regular organization.

If Mr. Lever is a Republican because he voted for a tariff on lumber, what are the other forty-one members of the House, and the seventeen Senators, who voted with him? Champ Clark, the leader, and Senator Tillman both say Lever is still a Democrat in good standing, and that his vote on lumber did not make him a traitor to the party, and their opinion is entitled to as much weight as the dictum of any other Democrat who volunteers to construe the party rules and lay down the law to the rank and file.

Mr. Lever and the Platform.

If the Democratic party or any other party is "to do business" it must move in a straight line. Some authority must point its course. That authority is the national convention and the platform is the chart it prepares.

If Congressman Lever is justified in kicking out of traces in respect to the lumber schedule, Doe, Roe Dick, Tom and Harry, from this, that and the other district and State, are equally justified in voting against the party programme according as whim or interest may dictate.

To vote against free lumber would be undemocratic irrespective of platforms because it would be out of harmony with the traditional Democratic tariff position. To vote against it in defiance of a specific platform declaration is an overt act of downright treason against the Democratic party.

If the Democrats of the district are prepared to grant Mr. Lever an indulgence to vote with the party or against it as suits his humor, they must be prepared to pardon any and all violations of platform pledges and to hold themselves responsible for consequent party defeat.

The contention that the party platform may be ignored at pleasure insults intelligence. A political party must have something to steer by—when its platform is abandoned, there is nothing left.—The State.

LEVER'S LUMBER VOTE.

What Senator Tillman Has to Say About It.

The following letters are printed by Congressman Lever in the Orangeburg Sun:

Lexington, S. C., Aug. 15, 1910. Senator B. R. Tillman, Trenton, S. C. My Dear Senator Tillman:

The Times and Democrat, a newspaper of Orangeburg County, is making a great ado about my vote against putting lumber on the free list in the last Tariff Act. This paper practically accused me, in effect, of being a Republican because of this vote.

I should, therefore, appreciate it if you will write me, answering the following questions:

First: Was the vote on the lumber schedule regarded by Democratic leaders as a test of party loyalty?

Second: Do you personally regard my vote on this proposition as a breach of party loyalty?

Third: Have I not always, as far as you know, given loyal support to the fundamental principles of the Democratic party?

I will greatly appreciate your kindness in giving me an immediate reply, which I shall use for publication in the Times and Democrat and the Orangeburg papers.

Very truly,
(Signed,) A. F. Lever.

Senator Tillman's Reply.

Trenton, S. C., Aug. 19, 1910. Hon. A. F. Lever, Lexington, S. C.

Dear Lever:

Replying to yours of August 15 I would say my answer to your first question would be emphatically, no; to the second question, no; to the third question, yes; all with equal emphasis. Party lines were not drawn in the Senate or House as far as I know on the lumber schedule.

Very truly yours,
(Signed,) B. R. Tillman.

When will work on the Truoney Hospital be started?

There is said to be less cotton blight in the vicinity of Dalzell and Galliard Cross Roads this season than there has been for several years. This is due in part to the planting of wilt-resistant cotton, and in part of the seasons, it is said.

BRUNSON REPLIES.

Discusses the Letters of Messrs. Everett and Bristow—The Jerome Conference.

To the Editor of The State:

I regret to have to ask space to answer Messrs. Everett and Bristow, as I have already taken more than my share of your paper. However, I think this is my last letter, as I have said enough to satisfy any intelligent man. If a few more of the members of that Jerome caucus should rise in Mr. Featherstone's behalf, I shall be able to write out the minutes of that meeting.

"A short horse is soon curried," and I need say but little in reply to Mr. Everett. I wish he had said something definite, so that I could get hold of it. I did not say "Mr. Featherstone was in the least weakening as a prohibitionist." I have not regarded Mr. Featherstone for years as a prohibitionist with any fixed principles. But a short time has elapsed since he advocated the sale of liquor in each and every county where a majority of the voters were in favor of it, and I believe if a majority of the counties were in favor of selling it he would be singing that same song today. If it was a matter of principle and right in the past, it should be right today. We do not do evil that good many come.

Mr. Everett says: "In that meeting no word or act of Mr. Featherstone's could have been construed as wanting in fidelity to the cause of prohibition." Mr. Everett has very poor conception of the duties of one who becomes a member of an organization—of party fealty. Should a member of any political party commit such an act he would be kicked out.

Now let me convict Mr. Featherstone out of the mouths of his own witnesses.

Mr. Featherstone acknowledged the authority of the regular prohibition conference held in the Methodist church June 15 1905, when he claimed a seat in the committee appointed by that body, addressed the chair and said "I move," etc. And then when he moved to adjourn the subject to the call of the chairman, he clinched his acknowledgement of the right of the prohibition conference to form the committee. No escape by that channel.

Was Mr. Featherstone at the Jerome hotel meeting? Dr. Cramer says he was there. Mr. Bristow makes the impression that he was not there, but does not say so. Mr. Featherstone admits he was there and gives as the object of the meeting "to discuss the situation in general and to consider the advisability of putting out a ticket in 1906." Further he says: "It was decided that it would not be wise to put out a ticket. It was also decided that we would attend the conference during fair week, which had been called or which we anticipated would be called by Mr. Brunson and certain others, and do what we could to keep them from putting out a ticket."

Now, Mr. Editor, Rev. Louis J. Bristow gives the key to the whole situation. Mr. Bristow says: "The sense of that conference was that it would be inexpedient to call a prohibition conference to nominate a State ticket, and that the idea should be opposed at the State fair conference, which Mr. Featherstone subsequently did."

That is the evidence put in by Mr. Featherstone and his friends and it proves a very bad case. Mr. Featherstone did not attend the June 15, 1905, conference of prohibitionists which was called openly and the call published, where he could have used his influence honorably and tried to shape the policy of the prohibitionists of the State, or prevent the calling of a State convention. Or he could have gone into the State convention when it assembled and tried to prevent the nomination of a ticket and it would have been honorable. But for him, after the prohibition conference had declared in favor of a State convention and appointed a committee with positive instructions to call the same, to get together a dozen-called body of less than a dozen men and there decree that it would be unwise or inexpedient for the prohibitionists to hold a State convention, and decide that "we," we, we, would go into the committee meeting soon to be held and prevent the calling of that State convention; then to carry it out with men who were not members of the committee—for Featherstone himself was an intruder, never having been appointed on the committee—it was a political trick of which hardened politicians would be ashamed. The prohibition conference didn't ask Mr. Featherstone whether it were wise or otherwise as to the holding of a State convention. It adopted Mr. Bristow's resolution declaring in favor of a State convention and appointed a committee to call it. Why was Mr. Featherstone so opposed to a State convention? Because his ticket was already in the field; he did not wish any regular prohibition candidate to oppose it and was unwilling to submit the claim of his ticket

Farmers' Union News
—AND—
Practical Thoughts for Practical Farmers
(Conducted by E. W. Dabbs, President Farmers' Union of Sumter County.)

The Watchman and Southron having decided to double its service by semi-weekly publication, would improve that service by special features. The first to be inaugurated is this Department for the Farmers' Union and Practical Farmers which I have been requested to conduct. It will be my aim to give the Union news and official calls of the Union. To that end officers, and members of the Union are requested to use these columns. Also to publish such clippings from the agricultural papers and Government Bulletins as I think will be of practical benefit to our readers. Original articles by any of our readers telling of their successes or failures will be appreciated and published. Trusting this Department will be of mutual benefit to all concerned,
THE EDITOR.
All communications for this Department should be sent to E. W. Dabbs, Mayeville, S. C.

Organize For 6 Per Cent. Cotton Tare

Here is Work Which Farmer's Unions in Every Cotton State Should Begin at Once—Farmers Are Entitled to 6 Per Cent. Tare, But We Cannot Help a Man Who is Willing to be Run Over—Prompt Action Needed for 1910 Cotton Season.

Some time last fall, if I am not mistaken, I saw in The Progressive Farmer and Gazette an article, advising farmers to put 30 pounds of bagging on their cotton, including ties. The farmers here, following your advice did so. The mill men kicked on it and stopped all local buyers from buyers, saying a farmer had just as well put in plank to make up, as it would be more honorable.

Some one wrote an article in the Charlotte Observer about it making the same sort of argument, and I am surprised at your not replying to it. You surely have not noticed it. Not only myself, but all farmers are surprised at your not replying. What I want to know, is it law to put it on? If it is defend us; if not publish the amount we can put on it. C. Shelby, N. C.

(Answer by Editor Clarence Peck)
I am glad to get the letter from you, but he should remember that all the Progressive Farmer and Gazette can do in a case like this is to tell what is right. With all the information before us, we said, and still say,

for the nomination to a State prohibition convention.

Now, Mr. Editor, I am to write the painful part of this article. I loved Bristow like a younger brother. Who persuaded him into that Jerome hotel caucus? He wrote and advocated the resolutions calling a State convention, as adopted by the prohibition conference. Not long after he was nominated for lieutenant governor there began to drop from his pen, little pieces complimentary of Featherstone. Was it Featherstone's hand that tendered the crown—or counseled his nomination, that fascinated the boy? I don't know.

Mr. Bristow says I was "wrongly informed" as to the Jerome hotel meeting, and "it is very gratifying to see that The State's editorial comment upon Mr. Brunson's card does not endorse nor sustain the statement concerning the Hotel Jerome conference." Et tu Brute!

I now take a few words from Mr. Bristow's letter written to me a few days after the Jerome hotel meeting, in which he tells me what occurred there. After saying they all thought the prohibitionists should put out a ticket for the next year, and the candidate was to be not "Featherstone or a man like him . . . I told him," referring to Featherstone, "plainly before all present that he could not be nominated, and that . . . I and others had utterly lost confidence in him." In the matter of nominations he says: "There was a decided move toward McCullough . . . I am inclined to favor him."

A few days later Mr. McCullough's nomination appeared in print. Was it the product of that Jerome hotel conference?

If Mr. Bristow still thinks I was "wrongly informed," or that I have twisted to suit my purpose any clause of his letter and demand its publication, it shall go to the press though it make a momental ass of him.

If Mr. Featherstone, or Mr. Everett, or Mr. Frist, claims that I have not quoted correctly from the minutes of the prohibition committee meeting of October 26, 1905, that paper also properly signed by Mr. Jaynes can go to the press.

Now, Mr. Editor, I have "made good" from the testimony of Mr. Featherstone, his friends and the records without calling a single witness on my side.
I thank God for a fine memory and for carefully preserved records in this controversy.
Joel E. Brunson,
Sumter, August 20, 1910.

that the farmer is entitled to put 6 per cent. tare on his cotton bales. This is his right, but if the farmer is not disposed to insist on it, we cannot help it. The farmer has a right now to get 14 to 15 cents for good cotton, but if he is willing to be run over and let a buyer take it for 10 cents, we have too much important work to do to go out and fight the battles of a man who won't stand up for himself.

The 6 per cent tare is right and farmers from one end of the South to the other ought to organize with a view to enforcing this right on all 1910 markets.

All that we can do is to tell them this and then it is up to them, through the Farmers' Unions and other ways to do the rest.

But why do we say the 6 per cent. tare is right?

Put in a nutshell, our position is just this: Europe buys most of our cotton, and buys it on a basis of 6 per cent tare—fixes prices with a view to losing 6 per cent. to get net weight. President J. L. Lee of the Georgia Farmers' Union publicly asserted last fall that Wilmington, Atlanta, Augusta, and Savannah exporters buy cotton on a basis of 22 pounds and put on the full 30 pounds before exporting.

If the European man secures a 6 per cent. for tare, then the American manufacturers should either allow 6 per cent or pay a higher price for their lint. And if 6 per cent is right, then it is not the case that where the farmer puts on the full 6 per cent, he is acting dishonorably and selling bagging and ties at cotton prices; the real truth is, that where less than 6 per cent is used the buyer might more reasonably be accused because he gets cotton at bagging prices. And it is not in getting cotton at bagging prices that the only unfair action has been going on, if the information I have is correct.

Last fall the American Textile Manufacturer jumped on me for my fight for the 6 per cent tare, and I answered them with the letter added herewith. Although I watched their paper carefully they have never yet published this reply, so far as I can learn, nor have they ever refuted my position by private correspondence. One or two leading cotton manufacturers also attacked my position, but could not come back at me when I presented these arguments, although I made it plain that I wrote with no feeling toward either cotton buyer or cotton manufacturer and with an earnest desire not only to be absolutely fair, but to get any information that might show me in error. For as I said to them in the language of old Marcus Aurelius: "If any man can show me that I do not think or act aright, I will gladly change for I seek only the truth by which no man was ever injured." The fact that neither the manufacturers themselves nor their official organ were able to attack or overturn our arguments is the best commentary on their soundness.

The paramount need, as I see it, is for a uniform system. There ought to be a definite understanding between the farmers' organizations and the manufacturers' organizations as to the amount of tare to be allowed on each bale and the present double standard system, with all of its irregularities and losses forever done away with.

If the tare were less than 6 per cent, but uniform and unvarying, prices would soon be adjusted through natural law to compensate for the increased percentage of lint in a bale, but with the present double-standard system the farmer gets caught between the upper and nether millstones and has lost thousands of dollars as a result.

If 6 per cent tare is to be and continue the recognized standard by European manufacturers—and it has been the standard so long that manufacturers tell us it would be almost impossible to change it—then the American standard should be revised to accord with it.
In other words, we must have a

uniform system, and the 6 per cent tare seems to be the only one that can be agreed upon.
The letter which I sent the American Textile Manufacturer, and which they did not even publish, may make our position even clearer and is appended herewith:
A Letter the Manufacturers Wouldn't Print.

"To the Editor: I have read your editorial in this week's Textile Manufacturer, and I think that you entirely misunderstand the spirit of the Progressive Farmer and the Southern Farmer. We do not wish to have a single piece of bagging sold at cotton prices. In fact, so far from the system of selling by net weight being objectionable, the farmers know very well that the mills do not really buy bagging and ties but always made their price with a view to buying only the net weight. The point I make is, that long custom and the uniform practice among European buyers is to assume that net weight is 6 per cent. less than the gross weight, and that prices for cotton are fixed upon this basis—as it is reasonable to assume since the larger part of our cotton crop is bought by Europe in which the 6 per cent tare is the rule.

"As a matter of fact, then, it is not the case that where the farmer puts on full 6 per cent, he is selling bagging and ties at cotton prices, but the real situation is, that where less than 6 per cent is put on, cotton is sold at bagging prices.

"As for buying at net weight that is what the cotton world is aiming at now, for the price is lowered sufficiently to allow for the bagging and ties. The need is for uniformity, so that one class (the buyers and manufacturers) will not get the advantage which another class (the farmers) is entitled to.

"Our position in the matter is more clearly set forth in the enclosed editorial which we should like to have you publish. We are only seeking the truth in the matter and a square deal, which we believe can only come about by having a uniform system instead of the present double standard.—Progressive Farmer."

SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED.

Young Men and Women Who Will Receive College Educations on State Scholarships.

At the meeting of the State Board of Education held in Columbia Wednesday scholarships in the State colleges were awarded. The following were the awards for Sumter county:

Clemson College—Bush M. Jackson, Clarence C. DesChamps and one vacancy yet to be filled.

University of South Carolina—Thomas M. Moore.

For Lee county the awards were:

Winthrop College—Sarah Bates James.

For Clarendon county:

University of South Carolina—Furman Bradham.

Clemson College—Ellison Capers, Jr., R. Henry Ridgill, W. T. Sprett, Jr.

Death.

Alexander, infant son of Mrs. Mary H. Sparks, died at her residence on Sumter street, at 1 o'clock Tuesday 23rd, age 4 months.

"Dysentery is a dangerous disease but can be cured. Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy has been successfully used in nine epidemics of dysentery. It has never been known to fail. It is equally valuable for children and adults, and when reduced with water and sweetened is pleasant to take. Sold by W. W. Sibert.

Monday afternoon the Liberty Street and Little Rocks base ball teams played a fast game of ball, resulting in a victory of 9 to 0 in favor of the Little Rocks.

Batteries: Little Rocks; Hoyt and Richardson; Liberty Street; Gallagher and Gallagher.

"When the digestion is all right, the action of the bowels regular, there is a natural craving and relish for food. When this is lacking you may know that you need a dose of Chamberlain's Stomach and Liver Tablets. They strengthen the digestive organs, improve the appetite and regulate the bowels. Sold by W. W. Sibert.

A great many farmers are talking of planting winter cover crops, either rye, vetch or crimson clover. The campaign for scientific farming is beginning to tell.

"In buying a cough medicine, don't be afraid to get Chamberlain's Cough Remedy. There is no danger from it, and relief is sure to follow. Especially recommended for coughs, colds and whooping cough. Sold by W. W. Sibert.

It is said that the magisterial race in Privateer is the hottest political proposition in the county camp. There is also a hard fought race on the Providence district.

"If your liver is sluggish, a dose of Chamberlain's Stomach and Liver Tablets will do you good. It is all right in the morning. Sold by W. W. Sibert.