

**The Watchman and Southron.**  
Published Wednesday and Saturday.

—BY—  
**OSTEEN PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
SUMTER, S. C.

Terms:  
\$1.50 per annum—in advance.

Advertisements:  
One Square first insertion . . . \$1.00  
Every subsequent insertion . . . .50  
Contracts for three months, or longer will be made at reduced rates. All communications which serve private interests will be charged for as advertisements.

Obituaries and tributes of respect will be charged for.  
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.

The final developments in the investigation of the charges against President Mitchell, of the University of South Carolina, respecting the distribution of the Peabody fund—said charges having been made by Gov. Blease, who cited President Johnson of Winthrop College as his authority—leave a decidedly bad impression. The conclusion finds the two learned educators making faces at each other and calling names—a rather undignified performance. We are still of the opinion that Dr. Mitchell was unjustly attacked, that the charges were unfounded and that jealousy or malice inspired them, the testimony of Dr. Rose and others having completely vindicated him; but when he appeared before the committee and, instead of confining himself strictly to the facts, branched off into personal criticism of Dr. Johnson he weakened his case and descended to the same level as his accusers. It is a sorry spectacle for the heads of two of the State's colleges to be engaged in what is nothing more nor less than a vulgar brawl, despite the elegant, chaste and precise language used in expressing their opinion of each other. Dr. Johnson has gained no credit and has added nothing to his reputation by his conduct and attitude throughout the investigation, nothing being said concerning his antecedent connection with the attack on Dr. Mitchell, it not being clear in our mind whether he used Gov. Blease as a tool in this matter or was used by Gov. Blease. On the other hand Dr. Mitchell displayed lack of judgment and dignity when he expressed opinions and uttered caustic criticisms of Dr. Johnson in his testimony before the committee. But for this stupid blunder Dr. Mitchell would have come out of this investigation with flying colors, to the confusion and undoing of his enemies and detractors. As it is the whole thing winds up with a jawing match between Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Johnson.

A member of the House of Representatives moved to appropriate \$1,100 to pay Architect A. W. Todd for the plaster model of that unlucky child of his imagination—the one million dollar State House. Wonder what the member expected to do with the model.

The Legislature is nearing adjournment and not a single thing has been done towards the enactment of a school law adapted to the needs of the time. The report of the commission on school law is still in the pigeon-hole where it was placed two years ago when the legislature got weak-kneed on the subject.

Another measure that was exceedingly popular among the campaigners last summer—the Torrens system of land registration—has been forgotten.

The Corn Show is over, now for the corn and tomato clubs.

**MR. EPPS DEFENDS POSITION.**

Editor Daily Item:  
Dear Sir: A recent editorial in The Item has been called to my attention, in which you think Dr. Dick and I have fallen under the evil influences of "Demagogues." You arrive at this conclusion on account of our vote on the newspaper bill.  
This very instance shows the propriety of allowing a man to have a reply, when he has been placed in a false position by the press, and a right which you have always granted.  
In the first place, neither Dr. Dick nor I voted to pass the said bill.  
The bill provided that a person attacked or reflected upon in a newspaper should have the right to present his explanation or reply in the same paper, free of charge.  
This bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. I was, and am, in favor of the right of any person to have a short reply to an article reflecting upon him, but I did not favor the bill as it stood, nor were the three amendments offered by the committee satis-

factory to me. For these reasons I would sign neither the report of the majority nor that of the minority, and reserved my right upon the floor of the House.

When the bill came on for its second reading, there were a number of amendments, and I was desirous of having these amendments read so as to ascertain whether these would properly modify the bill. But before this could be done, a motion was made to strike out the enacting words of this bill, which motion, if carried, shuts off any further consideration. Dr. Dick and I voted against this motion as we wished to consider these amendments. This motion, however, carried, and that ended the matter.

As to the constitutionality of the proposed bill, the present law provides for fine or imprisonment of an editor and also for the recovery of a money judgment against him. All this is certainly more drastic than to require the paper to print free of charge a short reply.

So far as I am concerned, I do not believe in stifling the press, but, on the other hand, I have not reached that stage of newspaper worship as to call a man a demagogue just because he is not in favor of an unlicensed press.

You say you are surprised at our action, since neither of us has ever been attacked by a newspaper. Can you not conceive of men being actuated by a desire to achieve the common good, and not always influenced by selfish motives?

I consider your unkind editorial as evidence of the fact that some editors are still mortal, and liable to err.

Very respectfully,

R. D. EPPS.

The foregoing communication from Mr. R. D. Epps, in reply to our editorial criticising his vote on the Rembert newspaper bill, throws more light on his position respecting the bill, and we are glad to learn that he was not, and is not, an advocate of the original bill. We were led to believe that he endorsed the bill and advocated its enactment by the reports of legislative proceedings wherein it was stated that Mr. Epps argued in favor of the constitutionality of the measure. We regret that through a misunderstanding of Mr. Epps' position we have done him an injustice by attributing to him a wholehearted support of the Rembert bill in its original mischievous form. We, however, do not recede from our position that the bill, no matter how it may be amended in minor details, is wrong in principle, dangerous and needless. We do not stand for an unlicensed press, an unfair, partisan or venal press, and our twenty-two years record as an editor is proof of this assertion. We believe that a newspaper should have the same rights as an individual and should be held to the same responsibilities. We have no objection to, or fear of, the present law, which Mr. Epps declares drastic. If a lawyer, preacher or any other person slanders or libels another he can be held responsible and made to pay a just penalty for his wrong—so can an editor—and this is fair and just. But to require a newspaper to place its columns at the service of any notoriety-seeking individual who may desire to advertise himself is neither fair, reasonable nor constitutional, in our opinion. Mr. Epps' conclusion that the editorial to which he replies is proof of the need of a law along the lines of the Rembert bill may be sound, but we differ even as to this, for when writing the editorial we expected to print any reply that either Mr. Epps or Dr. Dick might see fit to make. We have never denied the use of our columns to a man whom we criticised and never expect to do so. What we object to in the Rembert bill is that it makes the man seeking free publicity the sole judge of whether or not he has been unjustly criticised or reflected upon by a newspaper. With such a law a notoriety-seeker could frame up any sort of flimsy excuse to get into the newspapers at the expense of the newspapers, for his own profit.

**THE CITY NURSE FUND.**

The committees that are canvassing the city today for funds to maintain the Civic League nurse have met with a liberal response from a majority of those to whom the needs of the cause have been presented. The response cannot well be too liberal, for while the city nurse can be maintained for a minimum of \$95 a month, the sum barely provides actual operating expenses, leaving nothing for widening the scope of this praiseworthy and utilitarian charity. Time and again in cases of illness and destitution among the poor the city nurse finds herself in dire need of funds to provide for the immediate necessities of those under her care, and heretofore she has had to rely on individual charity in response to personal appeals. There should be a fund upon which she can draw in such cases, and now is the time to raise sufficient money to adequately support the City Nurse and the work she has to do.

**Cheaper Money for Farmers.**

Wilmington Star.

An American committee representing the agricultural interests of this country will sail this spring for Europe to investigate the co-operative rural credit system that have proven so successful in France, Germany, Italy and other continental countries. It won't do any harm, of course, for the committee to take the trip and investigate the systems first hand, but it strikes us that the government at Washington has about all the information that could be picked up by the committee. If it has not, it could easily get the information through its representatives in the countries that have systems under which farmers can borrow money at as low rate as any other class of borrowers.

It is estimated that the average American farmer pays 8 1-2 per cent on the money he borrows to aid him in his operations. The probability is that the larger per cent of rural borrowers pay more than that. Actual loans of money may cost them 8 1-2 per cent, but there are thousands who cannot borrow money but who do get credit for their fertilizers and farm supplies. Those acquainted with conditions in the cotton belt know that a farmer who buys his supplies on credit pays an interest in credit charges all out of proportion to the profits on his crops. The fact is, the man who farms on high credit is doing business on a basis that would ruin any other business.

Since it is known that agriculture is handicapped by heavy costs on production we don't know of any more effective aid that could be given to Southern agriculture than by the movement to bring about a system that will furnish farmers with working capital at as low a rate of interest as is paid by those engaged in any other legitimate industry. Many more men would farm if they could get financial encouragement, and even more would enlarge their operations if they could get the money. We mean men who are trustworthy, not the class that could not be trusted with money. However, the rural credit system of Europe is one that capitalizes what a farmer owns and his assets become bankable so he can borrow money at low interest on his own hook without being under obligations to anybody. Even should he have endorsed the farmer's assets, make his endorser of a rural zone bank perfectly safe.

The South has its own peculiar agricultural problems to be met, and it is easy to conceive that the agricultural problems vary in each part of American. We are satisfied, however, that a study of our own problems would aid us in bringing about a rural credit system that would fill the bill in the South.

We have long ago become satisfied that the European system is as applicable in this country as it is in that country, and the American committee that is to visit European countries this spring will find it so. It is proposed for each State to send two representatives to Europe as members of the American committee. It will cost \$2,500 to pay the expenses of the two representatives. The Jacksonville Times-Union is urging Florida to send a couple of representatives on that errand, and in doing so that paper says:

"Nowhere more than in the South are the advantages in the direction of cheap money for the farmer needed for the development of agricultural wealth, and agricultural wealth means more money for city business in the long run. It is often said that no city is permanently prosperous and growing that is not backed by a prosperous rural district tributary to it. Cheap money means not merely money lent at a low interest rate, but also money lent on time long enough to allow the borrower to 'turn it over' and make a profit with it before he has to pay back interest and principal.

"Florida has some peculiar agricultural problems to solve, and money is needed to solve them. Probably no other State has so many small farms, unless it be California. It is the small farmer who needs money oftenest, and he generally needs it at low interest and on long time—he needs to borrow in small sums, too. Then, too, why teach the farmer improved methods of agriculture if he cannot borrow money to apply those lessons which will enable him to make larger crops? Therefore is it important that the State be represented on the American committee which will sail this spring to study near at hand in Europe the system of co-operative rural credit, which have not only saved the rural populations of that continent from impending ruin, but have actually made them wealthier than those of America, which once boasted that she fed the world. Florida has some questions to ask, and can ask them only through citizens acquainted with her agricultural conditions."

Probably each State has its peculiar agricultural problems to deal with, but it seems that the agricultural interests of each State could easily raise the \$2,500 necessary to be represented in the European investigation. The

Legislatures might be able to make the necessary appropriations and send the committee, since it is for the good of all the people that the agricultural sources of a State are developed. Nevertheless, the financial and commercial interests are directly concerned and they would find it to their interest to keep up with and take a hand in the efforts to establish a sound rural credit system.

**\$5 Per Horse a Year for Papers; \$5 Per Horse a Year for Books.**

There is one fact that cannot be too strongly emphasized, and that is, that while you want to make your neighborhood a reading neighborhood, it must be the right sort of reading. A semi-weekly or tri-weekly edition of some city daily, its news columns filled with stories of suicides and murders and scandals and railroad wrecks and criminal trials, and its advertising columns filled with shameless announcements of patent medicine fakirs, whiskey distillers and quack doctors—such a paper won't help you at all. Nor will a cheap monthly, with sensational stories and fortune-telling articles and fraudulent "free" advertisements in unlimited number.

You must spend some money to get the best local paper, the best farm paper, the best political and church papers, the best magazines, even if they do cost more—the clean, wholesome, wideawake, ably-edited papers that stand for progress, for improvement, and for high ideals.

In fact, in this plan to make your neighborhood a reading neighborhood, the very first idea to get rid of, is that you must have cheap reading matter.

We never can make the South what it ought to be, you never can make your neighborhood what it ought to be, until the farmers get rid of this idea that their minds are not worth feeding. A man has got to believe in himself more than that, must have more respect for himself, more respect for his brain and his mind, before he can amount to anything. He must believe that his own mind and his children's minds deserve the best intellectual food he can find—and plenty of it. He wouldn't let his children go with two meals a day when they need three. Why, then, should he compel them to get along with only an occasional monthly or semi-monthly feast of intellectual food instead of seeing to it that the best papers to be had come to his home every week.

No hard and fast rule can be laid down, but a reasonable minimum can be fixed, and we would say that no man is doing right by himself or his family if he spends less than \$10 a year for papers, magazines and books for each horse he works—say \$5 for papers and \$5 for books for the one-horse farm; \$10 for papers and \$10 for books for the two-horse farmer, etc.

Five dollars a year per horse for papers; \$5 a year per horse for books—provided the right sort of papers and books were selected—would soon revolutionize the South and go far to dispel the ignorance that the inefficiency of our schools has cursed us with. No man who is not poor enough to starve his body is poor enough to starve his mind.—The Progressive Farmer.

**Whatever You Do!**

Remember to read the ad of D. C. Shaw in this issue. He tells about "The Ford."

**SCHEDULE**

**SOUTH CAROLINA WESTERN RAILWAY.**

Sumter, S. C., Feb. 14, 1913.

No. 6.	No. 8.
8.00 A. M.	3.00 P. M. Lv. Sumter.
8.19 A. M.	3.19 P. M. Lv. Brent.
8.28 A. M.	3.28 P. M. Lv. DuBose.
8.35 A. M.	3.35 P. M. Lv. Aman.
8.45 A. M.	3.45 P. M. Lv. Meredith.
8.50 A. M.	3.50 P. M. Lv. Manville.
9.07 A. M.	4.06 P. M. Lv. Bishopville.
9.22 A. M.	4.22 P. M. Lv. Alcot.
9.27 A. M.	4.27 P. M. Lv. Young.
9.36 A. M.	4.36 P. M. Lv. Lydia.
10.03 A. M.	5.03 P. M. Ar. Hartsville.
No. 5.	No. 7.
10.40 A. M.	5.15 P. M. Lv. Hartsville.
11.07 A. M.	5.42 P. M. Lv. Lydia.
11.16 A. M.	5.51 P. M. Lv. Young.
11.21 A. M.	5.56 P. M. Lv. Alcot.
11.37 A. M.	6.12 P. M. Lv. Bishopville.
11.53 A. M.	6.28 P. M. Lv. Manville.
11.58 A. M.	6.33 P. M. Lv. Meredith.
12.06 P. M.	6.43 P. M. Lv. Aman.
12.15 P. M.	6.50 P. M. Lv. DuBose.
12.24 P. M.	6.59 P. M. Lv. Brent.
12.43 P. M.	7.18 P. M. Ar. Sumter.

No. 6 leaving Sumter 8 A. M. connects at Hartsville with train from North and West, and for Darlington and Florence.  
No. 8 leaving Sumter 3 P. M. connects at Hartsville with train from Darlington and Florence for the North and West.  
New coaches, new engines, polite attention.  
J. T. CHINA, Agent.  
Sumter, S. C.  
C. C. GRAVES, T. M.  
Hamlet, N. C.

**HOT BISCUIT,**

hot cakes, made with **ROYAL Baking Powder** are delicious, healthful and easily made.

**Get Rid of the Stumps.**

Although the Southern farmers, as a general rule, or on an average, produce smaller yields per acre than farmers in other sections, they receive as much per acre for the products of their land. Their profits or yearly earnings are less because they cultivate fewer acres at a larger expense per acre. This is chiefly due to their failure to use sufficient work-stock and labor-saving implements. The reasons for this failure to use more labor-saving implements are many, but perhaps the most important one is that the condition of our fields is such as to make their use less profitable or at least more difficult. Small fields of irregular shape, with stumps, gullies and open ditches are serious obstacles to the satisfactory use of the larger and better labor-saving implements.

It takes time and costs money to remove these obstacles to cheap cultivation of the land, but the time has come when the stumps should be removed from all cultivated fields. It costs less to remove them than to allow them to remain on the land. The crops that may be grown on the land they occupy and the extra cost of cultivation which they cause will pay for their removal in a year or two. The stump puller should be on every farm where there are stumps on the land. If there are not enough stumps to justify the purchase of a stump puller, or if the farmer is not financially able to buy one alone, he should set to work to get his neighbors to join with him in the joint purchase of a machine.

Too often when we feel that we are not able to do all of a certain piece of work, we allow that to serve as a reason for doing none of it. Stumps should be removed as fast as possible and a good stump puller is a great help in clearing the land of stumps wherever and whenever used. Why not join with your neighbor and buy a stump puller or buy one alone, if you can, and clear a few extra acres this winter? It will pay.—The Progressive Farmer.

**SUMTER COTTON MARKET.**

Corrected daily by Ernest Field, Cotton Buyer.  
Sumter, Feb. 17.  
Good Middling 12 3-8.  
Strict Middling 12 1-4.  
Middling 12 1-8.  
St. Low Middling 11 3-4.  
Low Middling 11 1-8.  
Staple cotton, nominal.

**NEW YORK COTTON MARKET.**

New York, Feb. 17.  
Opening. Close.  
March . . . . .12.16 12.11  
May . . . . .11.98 11.92  
July . . . . .11.92 11.83

**FOR SALE**—One carriage, road cart and set of harness; all in excellent condition. Cheap for cash. J. Edwin Brunson, 304 S Sumter St.

**FOR SALE**—Eggs from thoroughbred Barred Plymouth Rocks, \$1 for sitting of 15 eggs. A. P. Vinson, Sumter, S. C., R. F. D. 4.

**LOST**—Red and white spotted ox, strayed Wednesday night, from my home near Dabzell. Reward for return. Murray Sammons, Dabzell, S. C.

**WANTED**—The following hard wood in any quantity: oak, ash, hickory, maple, locust, walnut, holly. Write me what you have and price per cord or thousand f. o. b. Sumter. D. China.

**FOR SALE**—Dixie Wilt resistant cotton seed from 1911 crop, price \$1 per bushel, sound and pure. E. B. Colcolugh, Oswego, S. C., R. F. D.

**STAPLE COTTON**—Sun Flower seed variety. Only a few left. J. M. Fraser, Oswego, S. C., Route 1.

**A LOT OF NO 1 DIXIE BLIGHT RESISTANT COTTON SEED, 1 DOLLAR PER BUSHEL.**

J. C. DUNBAR.

DALZELL, S. C.

**BLANKETS**



☐ We have some good numbers left in White, Reds, Grays and Plaids,

**10-4 and 11-4**

AT

**\$3.50, \$4 & 4.50**

☐ Two months left in which to use them this winter, and then other winters.

**O'Donnell & Co.**