The Fairfield News and Herald.

VOL. XLVIII. WINNSBORO, S. C., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1894. NO. 44.

THE CAMPAIGN DATES.

AS ARRANGED BY THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE.

Schedule for the Political Fight in South Carolina—Big Discussion Over Weaverites and Haskellites—All to be Allowed to Vote.

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 8.—The meeting of the State Democratic Executive Committee last night was an interesting and important one. Besides the fixing of dates for campaign meetings, the question of allowing the men who voted for Weaver in 1892 to vote in the coming campaign was a live one. It excited the warmest talk of the evening.

By instruction of the chairman, Secretary Tompkins read the roll of members. The majority of the regular members who were absent had telegraphed and had substitutes in their places. The following was the roll as made up:

Abbeville—Y. J. Jones.
Aiken—John Gary Evans.
Anderson—W. A. Neal.
Barnwell—F. M. Mixon, (substitute.)
Beaufort—Henry D. Elliott.
Berkeley—T. W. Stanland.
Charleston—J. M. Kinloch.
Chester—A. E. Cunningham.
Chesterfield—D. T. Redfearn.
Clarendon—S. A. Nettles.
Colleton—M. R. Cooper, (substitute.)
Darlington—T. E. Early.
Edgefield—H. H. Townes.
Fairfield—J. M. Kirkland, (substitute.)
Florence—R. M. McKeown.
Georgetown—
Greenville—J. W. Gray.
Hampton—T. J. Russell.
Horry—J. P. Derham.
Kershaw—T. J. Kirkland.
Lancester—Ira B. Jones.
Laurens—J. L. M. Irby.
Lexington—J. L. Shuler, (substitute.)
Marion—J. D. Montgomery.
Marlboro—W. D. Evans.
Newberry—Dr. Sampson Pope.
Oconee—J. R. Earle, (substitute.)
Orangeburg—J. H. Claffey, (substitute.)
Pickens—T. C. Robertson.
Richland—C. A. Douglass.
Spartanburg—D. L. Bennett.
Sumter—Frank Mellette.
Union—A. C. Lyles.
Williamsburg—Wm. Cooper.
York—D. E. Finley.

The chairman announced that a quorum was present and that the committee was ready for business.

Chairman Irby thought that the first business would be the fixing of dates for the campaign meetings. On motion it was resolved that the ensuing Democratic State campaign meetings be held as follows:

Yorkville, Tuesday, June 19th.
Chester, Wednesday, June 20th.
Lancaster, Thursday, June 21st.
Camden, Friday, June 22d.
Sumter, Saturday, June 23d.
Chesterfield, Tuesday, June 26th.
Bennettsville, Wednesday, June 27th.
Darlington, Thursday, June 28th.
Florence, Friday, June 29th.
Marion, Tuesday, July 3rd.
Conway, Wednesday, July 4th.
Georgetown, Friday, July 6th.
Kingstree, Saturday, July 7th.
Manning, Tuesday, July 10th.
Bonneau's, (Berkeley) Wednesday, July 11th.
Charleston, Thursday, July 12th.
Walterboro, Friday, July 13th.
Beaufort, Saturday, July 14th.
Hampton, Monday, July 16th.
Barnwell, Tuesday, July 17th.
Aiken, Wednesday, July 18th.
Edgefield C. H., Thursday, July 19th.
Lexington C. H., Friday, July 20th.
Winnsboro, Tuesday, July 24th.
Columbia, Wednesday, July 25th.
Orangeburg, Thursday, July 26th.
Newberry, Friday, July 27th.
Laurens, Saturday, July 28th.
Union, Tuesday, July 31st.
Spartanburg, Wednesday, August 1st.
Greenvillee, Thursday, August 2d.
Pickens C. H., Friday, August 3d.
Oconee, Monday, August 6th.
Anderson, Tuesday, August 7th.
Abbeville, Wednesday, August 8th.

Mr. Kirkland, of Kershaw, introduced the following resolution in regard to voting at primary elections:

"Resolved, That in the ensuing Democratic primaries the following pledge shall be exacted by the managers of each voter before he casts his vote:

"'I solemnly swear that I am entitled to vote in this primary election and will abide the result of the same.'"

Secretary Tompkins, by request, read the oath enacted at the last primary. It was practically the same as that proposed by Mr. Kirkland, and the latter withdrew his resolution.

Chairman Irby remarked that there was some misunderstanding as to the qualifications of a voter. He then spoke as follows:

"Gentlemen and the Committee:

"There is one question that is being agitated in South Carolina and has been agitated for several months to which I would call your attention. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Democratic party, I do not propose to dodge the question. In its consideration I shall not undertake to influence or dictate to any member of the committee, and I repeat it most emphatically, that I will not dictate to the committee, but to suggest to you, gentlemen, that we march right up to front and take our position upon this question. So far as I am concerned, as the member of this committee from Laurens and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the party of this State, I shall not hesitate (even should it be necessary by a tie vote to give my opinion by my vote) to express my own convictions on this question.

"The question I refer to is this, and I am unwilling to evade it, for I see a disposition to dodge it, though I do not use the word dodge in its offensive sense—whether men who participated in the primaries of 1892, in the nomination of State officers and other candidates, who voted in the club and sent delegates to the State convention which elected delegates to the national convention at Chicago to nominate a President—whether these men who are known as Third partyites, shall be permitted to participate in the general primary to be held in August next. As your chairman I feel it to be my duty to say that we should take some positive, decided, outspoken action on this question. I say, I repeat, that we, as representatives of the Democratic party of South Carolina—and I am glad to see that every county is represented here—ought not to dodge that important question. If we believe that the men who participated in the primaries of '92 and who voted for Weaver should not be permitted to vote at the approaching primaries we ought to say so. If we believe that they are Democrats within the meaning of the Constitution and rules of the Democratic party, then we ought to say so and permit them to participate. What I wish to emphasize is that we should not evade or dodge this question. We ought to discuss it fully whether it be in public or in private, but we should declare whether or not they can participate under our rules. If we do not take such action we lay ourselves open to the charge that we have dodged the question and that this committee was unable to solve it one way or the other. I thought, gentlemen, that it was my duty to say this much to you on this subject which is now open to you for discussion."

Chairman Irby's remarks brought on the hottest discussion of the evening and made things lively for a good while. Immediately after the Senator had concluded Mr. Mellette, of Sumter, offered a verbal resolution that the men who voted for Weaver in 1892 be excluded from voting.

The motion had no sooner been made than a half dozen memders were on their feet ready to offer some kind of a resolution or to make a speech. Mr. Derham, of Horry, was recognizsd by the chair and offered the following resolution as a substitute to Mr. Mellette's resolution:

"Resolved, That those white men who voted the Weaver ticket in 1892 shall be allowed to vote in the coming primaries."

Dr. Sampson Pope made a strong speech in favor of the substitute. He said that this committee had allowed the Haskelites to vote in 1892 and the men who voted for Weaver had a right to be treated in the same manner. The Democratic party needed white voters and did not want to throw any of them out of the party. (Applause.) The men who voted for Weaver were no worse than who voted for Haskell. (Applause.)

Mr. Kirkland, of Kershaw, offered as an amendment to the substitute the words: "Upon taking the oath prescribed by the party." He said that he had no speech to make but thought that this provision was wise and proper.

Mr. T. C. Robertson, of Pickens, thought that the proposed amendment was an insult to the men who had voted for Weaver. There were good and true white men in his county who voted for Weaver.

Mr. Townes, of Edgefield, asked the question whether the men who violated thir oaths and pledges by voting for Weaver in 1892 would keep their oaths if allowed to vote this year.

Colonel Neal, of Anderson, did not think any more should be required of the men who violated their pledges in 1892 than of the men who did the same thing in 1890.

Col. F. M. Mixson, acting as the representative from Barnwell, moved to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. Kirkland.

National Committeeman Donaldson, of Greenville, thought that the amendment should be adopted so as to prevent any misconstruction of the action of the committee.

Just before Mr. Donaldson's remarks, however, the motion of Colonel Mixson to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. Kirkland was put and carried by a vote of 21 to 8, thereby calling out the remarks from Mr. Donaldson that he thought some amendment should be made to Mr Derham's substitute.

Senator W. D. Evans said he thought every party desired to increase its membership and its stregth. He wished that every man in America was a Democrat. He for one would like to ask every man to come into the party.

Mr. Robertson said that there had been a good deal of talk about the violation of pledges, etc. The men of his county who voted for Weaver did not consider that they had violated any pledge, unless it was a moral one. The great majority of them had not taken any pledge in the primary.

Dr. Pope declared that the oath throughout the State had been administered to few voters and that not many of those who voted for Weaver had taken any oath in the primary.

Mr. Mellette said that the chairman and the committee had misunderstood his motion. He meant to exclude only those who had taken the oath, participated in the primary and then voted for Weaver.

Hon. S. A. Nettles of Clarendon, to stop the discusion and to please the different minded committeemen, introduced the following resolution, which was accepted by Mr. Derham in place of his own resolution;

"Resolved, That no white man shall be excluded from participating in the Democratic primaries who shall take the oath required by the Democratic party."

Speaking to this resolution C. A Douglass, of Richland, made the longest speech of the session, and one of the most eloquent. He said he was glad that Mr. Nettles had introduced the resolution. It was along the line of liberality and kindness and would tend to increase the membership of the party. He declared, however, that he could not remain silent after all the unkind remarks which had been made about Democrats. He said that the Haskellite movement may have been inexpedient, and he had condemned it at the time, but say that Judge Haskell was not a Democrat was to controvert history. He asserted that Haskell was a Democrat and had always been one. In the heat of political discussion men might say he was not a Democrat, but in the quiet of the home circle there came a change in that feeling and all must recognize him as a Democrat. In 1890. Mr. Douglass said, there had been no pledge in the primary. The men who voted for Haskell had taken no pledge and had violated no oath and it was their right to vote in 1892 without the sanction of the Democratic executive committee. He said that he would be untrue to himself and to his convictions if he stood by and did not draw a distinction between the men who voted for Weaver and those who voted for Haskell. He asserted that there was a vast difference, and all his words intimated that the Weaverites were the worst of the two.

Mr. Douglass was interrupted by members of the committee who asked him what about the Haskellites who had voted for Ensor for Congress and if Haskell himself had not voted for Ensor. Mr. Duglass said that he did not know what Haskell had done, but as for himself, he hoped that his right arm would lose its cunning when he voted for a Republican over a Democrat.

Mr. Douglass concluded with a patriotic appeal for peace and laudatory and pretty remarks about the farmers. He wanted to see the people happy and wanted to see Mr. Nettles's resolution carried.

Dr. Pope spoke of the panegyric of Mr. Dougless and of his insinuations against the Weaverites. Then Dr. Pope declared that there was a take behind the action of the committee two years ago in allowing Haskellites to return to the party. It was to keep from disrupting the party and to bring about harmony. White men were at work registering negroes. He declared that if any one would show him a Weaverite who had tried to vote negroes he would be in favor of turning him out of the party. The Haskellites had voted negroes against white men, but no Weaverite had done so. (Loud applause.)

After this the question was quickly settled. Mr. Mellett's resolution was set down on by almost a unanimous vote and Mr. Nettles' substitute was carried: The Weaverites and the Haskellites and all kinds of "ites" will be allowed to vote in the next primary provided they take the oath prescribed by the party.

Dr. Pope said that he had been instructed by the Democrats of his county to inquire whether clubs having a membership of less than twenty-five should be disbanded.

Chairman Irby said that it was his impression that no county convention should allow a delegate from a club which had a membership of less than twenty-five. It was the business of county conventions, however, to pass upon that question.

On motion of Mr. Douglass the rules of 1892 were adopted as the rules for this year, a few changes being made in dates, etc. The first primary will take place on the last Tuesday in August, the 28th.

A resolution was introduced authorizing the treasurer to pay the mileage of the members of the committee.

No election of officers was held, as that is not done until the counties select new members of the committee.

On motion of Colonel Neal, Secretary Tompkins furnished each county with 100 copies of the rules and Constitution of the party.

CROP CONDITIONS.

The Interesting Weekly Bulletin of the State Weather Service.

COLUMBIA, June 7.—The following is the weekly bulletin of the condition of the weather and the crops throughout the State, issued yesterday by State Observer Bauer:

The temporary condition varied greatly during the week, being favorable and nearly normal for the last days of May, but on June 1st there came a cold wave that carried the mercury low enough for very light frosts in exposed places in the Piedmont country. Damage done by the frost to the hardier plants was inconsiderable, scarcely worth noticing, but the low temperature damaged cotton very much and checked the fine recovery it was making from the previous cold weather. Saturday and Sunday were warm and seasonable. There was a plenty of sunshine, with a percentage of from 80 to 90 for the whole State. The rainfall was generally light or wanting, except in the range of the counties bordering on North Carolina, two tiers deep, extending also along the upper coast. There were showers in Beaufort county. Florence county reports too much rain, and Williamsburg a plenty. The need for rain is widespread throughout the State and the drought is becoming serious in localities with sandy soil. All crops would be much benefitted by a general, soaking rain, gardens standing in especial need of it.

Of cotton it can be said that its condition is not as good as it was two week's ago, taking the State as a whole, and during the past week the best that can be said of it is that it remained at a standstill as the direct effect of the few cold nights, but at the present time it is next to impossible, and the attempt will not be made in this bulletin to make an estimate predictive of the crop a month or two ahead. While it is reported that the stand is dying, except in favored localities; and infested with lice; and developing "sore shank;" and the ground lacking moisture for growth or germination of late planting; and the large leaves shriveling and dropping off and the stalk turning red; and fields being replowed and replanted; and the crop generally from two to three weeks late, yet with plenty of rain and a continuation of the warm nights of the past two days, or in general terms, with favorable weather the condition of this staple would improve rapidly for it is not yet in such a hopeless state but that a full crop may be made. Much depends upon the weather of the next two weeks.

Corn continues to keep a good healthy color, but does not grow much. Warmer weather will, however, make a vast improvement in a short time. A A little damage by worms noted. Rice doing very well, although these cold nights were not favorable for its growth. Oats harvest continues or is finishing in different parts of the State, and wheat harvest well begun with uneven yields of both crops. No change to be noted from previous reports. Irish potatoes being dug in eastern portions of the State. The yield is poor and the potatoes small, but they bring satisfactory prices. A large yield would have made this a very paying crop for truck farmers and planters near shipping points. Too cool for sweet potatoes. Tobacco doing fairly well. Melons not growing much, and in localities show a touch of frost. They are in blossom in some places. Blackberries ripening with promise of large yield, and will be about the only fruit of any abundance. Second crop of figs promises an immense yield along the coast. The few apples left in the western counties are dropping badly. All field crops are well worked and clean and could stand a great deal of rain. The following places report an inch or more of rain during the past week: Georgetown, 1.00; Beaufort 1.70; Effingham 1.28.

Charleston to Augusta.

The Times and Democrat has within the last few weeks published several articles, giving at some length the rumor that the Atlantic Coast line and Louisville and Nashville systems proposed to build a new road between Ashley Junction and Augusta. It was actually known that Mr. H. Walter, of the former system, had ordered a preliminary survey of such a line to be made with all possible dispatch and that the work had been begun and was being pushed rapidly forward. A confirmation of all that has been said in The Times and Democrat on the subject comes from an unexpected quarter. The Baltimore Sun of June the 4th publishes locally an account of the same enterprise and on the night preceding a press dispatch was sent out of that city covering the same ground. The Baltimore paper treats the matter as an actual enterprise and not merely as a rumor of one. Where it obtained its information is not known, but the account which it gives will be read with interest. The Sun says: "The Atlantic Coast Line system and the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company are jointly making a survey for a new road from Ashley Junction, S. C., to a connection with the Georgia Railroad at or near Augusta. The Atlantic Coast Line now has a route from Ashley Junction into Charleston, connecting with the terminals in Charleston which were recently purchased in the interest of the Louisville and Nashville Road and which formerly belonged to the South Carolina Railway. The Louisville and Nashville is half owner of the lease of the Georgia Railroad from Augusta to Atlanta, with which the new road will connect. The other half of the lease is owned by the Central Railroad of Georgia. The Atlantic Coast Line will make its connection with the projected road at or near Barnwell Court House. The construction of this road will give the Louisville and Nashville Railroad a terminus on the Atlantic Ocean at Charleston. The Jetties have already secured twenty-two feet of water at low tide, and it is said that this will be increased to twenty-five feet within a year, giving Charleston excellent shipping facilities. The new connection will also make the Atlantic Coast Line the shortest route from all points in the East to Augusta and to nearly all interior Georgie points."

RECREANT DEMOCRATS.

SEVENTY-FIVE OF THEM REFUSE TO RESPECT THEIR PLATFORM.

The State Bank Tax Bill Killed—The Announcement in the House Received With Confusion and Applause.

WASHINGTON, June 6.—Immediately after the routine morning business of the House yesterday Mr. Catchings reported from the committee on rules an order respecting the further consideration of the bill to repeal the State bank tax. It provided for discussion throughout today's session under the five-minute rule, the vote on pending amendments and passage to be taken immediately after assembling of the House tomorrow. Leave to print remarks on the bill was granted to all members, the privilege to extend over a period of the ten following days. After a short debate between Messrs. Reed and Catchings the resolution was agreed to—93 to 71.

Mr. Springer presented the substitute of the committee on banking and currency for the original Brawley bill as follows:

"That the operation of Sections 3,412 and 3 413, Revised Statutes, and Section 19, 20 and 21 of the Act to amend existing customs and internal revenue laws, and for other purposes, approved February 8, 1875, and all other sections of said Revised Statutes, and all Acts and parts of Acts imposing a tax of 10 per cent. on the amount of certain notes when used for circulation and paid out, be and are hereby suspended as to any such notes which were originally issued between August 1, 1893, and October 15, 1893, and no such tax shall be collected on the amount of any such notes. Provided, that nothing herein shall suspend the operation of such Acts as to the tax on amount of any such notes paid out and used for circulaton after January 1, 1894."

Mr. Cox offered his amendment repealing all the laws and parts of laws which impose a tax on State bank circulation.

Mr. Bowers, Republican, of California, said the bill was intended as a premium upon the violation of the law; it was a notification to the banks having made their pile that the penalty of the law would not be enforced against them for subsequent violations, and a notice to the country that the New York banks, like the New York newspapers, were to run the Government.

Mr. Grow, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said a national bank was just as much a local bank as though it had been chartered by a State.

Mr. Livingston, Democrat, of Georgia, said the 10 per cent. tax law should be repealed, because it was intended as a measure of protection to the national bank system, and that system no longer needed protection.

Mr. Talbert, Democrat, of South Carolina, said that he would vote for the Brawley bill and for the repeal of the 10 per cent. tax for the reason that the latter was in the Democratic platform. For him, he said, party platforms were made not only to get in on, but to stand on after he got in. Gentlemen who came into the House after having been elected on a Democratic platform and repudiated the platform, "spreading themselves over the face of the earth and not knee-deep anywhere," need not be surprised if the people repudiated them and the Democratic party.

Mr. Quigg, Republican, of New York, spoke against the proposition to repeal the existing tax on State bank issues

Mr. Harter, Democrat, of Ohio, desired an hour in which to present his reasons why the State bank tax should be repealed, and Mr. Cox, Democrat, of Tennessee, asked that it be given him—some gentleman on the other side to be accorded the same privilege. Objection was made, however, and Mr. Harter declined to proceed, saying he had no ambition to rise simply to have his remarks extended in the Record.

Mr. Kane, Democrat, of Illinois, said he was a hard money man, believing all except gold and silver was make believe money only. He desired to bear witness to the fact that the paper money, however, of the United States was the best in the world. It was a fallacy to assert that the money was issued by banks; it was issued by the Government through the banks. A man who happened to have a State or county bond had no more right to issue notes upon that security than he had to issue them upon the security of 400 acres of good farm land.

Mr. Broderick, Republican, of Kansas, said the bill was obnoxious, it was class legislation of the worst sort. If the tax was a good thing when passed, it should be enforced until the law had been repealed.

The arrangement sought to be made earlier by Mr. Cox was then agreed to.

The late hours, from 3 to 5 o'clock, were divided between the two sides, Mr. Harter, Democrat, of Ohio, to occupy an hour in favor of the repeal of the State bank tax and Mr. Dingly, Republican, of Maine, to control an hour in opposition to the report.

Mr. Campbell, Democrat, of New York, had read a letter from Conrad N. Jordan, ex-United State treasurer and president of the Western National Bank of New York, favoring the repeal of the tax law.

Mr. Gear, Republican, of Iowa, gave a leaf or two from his personal experience with the issues of State banks in ante-war time as reasons why in his opinion the people of that country would not return willingly to that system of currency.

Mr. Harter said that the trouble with the country was not that it suffered an insufficient volume of currency, but from the quality of the currency, its inflexibility and inability to perform promptly the purposes of money at the places where it was needed. A new system was essential to the renewed and continued prosperity of the country, and his belief was that if proper system of State banks was established, by the end of the century the country would do its business upon a volume of currency of less per capita than the volume of currency today.

Speaking of the work accomplished by the State banks in the past, Mr. Harter said the Government never had such a friend nor such an efficient ally as the State banks of 1860. They were stronger than the Government, maintaining gold payments long after the latter had suspended. The national banking system, he said, was based upon the State banks, but unfortunately for the country since the best features of the State banks had not been taken in establishing national banks. In conclusion Mr. Harter pleaded with Republicans, upon patriotic grounds, to vote for the repeal of the tax law, asserting that with the accomplishment of that purpose would disappear the greenback craze and the free silvercraze.

Mr. Bland, of Missouri: "Not a bit of it."

Mr. Harter: "I want to say that no man on the floor of the House gives up so much in voting for this bill as does the gentleman from Missouri. A candidate for the Presidency, [cheers and applause] the moment he votes for this bill his platform disappears from beneath his feet, never more to appear." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Newlands, Populist, of Nevada, said the disease which was sought to be remedied by the proposed legislation was a world-wide disease, due to falling prices, due to the appreciation of gold. He criticised the bill because it was incompetent to do that which was expected of it.

Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi, and Mr. Wheeler, Democrat, of Alabama, spoke briefly, and at 5 35 o'clock the House adjourned until today at noon.

After some further discussion today a vote was taken on the Cox amendment to repeal the 10 per cent. tax outright. The vote was announced as yeas 102; nays 170. The following is the vote in detail on Cox's amendment to repeal the 10 per cent. bank tax law:

Yeas—Abbott, Alexander, Arnold, Bailey, Bankhead, Bell (Tex.), Black (Ga.), Bland, Boatner, Bower, Branch, Breckenbridge (Ky.), Bunn, Cabaniss, Campbell, Catchings, Clark (Mo.), Cobb (Ala.), Cockrell, Cooper (Fla.), Cooper (Ind.), Cooper (Tex.), Cox, Crain, Crawford, Culberson, Cummings, Davey, Dearmond, Denson, Dinsmore, Edmunds, Ellis (Ky.), English, Claif, Enloe, Esper, Fithian, Fyan, Geary, Gorman, Grady, Hall (Mo), Harter, Heard, Henderson (N. C), Hutcheson, Izlar, Jones, Kyle, Latimer, Lawson, Lester, Livingston, Maddox, Mcguire, Mallory, Marshall, McCulloch, McDearmon, McLaurin, McMillin, McRae, Meredith, Money, Montgomery, Morgan, Moses, Neill, Oates, Ogden, O'Neill, (Mo.), Paschal, Pattison, Paynter, Pendleton, (Tex.) Robbins, Russell (Ga.), Sayers, Shell, Snodgrass, Stallings, Stockdale, Stone (Ky.), Strait, Swanson, Talbert, Tate, Terry, Tracey, , Tucker, Turner (Ga.), Turner (Va.), Turpin, Washington, Wheeler (Ala.), Williams (Miss.), Wilson (W. Va), Wise, Woodsrd and the Speaker—102—all Democrets.

Nays—Republicans: Adams (Pa.) Aldrich, Apsley, Babcock, Baker (N. H.), Bartholdt, Belden, Bingham, Blair, Bowers, Broderick, Brosius, Cannon (Ill.), Chickering, Cooper (Ws.), Cousins, Curtis (Kan.), Dalzell, Daniels, Dingley, Dolliver, Doolittle, Draper, Ellis (Ore.), Funston, Gillet (N. Y.), Grout, Grow, Hager, Hainer, Harmer, Hartman, Haughen, Hepburn, Hermann, Hicks, Hitt, Hooker (N. Y.), Hopkins (Pa.), Houk, Hulick, Hull, Johnson (Ind.), Johnson (N. D.), Kiefer, Lacey, Linton, Loudenstager, Lucas, Mahon, Marsh, Marvin, McCall, McCleary, Meiklejohn, Mercer, Murray, Northway, Payne, Perkins, Philips, Pickler, Post, Powers, Quigg, Ray, Reed, Reyburn, Robinson, Settle, Shaw, Smith, Stephenson, Stone (C. W. of Pa.), Stone (W. A. of Pa.), Sweet, Tawney, Taylor (Tenn.), Thomas, Updegraff, Vandeerpoorhis (Ohio) Walker, Wanger, Waugh, Wheeler (Ill.), Wilson (Ohio,) Wilson (Wash.), Woomer, Wright, (Mass.),—89.

Democrats—Baldwin, Barwig, Bretz, Brickner, Brookshire, Brown, Bryan, Bynum, Cadmus, Capeheart, Causey, Cannon (Cal.) Clancy, Cobb, (Mo.) Cockran, Coffeen, Conn, Coombs, Cornish, Covert, Dunn, Dunphy, Durborrow, Erdman, Everett, Fielder, Forman Greissenhainer, Goldzier, Griffin, Haine, Hall (Minn.), Hare, Hayes, Hendrix, Holman, Hunter, Irkirt, Lane, Lapham, Layton, Lynch, Magner, Martin, McDannold, McEttrick, McGann, McNabny, O'Neil (Mass), Pearson, Pendleton (W. Va), Pigott, Rayner, Reilly, Richards, Richardson, (Mich.), Richie, Rusk, Ryan, Sibley, Sickles, Sipe, Sorg, Sperry, Springer, Stevens, Talbert, Tarsney, Taylor (Ind), Warner, Weadock, Williams (Ill.), and Wolverton—75.

Populists—Baker (Kan.). Bell (Colo.) Davis, Harris, Hudson, Kem, McKeighan, Pence—8.

The substitute of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the original Brawley bill, suspending the operation of the 10 per cent. tax as to the issues of the certificates, etc., by clearing houses and other organizations last year merely changing the verbiage so as to make it more explicit, was defeated on a viva voce vote. Then the original bill was lost. This was the end of ten days debate and a result that occasioned some surprise, and the announcement was received amid much confusion and applause.

The defeat of the bill would seem to lay the banks once more open to the assessment of the penalties provided in the law. Cox's amendment to this bill which was defeated by so decisive a vote, provided for the total repeal of the law, instead of a mere suspension of its provisons.

It Was Uncle Sam's Money.

SAN FRANCISCO, June 6.—The claim of $15,000,000 filed against the Stanford estate by Attorney General Olney as a preliminary step to enforce the Government's claim against the original holders of the Central Pacific grant has awakened much interest here. It is now learned that the Government's claim was presented on May 26, but that an attempt was made to keep the proceeding quiet in order that the financial operations of the estate need not be embarrassed. The late Senator Stanford's estate was recently appraised at $17,600,000. Since the appraisement heavy obligatians have been met and it is stated now that the enforcement of the Government claim would practically wipe out the estate, not only leaving the widow penniless, but cutting off all the beneficiaries under the late Senators will, including the endowment of $2,500,000 to the Stanford University. It is even said that the estate, after the liquidation of its acknowledged debts, may not equal the amount of the claim of the Government. In this event Senator Stanford's deed of trust, under which Stanford University was founded, would not stand in case the decision of the Courts should be in favor of the Government and the University would necessarily be sacrificed to satisfy the judgment. Mrs. Stanford in an interview has stated that the Government's claim will be resisted to the fullest extent of her ability. Today is the last under the law which Mrs. Stanford has to accept or reject the Government's claim. It is believed she will simply ignore the claim, which in law amounts to rejection. It will then be in order for the Government to institute suit, either in the United States Courts or the Supreme Court in San Francisco. Attorney General Olney's claim was filed in the Probate Court in San Francisco, before Judge Coffee, where the Stanford estate is now undergoing settlement.

Killed by a Car.

ATLANTA, GA., June 4.—Garnet Arnold, a five year-old child, was run over and killed by an electric car on the Consolidated Line today.

BRAYTON'S REASONS

For Trying to Overthrow the Registration Laws.

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 7.—The following letter was published this morning:

As I am the one mainly responsible for the institution of the proceedings in the Supreme Court to have the constitutionality of the registration law of the State tested, it may not be amiss to state the reasons which have governed my action.

This law enforced according to its provisions is more harsh, restrictive and obnoxious to fundamental principles than is generally known. It disfranchises every voter who passes one registration period without getting his certificate, regardless of the causes. If absent, sick, crowded out or indifferent he is subjected to the same penalty. It disfranchises every voter not previously registered, who moves into a county after the first Monday in July preceding a general election. Thus, though he may actually have been a resident in the county four months before the election and the constitution declares that but sixty days residence in the county preceding an election is required, his right to vote abrogated and he is remediless.

The law bases the right of electors to vote, not upon the registration, but equally upon the presentation at the polls of the certificates of registration. It is anomalous and un-American to say that the inalienable and sovereign right of suffrage must be confined to a flimsy piece of paper liable to be lost, destroyed, mislaid or stolen. The putting of the closing day of registration on the first Monday of July is contrary to the spirit and understood meaning of registration and is subversive of the franchise, making registration close before it should, and in other States does, begin, and before the excitement of the campaign and the nearness of the election have directed the attention and aroused the interest of the voters, cannot have for its object the purpose inherent in registration as declared essential by the courts and authorities, or abridging suffrage, but its effect is clearly to deprive voters of the possession and exercise of their constitutional rights.

The making secret the registration records is only destructive of the fundamental rights of voters and subversive of the principles inherent in registration. A registration to be constitutional must be easy, free, impartial and public, and its purpose should be to provide for the regulation of suffrage and to prevent repeating. Some States and courts consider even this kind of regulation an illegal restraint and infringement of the right of suffrage. Besides the registration books having been in use twelve years are dilapidated, confused and unreliable.

To these constitutional provisions of the law there are added the irritating, expensive and unnecessary exactions of forcing voters to go to the Supervisor's office and the getting of new certificates in case of their loss or the moving from the county precinct or change of residence. Under the operation of this law it is estimated there are one hundred thousand negroes and thirty thousand whites either disfranchised or disqualified from voting. In addition to the constitutional defects in the laws are to be considered the capabilities it affords for evasions and partisan manipulation. Heretofore the Republicans have had to encounter and endure these. Those who have not studied the law or practiced its iniquities can not comprehend the advantages afforded to those in control of the machinery or the helplessness of those victims to its unfair execution. The division among the Democrats presents a new situation. It foreshadows the time when one faction will be treated as the Republicans have been. This white men will not submit to and when the crisis comes there will be bloodshed and anarchy. Is it not better to forestall and avert this calamity by uprooting a law which has outlived the purposes of its creation? It is not necessary, for elections were carried between 1876 and 1882 without it and and now there is the eight box law to supplement old agencies. It is hazardous to depend upon the law being used for the benefit of the Democrats, because when they divide at the polls it will afford a weapon for the dominant side to scourge their hostile brethren. Besides it is demoralizing to be dependent upon these sworn Supervisors being subjected to the need of committing perjury to favor their partisans and make those citizens thus accommodated and illegally favored particeps criminis.

Such a law, besides being a badge of shame to a state, is a serious impediment to its growth and prosperity. To a self-respecting and independent man there would be well grounded objections to moving into a State dominated by such a law and where constitutional rights are so easily lost or abrogated.

The court can safely set aside the law, for, if the eight-box election law is not considered sufficient, there is time for the Legislature to be convened and other laws passed, while if this law stands and a new Constitution is adopted upon the vote at the next election, wherein not over one-quarter of the citizens of the State can vote, the question will some day be raised, and the new Constitution will itself be held illegal and void.

ELLERY M. BRAYTON.

Columbia, June 6, 1894.

Texas' Cotton Crop.

HOUSTON, Tex., June 6.—Tomorrow the Post, whose crop report last season proved to be accurate as to the acreage and yield will publish the first report of the crop of 1894. The reports are from every cotton growing county in Texas and are full and complete. With scarcely an exception there is a general increase in acreage, aggregating, on a conservative estimate, at least 10 per cent, some of the largest cotton producing counties in the State showing an increase of 25 per cent. In one county where no cotton was raised last year 10,000 acres are under cultivation this year. Fabulously high prices for cotton seed last season—$14 to $18 a ton—stimulated prices so that 7 cent cotton meant 10 cents a pound on old methods where the seed was wasted. Besides this the immigration has been very large, the new comers cultivating cotton through necessity and adding to the acreage. At no time in the State's history has there been promise of such an enormous yield. In the past few days seasonable rains have fallen over large area of country. All reports give conditions as being from fair to the best ever known, the latter being in the majority. The plant is healthy and vigorous and the fields are clean and in a good state of cultivation. No destroying insects or worms have made their appearance and the outlook is generally for an early crop. From present indications the yield should exceed $2,250,000 bales The crop of '93 94 is between 1,900,000 and 2,000,000 bales and was grown under the most unfavorable weather conditions. This season's crop will be difficult to handle by January with an open fall. Ten days ago polls from Fort Bend and Bosceria county plantations were exhibited here.

SENATOR BUTLER REPLIES

To Allianceman's Criticism of His Letter to Chairman Mitchell.

Editor Registor: In your issue of May 31 a correspondent signing himself "Allianceman," referring to my letter in reply to Mr. Mitchel, says: "Senator Butler thinks the subtreasury plan is unconstitutional, and, of course, it never occured to the learned Senator that the Constitution might be amended. He says the subtreasury has been abandoned, but fails to give the time when it was abandoned."

It seems to me "Allianceman" gives his case away when he impliedly admits that the Constitution must be amended to make the subtreasury plan constitutional, and confirms my view. It is gratifying to be reinforced in my opinion by "Allianceman," who is evidently a man of intelligence, and, I assumed, speaks by authority.

In regard to the abandonment of the subtreasury, it is only necessary to state what will not be disputed, that two subtreasury bills were introduced in the House in the Fifty-first Congress, which were never reported from the committee, and therefore never acted on. In the last Congress there were a number of members belonging to the Alliance, and in the present Congress there are quite a number, four or five from South Carolina. If any one of them has introduced a subtreasury bill I have failed to hear of it. I think, therefore, I was justified in saying it had been abandoned.

Further along "Allianceman" says:

"He can see no way of the government owning and operating railroads except by the government buying those already in existence. Of course it has never occurred to the versatile Senator that the government has the right to build and equip such roads as are needed. Millions of laborers would be glad of the job at very reasonable wages to be paid in legal tender greenbacks—building two, three or five thousand miles a year. Oh, no; the Senator is too good a railroad attorney to see any other way of having government railroads except by purchase of his client's property at enormously inflated valuation of watered stock. But the people have been thinking along this line a little in the interest of the people rather than of the railroad wreckers and manipulators."

Of course if the government is going into the business of building railroads, to give empolyment to "millions of laborers," a very different proposition is presented. My observations were based upon the assumption that one of the Alliance demands was that the national government should own and operate all the railroads and telegraph and telephone lines, now inexistence, or hereafter to be built. Such, at least, was my understanding of it. It seems, however, "Allianceman" proposes to change the issue and have the government "build and equip such roads as are needed." Has it occurred to "Allianceman" that the Constitution might have to be amended to enable the Federal government to "build and equipt" railroads through the States, without the consent of the States, in time of peace? In time of war the government might build railroads, as a military necessity, but I should doubt whether it had this constitutional power in time of peace. At least it is an open question, with the weight of the argument against it.

"Allianceman" says, "Oh, no: the Senator is too good a railroad attorney to see any other way of having government railroads except by purchase of his client's property at enormously inflated valuation of watered stock." Perhaps it will suprise "Allianceman" to be told what is a fact, that I never had a railroad for a client in my life, except on two occassions, many years ago, and then for a very short time. It has usually been my fortune to be on the other side in railroad cases, so that my clientage of railroad could not have been very heavy, and I could not have a very large interest in the purchase of railroads by the government. Let "Allianceman" "pick his flint and try it again." Very truly yours,

M. C. BUTLER.

Washington, June 2.

Civil War in Illinois.

PEORIA, Ills., June 6.—One dead body, several men on the verge of the grave, a number of others seriously injured, $30,000 worth of property absolutely destroyed any many homes made desolate, was the result of an attempt made to-day by the miners of the Peoria district to close the mine operated by Little Brothers in Tazewell County, a mile or more back of Wesley City. The dead man was Edward Blower, of Bartonville, married, shot in the side of neck and kill instantly. The injured are James Little, shot twice in the body, thought to be fatally injured: Peter Little, secretary, shot in the left eye and in right arm, not seriously injured; Peter Little, Jr, shot in the left side; Wm Diedon, colored, shot in right arm and through left shoulder, may die. Several miners were shot, out they were taken away and no one could secure any information from them about anything. The tragedy was the sequal of the meeting held at Bratonville the other day about which there was so much secrecy. No one could get the faintest inkling of what was done at the meeting. Now everybody knows. It was decided at that time that the Little Brothers mine must close. There could be no equivocation, no half-way measure. It must close and remain closed. Inconsequence of the conclusion arrived at the meeting about four hundred miners started out of Bartonville at 1 o'clock this afternoon. They came from nearly all the mines in the district. Without anything being previously said on the subject, except in the utmost secrecy, every man apparently came armed. They were desperate and were ready to use desperate means to accomplish desperate ends. Sheriff Frederick, of Pekin, Taswell County, having been advised of the trouble went to the mines with a posse. The strikers crossed the Illinois on boats and were met on the side by the sheriff who commanded peace and reason with them in vain. Led by a stalwart miner with a revolver in each hand, crying, "Follow me," they charged on the mine. The two Littles and their sons and a colored man retreated into the tower over the shaft and opened fire on the besieg ers, some of whom fell. The fire was returned and the men in the tower hoisted a white flag for surrender. The firing was hotly continued and the tower rid died.