The Charlotte Observer.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Daily, one year, (post-paid) in advance.....$8 00
Six Months.....4 00
Three Months.....2 00
One Month.....75
WEEKLY EDITION:
Weekly, (in the county) in advance.....$2 00
Out of the county, postpaid.....2 10
Six Months.....1 00
Liberal Reductions for Clubs.

Daily Charlotte Observer.

VOL. XXV. CHARLOTTE, N. C., WEDNESDAY MARCH 9, 1881. NO. 3,743.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION

Discussed in the State Senate—Failure of the Proposed Law Regulating the Sale.

In the Senate Saturday the special order was the House bill "to render more efficient the laws regulating the sale of liquors by the small measure." It was treated as follows, according to the report of the *News-Observer*:

Mr. York proposed an amendment: "Provided that the provisions of this bill shall not apply to Wilkes county."

Mr. York spoke strongly against the passage of the bill, saying, among other things, that its passage would sound the death knell of the Democratic party.

Mr. Harris said that only his interest for the public good could induce him to speak on any subject. Mr. York's professions of friendship to the poor man were not consistent with his present stand. He wanted to say that it was good-bye to the party if some legislation was not made upon this subject. It was the proudest day of his life to be enabled to vote for a bill which offered such protection to the poor and oppressed of our land.

Mr. York thought the Senator from Franklin was excited and had not touched the subject. Mr. York continued his remarks at length, which were very humorous.

Mr. Williamson, of Edgecombe, said that the Democratic party was making this a party question in order to defeat it; that Mr. York had urged no other reason against it.

Mr. Staples said he thought the effort of the Senator from Edgecombe to make this a party question would be a failure. The record would not support his assertion that the Republicans had nothing to do with making it a party question. There was a striking similarity between the bill and the United States revenue law. It was like it in its penalties and it would have the same effect of arraying citizen against citizen. Again, this bill did not meet the popular demands in North Carolina. There was a demand, a great demand, from the most respectable citizens of North Carolina not to pass such a law as this, but a total prohibitory law. This bill was dodging the question and would not gain the support of those very men at whose instance we thought we must pass it. The prohibitory agitation was not as deep as one might suppose. Of the 200,000 signers of the petitions 100,000 were ladies. Mr. Staples continued his remarks at length.

By Mr. Williamson, of Edgecombe, excluding his county from the provisions of this act.

By Mr. Manning, excluding the provisions of this act from the counties of Gates, Camden, Chowan and Currituck.

Mr. Davidson offered an amendment striking out "or at his place of business," etc., in lines 11, 14 and 15.

Mr. Burwell thought he could assume that these amendments would not be adopted. He could see no class legislation in this bill. If such was the case, then there was much of such legislation in our laws. It was not a political but a social question. But he submitted that in handling such a dangerous thing as liquor it ought to be done by men able to answer for the damage done. It bore no analogy to the revenue law. This bill would close the cross roads bar-room in the country and the low grogery in the city. The liquor traffic was so dangerous, he repeated, that it ought to be confined to men who could be held responsible for the damage done. The only room for argument was not in the merits of the question, for nobody could deny them, but in the practicability of it.

Mr. Tucker explained the action of the committee. The bill was to be put into effect in case the prohibitory law failed. Under our local prohibitory law one-fourth of the people could at any time have the question of prohibition submitted to the people. This was but carrying out the spirit of this law, for in about fifteen days, more than one-fourth of the voters of North Carolina had already signified their desire in unmistakable terms that the question be submitted to the people. With regard to the oppression of the poor man, he would say that the proposed law is the strongest appeal that had ever been made in their behalf, for whenever they exercised the right to set up a cross roads grogery, from that time they could date their ruin and the ruin of their families.

Mr. Scott, of New Hanover, opposed it on account of the monopoly.

Mr. Jenkins offered an amendment: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to the new county of Vance, nor to that narrow strip of land which now constitutes the county of Granville.

Mr. Spears spoke at length, strenuously urging the passage of the bill.

Mr. Glenn made a very able and eloquent speech, advocating with more than his accustomed vigor the passage of the bill. The question was one calculated to inspire the ablest speech of the session, and would be no injustice to others to say that Mr. Glenn made it.

Mr. Staples replied in his usual forcible manner at the conclusion of his speech.

Mr. Davidson moved to call for the previous question, which was upon the amendment of Mr. York. Lost.

The amendment of Mr. Respass, of Davidson, was lost.

The amendments of Messrs. Harper, Carter, Williamson, of Edgecombe, Oates, Manning and Bernard were lost.

Mr. Tucker offered an amendment that all after the word "provided," in line 5, section 1, be stricken out, which was adopted.

Mr. Jenkins' amendment was lost.

The bill failed to pass its third reading—yeas 21, nays 26, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Battle, Blue, Carr, Cunningham, Davidson, Dickey, Dortch, Faison, Finger, Glenn, Gudger, Hanes, Harper, Harris, Lockhart, Merritt, Newland, Spears, Stowe, Tucker, Williamson, of Davie—21.

Nays—Messrs. Bernard, Carter, Clarke, Foil, Hampton, Jenkins, Jones, King, Manning, McMillan, Mebane, Newson, Oates, Parish, Pridgen, Respass, Richardson, Scott, of New Hanover, Scott, of Rockingham, Spruill, Staples, Whitaker, Williamson, of Edgecombe, Woodhouse, Wayne, York—26.

Sol Smith Russell's Mother.

The mother of Sol Smith Russell, the actor, was a very pious woman, and set her face firm against theatres. One of her sons was a preacher, and one is now president of the Young Men's Christian Association of a neighboring State; but Sol inherited his uncle's humor, and it could no more be restrained than imitated. Mrs. Russell, Sol's mother, was at the head of many benevolent enterprises, and was one of the officers of the Woman's Sanitary Commission during the war.

THE FORGER LEGISLATOR

And the Question of Private Bills in the General Assembly.

RALEIGH, March 7.—There is a quorum present, 75 on a vote, this morning. Mr. Glenn, of Stokes, offered a resolution that no private bills shall be disposed of until those of a general nature and demanding the ayes and noes were acted on. He said he did this because he had heard a great many members say that if they had their private bills through they would leave this House and go home, and he wished to save a quorum by holding back the private bills.

Mr. Lineback, Republican, most heartily agreed to the resolution; he was for holding a quorum.

Mr. Munden, Republican, was opposed to it. It was too much like gagging.

Mr. Manning thought like Mr. Blaisdell said the other day—that if the members were here at their own expense they were entitled to call up their bills.

Mr. Munden called the eyes and noes on the resolution, and it failed—ayes 21, noes 47.

FORGERY IN THE HOUSE.

Under a House resolution to investigate an alleged forgery of a certificate of per diem of John Newell, colored representative from Bladen, for the amount of $16, on the State treasury, the committee, consisting of Messrs. McClure, Grainger, Rowland and Holton, after a careful investigation, reported this morning, fastening the forgery upon Wm. W. Watson, the colored representative from Edgecombe. Two of the committee are Republicans, and all concur in the report. Mr. Holton is now speaking to the report, justifying it in every particular. Newell, it seems, had charged one of the pages with it, and the page had paid him the money, which he has now refunded to the little fellow. This is the beauty of colored representation; Mr. Newell being barely able to write his own name got Mr. Watson to sign it for him. This time he signed it once too many.

Newell bears a good character. Mr. Bledsoe defended Watson, holding that it might be a mistake of Newell's; that it was the $16 order he got Watson to sign for him instead of the $100 order. But Mr. Holton, Republican, is now speaking to the report, and to a question of Mr. Day, whether he had a doubt in his mind as to Watson's guilt, he replied: "None in the world, sir." Watson sits in his seat, watching Holton, his chin in his hand. The mail is near closing. CLANCY.

THE De JARNETTE TRAGEDY.

A Supplemental Act—The Woman He Loved has a Romantic Marriage.

Last summer when Thomas De Jarnette killed his sister in a house of ill-fame in Danville, Va., he was engaged to Miss Mary Allen Murray, of Milton, N. C., who visited him very frequently for several months after his incarceration. De Jarnette was sentenced to be hanged, but the Supreme Court granted him a new trial, which will be begun in a short time. Recently Miss Murray has not been so constant in her visits to the prisoner. It seems that at the time of her engagement to De Jarnette, Charles Gordon and Alexander Bonhum, two young men of Milton, were also rival suitors for her hand. About a week ago, says a Danville dispatch to the New York *Sun*, the announcement was made by the young lady and her friends that she was to be married to Mr. Bonhum, and that the marriage was fixed for next Thursday night. Friday evening Mr. Gordon went to see the young lady, and she told him that she had come to the conclusion that he was the only one she loved, and she was willing to marry him. Gordon, although he knew that her marriage with Bonhum was fixed for next Thursday night, proposed an immediate solemnization of the nuptials. Saturday morning he obtained the marriage license, and this evening a magistrate, with witnesses, met the couple by appointment on a bridge which crosses the stream near the suburbs of Milton, and there Miss Murray and Gordon were quietly married. De Jarnette is quite ill in his cell, whether because of the marriage or long confinement is not known.

Judge Hunt's Divorce Suit.

A correspondent of the New York *World* gives some particulars of a divorce suit in which Judge Hunt, the new Secretary of the Navy, figured as one of the principals. According to this correspondent Judge Hunt, in 1866, married Mrs. Sarah B. Harrison, a daughter of the late Jacob Baker, a noted New Orleans banker. Judge Hunt was at that time a widower, with seven children. His wife, from the first day of their marriage, expressed regret at the step she had taken, and in 1869 she went to Europe, her husband having given her $1,000 and a letter of credit authorizing her to draw $200 monthly. In January, 1880, Judge Hunt wrote to his wife announcing his purpose to get a divorce. She replied, begging to be allowed to return, and took the first steamer homeward. She came as far as New York, and afterwards resided there. In April, 1870, Judge Hunt petitioned for a divorce, which he obtained the following June. In May 1871, Judge Hunt married again in New Orleans, and in the following July this divorced wife, who, by the advice of counsel in New York had not appeared in the New Orleans suit, began an action in New York for divorce, on the ground of his alleged adultery. The case was tried in December, 1873, before Judge Davis, who held the New Orleans divorce to be valid, and gave judgement in favor of Judge Hunt. An appeal was finally heard in the Supreme Court, which confirmed the action of the lower court.