

The News and Observer.

VOL. LIII. NO. 133.

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, SUNDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY, 15, 1903.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

Leads all North Carolina Daily Papers in Both News and Circulation

Temperance Legislation

Its Reasonableness Discussed by Mr. J. W. Bailey, Chairman Anti-Saloon League.

Senator Godwin's Experience. Saloons Should be Established Only by Popular Vote. Policed and Unpoliced Districts. Smith Bill and London Bill. Watts Bill and London Bill. Democracy's Best Opportunity. State-Wide Campaign Assured.

To the Editor: Senator Godwin's utterance in the Senate Committee on Prohibitions and Grievances last week was significant. A week before he had requested the consideration of the London Bill be deferred as he had not had time to examine it. The week having passed, he arose and declared, "I have examined the London Bill, and I am ready to vote for it as it stands."

There are other gentlemen who will be more favorable to the London Bill when they have examined it. They have prejudged it. Because it is so ardently urged by the temperance forces, they have concluded that the bill is extreme. This comes up to the mark if the cracks in times past. The London Bill is not extreme. It is reasonable, and it is adapted to the people—meeting at once the demands of good morals and sound public policy.

Suppose the General Assembly should declare that the State's policy is to assume that the people desire prohibition, and declare also that prohibition is desirable; but should add that, if any city or town preferred saloons or dispensaries either might be established by popular vote or petition?

Is there anything drastic or extreme or unreasonable about that? Does it not fully meet the demand for local self-government and popular rights? Is it in the least less right or reasonable to declare that saloons should not exist, save upon the expressed will of the majority than it is to declare that prohibition or dispensaries shall not be established, save upon the expressed will of the majority?

And yet this is the block upon which many gentlemen are stumbling. This is in effect the fifth section—the much opposed fifth section—of the London bill. It is this that they have permitted to overshadow the entire bill.

In view of the fact that this matter of temperance legislation is in the nature not of popular legislation, but of police regulation; that is, in view of the fact that the Assembly is dealing with a recognized evil, in the endeavor to find a remedy for it; and in view of the fact that there is such a trend in the Assembly for "leaving it to the people," it seems to me that this feature of the London bill is, after all, the most timely and accepted part of it.

It merely gives the people opportunity to vote their towns "wet" if they want them so. Can the saloon men ask more? Do they wish to be maintained by the Assembly—and not by an expressed popular vote? Does the Assembly wish to stand before the State as so maintaining them?

Now I must add that the fifth section as it stands would call for a vote every two years. This would be well for two or three elections, as the State's policy should be to lead the people into something better than the saloon system of handling the great drink evil. This feature is decidedly constructive in its character.

So the fifth section is not such a terror, but merely a well-conceived and timely piece of constructive legislation looking to the cure of the great drink evil.

IT LEAVES THE MATTER WITH THE PEOPLE.

This reminds me that the Smith bill—which has gained so much ground while the gentlemen were running away from the London bill's fifth section—is after all the application of this very fifth section to the whole State! But gentlemen who have rejected the London bill on account of the fifth section have readily embraced the Smith bill. The Smith bill presumes that prohibition is good and is desired, but permits the people who do not think so to test the question. Instead of establishing prohibition only by popular vote, it provides that saloons and dispensaries may be established only upon popular vote.

It seems to me that the advocates of saloons who are crying, "Leave it to the people," are really pleading for the fifth section of the London bill.

I am willing to leave the question of establishing saloons to the people. The fifth section of the London bill distinctly calls for just this. But I fear the gentlemen mean by their cry of "Leave it to the people"—"Leave it alone!"

So much for the fifth section. I judge that the other features of the London bill are pretty well understood and largely conceded.

It calls for an anti-liquor law. That simply makes prohibition laws just and effective in prohibited territory. Any man who seriously desires prohibition or dispensary laws will desire to make them effective. Senator Simmons has declared in favor of a national anti-liquor law. It is not equity to forbid people in a terri-

tory to sell liquor or permit people outside to sell it into that territory.

The London bill also calls for limiting the incorporated laws in which liquor may be sold or manufactured, by population. This is simply calculated to work effectual the legislation contemplated in the Watts' bill. That bill aims to protect the unpoliced districts—not merely the rural districts. To base the argument on rural districts will aggravate the legislation against discrimination. It is not a question of city and county, but of policed and unpoliced districts. But surely any one will agree with me that to incorporate a town is not to police it. Half the incorporated towns in the State are not really policed. They are both rural and unpoliced. To establish saloons or distilleries in them is as dangerous as to establish them in the back woods. The London bill simply makes the Watts' bill effective—and it is based upon the governor's advice in his message, that the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors be restricted to police districts.

The London bill also provides that towns and cities may vote for dispensaries in local option elections—a provision that is called for in the Murphy bill and the Smith bill, and that all sides recognize as right and reasonable. The dispensary is constructive. The saloon is destructive.

So then I think the gentlemen of the General Assembly will undergo Senator Godwin's experience, if they will examine the London bill, and conclude that so far from being extreme it is both timely and reasonable.

I should like to say that there is more danger in passing too weak legislation than there is in passing too strong. The people are quick to catch a compromise and put it under their feet. They are aroused, and they are in earnest. We must avoid a revelation. A State campaign is ahead of us, under any conditions—no matter what the Assembly shall do in that campaign there will be a reckoning, and it will determine some things in North Carolina. For the first time in history an Anglo-Saxon commonwealth has the open opportunity of self-government. The plain people of North Carolina, first suppressed by class distinction, then by the freed negroes, now stand forth in the arena—the aristocracy having been gathered to its fathers, the negro vote destroyed—free at last to rule. The arm of Democracy is free at last, and his sword gleams in the sunlight. The people will rule from now on in far greater measure than they have heretofore. This is to me the most thrilling fact in American history. We stand today in North Carolina face to face with the best opportunity that popular government has ever had. I devoutly thank God that that opportunity has come in North Carolina and in my day. I am glad that a great moral issue marks the arrival of this opportunity. It will serve the purpose of cutting off the baser element at the very beginning. It will drive the wolves from the flock.

Let the thousands and tens of thousands of people who are looking toward our capitol this week to be of good courage. Their cause has improved every hour since the Assembly met. It will continue to grow in the ratio of their earnestness. This week may determine the question so far as the Assembly is concerned. I want the people to do this week whatever they can do by prayer by word of mouth, by letter and by any other means to expressing their will. In this terrible compli with the monster evil of our times—the recognized worst cure of our country; the open dare on our civilization—we have engaged with full knowledge of what it required; not one blow, but a thousand. The Legislature will determine on what terms the war shall be waged—on which side the members shall stand. We must go out into the State straight way with one determined purpose, namely, not to relent until the last saloon has gone out of business and the last drunkard shall be saved from the error of his way.

JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY.

February 14, 1903.

The People Want the London Bill.

To the Editor: The people will not be satisfied with anything but the London bill. Thinking men everywhere say abolish the traffic in liquor. If it is an evil it is wrong, and whatever is wrong should be suppressed, and every evil that needs regulation needs death. What would be thought of a law regulating burglary or adultery, or arson or larceny? Such an evil may be abolished but not regulated. You cannot regulate the traffic in intoxicants, but you ought

to treat it as a crime and punish it as a crime. It should be strangled without the benefit of the clergy, with the stake of public opinion thrust through its foul body.

We should be ashamed to write on the dollar and cent aspect of the traffic with the black shadows of the misery it inflicts hanging over us. One hundred and fifty million dollars annually are expended for liquor in the United States! What an infinitesimal figure the license tax cuts compared with this colossal pile of blood money! What is the cost of your jails, almshouses, reformatories, criminal courts, insane asylums, charged in the account.

The licensed bar-room is where the smut of the world is retailed, where the gambling hells, prize-fighting are most securely enshrouded. There is rotten and rotting humanity under its gas lights. If there is a difference between the saloon and the tipping shop in the incorporated towns, it is simply the difference between broadcloth and fustian; both hold a mortgage upon the depraved stomach.

The drunkard must go and will go, and the sooner the better, but for the sake of our young men shield the unsuspecting from the warmth, the glitter, the light of the saloon.

High license has never killed the traffic in this liquid hell and never will. If it drops money in the public treasury with one hand, it takes it out with the other in increased misery and more shameful raids upon the attenuated purse of the poor victim. It does not stop the infernal raid upon humanity, which is filling jails and lunatic asylums and feeding the galleys. It leaves the conscienceless dealers in strong drink to pursue their devilish trade, initiating the young into the vices of which it is the centre and inspiration; it invents new and strange devices for perpetuating its reign, and exercises its power; it throws no shield over the helpless wife, or the naked, hungry child; it leaves the State with an accumulated burden of lunatics, paupers and assassins.

The wall of the broken-hearted wife in her rags and the starved child goes up to Heaven, but no answer comes but that incited by human fatuity, "We have regulated the traffic in immortal souls by high license." High license with a vengeance!

Do you want to take a census of your children in order that you may say, "This child is mine and that one belongs to the State—if the rum power owns the State, in God's name stop tantalizing the people with your deceptive bills and petitions. Let it have its reign of vice in peace! But if humanity has any rights, if the family claim can be considered, let the law assert itself and stamp it out. It is regulated in Ohio and Ohio is given over to rum and beer; it is prohibited—destroyed in Maine, New Hampshire, Kansas and Iowa. Let us save the coming generation. Boys and men will not drink until they have been learned to drink; no man was ever born with an appetite for liquor save those born of drunken parents. No natural stomach ever craved it; it is purely a matter of education and the rum-seller is the teacher. The drunkard is made—not born. Regulation by high license ought not to be thought of by the Legislature if the liquor traffic is wrong. When you admit the necessity for regulation you admit the necessity for prohibition. If it calls for any interference, it calls for but one kind, and that is destruction. A good thing that is abused may be regulated, but a bad thing, never! The starving wife does not want high license. Let the saloon go, with its beautiful lights and pictures, warm in the winter, and cool in the summer; with its allurements that are made the more attractive by the protection of the law. If no other remedy appears available, let the applicant for license be required to file with the county board of commissions an application signed by three-fourths of the qualified voters of the township who shall say above their signatures that they are in favor of the traffic in liquor and do recommend the applicant as a proper person to be licensed, and let a copy of this application be posted for four weeks at the court house door before the license is granted.

All honor to Senator London for the bill.

D. WORTHINGTON.

An Open Letter to the Legislature.

Gentlemen, consider four facts: 1. The Saloon as Related to Business: It thrives by destroying everything it touches. It destroys wheat, rye, barley, and corn which the Creator intended to support life, and converts them into a poison producing death. It destroys the most delightful fruits and forces them to make men miserable. It destroys homes, happiness, property, men, women, children. Nothing is sacred to its fatal touch. I give an instance: A leading periodical says: "At a recent meeting of the Ohio Liquor League, one of the officers delivered an address, from which the following is an extract: 'The success of our business is dependent largely upon the creation of appetite for drink. Men who drink liquor, like others, will die, and if there is no new appetite created, our coffers will be empty, as will our coffers. After men have grown and their habits are formed, they rarely ever change in this regard. It will be needless, therefore, that missionary work be done among the boys, and I make the suggestion, gentlemen, that nickels expended in treats to the boys now will return in dollars to your tills after the appetite is formed. Above all things create appetite.' This species of devilry is equalled only in the heathen myth of Tantalus, who in hell was tortured by having boughs of fruit swung before his lips to "create appetite," and as he reached out his hands to pluck the fruit, the boughs receded. The methods of Hades and the saloons are wonderfully alike.

The saloon can no more run without

boys than a saw-mill without logs or a grist mill without corn. Gentlemen, protect these boys. You protect partridges and fish and oysters, will you not protect also the boys? for a boy is of more value than many oysters.

2. The Saloon as Related to Progress: It opposes all progress that gets in its path. It hates Christianity, despises patriotism, denounces decent politics, and arrays itself against the advance of civilization. A travelling man reports the attitude of a bar-keeper towards the free rural delivery system thus: "Why, when men came into town every day for their mail they were sure to drop into my place while they waited; everybody drank, and everybody treated everybody else, and it made trade lively. Now the farmers come into town but two or three times a week and more often but once, and the worst of it is they don't happen to come in together for they only come in for groceries or some other supplies, and no two men's supplies are apt to give out at exactly the same time. This, you see, does away with the matter of treating and reduces trade tremendously. It's ruining business, I tell you." Thus the selfish spirit that animated the liquor men is of the earth earthy and of hell belly.

3. The Saloon as Related to Politics: The rum traffic is a cancer on the body politic. I quote from a circular sent out to its members by the North Carolina Retail Liquor Dealers' Association with reference to the present Legislature: "The membership of our association is promptly responding to this matter, and we trust, as you are deeply interested as we in the result, you will forward your check for \$5 at once, as we must put ourselves in position to meet this vital issue before nominations are made for the Legislature and continue our vigilance until it shall meet and adjourn." Here is a deliberate attempt on the part of the liquor forces to bribe our lawmakers, and corrupt our laws. But freemen will not submit to such base tyranny; and the saloon must go, or the party that sustains it.

4. The Saloon as Related to Morals: It is Satan's own work, and is the prolific source of taxation, pauperism, insanity, disease, crime, and death. The United States Supreme Court says: "The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than to any other source." The records of every court house is blackened with its shame. Its various ramifications the saloon is connected with the brothel, the gambling den, murder, anarchy, and hell. It is out of place in this State and out of date in this age. Its principles might have been recognized in its reign of Nero, during the French Revolution, or in the land of cannibals, but it has no legitimate home in a civilized country. Some tell us of more suasion, but moral suasion can't act where there are no morals to act on.

Our people will not be satisfied with a compromise. We want the London bill pure and simple. The Watts bill is regarded as a saloon measure, and is an affront to the better element of the land. Failure to meet the demands of the best citizens of the State, may mean more in the coming years than our law-makers dream of, for people are thinking. Veritas sat.

Goldsboro, N. C. C. A. JENKINS.

Argument Against the London Bill

To the Editor: It seems to me that we have a great many people in North Carolina who are about fifty years behind the age. Vermont over fifty years ago became a prohibition State and after so long a trial the people found the law would not work, so within the past few weeks at a general election they have voted to try local option. What does this mean? Does it not mean that the people of Vermont have learned by experience?

Do prohibition laws prohibit in Kansas? If so why do we hear of Mrs. Lease and her hatchet's work in the bar-rooms (?) of Kansas?

If I read the so-called "London bill" aright it would put all of North Carolina under prohibition. According to the United States census bulletin the following counties have no towns as large as one thousand, and under the London bill the manufacture of "spirituous, vinous, malt or other intoxicating liquors" would be prohibited in them, to-wit: Alexander, Alleghany, Ashe, Bertie, Bladen, Camden, Caswell, Chatham, Cherokee, Clay, Columbus, Currituck, Dare, Davie, Duplin, Gates, Graham, Greene, Hertford, Hyde, Jackson, Johnston, Jones, Lincoln, Macon, Madison, Martin, Mitchell, Montgomery, Northampton, Onslow, Pamlico, Pender, Polk, Robeson, Sampson, Stokes, Swain, Tyrrell, Transylvania, Warren, Watauga, Wilkes, Yadkin and Yancey—a total of 45 counties in which no liquors could be manufactured, except "wine and cider, made from grapes berries or fruits raised on his own land."

Then we have the following counties in which no liquors could be sold, (not even a dispensary established) except by physicians' prescriptions. Wine and cider made from fruit, grapes, or berries manufactured from fruit raised on one's own land excepted. These counties have towns of less than five hundred inhabitants, to-wit:

Ashe, Alexander, Bladen, Camden, Caswell, Chatham, Clay, Currituck, Davie, Gates, Graham, Greene, Hyde, Jackson, Jones, Macon, Madison, Northampton, Onslow, Pamlico, Pender, Polk, Stokes, Swain, Tyrrell, Watauga, Yadkin and Yancey—a total of 28 counties.

Now in regard to the other sixty nine counties—the London bill has forever stopped the sale of liquors in the twenty-eight mentioned above. Upon petition of one-third of the registered voters of any incorporated town or city having more than five hundred inhabitants, to the county commissioners, it becomes the duty of said county commissioners to order an election in the town or city to

The Liquor Devil.

The late Bishop Peck, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, wrote the following vivid account of what calamity and ruin intemperance brings upon a man, a family, a nation:

"Intemperance cuts down youth in its vigor, manhood in its strength, and age in its weakness. It breaks the father's heart, bereaves the doting mother, extinguishes natural affection, erases conjugal love, blots out filial attachment, blights parental hope, and brings down mourning age in sorrow to the grave. It produces weakness, not strength; sickness, not health; death, not life. It makes wives widows; children, orphans; fathers fiends; and all of them paupers and beggars. It feeds rheumatism, nurses gout, welcomes epidemics, invites cholera, imparts pestilence and embraces consumption. It covers the land with idleness, poverty, disease, and crime. It fills your jails, supplies your almshouses, and demands your asylums. In engenders controversies, fosters quarrels, and cherishes riots. It grows your penitentiaries and furnishes victims for your scaffolds. It is the life blood of the gambler, the element of the burglar, the prop of the highwayman, and the support of the midnight incendiary. It countenances the liar, respects the thief, and esteems the blasphemer. It violates obligations, reverences fraud, and honors infamy. It befames benevolence, hates love, scorns virtue, and slanders innocence. It incites the father to butcher his helpless offsprings, helps the husband to massacre his wife, and aids the child to grind the parricidal axe. It burns up man and consumes women. It suborns witnesses, nurses perjury, defiles the jury box, and stains the judicial ermine. It bribes votes, disqualifies voters, corrupts elections, pollutes our institutions, and endangers our government. It degrades the citizen, debases the legislature, dishonors the statesman, and disarms the patriot. It brings shame, not honor; terror, not safety; despair, not hope; misery, not happiness; and with the malevolence of a fiend, it calmly surveys its frightful desolation, and, unsatiated with havoc, it poisons felicity, kills peace, ruins morals, blights confidence, slays reputation, and wipes out national honor; then curses the world, and laughs at its ruin, it does all that and more. It murders the soul. It is the sum of all villainies, and father of all crimes, the mother of all abominations, the devil's best friend, and God's worst enemy."

determine whether the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be prohibited, sold by dispensary or by saloons. Now if a majority of the voters are for saloons, the London bill, says "It shall be lawful for the Board of County Commissioners to grant license in such city or town to all proper persons applying for same according to law." As a temperate man, as an honest man, I ask these questions: If after an election in a town or city of over five hundred inhabitants when a majority of the voters have been cast for saloons is there a single line in the London bill or any other law that compels the county commissioners to grant license?

Why does the London bill ignore the town commissioners or aldermen, and put the calling of elections, appointment of poll-holders, declaring result, election of dispensary commissioners, &c., in the hands of the county commissioners?

Do they mean by this that our city fathers are venal and cannot be trusted? It is now "lawful" to grant license in Granville county, but none have been granted this year.

If the liquor question is submitted to the voters of any city or town, why not allow the municipal authorities to call the election and declare the result? If a majority vote for saloons, why not say the commissioners shall grant license to proper persons? This is Democracy.

If after a majority have voted for saloons, why require a majority of the voters names on a petition of a saloon keeper? If a majority of the votes are for prohibition, would it be right to also re-

quire a petition containing a majority of the voters' names to remain in a public place for 30 days before declaring the result?

How many of the voters are for a dispensary, would it be right to then require a petition for a dispensary from a majority, said petition to be kept open to the public for thirty days, before declaring the result of the election?

How many of the petitioners for the London bill have read it? I ask all those who are clamoring for its enactment to read it—read it carefully. We can afford to do right. J. P. STEDMAN. Oxford, N. C., Feb. 9, 1903.

For the School and Temperance.

To the Editor: I see that some member of the Legislature has introduced a bill to make it so, that the taxes paid by the whites would go to the white school and that paid by the negroes to go to the negro schools. I do not think that would be right. We have got the negroes here and we should give them sufficient education to do ordinary business. But I do think that the whites should have the right to vote an extra tax on themselves, leaving out their property, if they see fit to supplement the regular school fund with an extra tax. I think it would be fair to allow either race to vote the extra tax on themselves, or if an extra tax is put on all allow the parties who are taxed extra (Continued on Tenth Page.)