



Established 1871.

RALEIGH, N. C., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1902.

Vol. XXV. No. 27.

THE TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION

The Situation in the General Assembly Reviewed. An Appeal to the People to Make Known Their Wishes.

To the Editor: It appears that the General Assembly will be considering the anti-liquor bills at least ten days longer—perhaps two weeks. This will give the people of North Carolina who are in earnest for effective legislation looking to the abatement of the drink-evil further opportunity to convince the gentlemen elected to represent them, that the hour has struck when decidedly progressive steps may be wisely taken.

If I understand the position of the most of the members of the Assembly, they are favorable to temperance legislation, but they fear that an advance may be made that the moral condition of the Commonwealth cannot sustain. The only resource, therefore, is a demonstration of public opinion. No more than any other citizen do I desire the enactment of temperance laws so far in advance of the people that they will create a revulsion. But I do not think that the London bill proposes such legislation. All I ask is that the people of the State shall make known to their representatives that they will enthusiastically endorse and stand by this legislation. This is no more nor less than should be expected. I know thousands have spoken. But they will speak again if they are in earnest and there are thousands yet to arouse. Let no one think that it is too late.

I desire that it be understood that the Watts bill covers only that part of the London bill that relates to rural districts. But it does cover that part and if instead of confining the manufacture and sale of liquor to incorporated towns, we shall succeed in confining the manufacture of liquors to towns of 1,000 population and the sale to towns of 500 inhabitants, there can be no objection to this bill taking the place of that part of the London bill that relates to rural saloons and distilleries. Without this population limit, however, the Watts bill will be made ineffectual in some sections. With this law there should also go an anti-jug law, since it is not reasonable to close up distilleries and saloons in a district and then make every railroad station somewhat of a bar-room. We must make our laws effectual.

I am sure, too, that there will be much disappointment unless legislation is adopted that will relieve conditions in our cities and towns. We have no right to concentrate the saloons and distilleries in our towns and cities without giving the people a fair opportunity to protect themselves. The saloons are a curse in the cities as well as the rural districts, and there is nothing in town life to make a distillery a moral centre. In view of the enactment of laws that will bring these afflictions in double force upon our towns and cities, the much opposed fifth section of the London bill requiring a vote of the people to establish saloons and distilleries in towns is not without unusual force—from every point of view.

The gentlemen should remember that we are dealing with a recognized curse. The saloon is the worst form of the liquor traffic—without question. We run no risk in doing anything that will tend to close the saloon. The saloon question is no longer a debatable question in America. The bar-tenders being witnesses, it is an unmitigated evil.

There is every reason why a strong law for establishing dispensaries by popular vote should be passed. There are cities in which prohibition would prove ineffectual. In such cities the dispensary is the only practicable step toward our purpose. The chief argument for the dispensary is that it destroys the saloon, and that it is incomparably better than the saloon. If a local system, such as we are building up in North Carolina, there is not the political danger that has developed into such proportions in South Carolina.

I think the Assembly will readily enact a law permitting the people to vote for dispensaries in local option elections. If so, our warfare shall move immediately out into the State, and we shall undertake to close the saloons in every city. With a white electorate we shall be able to carry these elections, no matter on which side the burden of proof is put. It would be wise and right and helpful to put it on the moral side. But if that shall not be granted, it shall not deter us from the battle.

Our State presents a peculiar opportunity. In the other States the drink evil has fastened itself upon the large cities. The nature of the modern city and the foreign character of population in our American cities makes the task of solving the drink problem all but hopeless. But in North Carolina we have neither large cities nor foreign population. We can handle the problem—now. We shall soon have cities and the tide of immigration will surely turn toward our State. In that day such legislation as we now propose will be out of the question. We are confronted with an opportunity that will not always wait. It is easier now to enact and enforce temperance laws than it will be in time to come.

The State is deeply aroused. My correspondence is enormous. The activity of the business men, the lawyers and the farmers is astonishing. This is no sudden movement. It is the freeing of sentiments that have been suppressed for twenty years and more and that have been gathering strength all the time. They will not again be suppressed. Cumberland and Mecklenburg tell the story. Only a few years ago their seats in the Assembly were filled by men of no especial sympathy with the temperance cause. Today their men are mainstays of this cause. The majority of the people in North Carolina are against the saloon; and if they shall not be heard this year, they will be next. Democrats will remain Democrats, but whether legislators will remain legislators remains to be seen.

JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY,
Chairman Anti-Saloon League.

PROHIBITION'S FIGHT

The Arguments of Liquor Men are Busted.

"Moral Question for the Drinker and Legal Question for the Seller"—Prohibition Does Prohibit.

To the Editor: It is not strange that this movement in North Carolina is so wide-reaching and aggressive. The wonder is not that it has come so soon, but that it did not come sooner. The time has arrived when something must be done, and the people know it.

License laws have been and are a failure or this movement could never have been begun and continued as far as it has gone. The people have borne as much as they can from the results of a traffic which has by its excesses demonstrated that society must destroy it, or be destroyed by it. Seeing on the wall the handwriting that foretells the utter destruction of their trade; seeing that they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting in every element of humanity, morality and good citizenship, the liquor men are beginning to call a halt. Shall we continue to wage a deadly

warfare against our greatest foe? Let the noble yeomanry of our State thunder yes.

It is said Prohibition should be abandoned because it will hurt trade. But the people can never be made to believe that the corner-stone of their commercial prosperity is a whiskey jug.

It is declared that moral suasion is sufficient to remove the evils of intemperance, for the eradication of which the people are rising up. But if this were true the present ills would not exist, for moral suasion has been most vigorously employed during all the past, during which time the harmful results of drink have been steadily increasing. What can moral suasion do when in every community there are men whose greed prompts them and whose license allows them to intercept moral conviction and beat down moral resolution?

Under a license system, be it high or low, a premium is paid upon vice, and moral suasion operates at the greatest possible disadvantage. Prohibition is the proposal of the men and women who have done all that has been done in the way of moral suasion, and who have learned by the saddest experiences why their efforts have so frequently failed. Their battle is, "Moral suasion for the drinker and legal suasion for the seller."

The liquor men affirm that men cannot be made moral by legislation. Nobody claims that they can, and the objection is unworthy of even passing notice. It is a fact that statutes cannot make men moral, but statutes can remove tempta-

tion that betray men into sin, and so give them a fair chance to make themselves moral. Statutes can prevent saloon keepers from making men immoral. The other day Mr. Bryan, one of the representatives from Wilkes county, in the committee meeting, replying to Rev. Mr. Bradshaw's earnest appeal in behalf of prohibition that that county advised Mr. Bradshaw to preach the Gospel instead of prohibition, adding that men could not be legislated into doing right. Such argument that these liquor men offer is the worst I have ever heard of.

The saloon and the liquor house exist under the protection of a civil right—a right created by the State. No man can fairly claim in organized society a natural right to sell liquor. "A license is not required for the exercise of a natural right." But if one sells intoxicants by a civil right, does he thereby acquire the privilege of compelling the State to grant him this right forever? Rights are secured by law. If any man's rights are abridged by prohibition let him appeal to the courts. It is the boast of our civilization that under our laws for every wrong there is a remedy. Why do these liquor coyotes decline to avail themselves of their privileges in the courts, and be avenged of their adversaries? "Because of an absolutely unanimous line of decisions of the highest courts, both of this country and of Great Britain, they have been repeatedly told that not a solitary right of theirs is invaded by prohibition."

But prohibitory laws are denounced as a form of sumptuary legislation. If the charge were true, what of it? There is not a well-ordered government in the world which can afford to dispense with all sumptuary laws. The sale of decayed vegetables and of tainted meats is prohibited. Poisons and explosives are subject to the most stringent prohibitions. Shall these statutes be repealed? This cry of "sumptuary legislation" is an appeal to prejudice which reveals the straits to which the men who make it are driven to find arguments with which to support their cause.

Then they say prohibition does not prohibit. Now the truth is, a prohibitory law is just like any other statute. It is successful where it is supported by public sentiment; it is a failure where it is not thus supported. It restrains drunkenness as much or more than murder laws restrain homicide.

Prohibition in a town or county and at once you see the jug trade with the neighboring license places springing up. If the law fails to prohibit the sale, why are the red-nosed tapers forced to send away from home to get their jugs filled? This very fact brands the argument that prohibition does not prohibit as a lie. In prohibition towns and counties drinkers have to send elsewhere to get their jugs filled. If prohibition does not prohibit why do the whiskey men oppose it and employ men to fight its passage and raise \$500 to pay them like they did in Wilkes county.

And Mont. Wellborn our Senator and tool of the whiskey ring has the gall to say that prohibition fails to prohibit in any county, and further that he could scarcely get to the jails for drinking men, that during his race with Mr. Bowie the speaking was broken up by drunken crowds, &c. When asked about this latter declaration Mr. Bowie recalls only one place where there was any drunkenness at all. The first time our people have heard of people crying in the night—"Liquor for sale," was when Mont. Wellborn told it, and remember the place where they raised the cry—Hon. H. M. Wellborn's home.

Then again, it is inconvenient to send abroad to have a jug replenished, and so the jug trade soon perishes. The stream has to run so far from the spring before it gets to the drinker, and on the way is so exposed to the scorching rays of an aroused public opinion, it soon dries up.

In conclusion, a great battle is on in our State. The greatest question in North Carolina today is the liquor question.

Shall we be ruled and dominated and debauched and damned longer by this enemy of hell. No, a thousand times no. Let us work and fight and pray for the passage of the London bill.

L. P. BOYLE,
Jefferson, N. C., Feb. 4, 1902.

The People Firm for Temperance.

To the Editor:—No doubt some will stop taking your paper because of the noble stand you have taken for God and native land by coming out for strict temperance legislation, but you, like the Democratic party, will make larger gains from the best element of citizens.

I send you herewith \$5.00 to be placed to my credit on subscription. I am proud to see the leading daily in the State take such a firm stand for right. Let me say that the thousands who asked for the London bill will never be satisfied with anything else. It is true the Watts bill is better than nothing, but all the compromising had been done by the best people when they agreed on the London bill. Continue to blow your trumpet blast for prohibition.

It was Democratic to give good government to communities threatened with negro rule; it is Democratic to liberate a people who are already under liquor rule. Praying God's blessing upon you in your great work and thanking Him for your stand, I am

Yours sincerely,
J. J. BARKER,
Bethel, N. C., Feb. 6, 1902.

An Anti-Jug Law Needed.

To the Editor: Let me in the name of the good men and women and also the

children of Pender county thank you for the brave and glorious work you have done for the homes and families of North Carolina in your fight for temperance legislation to rid North Carolina of the blighting curse of the liquor traffic.

I think the cartoon in last Sunday's News and Observer the finest production of the age. I trust you will publish it every Sunday until the Legislature adjourns. I wish this cartoon could reach the home of every whiskey drinker in North Carolina.

We were greatly disappointed that the committee did not report favorably on the London bill. The Watts bill is better than no bill, but it does not help Pender county. We have prohibition, but are cursed with the jug traffic. We are within twenty miles of Wilmington. We have two railroads and four navigable streams running through our county. If we had got the London bill it would prevent this miserable jug business that is so demoralizing to the country people. I trust you will, through your powerful Journal, advocate some measure that will give protection to this and other prohibition counties.

Again thanking you and believing that the good Lord will reward you for your efforts in this good cause, I am
Very truly,
R. P. PADDISON,
Point Caswell, N. C., Feb. 7.

TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION.

A Plan to Unite all Temperance Forces in Local Elections.

To the Editor: The people of the State expect the General Assembly to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the country, and I have no doubt their expectation will be realized. How much further the members of the Legislature will go in response to the public demand for temperance legislation I do not know, but there can be no objection, it seems to me, offered by any reasonable man, desirous of minimizing the evils of the liquor traffic, to the enactment of legislation submitting the questions of license, prohibition and dispensary to the qualified voters of the towns.

I wish to suggest, however, that the first question which should be submitted is whether the sale of licensed saloons shall be continued, and if the election on that question be decided in the affirmative, that within sixty days thereafter the further question of prohibition or dispensary legislation be submitted. If the election should result in favor of licensed saloons no further election shall be held in two years, and if the election should result in dispensary or prohibition no further election on these questions shall be held within two years. The submission of the question of prohibition or dispensary to the voters of the liquor traffic against the open saloon and unite the advocates of prohibition and dispensary in a contest against the saloon, which would result in most of the towns in the elimination of the bar-room. After that result had been accomplished the prohibitionists and the advocates of the dispensary would have an opportunity of presenting to the voters the relative merits of the two systems uncomplicated by the saloon question.

The liquor interest will rely in local elections very largely upon the difference existing among the temperance people on the subject of prohibition and dispensary, and if these forces can be put in antagonism to each other the bar-room will reap all the advantage; whereas, as a vigorous and determined attack by all the temperance forces on the license system in a campaign with only one clear-cut issue, and by one of the great issue upon which all are practically a unit, will, in my opinion, result in a great victory.

Very truly yours,
E. A. DANIELS,
Goldboro, N. C., February 7th.

A Substitute for the Watts Bill.

To the Editor: If the Legislature will re-establish the whipping post and enact a law requiring the sheriff or chief of police to administer thirty-nine lashes to the bare back of every person caught under the influence of liquor, as soon as he or she is sober enough to appreciate the efforts of those officers, there will be no need in North Carolina for either the London Bill or the Watts Bill. Don't harass people who sell spirits, but punish those who drink to excess. Let us have the whipping post and temperance will follow.

GEORGE W. GRAHAM,
Charlotte, N. C., Feb. 6, 1902.

They Favor the London Bill.

(Special to News and Observer.)
Margaretville, N. C., Feb. 7.—Watts bill gives no relief; want London bill for Northampton.
Mark R. Vick, James B. Gove, P. P. M. Garris, D. E. Bridgers, Walter Garris, J. T. Bridgers, J. A. Goode, Jordan Edwards, J. G. Bottoms, J. W. Rose, I. P. Parker, J. E. Taylor, C. B. Vick, W. T. Norvell.

The London Bill Wanted.

(Special to News and Observer.)
Marion, N. C., Feb. 7.—Watts bill unsatisfactory; want London bill; no compromise.
S. W. Wood, County Superintendent of Schools; Thomas Morris, Clerk of Court; T. W. Wilson, Register of Deeds; E. H. Dycart, B. H. Price, E. L. Gaston, W. H. Willis, pastor M. E. Church; W. S. Wilson, pastor Presbyterian Church; C. S. Cashwell, pastor Baptist Church.

The London Bill Wanted.

To the Editor: We want no compro-

mise on the liquor question. God knows it has wrought enough evil to deserve eternal annihilation. Now that an opportunity is given, we trust our Legislature will give it a blow in our State, from which it can never recover. By all means we must have the London bill.

Yours truly,
REV. E. C. SELL,
Cumberland, N. C., Feb. 7.

The Press on Prohibition.

MAY TRUST THE PEOPLE.
(Charity and Children.)

The temperance people have a bold and able champion in the News and Observer. No other daily paper in the State has done so much for this righteous cause and it will be rewarded for its fidelity in the gratitude and esteem of the best people of North Carolina. As the Governor said in his message: "There is but one way only to serve the people well, and that is to do the right thing." The News and Observer has done the right thing, and it may trust the people to uphold it in its course.

THE NEWS AND OBSERVER IS RIGHT.

Greensboro Telegram.
The Raleigh News and Observer courageously speaks its mind on the liquor question. We believe that it is right in its contention that the Democrats who are predicting ruination for the Democratic party if it moves for reform in the liquor traffic could be engaged in better business. If the time is ripe for a step forward in this matter, the Democratic party is the party to see that that step is taken. If it does not do so, it will be derelict in its duty and it will lose the respect of the thousands of voters who are stirred up this year on the liquor question more than ever before.

ADVOCACY OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND TRUTH.

North Carolina Christian Advocate.
We are glad to note that Mr. Joseph Daniels, editor of the News and Observer, has thrown all the strength and force of that paper into the fight against the saloons. He is standing side by side with Mr. Bailey. The public will not forget this, and the News and Observer will make quite as many friends as it loses, and will greatly improve the quality of its constituency. Happily, there is little to lose in North Carolina by a fearless advocacy of righteousness and truth.

THE BATTLE FOR MORAL REFORM.

Scotland Neck Commonwealth.
The temperance forces of the State have turned to the News and Observer as a pioneering influence in the work of temperance legislation. That paper has manfully supported those who are engaged in the great battle for moral reform in the State, and in some phases of the question it has led the fight.

DOES NOT EXPECT MUCH.

Monroe Enquirer.
The battle between the advocates of temperance and the liquor makers and dealers, which has been waged for several weeks, draws to a finish and the Legislature will pass some kind of a liquor law in the very near future. We have no high hopes that the present Leg-

INGERSOLL ON ALCOHOL.

In 1876, in the course of my argument in the Mann trial at Chicago, I used the following language:

"I believe, gentlemen, that alcohol, to a certain degree, demoralizes those who make it, those who sell it, and those who drink it. I believe from the time it issues from the coiled and poisonous worm of the distillery until it empties into the hell of time, death and dishonor, it demoralizes everybody that touches it. I do not believe that anybody can contemplate the subject without becoming prejudiced against this liquid crime. All you have to do, gentlemen, is to think of the wrecks upon either bank of this dream of death—of the suicides, of the insanity, of the poverty, of the ignorance, of the distress, of the little children tugging at the faded dresses of weeping and despairing wives, asking for bread; of men of genius it has wrecked; of the millions who have struggled with imaginary serpents produced by this devilish thing. And when you think of the jails, of the almshouses, of the prisons, and of the scaffolds upon either bank, I do not wonder that every thoughtful man is prejudiced against the d--n stuff called alcohol."

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

This is the only temperance speech I ever made.

islator will pass an anti-liquor law which will amount to very much. The anti-saloon people have made a strong, hard fight and petition, thousands strong, have been rolling in to the lawmakers ever since the Legislature convened praying for laws that will restrict the manufacture and sale of liquor in the State, and on the other hand the liquor-makers and dealers have lined up with money and influence and have made demands for no anti-liquor legislation. We may have some kind of a so-called anti-liquor law passed by the present Legislature, but it will be a weak affair from the viewpoint of the temperance advocates and will be one which will not cripple the liquor business to any great extent. There are some men in the Legislature who will unflinchingly stand for temperance legislation, but the majority of them will fight shy of anything which curtails the liquor evil. That is not an optimistic view of the matter, but it is simply a size-up of the present law-making body of our State. The advocates of temperance are in the majority, but when it comes to the test and an anti-liquor bill comes up in the Legislature you will see that the distillers and the liquor dealers, with their money and their influence, will be in the saddle.

Both members of the House from Wilkes oppose the bill. Mr. Bryan, a very old man, one of the members of the House from that county, declared that "Most of the distillers in Wilkes were church members of good standing and believe in the old time religion."

AN ENSEMBLE RECORD.
Lumberton Bulletin.
A staunch, unswerving exponent of Democracy, a fearless champion of the people's rights, a relentless foe of the liquor traffic, is the valuable record of the News and Observer.

LIQUOR MEN IN THE "STATE OF WILKES" MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH (Asheboro Courier).
There is trouble in the "State of



WHO PAYS THE FREIGHT?

Merchant—This is where our exorbitant freight rates go.
R. R. Baron—Come, no kicking, I must have more dividends on my stock.