

A NEW EDEN

Where They Will Dress Only in Fig Leaves as In

THE GARDEN OF EDEN

How Would You Like to Wander In This Curious, Freakish Earthly Paradise With a New Adam and a New Eve Entirely Free From Clothes, Conventualities and Original Sin.

"Oh, yes," said Mother Eve, smiling proudly and indicating a boy of twelve with a bulging forehead and a solemn expression. "That is little Adam. He is the brightest flower in the Garden of Eden. He has preached hundreds of times and he is almost as powerful a preacher as his father. He will bring many of the race of Eve into the promised land."

"As you have a little Abel, am I to infer that there is also a little Cain?" ventured the correspondent.

"Ah," said Mother Eve, "it makes us very sad to speak of Cain. Yes, we have a little Cain. His name at first was Thomas, but when the light was revealed to us we knew that he was Cain. He put our dear little Abel on the stove and did a lot of other dreadful things. Of course, Cain could not come into the Garden of Eden. We had to leave him to wander in the wicked world."

"You don't mean to say you have deserted your child?"

"Well," said Mother Eve, "that is hardly the way to put it. Cain would not come with us. He is working for a grocer in Kansas City and is earning a living."

"How will your community be supported in the Garden of Eden?"

"Every believer must give up all that he has and follow Adam. He will care for everybody. We shall need very little in the Garden of Eden. We shall not have money or clothes or houses or any property. We shall sleep in the fields or under tents, and every man will take what he needs from the garden."

"There will be neither sin or sickness in the Garden, for it was by sin that death came into the world. Adam will cleanse men from their sins and lead them back to the Garden. There shall be no need of doctors. There shall be no need of lawyers and plants of the field in the Garden. We shall not have herds of cattle. They were the earliest form of property that man took to himself after the fall, and they were a sign of his sinful condition. It is wicked to own cattle and to eat meat. He that eats the flesh of his fellow creatures is surely bringing about his own destruction."

"Will you do any work in the Garden of Eden?"

"Certainly not. You know that the first punishment of Adam for his disobedience was that he should earn his bread in the sweat of his brow. When my Adam redeems men from their sins they have no longer need to work. It would be a sin to do so. We shall just wander happily and gaily in the Garden and smell the flowers and work for the birds. We shall do no work forever and ever. Adam will preach to us when the spirit moves him."

Here Adam thumped his Bible and yelled out:

"I am opening up the third kingdom. I will redeem the world. These children here will help me."

"A—men!" cried Mother Eve.

"A—men!" cried all the others.

"Do you feel quite sure that none of the sisters and daughters of Eve will disturb your sinless and peaceful life in the Garden?" pursued the visitor.

"Of course not," said Mother Eve, indignantly. "If you imagine that, you have failed to understand one of the greatest truths of our religion. When a woman is redeemed by Adam, she ceases to lead man into temptation, which is her great fault in an unregenerate state. Nearly all the unhappiness and wickedness in the world are caused by this fault of woman, as you are aware. When she is free from it, the greatest cause of sin will be removed and that is why we shall all be good in the Garden of Eden."

"Will woman have no desire to wear beautiful clothes in the Garden of Eden?"

"None whatever," said Mother Eve, with conviction. "That desire was paid of her punishment for her disobedience. The woman was condemned to desire for nothing in order that she might perpetually tempt the man, and he was condemned to labor in the sweat of his brow in order that he might perpetually strive in vain to satisfy her longings. We are the new Adam and Eve, and we are sent to redeem our brothers and sisters from this slavery. Henceforth Eve will only desire to appear as the Lord made her."

The correspondent felt that he had learned everything essential about the new garden of Eden and he went away.

As he did so, Mother Eve called out: "Come and join us when you are pure in heart."

NEW SCHOOL LAW.

Full Text of the Act Giving Fifty Thousand Dollars

To Help High Schools in Certain Districts Not Able to Maintain Them Alone

The most important act passed at the late session of the General Assembly in reference to schools was the one appropriating fifteen thousand dollars for a system of high schools. This was introduced in the senate by Senator T. M. Rysor of Orangeburg, for years a member of the State board of education and in his legislative career the champion of compulsory education and other movements. This act is intended to provide a system of schools that will help poor boys to prepare for college. An act to provide high schools for the State.

"Be it enacted by the general assembly of the State of South Carolina: Section 1. That it shall be lawful for any county, or for any township, or any aggregation of adjoining townships, or for any aggregation of adjoining school districts, or any incorporated town or city within the State, of not more than 1,000 inhabitants to establish a high school in the manner and with the privileges herein given.

"Sec. 2. That any high school territorial unit mentioned in section 1 of this act may establish a high school by an election to be held in said proposed high school district upon the question of establishing the same; said election to be conducted in all other respects, including the requirements of those who are allowed to vote therein, as elections are now conducted under section 1208 of the civil code of 1902, in reference to special levies for school purposes. If a majority of the votes cast shall be 'for high school,' and not 'against high school,' the high school shall be established, and become a body corporate under the name and style of high school district. No blank or blank county (the State board to insert the number in order of its establishment in the particular county, and the name of the proper county, and whereupon the county board of education shall appoint for said high school a board of trustees composed of five regular members: Provided, That the five trustees for said high school shall be appointed for six years, one of whom shall serve for only two years, two for only four years, and two for six years, the tenure of each to be determined by lot; Provided, further, That the chairman of each school district board within the high school territory be ex officio a member of the high school board; Provided, further, That the trustees of any special district in any incorporated town or city operating under a special act of the general assembly, shall be ex officio trustees of the high school for that town or city; Provided, further, That the right to make a levy merely for conducting the high school for the then next current scholastic year as now defined in section 1232 of said code may be voted down for that year in the same manner as now provided for in said section 1208 with reference to voting upon special levies for school district purposes.

"Sec. 3. That any public high school already established, or any number of high school grades in a public school already established—provided it shall be organized and adopted as a high school by special election as prescribed in section 2 of this act—in any high school territory above described may claim the privilege of this act: Provided, It conforms to the provisions thereof; and that the provisions of this act shall be construed as a repeal of any of the privileges granted them in the special acts of the general assembly.

"Sec. 4. That any public high school maintaining a four years' course of study beyond the branches of learning prescribed to be taught in the common schools of the State, and embracing not fewer than seven grades or school years, shall be known as a four-year high school; a high school maintaining a three years' course beyond the common school course, shall be known as a three-year high school; and one maintaining a two years' course beyond the common school course, shall be known as a two-year high school. That any and all high schools so established shall include in the course of study instruction in manual training, especially in respect to agriculture and domestic science.

"Sec. 5. That the State high school board shall provide for the inspection and classification of high schools under this act. In doing this, it may invite the assistance of such members of the faculties of the University of South Carolina, Clemson college, Winthrop college, and the South Carolina Military academy as they may select, and their actual expenses shall be paid out of the fund hereafter appropriated from year to year while actually engaged in the duties devolving upon them.

"Sec. 6. That the State board of education as now constituted shall provide for the State high school board. The State high school board shall provide rules for the apportionment and disbursement of the State aid to the high schools, giving due recognition to the number of years of high school work, to the number of courses of study offered, to the enrollment of pupils, and to such other matters of local merit as may appear to the board after a careful examination of each high school. Provided, That no school shall receive more than 50 per cent of the amount raised annually by taxation, subscription or otherwise: Provided, further, That no school shall receive aid unless it has at least 25

NO CONSTABLES.

The Carey-Cothran Act Dispensed with This Department.

By Request Gov. Ansel Appoints Special Officers for Chester, Greenwood and Greenville.

There has been considerable inquiry relative to the status of the constabulary, as a result of the passage of the Carey-Cothran bill. There is no State constabulary provided for under the Act. Governor Ansel thought so, but to make certain he took the matter up with Attorney General Lyon, and then with Mr. Stevenson, of counsel for the winding up commission, and they both agreed that there is neither legal authority nor money with which to pay for constables out of the money to be handled by the winding-up commission.

The terms of Section 38 of the Carey-Cothran Act provided:

Section 38. It shall be the duty of sheriff, their deputies, magistrates, constables, rural police, city and town officials, to enforce the provisions of this Act. If they fail to do so it is hereby made the duty of the Governor to enforce the same, and he is hereby authorized to appoint such deputies, constables and magistrates as may be necessary, the salaries of such officers to be paid out of the profits of the dispensary in counties wherein they may be established, and out of the ordinary county funds in counties wherein they have not been established.

There is, therefore, no State constabulary force. If a county wants constables they will be appointed by the Governor, but they must be paid for out of the county funds. In counties with dispensaries the expenses of constables must be paid out of dispensary profits. In counties without dispensaries and wanting constables then the expenses must be borne by the county out of its general funds. There is no State fund available. The winding-up commission has no money to pay for constables. It will have to do some very tall hustling to get out even," although some time ago some of the friends of the State dispensary system said that it had bundles of money and real bona fide profits, and that when it came to being insolvent or not being able to pay its debts that it was simply ridiculous, and the usual cry of those anti papers or correspondents. Wait and see!

Governor Ansel appointed two constables to keep in touch with the Chester situation. The sheriff and mayor of Chester asked for constables, particularly because of the large number of laborers on the Power Company plant. Under the arrangement these constables will report to the sheriff of the county and the sheriff must report at least once a week to the Governor as to what the constables are doing and how things are getting along.

Whenever Governor Ansel is appealed to by proper authorities and is satisfied that constables are needed in a county he will appoint them as provided for by the Act, to be paid for by the county out of the dispensary profits or the general fund as the case may be. He has full authority to appoint constables even if they are not asked for by constituted authorities and will do so if he thinks it necessary in any county.

The chief State constables is being retained only for a few days, in order that he may check up claims and wind up the affairs of the constabulary department, which cost the State about \$70,000 per annum.

Governor Ansel has received letters from various sections of the State relative to the status of the constables, and he wishes it plainly and definitely understood that, under the terms of the Carey-Cothran bill and the bill to wind up the State dispensary, that the State constabulary force is abolished and there is no State fund from which to pay constables. He expects to see that the laws are enforced and has already taken the matter up with all sheriffs, mayors and magistrates, but wherever there is a legitimate need for constables they will be appointed, to be paid for out of dispensary profits, where there are dispensaries, and out of the general county funds where there are no county dispensaries.

In response to the general demand Governor Ansel has decided to place two constables in Greenville County and one in Greenwood. These appointments are made in response to the public wishes and because it is believed that they will do good. The constables will report daily to the sheriff and the sheriff must report each week at least to the Governor as to what is being done. The constables will be paid in Greenville and Greenwood by the counties out of their general fund, as is now provided for by law and as has been the law for some time.

BURNED TO DEATH.

One Teacher and Sixteen Children Perish in School Fire.

At Montreal, Quebec, Principal Maxwell and sixteen children perished in a fire, which broke out Tuesday afternoon in the Hochelaga school of the protestant school commission. The school was located in a brick two story building in the east end of the city, and was attended by about 200 children, whose parents are mechanics living in the neighborhood.

The fire started from the furnace and was first noticed by a workman employed nearby. The teachers were notified and the work of getting the children out began. The kindergarten department was located on the second floor and it was here that the loss of life occurred.

The children were started out, but on reaching the landing, found the lower part full of smoke. Into this they refused to descend, though the way at this time was quite safe.

Huddled together on the stairway at first they retreated to the rooms from which they had come. When the fire broke out an extension ladder was placed in position, and a large number of children were rescued in this way.

Assisting in the work was Miss Maxwell. The fire by this time was making its way upwards, and the smoke was growing so dense that even the experienced firemen could not stand it. Captain Carson endeavored to get Miss Maxwell to go down the ladder, but she refused and evading the attempt to detain her rushed back into the back part of the building in search of others of her class.

When the firemen were finally able to make their way to the back portion of the building, she was found lying on the floor with a little one beside her. All those who perished died from asphyxiation, as the building was unprovided with fire escapes.

COST NEARLY FIFTY.

A Stolen Kiss Proves to be an Expensive Luxury.

It costs a fellow something in Baltimore to steal a kiss from a woman. One little kiss cost George Wilkinson \$47.75, according to a decision in the criminal court. Pansy Schmidt, a comely woman, told the court she was "tending bar at her husband's saloon on Milliken street."

It was time to close for the night. While reaching with both hands above her head to turn out the lights, she said Wilkinson embraced her and stole a kiss.

"Go 'way, you hard thing," she said, and Wilkinson went. Then she swore out a warrant for his arrest, and Wilkinson admitted he had that he had kissed her a number of times before.

"I kissed her right on the mouth," he said, with emphasis, as though recalling a pleasant memory.

The Best Liquor Law.

The Charlotte News gets enthusiastic over our new liquor. "In our judgment," says the News, "there is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for its experience with the dispensary. In that connection the matter is not a State in the Union today that has a better law, relative to the whiskey question, than South Carolina, and such a law would possibly never have been obtained had it not been for