

A Liquor Man's Views

Between the prohibitionists on one side and the representatives of the liquor trade on the other, with the press ever alert looking on and certain to see in time the comedy of the situation, there would seem to be no possibility of our having any prohibition in this country, and this notwithstanding the millions that have been spent in fighting the liquor traffic, and the millions of properties destroyed by the passage of so-called reform legislation, and notwithstanding the prayers and the tears and the appeals of hundreds of thousands of good, earnest and emotional women.

Of course, it is easy to understand that the men connected with the liquor trade do not desire prohibition, and are unceasing in their efforts to prevent the adoption of such laws or to bring about their repeal. These men do not believe in prohibition, either as to principle or as to practice, and furthermore, they have vast financial interests at stake and, therefore, it is not to be expected that they would encourage such legislation.

The Anti-Saloon League, however, and the prohibition party, and the churches affiliated with these movements, and the W. C. T. U. and what are known as the reformers in general, profess to believe in prohibition in the matter both of principle and practice, and they certainly give an immense amount of time, and they subscribe or collect millions of dollars and they keep up a perpetual agitation in favor of what they call prohibitory laws, and in favor of the destruction without compensation of the properties of distillers, brewers, wholesalers and retailers.

To hear a prohibitionist speak, or to hear a woman connected with the W. C. T. U. recite an essay or poem in regard to drink, one would naturally suppose that they would go to any extreme to prevent the use of an article to which they attribute 90 per cent of our ills.

It is a remarkable fact, however, that the leaders in this prohibition crusade show a greater fear of a real prohibitory law than do the men who are connected with the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages.

The older men in our trade have become convinced that if prohibition really prohibited it would be repealed, and for that reason they would welcome a law that would prohibit not merely the sale of liquors, but the purchase, possession and use as well.

We could have no better object lesson than to have a State adopt such legislation for the purpose of finding out whether the majority of the people in that State really desire prohibition of the use of liquor, or whether they are simply making a pretense for the purpose of satisfying their conscience or of deceiving one another.

The leaders on the prohibition side, however, will not stand for a law that actually prohibits the individual from securing for his own use a liberal supply of whiskey, wine or beer. These reformers seem to be very greatly concerned as to the rights of the individual in such matters, and they throw up their hands in horror at the suggestion of a law that would prohibit a man from having liquor in his home.

That this is true is shown conclusively by the fact that, notwithstanding the passage of the Webb law, there is no territory except a few counties in Iowa, and a limited section known as Indian Territory, and under the supervision of the general government where dealers in "wet" States are prohibited from shipping liquor to individuals in "dry" States and counties in such quantities as they may require for their own consumption.

In North Carolina, for instance, it was evidently feared by the good prohibitionists that the Webb law would actually shut liquor out of the State, and the legislature, composed almost entirely of what are known as prohibitionists, immediately amended the prohibition law so as to make it legal for dealers in "wet" States to ship to consumers in North Carolina not in excess of one gallon at a time to each consumer.

Of course, this limitation has been dispensed with and shipments up to five gallons are being made in North Carolina without any hindrance, but even if the law were absolutely enforced it is hard to imagine why an individual in any kind of territory—"wet" or "dry"—should want more than a gallon of whiskey in his house at one time.

In Georgia, however, the prohibitionists have very liberal ideas as to the requirements of drinkers, and recently the "Temperance Committee" of the Senate unanimously recommended, and the legislature passed by an almost unanimous vote, an amendment to the prohibition law which

provides that where a shipment in Georgia of less than three gallons is seized, the burden of proof shall rest on the State to show that the shipment was intended not for consumption, but for illegal sale.

In other words, the prohibition legislature of prohibition Georgia deliberately provides that any individual of Georgia may legally have shipped from another State at any time not in excess of three gallons of whiskey, provided the goods are intended for his own consumption.

But this character of legislation, this comedy of reform, is not peculiar to North Carolina and Georgia, because in every State in the Union, with the exception of the "dry" counties in Iowa, similar provision has been made in the interest of consumers of alcoholic beverages.

As far as the "dry" counties in Iowa are concerned, they are being supplied by automobiles from "wet" towns within the State, or just across the line from adjoining States, and the question of permitting the people in these "dry" counties to receive their supplies of liquors interstate and without hindrance from the authorities, is now before the courts and will probably be decided in favor of the consumer.

When we remember that this prohibition movement has been going on steadily for more than sixty years, and when we take into consideration the fact that it has cost hundreds of millions of dollars, it hardly seems possible that such a situation can prevail today as we have described, and yet the fact remains that such a situation does prevail, and that real prohibition, so far as we can discover, is without a friend, insofar as any of the organizations are concerned on either the "wet" or "dry" side.

Those who are fighting on the "wet" side do not desire prohibition at all. Those who are fighting on the "dry" side desire prohibition each for the other fellow, but not one of them for himself.

Furthermore, as far as we can find out, not one of them, from the Rev. Purley A. Baker or the Hon. Wayne B. Wheeler down to the humblest contributor in the ranks of the Anti-Saloon League, will consider for a moment the passage of a law that will prohibit him from having liquor in his own possession, and from using it as he sees fit.

In this fact lies the great weakness of what we know as the prohibition movement, and it is this fact that makes it inevitable that in the future, as in the past, there will be no prohibition in this country either by national, State or local legislation.—Editorial by T. M. Gilmore in Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DISPENSARY.

Supt. Edmunds Gives three Reasons Against Re-establishment of Liquor Traffic.

Editor The Item.
In matters affecting the body politic citizens of a republic should be pleased to give or to receive without bias or prejudice expressions of opinion and, therefore, in questions, whose determination may promote or jeopardize the general welfare, there should be a readiness on the part of anyone interested to show where he stands and why he holds the views that he does.

In this attitude of friendliness and frankness towards those who agree as well as towards those who differ with me, I wish to say that, in the approaching election to determine whether or not the dispensary shall be re-established in Sumter county, I shall vote against the measure for at least three reasons: First: Undisputed statistics reveal the fact that not fifty per cent of the amount of whiskey is being sold in this county under the prohibition regime; Second: The records of the coroner's office show a most remarkable reduction in the number of homicides—a question of life and death affecting our fellow citizens; Third: The young men of our city, through their representatives, have appealed to those, whose habits are already formed, not to place before them this additional temptation.

In my judgment any one of these reasons is cogent; their combined strength is irresistible.

S. H. Edmunds.

There were about sixty-four tickets sold from Sumter on the northern excursion Wednesday, slightly more than in former years. A great many more Pullman reservations were made than usual.

The mania of Roumania seems to be getting more rampant.—Greenville News.

DISPENSARY OR NO DISPENSARY.

On the 19th day of August 1913, how many will vote No; of his own free will and accord?

How many will vote Yes; of his own free will and accord?

It will be the duty of the voter to consider well the many sides of the case before he votes at all. The prohibitionist claims No, means, and will bring about no dispensary, no legitimate sale of liquor and abstinence, total, eventually. Do you believe it? Do you believe that if you were able to vote No, a thousand times, you could break up a luxury indulged in by the race for many generations. A habit as old as religion, attendant with similar consolations and similar disasters to the human race. Every innovation of men's religious beliefs and endeavors to dictate to him what God he shall worship, or what forms, etc., he shall indulge in, or should not practice, has resulted in wars, deaths, and disaster to every generation. Almost every book in the Bible from Genesis to Revelations, is tragedy, where tribe after tribe was swept from existence on account of religion and even in this enlightened age we would back up missionaries with the sword to make the Chinaman embrace Christianity.

Fanatics commence it, who for awhile hold their sway, until another fanatic comes along to promulgate a new idea. You will find not one scientific principle has ever emanated from a fanatic.

Take the liquor question; the manufacture and sale, and drinking of it in one form or another has been in existence for as many generations as religion, and like it has been attended with consolations, pleasures, and disasters, and similarly each innovation dictating how it shall be sold, or how man should drink it, or that he be prohibited from drinking it at all; has resulted in trouble, disaster, and bloodshed, especially the dispensary system, and worse the bind tiger system.

It is futile to try and regulate man's appetite or his religion, outwardly he may profess abstinence while privately he gratifies his appetite. Outwardly he may profess great religion through policy, while privately he indulges in all that his religion forbids.

Some business men will vote No, believing that the class of men who spend money for whiskey would have more money to spend for their goods. Others will vote Yes, because they believe that the dispensary will draw more people and their indulgence will cause them to spend more money. The prohibitionist will vote No, because they think all men can, and must do without it as they do, who find no consolation, good, or pleasure in it. I think these are the chief reasons governing these three voters.

The first is voting No, from a selfish motive. The second is voting Yes, from an absolutely selfish motive, neither caring for the welfare of his fellow citizen. The third is, I believe, sincere in believing he can, by voting No, prevent the use of it, and benefit men. But if he will lift the curtain he will find often selfishness and a "dog in the manger" spirit behind it.

There is another voter who will vote Yes, from a purely business standpoint, which is that all will be benefited by the revenue obtained thereby from a population we do not now get any from as they pay no taxes. There is another voter who will vote Yes because he believes it to be better than the blind tiger or the country club; better for all such things to be under police surveillance. Take these voters; the first who votes No, forgets that if the men cannot get it from a dispensary they will find a thousand other ways to get it. The second voter votes Yes; he overlooks the fact that it may cost him more in the finish on account of enforcing law and order, and he paying for it. The third votes No; he is a fanatic, he cannot have prohibition, total abstinence, he cannot dictate or force every man to think and do as he does. They are too extreme, these men, no matter how good their intentions are, should pursue other means to stop the evil habit of drinking, than to endeavor to forge and enact laws to force the educated and ignorant, strong and weak, old and young alike, depriving one of pleasure, one of comfort, some of necessity, and making others, the young, fear to trust themselves. If you believe in the Garden of Eden story, then the Creator should not have allowed that tree of forbidden fruit to grow there in the Garden of Eden to tempt poor weak men. This is what you are trying to do when you vote No! Instead of removing the tree (dispensary) why do you not let it stay, and get to work to make the young more self-reliant than Old Adam was. One thing certain he cannot, like Old Adam did, get drunk in his wife's name. The other voter who votes Yes; for the sake of revenue should consider well whether it will be a source of revenue or not. If not conducted on a different plan from the one heretofore existing it will not be.

The evils that existed and which should be estimated are too numerous to mention here.

As to the dangers of it to the coming generations, that is a problem that is rapidly solving itself. The young men and women of this generation, have a new world teeming with new ideas, new vocations and new methods of pursuing them, never in the history of the human race has there existed such opportunities as are now forcibly presented to mankind. The pages of every magazine and newspaper teeming with information presented in forcible yet simple type on every subject in the world, and our government is spending millions to aid science. Take agriculture for instance, it will soon be, not only (as it has been) the most honorable profession in the world, but the leading one. If a man is deficient in mind or body there are new discoveries and new methods of restoration to assist nature in carrying out her work to enable man to perform what he was created for. Every human being like every living thing is made for a purpose. We all must leave our "footprints in the sand of time." Do not think that the day or that the minute, that has passed has no effect on the future because it is gone, every preceding moment, hour and day has its effort in governing what is done the next, making every action of this life, leave an impression on the beings we are creating to leave behind us after our duties are fulfilled and our forms are changed and been merged into other beings.

After considering all this what does it matter how whiskey is sold or any other injurious commodity? Instead of wasting time endeavoring to remove temptation, such as whiskey (there are existing worse, that can never be removed.) It would be best to control as far as possible necessarily existing evils. And let every aim be for higher education, nobler education, higher religion, nobler religion. I do not mean by this a classical education or religion such as is taught in colleges and schools by rules. But I mean that new education, that new religion which is now creeping like a current of electricity from man to man, pervading all nature, rapidly, surely and potently. To realize it we have but to compare a hundred years ago, with the present and a hundred years to come. It is startling, the changes up to now, and at the present rate more startling to think what will take place in a hundred years to come. This progress is all based on scientific principle asserting and proving and

By it the race is growing healthier
By it the world is growing great
By it nations are growing wealthier
Ever reaching a higher state.
No thinking or observant mind can deny this and note how rapidly old customs and old habits are becoming obsolete, in every vocation and pursuit of the race. Hence with one last illustration to liquor, no man can deny that it is harmful physically and mentally as is any drug. The business man shuns it, the physician or surgeon in his endeavor to aid nature in curing disease or wounds (though in some cases having to use it as a servant) dreads coming in contact with it where it has become a master often rendering his best efforts futile.

In conclusion I say it without doubt that the superior races and the superior minds in each race are, and will rapidly learn to cast aside old and injurious habits in the pursuit of other things, for the betterment of himself and his fellow man! It may be the survival of the fittest, but can they not by precept, and reason, and by the aid of the new environments now existing cast aside arbitrary measures, and let reason and experience hold her sway, and work her cure.
Respectfully,
T. S. Sumter.

Good Reason for His Enthusiasm.

When a man has suffered for several days with colic, diarrhoea or other form of bowel complaint and is then cured sound and well by one or two doses of Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy, as is often the case, it is but natural that he should be enthusiastic in his praise of the remedy, and especially is this the case of a severe attack when life is threatened. Try it when in need of such a remedy. It never fails. Sold by all dealers.—Adv't.

Washington, Aug. 13.—A report was made to congress today by the Secretary of War transmitting the recommendation of the board of engineers that an expenditure of \$129,000 be made to provide an improved inland waterway between Columbia, Camden and Charleston, S. C.

Remarkable Cure of Dysentery.

"I was attacked with dysentery about July 15th, and used the doctor's medicine and other remedies with no relief, only getting worse all the time. I was unable to do anything and my weight dropped from 145 to 125 pounds. I suffered for about two months when I was advised to use Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy. I used two bottles of it and it gave me permanent relief." writes B. W. Hill of Snow Hill, N. C. for sale by all dealers.—Adv't.

Mr. Sumter Answered.

Editor Daily Item.

I read the article by Mr. T. S. Sumter, in favor of the dispensary, in last night's Item and ask permission to answer it.

To begin with I respectfully submit that the author of the article has his major premise wrong when he says "The prohibitionist says, No, means and will bring about no dispensary no legitimate sale of liquor, and abstinence, total, eventually. The prohibitionist does mean that no will bring about no dispensary, no legitimate sale of liquor, but nothing can bring about total abstinence; the laws regulating the liquor traffic are violated, just as other laws are. It is against the law to kill, to commit arson and other crimes, and each has a penalty attached; in the two named above there is a death penalty; yet how many killings and how many house burnings take place annually? And yet no sane man will argue that the laws do not reduce the commissions of crime. If they do not what is the object of electing representatives to make laws, of what use are the laws when made?"

Then again, he says, "Fanatics commence it," here he seems to be speaking of religion, but that can not be, for he continues "You will find that not one scientific principle has ever emanated from a fanatic," surely he does not speak of religion in this manner. Then it must be, by process of elimination, the whiskey question he is speaking of. If he is, I would ask him, who brought up the question? The dispensaryites. They ask that a question which has for years been closed, be again opened. It is open! And those who have been called "prohibitionists" but whom I choose to call anti-dispensaryites, are merely putting before the public facts, and rebuttals of the arguments of the dispensaryites; which are pregnant with fallacies.

And in drawing a picture in which he represents the dispensary as the tree of forbidden fruit, saying that its presence would make or tend toward making the young men stronger and more self-reliant, he not only forgets that we are "poor weak mortals after all," but he also forgets to draw the picture of the seductive tempter, Satan. Yet Sumter's streets are not free from Satans, who to be "sociable" would ask a young man to have a drink, and would not be dispensary make such invitations so much more frequent than they are now?

One of the arguments upon which the dispensary men lay great stress is that we should have the dispensary for the revenue. The author of last night's argument says "If conducted on a different plan from the one heretofore existing it (the dispensary) will not be a source of revenue." How are we to judge? We can only judge the future in the light of the past. And, that light has been chiefly darkness.

Again he says "Every preceding moment, hour and day has its effect in governing what is done the next, making every action in this life, have an impression on the beings we are creating to leave behind us." Surely he would not want the young men to be impressed by the things done by a man under the influence of whiskey. Yet he would enlarge the number of "actions," as it is a fact ascertained by actual statistics that seventy per cent more whiskey is sold when the dispensary is in operation than when it is not.

Quoting again from the author, after he has spoken of the progress of the world, and the broadening view, "By it the races are growing healthier, By it the world is growing great, By it the nations are growing wealthier, Ever reaching a higher state."

Yet he acknowledges that whiskey is unhealthy. Yes; he acknowledges the power of progress, and then overlooks the fight against the legalizing of the liquor traffic which progress is bringing with its power.

"We must all leave our foot prints on the sands of time," he says; yet would he or any other man, want his son, his neighbor, his younger brother or any other young man in whom he has a sincere interest, following in the footsteps of an excessive drinker, a steady drinker or a drinker of any other kind? There are footsteps now on the sands of time that need to be covered up, and that would be if the shifting sands (the indifferent voter) would shift in the right direction and vote against the re-establishment of the dispensary.

I am confident that I speak for the majority of the young men of my age when I say, that we the young men are not willing to follow whiskey precepts or in the footsteps of some of the older men of Sumter. We do not care to emulate their examples and we beg you, the voters, not to make it any easier than it already is for us to do so. I know that I speak for one, and that one, myself. I do not want the dispensary, and I am going to vote against it because I don't believe it best for my friends, my county, and myself.

Respectfully,
R. O. Purdy, Jr.

GOV. SULZER IMPEACHED.

BUT GOVERNOR REFUSES TO VACATE OFFICE.

Indications Point to Clash of Authority when Mr. Sulzer and the Lieutenant Governor Meet at Capitol—Friends of "Indicted" Executive Say that He Intends to Continue in Office and Use Every Weapon to Maintain Power.

Albany, N. Y., Aug. 13.—With Gov. Sulzer impeached by the assembly and the date of his trial before the senate and the judges of the court of appeals set for September 18, the spectacle was presented tonight of two men claiming to be governor of the State of New York.

As soon as the articles of impeachment, adopted early today by the Democratic majority in the assembly, were presented to the senate, shortly after 3 o'clock this afternoon, Lieutenant Governor Martin H. Glynn announced his intention of occupying the executive chamber.

Friends of Governor Sulzer declared that the governor intended to continue in office and would use every weapon in his power to maintain his position on the ground that the assembly had no constitutional right to consider impeachment at its extraordinary session.

Some asserted that the governor would go so far as to summon military protection if necessary to prevent the Lieutenant Governor from occupying the executive chamber.

Judge D. Cady Herrick, who will act as chief counsel for the governor at his trial said tonight that "talk of resort to force is the merest rot."

"He will meet the charges against him in an ordinary and dignified way," said Judge Herrick, "and will do nothing unbecoming the dignity of the State. He will engage in no physical scramble to assert his rights to discharge the functions of the office of governor."

The governor himself was silent, when at 6 o'clock tonight he left his office in the capitol, where he had been closeted the entire day, he was asked if he expected to return tomorrow.

"Yes, siree," he replied in angry tones.

So far as could be learned no attempt was made by Lieutenant Governor Glynn in any way to exercise the functions of chief executive today, but there was every indication that there would be a clash of authority tomorrow, when both men appear at the capitol.

The Lieutenant Governor would not indicate tonight what action he proposed to take except to say that there would be no "circus or military manoeuvres about occupying the executive chambers; the law is supreme."

The inaction of Lieutenant Governor Glynn in the matter was in the face of arguments given expression both in the senate and in the assembly today that at the moment the articles of impeachment were presented to the senate Governor Sulzer automatically ceased to be the chief executive.

This contention was based on an article in the constitution which says that "in case of impeachment of the governor the power and duties of the office shall devolve upon the Lieutenant Governor."

It was held by the majority leaders that the word "impeachment" corresponded with the word "indictment" in a criminal trial and that, therefore, in the meaning of the constitution, the governor already stood impeached even though not yet convicted, and was, therefore, not now eligible to hold his office.

These arguments were placed before the Lieutenant Governor by the Democratic leaders early in the afternoon but, nevertheless, Governor Sulzer was not molested.

A few minutes after the governor left his office, Patrick E. McCabe, clerk of the senate, appeared at the executive chamber with a copy of the articles of impeachment and a summons and complaint, which he intended to serve upon the governor. When informed by the governor's secretary that he had missed the governor by scarcely a minute, McCabe asked for an appointment tomorrow. Platt replied that the governor would be at the executive chamber at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that he would "try to arrange matters for that time."

It seemed practically certain tonight that the governor and the Lieutenant Governor would both resort to legal tests of their respective claims in the courts, which in the history of New York State never have been called upon for an opinion which would act as a precedent. Rumors of what form these tests would take offered such a wide choice that, for lack of authoritative statement, no one cared tonight to venture more than a guess.

Upon leaving the executive chamber the governor went for a short automobile ride, and then returned to the executive mansion, where he was in consultation until a late hour with his advisers.