WEST VIRGINIA FREEMAN.

VOLUME 1. PARKERSBURG, W. VA., WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1881. NUMBER 1.

News Cullings.

A bill is pending in the Missouri Legislature providing for *viva voce* voting.

Congressmen have had more water than whisky, in Washington for a spell.

Ludlow street jail has in it prisoners for debt, one of whom has been there five years.

Alex. H. Stephen's body servant Henry, died recently, at Crawfordville Ga., worth $20,000.

Over five hundred thickly settled squares were submerged by the recent floods, in New Orleans.

The entire town of Pass Manchas, La., was swept away by a storm of wind and rain on the 9th inst.

The Grand Jury of New Castle County, Delaware, have been after R. G. Ingersoll for blasphemy.

A recently passed law in New Jersey allows a wife to testify at the trial of her husband charged with manslaughter.

A constitutional amendment is pending in Missouri, prohibiting the manufacture of alcoholic liquors in the State.

Seats in the New York Stock-Board sell as high as thirty thousand dollars. Big price, for a seat, a seat on a board, at that.

Three men were killed on the 15th inst., at New York, by the falling of an old mast, which, was being hoisted out of the Sweedish ship Cleopatra.

The fight between Tammany and anti-Tammany in New York, continues and is likely to result in the election of a Republican as against two Democrats, to succeed Fernando Wood.

The celebrated Long Bridge across the Potomac was partly carried away by the recent ice floods. Pennsylvania Avenue was turned into a canal and navigated by all kinds of small water-craft.

A Galveston widow, about to marry her fifth husband, being rebuked by her pastor for contemplating matrimony so soon again, retorted with a widow's spirit "I just want you to understand, that if the Lord keeps taking them I will too."

The Wheeling *Register* says the Republicans, when in power, took $60,000 from the school fund. The *Intelligencer* says, that up to last year the Democrats took from the school fund $127,511,48. Come, gentlemen, tote even. But then, the Democrats have been keeping house longer—Does that explain it?

Mr. Spencer Cockran, a young lark ninety-two years of age, was recently married in Patrick county, Va., to a spry old maid of forty, Miss Bethany Hubbard. We are not advised whether she is a daughter of "Old Mother Hubbard" who manifested such tenderness and zeal in efforts to supply the poor dog with a bone. If she is and has no better luck when she goes to the cupboard, than had the old lady, it will be rather rough for young Spencer, The grand-daughter and great grand-daughter of the groom waited on the couple, and his son married them.

A bar-room for women has been opened on one of the high-toned thoroughfares of New York. Let us have one on Market street. The ladies should not be deprived of the patriotic pleasures of adding something to the enterprise and business of the city.

The Trustees of the Peabody Fund held their annual meeting at Washington D. C., Feb. 2nd 1881, at which meeting they were addressed by Hon. Robert C. Winthrop. Glowing tributes were paid to the memory of the late Dr. Sears, whose unequaled services, has secured such magnificent results from the munificent gift of the great philanthropist.

The Amendment in the Senate.

Consideration of the Prohibitory Amendment having been made the special order for Wednesday Febuary 16, in the Senate the greater part of that day and the following was spent in discussing the matter. Both Wheeling Dailies had accounts of the proceedings. We give the substance of the *Intelligencer's* report.

The resolution provides: "That the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks are forever prohibited in this State except for medicinal, mechanical, and scientfic purposes, and that the Legislature shall enforce the same by appropriate legislation." After the reading of the resolution by the Clerk several Senators scrambled to their feet for recognition, and Judge Brown being the successful one asked Mr. Faulkner if he would not agree to a further postponement of the resolution. Mr. Faulkner replied that he did not think that a further postponement would accomplish any good. The Senate had nothing of special importance to consider at present, but it would be rushed with work later on; and the question might as well be decided now one way or the other.

Judge Brown asked that the resolution be postponed for one week, at least. He said there was a very important bill awaiting the action of the Senate—The bill regulating the Justices of the several counties—and until the bill was passed the people were virtually without laws for their government. He hoped, therefore, it would be the pleasure of the Senate to agree to his motion to postpone.

Mr. Wood said the question must be met sometime during the session, and he knew of no better time than the present to meet the issue, and, therefore, he would move that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

Judge Brown resisted the motion to indefinitely postpone, and warned the Senate if it was postponed now there would come an hour when there would be no postponement of the question. The people have petitioned for the privilege of voting on this question and we have no right to refuse them. The petitions contain the names of as many respectable ond wealthy people as ever appeared on a paper ever presented to this Legislature. Let us not, therefore, shirk our duty in this matter. As for myself I am with the people in this measure, and will stay with them if the consideration of it sinks every political party in the State.

Mr. Dennis said he freely confessed that he was a temperance man, and regretted the evils of drunkenness as much as any Senator on the floor, but he didn't propose to shirk his duty—

Judge Brown, interrupting: "I wish to correct the impression of the gentlemen, I did not insinuate that any Senator would refuse to do his duty. What I did say, was: 'Let us not shirk our duty.'

Mr. Dennis continuing spoke in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone. "I take it that every Senator's mind is made up as to how he will vote, and the prolongation of the discussion on the measure is useless."

Mr. Smith said he objected to the indefinite postponement, because it cut off amendments to the resolution. He thought it could be so amended as to suit the friends of the measure and meet with the approbation of the Senate.

Mr. Faulkner, the leader of the opposition to the resolution, then took the floor and made a long and exhaustive argument in favor of indefinite postponement. He asserted that one-half of the petitioners did not know that the Constitution already provides for the enactment of laws suppressing the liquor traffic. The ladies signed the petitions because they objected to the saloons. There are already laws on our Statute books regulating these places, but I doubt if they were aware of the fact when they signed the petitions. The Legislature is already authorized to pass laws suppressing the manufature and sale of intoxicating drinks, why, therefore, submit this question to the people.

Mr. Faulkner then referred to Maine as an example of the workings of a prohibition law. He said Maine was ahead of all the New England States in the number of divorces granted. Now the temperance people claim that drunkenness is the cause of most of the domestic wretchedness in the land. Let us see how is it in Maine. In 1878 there was one divorce to every 1,357 inhabitants; in Massachusetts one to every 2,800, and in liquor selling West Virginia I don't think the proportion would quite be one to 5,600. Now if you can prove to me that the passage of this amendment will benefit the people—make the men stronger and the women healthier, and the State more prosperous, then I will favor the adoption of the amendment.

How does prohibition work in Maine? A prominent temperance man in that State has written a letter to a gentleman on the floor of this House in which it is stated that in one town of 7,000 inhabitants that there are forty places where liquor is sold in violation of the law. Further, there are more special United States licenses taken out in Maine than in whisky selling West Virginia.

Mr. Faulkner said the question resolved itself into three propositions; Prohibition, Local Option and License. He quoted Senator Thurman, of Ohio, in support of his assertion that local option in Ohio was a failure. also the remarks of a man named Duffield, in relation to Michigan.

Now, in my county there is a distillery that turns out 2,240 gallons a day, but not five cents worth of it is sold in West Virginia. The product is shipped to Baltimore and Philadelphia. Yet this amendment would abolish this industry. With what effect? Why, another could be started up just across the line in Maryland. If suppressed in this State it would throw 200 men out of employment. If I was to go back to the days of the Pilgrim Fathers; to leave my land for a new country I would make such laws as are proposed by this amendment. But you must take things as they are and not attempt such radical measures as is proposed by this resolution. This State receives $35,575,59 from licenses, one-sixteenth of the expenses for running the State. How would you provide for this deficit? The only way left open to you will be to increase the tax on real and personal property.

Judge Brown was very happy in his reply to Mr. Faulkner. He said the question before the Senate was not one of individual preference, but it was the right of the people to pass upon the merits of the measure. According to the Senator from Berkeley the Barons didn't know what they were asking for when they presented the Magna Charta to King John; the ladies did not know what they were signing when they put their names to the petitions that are before this body asking for the passage of this amendment. I don't consider that reflection very complimentary to my constituents. If the gentleman had lived in the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, he would have said that the signers did not know what they did.

In my Senatorial district there is not one distillery. And I thank God for it. Only one village in the county has license. Where license is withheld the effect is magical. It used to be that court could not be held in our county for the uproar created by quarreling and fighting. Now that no license is granted the order is the very best. The Senator from Berkeley quoted Senator Thurman as authority on local option. I have heard that Thurman was the best Judge of whisky in Ohio, and also the best drinker. I ask you, Senators, to give the petitions of the people a respectful hearing. We have no right to withhold from the people to vote on this measure, and assume that we know what is better for them than they themselves do.

Mr. Smith followed Judge Brown in reply to Mr. Faulkner. Mr. Smith was very eloquent in his remarks presenting his plea for temperance. Continuing, Mr. Smith replied to Mr. Faulkner categorically. He said he objected to the indefinite postponement for the reason that it cut off all amendments. I had intended, said Mr. Smith, to prepare an amendment that would except beer and wine and prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors, and to prevent their importation into the State. My proposition is to submit both measures to the people. I would ask the Senator from Ohio county, therefore, to withdraw his motion to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. Woods refusing to comply the debate was continued at some length, when the Senate adjourned without coming to a vote on the question before the House.

The Senate having adjourned till Thursday the report of the second days discussion continues:

The prohibitory liquor amendment coming up under the head of unfinished business of yesterday, Mr. McGregor obtained the floor and spoke in favor of the measure. He denied the points made by Senator Faulkner, yesterday in regard to the failure of prohibition in Maine, and quoted extensively from statistics to support the position he took. He referred to the decrease of the liquor bill of that State from $13,000,000 annually to $500,000, and quoted the report of the Sheriff of Cumberland county, the county in which the city of Portland is situated, which officer asserted that the poor house had been emptied of paupers, and the death rate had decreased from one out of 50 to 1 out of 300, all of which resulted from the abolition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. Mr. McGregor also fortified his position by reading the testimony of Senators Blaine and Hamlin in regard to the benefits resulting from prohibition. Citing our own State, Mr. McGregor maintained that the crime prevailing could be traced to the use of liquor, and read from the Auditor's report as to the percentage of criminals sent to the Penitentiary from the counties in which no license was granted in comparison with the number sent from the counties in which liquor was sold—the comparison being largely in favor of the anti-license counties. In conclusion Mr. McGregor asserted that the State was responsible to a certain degree for murders committed in this State of which liquor was proven to be the elementary cause.

Mr. Dennis obtained the floor at the conclusion of Mr. McGregor's speech, and spoke for half an hour in favor of the indefinite postponement of the resolution. The Senator said what he most desired to do was to present the real issue involved in this question—the true question the Senate was called on to decide. He didn't propose to discuss the temperance question, as it didn't enter into the matter at all. He admitted that all that was said of the evils of intemperance was literally true; that wretchedness and crime were prevalent and that whisky in the main was the cause. Mr. Dennis then argued the futility of the amendment even if it became a part of the fundamental law. The resolution seeks to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks. The great question, said the Senator, with the temperance people was to find a remedy for drunkenness. But does this do it? No; he didn't think it did. The manufacture of liquor in this State does not amount to anything, as hardly any of the liquor drank was manufactured in the State. If the sale of intoxicating liquor was prohibited then some good might be accomplished. Mr. Dennis referred to Mr. Smith's proposition made yesterday to forbid the importation of liquor into the State in addition to prohibiting the manufacture and sale, claiming it to be unconstitutional, as it was delegated to Congress to regulate the commerce between the States. Mr. Dennis claimed that his sympathies were as great for temperance as any man, but he did not think the passage of the amendment proposed would work the benefits and good claimed, and he would therefore vote for the indefinite postponement of the measure.

Mr. Brown thought it was about time to inquire what question was before the Senate. It was not whether the Senate thought the measure proper and right, but whether the request of the 20,000 people who petitioned for the privilege of voting on it would be granted. The Senator from Greenbrier has stated that there is already a provision in the Constitution providing for the enactment of laws regulating the sale of liquors, and if the Legislature would pass the laws asked for what need the people bother about it. But, continued Mr. Brown, if this Legislature would pass a law of this kind the next Legislature could repeal it. The people want the matter fixed for all time.

Pending further debate the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock prompt, when Senator Dawson obtained the floor to speak against the indefinite postponement. Few people were in the lobby at the opening of the session, but before Mr. Dawson had concluded all the visitor's seats were occupied and many were standing.

Mr. Dawson said that there were three modes of dealing with the whisky question: license, local option and prohibition. He had his opinion as to which was the best, viz: local option. But he would not say that his opinion was better than some thirty thousand petitioners. He was willing for the question to go to the people, and to let them, after thorough discussion, decide which was the best mode. What harm can come by allowing the people to vote on the question? The Senator from Greenbrier, [Mr. Dennis] had asked: Can you convert a man by act of the Legislature? Can you make women virtuous by act of the Legislature? But the answer to these questions proved too much; for as you cannot make women virtuous nor men moral by law, then the logical sequence of the Senator's questions would be, pass no act to prohibit or regulate houses of ill-fame, gambling-dens, etc.

The Senator then read from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the State and of the United States, to show the sacredness of the right of petition, and then passed to an exposition of the results and workings of the Maine prohibitory law, and drew the conclusion that it had been a reasonable success, as prohibitionists did not claim that their measure would transform earth to Eden. Touching the argument of the other side, that if the amendment should be adopted, it would result in a loss of revenue to the State, the Senator said the revenue from whisky licenses was $35,000 per year, the State paid at the same time for criminal expenses in felony cases alone, $65,000, (to say nothing of the enormous expenses paid by the several counties for misdemeanor trials,) three-fourths of which it is admitted by anti-prohibitionists, were caused by whisky. He argued that the number of the petitioners was sufficient to make it imperative on the Legislature to submit the amendment to the people, as it had been asked for by one-twentieth of the people of the State. One-fortieth of the voters of Preston county could compel the County Court to submit to the voters of that county the law for the protection of sheep; why ought not the petition of one-twentieth of the people of the State be sufficient to justify the Legislature to submit this measure for the protection of humantiy? Are sheep better than men?

Mr. Newman followed Mr. Dawson, arguing in favor of the indefinite postponement of the resolution. He was opposed to the proposed amendment, because he thought it would not be efficacious in remedying the evil it sought to do, claiming that prohibition in Maine was a failure and that it would meet with no better success in this State if adopted.

Mr. Woods of Ohio county, made the closing speech on the measure, speaking at considerable length in support of his motion to indefinitely postpone the resolution. He said the effect of the motion to postpone was to bring it squarely before the Senate on its merits. Because, said the Senator, these petitions come to us from the people, it is no reason they should be granted. The Legislature has the right to use its discretion in the matter as to what shall be done and what not done. The Senator asserted that if adopted the amendment would not work the good intended, contending that the harder an object was to obtain the more eagerly would it be sought for, and that "stolen fruits were the sweetest." The Senator then referred to the workings of prohibitory laws in Maine, Kansas and Ohio, and quoted from a letter written by Mr. Murch, of Maine, to substantiate his assertion that prohibition was a failure in that State. Mr. Woods said he was opposed to the amendment because it was inconsistent with the idea of local self-government. This, said he, is a democratic idea and extends down to minute affairs of life. He was also opposed to it because it would deprive a number of citizens of property without making any provision for compensation for their loss. Mr. Woods took occasion in closing his speech, to resent the remark of Senator Brown, "who wondered at the brazen-faced impudence of men who thrust themselves in the way of Senators in lobbying for the defeat of the measure."

Mr. Woods said the other side was lobbying as much as his side, and he knew of one man who had been threatened with political damnation if he voted against it. I don't deny the right of any man, added Mr. Woods, to work for either side of a measure, but I think the Senator from Jackson was unjust and unkind in his strictures.

Mr. Brown—How are you going to stop it? I am responsible for what I say, and if any person feels aggrieved at what I have said he knows who I am and where I live.

Mr. Woods replied that there were certain considerations which ought to impress the Senator in this matter.

This ended the debate, and the question being on the indefinite postponement of the resolution, the yeas and nays were demanded and the demand being sustained, the vote resulted as follows:

Yeas—Davison, Dennis, Donehoo, Ewin, Faulkner, Maxwell, McNeel, Newman, Roberts, Shelton, Stollings, Stout, VanMeter, Williams and Woods—15.

Nays—Barbee, Brown, Dawson, Farnsworth, McGrew, Samples, McGregor, Smith, and Summers, (President)—9.

When the result was announced Mr. Newman moved to reconsider the vote and then moved to lay the motion on the table, which prevailed, thus virtually killing the measure so far as the Senate is concerned in the matter.

If the House should pass the bill it will go to the Senate again.

Ex-Gov. Furnas, in an address before the Nebraska State Horticultural Society at is recent session, quoted from official reports showing that during the year 1880 there were planted in Nebraska 53,092,046 forest trees, 2.440,288 fruit trees, and 464,426 grape vines. He claimed that his State was peculiarly adapted to successful fruit growing.

Eight Court officers dug the grave of the late favorite wife of the Sultan of Morocco. She was laid in it, wrapped in a priceless shawl, and all her costly clothing was buried with her, her jewels being broken up at the grave and distributed there among the poor.

A Temperance County.

From "A Plea for Prohibition," by Pres. A. G. Haygood, D. D.

No county in Georgia had more still-houses and bar-rooms to the number of inhabitants than Carroll, twenty years ago. Drinking places were not only to be found in the little towns; but also at the cross-roads and country places throughout the county. No more unfavorable place for the success of prohibition could have been selected than this county. It was settled by a class of citizens who regarded plenty of corn whisky and peach brandy essential to good living. Liquor was sold without scruple and drank without stint. Many of the people spent all their means, beyond a bare living, for strong drink. Education and churches were neglected. Ignorance and vice prevailed to such an alarming extent that the very name of the county became a by word and reproach in the state. It was called the "Free state of Carroll." The better citizens, going from the county, were ashamed to acknowledge where they were from. The County of Carroll was once synonymous with still-houses, chicken-fighting, horse-swapping, pony clubs, one-ox carts, poverty, piney woods, and ignorance.

The first move toward prohibition in this county was made at Bowdon. In the very act by which the town was incorporated was a clause prohibiting the sale of whisky in so many miles of the place.

In 1883 D. W. W. Fitts moved to Carrollton, the county seat, and began at once the abolishing of the whisky traffic by law. He stood well nigh alone for several years. With an energy that never tired and a determination that never faltered, he worked on. He was foiled frequently by the liquor men; but he never gave up the struggle. Other men moved into the town, and united their influence with his. They managed the prohibition movement with great prudence and tact. They did not organize for one election or one year. After an election, at which they were defeated by the liquor men, they did not abandon their hopes; but began again to work for another election. By keeping organized all the time, they conserved their forces; and, though they did not succeed for several years, they were all the time educating public opinion. Thus they prepared to hold the field when they won it.

In Carrollton the temperance men worked twelve years without success. In 1875 a bill was passed by the legislature prohibiting the sale of liquor in the town.

In spite of all opposition and abuse, the temperance men succeeded, and with results that are marvelous.

1. The trade of the town has been more than doubled. Before the liquor traffic was abolished the trade of the place was about $200,000 a year; now it is $900,000 a year. There are thirty stores in town, and I do not know of a single merchant among them who would not vote against the liquor traffic, on purely business grounds. Mr. John W. Stewart, who has made a fortune here, says, as a business man, that he would not have liquor back for any consideration. Some of our leading merchants were opposed to prohibition at first, because they feared it would injure their trade. They are unanimously in favor of it now. The $30,000 that was spent here for whisky prior to 1875 is now spent in building houses, improving stock, draining lands, and paying taxes. The farmers are nearly all out of debt. Many of the men who were spending all their money for whisky have quit drinking and are making a support for their families.

2. The argument that men would drink anyhow does not hold good but with few. Perhaps there are in every town some few men who have drunk so long that they are slaves to the habit. Such men would send off and get whisky and drink anyhow. But we have learned that, with nearly all the people, whisky is like watermelons—the supply creates the demand. Do away with the supply, and there will be no demand, as a general thing. By prohibiting the sale of whisky in the towns of Georgia we will soon have a generation of young men who will have no desire for it whatever.

3. We have two drug stores here; but not a particle of whisky is sold in either one of them. The leading druggist here told me that he kept alcohol in the store; but he used it only for tinctures. An attempt was made by one of the druggists to sell bitters; but the grand jury soon found so many true bills against him that he promised the people of the town if they would ask the judge to be as merciful as possible, he would never sell another bottle of bitters or a drop of whisky.

4. In a moral point of view, the results of this movement in our town are perfectly remarkable. The solicitor of this judicial circuit says there is less crime in this county than in any other in this circuit. Most of the people have joined the church. Profanity is almost unknown. On the train that comes into Carrollton not an officer or trainhand on it ever swears an oath.

The soberness and quiet which prevails here, even on election days and court weeks, strike visitors as being wonderful. At a barbecue here last year, though there were together four thousand people, Col. Thomas Hardeman, who spoke on the occassion, said that he never saw a drunken man. He regarded it as something almost new under the sun. A committee of good men revised the jury-box, leaving the names of those out who habitually drank whisky. The county has been electing, for the past twelve years, Dr. D. B. Juhan, ordinary, who will not grant license to sell liquor in the county, for love, or threats, or money He has done a grand work for the county, and so could every ordinary, if he would.

The prohibition movement in this county is a grand success. Three-fourths of the white people in Carrollton are opposed to the sale of whisky, and nearly the same portion in the county.