

G746

2. M37

1896

SOUTH CAROLINA

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE

1896

Michigan



State Library

HAMILTON
STORAGE

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

DEC 7 1987

STATE DOCUMENTS

27
62

353.9
Spray

MESSAGE



OF

JOHN GARY EVANS,

GOVERNOR,

RELATIVE TO

THE DISPENSARY LAW

AND THE

Operations and Results Thereunder,

TO THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

CHARLES A. CALVO, JR., STATE PRINTER.
1896.

MESSAGE.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
COLUMBIA, S. C., February 10th, 1896.

GENTLEMEN OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY: In 1892 the Dispensary law was enacted as a solution of the vexed and much discussed whiskey problem. All reasonable men, acting in the light of experience of other States, acknowledge that prohibition is impracticable so long as whiskey is regarded a legitimate article of commerce by the National Government. It can only be cherished as an ideal theory, and must be classed with other Utopian ideas. The drinking habit is recognized by all civilized governments as an evil, and one that is peculiarly within the province of legislative action. This action must be, from the nature of the evil, directed to the removal of the cause, as we cannot prohibit men from gratifying their tastes and thirsts. We can punish men for destroying the life, limb or property of others, and to some extent restrain their actions; but we can no more legislate the taste for whiskey out of an old toper than we can jealousy out of the human heart. As long as a stimulant is craved by the human appetite, and as long as whiskey is distilled in North Carolina, the drinkers of South Carolina will have it, law or no law. I have never dreamed of reforming a drunkard by law or moral suasion; for the habit once formed is a disease, a physical condition which legislation cannot cure. We must address ourselves then to the condition that confronts us, and not to theorize on ideal governments. The first object should be to prevent this habit from being formed by the young citizen; second, to eliminate drunkenness; third, to so gratify the thirst of the old toper as to make him unobjectionable to sober citizens.

We claim that the Dispensary law has practically accomplished the first and second objects; the third can only be accomplished by the death of the subject. When death occurs, and the National Government outlaws whiskey and alcoholic beverages, then, and not till then, will prohibition be practiced.

The law in this State has had a hard road. It has been opposed by the United States Courts with partisan Judges, and by a few of our own citizens with rifles and shot guns; but so far it has prevailed, and is now written in the organic law of this State—and, better, on the hearts of the people. It may now be said to be the settled policy of the State. Its experimental stage is over; and I am happy to inform you that in only one city in the State have the people refused to accept it as such. I have been requested by a representative of the Gospel Temperance League to ask you to amend the law so as to allow whiskey to be sold only for medical, pharmaceutical and mechanical purposes, or, in other words, to repeal the Dispensary law and adopt what was rejected by your honorable body, known as the Nettles Bill. I cannot do this, for reasons that must be apparent to you, and which I stated while a member of the Senate; and for the further reason that the Dispensary law is succeeding beyond the expectations of its friends; and to pass such a law as requested would not accomplish what the Dispensary is now doing, but would simply increase the crime of perjury and false representation in the State. I would not be understood as objecting to the agitation of prohibition nor to restricting the sale of whiskey

by any means. It is beneficial to all governments to have idealists, for if not we might lose sight of the principle and cease striving for the coveted goal.

As a moral reform measure the Dispensary must commend itself to any unprejudiced mind. The temptations to the youths of the State offered by saloons have been swept away, and with them have gone the games of billiards, pool, the faro banks, and the corrupt influences of the barkeeper in municipal and State elections. During the late holidays there occurred only one homicide in the State, and this was not from whiskey but an old feud. This record has never been known before. Not a case of the crime for which lynching is resorted to, or an attempt at such, has occurred within the past year. Two circuses traversed the State during the past year, visiting all large towns of importance, and with the exception of Spartanburg not an arrest was made for drunkenness or disorderly conduct. In Greenville one arrest was made; but he was exhibited as a curiosity. It was the invariable practice of the colored population to drink on circus days; but it passed away with the barroom customs. I dispatched four Constables to follow the circuses in their tour through the State; but they were not needed to preserve the peace, and not an accident of any kind was reported.

I addressed to the various Mayors of the towns of the State the following circular letter:

“DEAR SIR:

“You will greatly oblige me by answering the following questions at your earliest convenience. This is important:

“1. Has drunkenness and crime increased or decreased in your town and County since August 1st, 1894, to the present time; if so, by what per cent?

“2. Has the number of plain cases of drunkenness tried before you, Mayor or Intendant, increased or decreased since August 1st; and if so, by what per cent?

“3. Has the consumption of whiskey increased or decreased since the establishment of the Dispensary; and if so, by what per cent?

“4. What has been the effect of the Dispensary law upon the general good order and peace of your town or city?

“Some time ago we had replies to these queries from your Board of Control; but the letters have been disposed of, and it is important that we hear from you. Please number your answers to conform to the number of the questions above.”

The replies received in some cases were unreliable, as the Mayors were unworthy of belief in such cases. However, I took the precaution to address a letter to one of the Aldermen of the town, and they are submitted herewith, and I trust will be published in full, as they speak for themselves. It appears from these reports that drunkenness has decreased for the entire State fifty-seven per cent. The number of cases tried in Mayors' courts for drunkenness and disorderly conduct has decreased sixty-six and nine-sixteenth per cent.

The consumption of whiskey has decreased forty-seven and six-sevenths per cent.

It must be observed that this decrease is not for the entire period since the enactment of the law, but for the past year. Compared with the preceding year, 25 per cent. may be added as a reasonable estimate for that year. It is quite encouraging to the friends of the law to note the general change of sentiment in most of the towns in its favor.

The country has always been a unit in favor of it, and has demanded its strict enforcement. The bitterest enemies of the system now admit that, morally speaking, it is a grand success.

THE DISPENSARY AS A BUSINESS.

In 1892-93 there were in the State sixty-nine dispensaries.

The total amount purchased by them.....	\$671,555 99
Sales at invoice price.....	573,578 38
Total sales to consumers.....	679,222 88
Gross profits.....	165,355 40
Expenses.....	88,580 15
Net profits.....	76,775 25

The operation of the State and County Dispensaries for the past year has been peculiarly successful. The volume of business has greatly increased, the sales by the County Dispensers for the eleven months ending December 31st amounting to nearly one million one hundred thousand dollars. It is not to be inferred from the increased sales of the Dispensaries that the consumption of intoxicants is on the increase, for the statistics which I have already given clearly prove the contrary, and go to show that the intemperate use of intoxicants is on the decrease. That the Dispensary is a potent factor in this great moral reformation, I venture no unbiased mind will dispute. The increased sales by the Dispensaries are accounted for from the fact that the fierce and bitter opposition to the law which has hitherto existed has largely subsided, and the sober second thought of law-abiding citizens has disclosed the fact that their unreasonable opposition to a law designed for the protection of the morals of the State was grounded more on prejudice and a misconceived idea of personal liberty than aught else. With this return of reason, and the exhaustion of the supply of bar room whiskey, came in a large degree a cessation of the bitter hostility to the law, and as a result the traffic in liquors was directed to its legitimate channels, and public sentiment crystallized about the Dispensary law as the wisest and most practical solution of the whiskey problem.

The sales to the County Dispensaries for the eleven months ending December 31st amounted to \$875,580.20. The sales by County Dispensaries for the same period amounted to \$1,076,963.65, at a gross profit of \$201,383.45. The net profit that accrued to the State from the operation of the State Dispensary for the eleven months ending December 31st amounts to \$133,467.77, and the net profits to the towns and Counties from the operations of the sub-Dispensaries for the corresponding period amounts to \$106,131.28, making a total of accrued profits to the State and towns and Counties for the eleven months of \$239,599.05. Adding the \$25,571.85 unearned profit due the State on goods in hands of County Dispensaries at the close of the past year would swell the total of earned and unearned profits to the State and towns and Counties for the eleven months to the amount of \$265,170.90.

The net profits accruing to the State as revised to December 31st, from the beginning of the operations of the Dispensary to the close of ex-Commissioner Traxler's term on January 31, 1895, amounted to \$110,348.80. Added to this the net accrued profit of \$133,467.77 for the period of eleven months from February 1st to December 31st, 1895, makes a total of net ac-

crued profits to the State from the operation of the State Dispensary to the amount of \$243,816.57.

The books of the State Commissioner, as is shown in his annual report, and also in the report of the Special Legislative Examining Committee, show that at the close of the past year the total assets (at cost price) of the State Dispensary were \$314,070.24 and the total liabilities \$70,253.67.

These assets consists of:

Cash	\$54,107.03
Wines and liquors at the State Dispensary	55,631.56
Teams and wagons	800.65
Machinery and office fixtures	2,656.47
Bottles, cooperage and corks, etc.	26,581.43
Cash loaned to the State Treasurer	50,000.00
Wines and liquors at the sub-dispensaries	116,235.65
Personal accounts	8,051.45
	<hr/>
Making total available assets	314,070.24

Outstanding against these assets are liabilities to the amount of \$70,253.67 which is due by the State for wines and liquors purchased, making net balance of assets above liabilities of \$243,816.57, which amount represents the net earned profits to the State at the close of the year, and this profit has been placed by the Commissioner to the credit of the general fund of the State. In conformity to a clause in the new Constitution providing that all future earnings of the State Dispensary shall go to the schools of the State, the Commissioner will place to the credit of the school fund all net earnings which shall hereafter accrue. From a careful analysis of that provision of the Constitution, it will be seen that the school fund will not be entitled to any portion of the net earnings of the Dispensary until the net earnings to December 31st, \$243,816.57, shall have been covered into the State Treasury to the credit of the general fund. Hence it will be eighteen months at the earliest before we may expect any increase in the school fund from this source. I am happy to state that the State appropriation of fifty thousand dollars has been refunded from the net earnings of the Dispensary, and an additional fifty thousand dollars surplus covered into the State Treasury to pay the expenses of the Constitutional Convention.

From the following tabulated statement you can gain an idea of the heaviest items of expense incident to running the business:

Supplies used for eleven months	\$93,864.70
Freight charges	50,956.14
Cost of Constabulary	43,032.01

I found that the system of bookkeeping in vogue at the Dispensary was most unsatisfactory, and I employed Mr. Seth W. Scruggs, an expert book-keeper, to devise a system especially suited for this business, for which I paid him for services \$250, and I regard it as the best investment the State has ever made. The system, as inaugurated by and now in charge of Mr. Scruggs, its originator, has received the endorsement of many of the leading business men of the State and your honorable Committee. It is a most satisfactory check on the County dispensers, and is so simple and compre-

hensive that any one of any business knowledge can understand it. A record of the gallons, value and brands of all liquors bought and sold is kept at the office, as is also a record of the number of gallons of all kinds dumped into and bottled from the tanks. The County dispensers are required to send a weekly statement of their sales at invoice and consumers prices and a weekly statement of their cash transactions and a check covering the State's share of all sales. At the end of each month they are required to send to the State Commissioner a copy of their merchandise purchases and sales and remittances and a copy of their cash transactions for the month, and also a copy of their sales at invoice and consumers' prices for the month and an itemized expense statement for the month. They are required to take stock at the end of each month in the presence and with the assistance of one member of the County Board of Control, and to send to the Commissioner an itemized inventory of all merchandise on hand signed by the dispenser and the member of the Board of Control who assisted in the stock-taking. At the end of each quarter they are also required to send to the State Board of Control a quarterly statement of their purchases, sales, expenses, gross and net profits and stock on hand. A duplicate statement is also sent to the State Board of Control. Under this system we have been enabled to dispense with the Inspectors.

THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW.

The Governor is empowered to employ two Chief State Constables and as many State Constables as may be necessary to enforce the law. Upon my induction into office I determined to reorganize the constabulary, and if possible to dispense with it altogether. After trying a small force for a month I found that it was impracticable, and unless the force was increased the execution of the law would be a failure. The expense of the constabulary has been more than met by the value of the contraband liquor and wine seized and the suppression of the liquor traffic in such. The amount for maintaining the force was \$43,032.01. The value placed on contraband dumped was \$17,031.70, leaving a net cost for maintenance of \$26,000.37. The value placed upon contraband seized does not represent the true value of the articles captured, as there is a large amount still of goods unsuitable for the business of the dispensary and consequently of no actual value. I am satisfied that no State officers are entitled to more commendation than these men, who do not hesitate to risk their lives, and in several instances have lost them, in defense and in executing the laws of this State. If it were not for the espionage of these officers the blind tiger would be rampant and the dispensaries would not be self-sustaining. If the present improvement in public sentiment in the towns and cities continues, I am satisfied that the constabulary can safely be cut to one-half the present force at the end of another year.

For the year ending June 1st, 1895, there were issued by the United States Internal Revenue Collector 805 licenses to retail liquor. This includes 85 Dispensaries, which leaves for illicit dealers 720. For the year ending June 1st, 1896, there have been issued so far three hundred and eighty-seven (387) licenses. This includes 88 Dispensaries, leaving a total of 299 for illicit dealers. Of this number 167 were taken out in the city of Charleston, ten of which were for the Dispensaries, which being deducted leaves a grand total of 157 illicit dealers in that city. It will be seen from

these figures that over fifty-two per cent. of the illicit traffic in whiskey is carried on in the city of Charleston. It will be further observed that the number of United States licenses issued for the entire State has decreased over forty per cent. for the past year. The illicit sale of liquor had almost been starved out and dwindled to a minimum when we were paralyzed by a most unexpected decree from the United States Circuit Court through Judge Simonton. This Judge was the first to sustain the constitutionality of the law, but he has now completely reversed his former decision, and under the guise of inter-State commerce he nullifies every Section of the law intended to prohibit the illicit traffic. This law seems to be the "bete noir" of our distinguished United States Judges, Brawley, Simonton and Geff, but so far we have reversed them, and I feel satisfied that we will continue to do so. The case before Judge Simonton was brought by a citizen of Charleston named Donald, who claimed that whiskey had been ordered by him from without our State for his personal use, and the same had been seized by the Constables and confiscated by the State, to his damage \$6,000. After able arguments the Judge decreed that "The Dispensary Law nowhere declares that the use and consumption of alcoholic liquors in themselves are injurious to the morals and good health and safety of the State or of her people. Alcoholic liquor is declared to be contraband and against the morals, good health and safety of the State only when it is not imported by the Dispenser or not in his hands." He winds up by saying: "If all alcoholic liquors were excluded from the State, or if all persons were prohibited to import alcoholic liquors, or if the laws of South Carolina had declared that all alcoholic liquors were of such poisonous and detrimental character and that their use and consumption as a beverage were against the morals, good health and safety of the State, other and different questions would arise.

"LET AN INJUNCTION ISSUE AS PRAYED FOR IN THE BILL."

The following injunction was issued: "Ordered and decreed that a writ of injunction be awarded, and do issue, out of this Court commanding and enjoining and restraining the defendants M. T. Holly, Sr., as Chief Constable of the State of South Carolina, and all other persons acting under him, his and their successors in office, and also the defendants J. M. Scott, R. M. Gardner and E. C. Beach, and all other State Constables of the State of South Carolina, and all County Sheriffs and their deputies, and municipal officers, chiefs of police and policemen, and all other officers of the State of South Carolina, or any County or city or town of the said State of South Carolina, and all persons whomsoever acting or claiming to act under the authority of the Act of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina approved January 2nd, 1895, or warrant issued by or under authority thereof, from seizing or attempting to seize, in transit or otherwise, both before and after arrival in the State of South Carolina, and at any place in the State of South Carolina, take, carry away or confiscate any packages whatsoever of ales, wines or spirituous liquors, or any intoxicating liquors, the product of any other State or foreign country, imported into or brought into South Carolina by any means of transportation whatsoever by complainant James Donald, or any other person whomsoever, for his own use and consumption, and from entering and forcibly searching or attempting to search the premises or dwelling of the complainant James

Donald or any other person in the State of South Carolina, or any railroad depot, railroad car or steamboat or sailing vessel or other vehicle of inter-State commerce, or any vehicle whatsoever within this State for transporting such intoxicating liquors as aforesaid imported or brought into this State for his use or consumption, or from hindering or preventing by any means whatsoever the complainant James Donald or any other person in the State of South Carolina, as importer and consumer of ales, beers, wines and spirituous liquors of other States and foreign countries, from importing, holding, possessing, using and consuming the said intoxicating liquors as aforesaid so imported for his use and consumption."

I incorporated this injunction here in order to perpetuate it as a legal curiosity, and to show the extent to which a partisan Judge can be swayed by unreasonable prejudice. It will be seen that he enjoins everybody, from unborn babes up to the High Sheriff, from interfering—not only with Donald's whiskey, but from interfering with citizens in the State who had not even asked his gentle protection. Courts of Equity sometimes legislate for the parties before the Court, but this Judge has assumed the powers of our General Assembly to make a law for the State, and also for Congress of the United States. Under contempt proceedings he has incarcerated men in jail who were absolutely without notice of his injunction, and when brought to his notice that the Sheriffs were treating the jailed Constables as men charged with contempt and not as ordinary criminals, he ordered them removed to city jails with instructions that they be treated as commonest criminals. You are familiar with the state of affairs that followed this injunction. Whiskey was imported into this State by every quondam barkeeper for personal use, and the barrooms of Charleston were virtually thrown wide open. They became so bold under the protection of their Judges as to violently resist the efforts of the Constables to close their hell holes. I found it impossible to do anything with them on account of the sentiment of the city being overwhelmingly in their favor. I ordered the Constables to confine their efforts to seizures that they had reason to believe were not for personal use, and they accomplished a great deal, although the results were quite unsatisfactory. I appealed to the Mayor and he promised co-operation; but shortly afterwards the City Council refused to pass an ordinance prepared by the Mayor which provided for the punishment of keepers of blind tigers. I called upon the Mayor, and he endeavored to have the ordinance enacted, but in vain. They were joined to their idols. The Chief of Police was a friend to the law, but he had neither the moral nor the legal support of the Council or the community, and his efforts were only partially successful. I gave the city notice that unless the law was better enforced I would have to resort to the metropolitan police law. This had a slight effect, but it soon wore off. I again gave warning several months afterwards, and the Chief of Police asked me to give him a little more time and he thought matters would be in a better condition. He succeeded in making several cases against illicit dealers; but the grand jury of the best citizens, so we are informed, refused to take the oaths of men whom they placed in charge of their homes and lives, and unceremoniously threw out all bills against illicit dealers in whiskey. This emboldened the illicit dealers, and I again invoked the aid of the Courts, and succeeded in obtaining changes of venue in several cases; but the question is still in the Supreme Court as to the rights as to such change.

My patience became exhausted, and I appealed to the State Board of Police Commissioners, and they did not hesitate to place the police of the city of Charleston under their control. I regret that this was necessary; but it was simply a question of whether we should abandon the Dispensary in Charleston or first exhaust every means in our hands for the enforcement of the law. I am satisfied that the police can do more than all the Constables in the State toward enforcing the law in our cities, and if the city authorities will not allow them to do so it is the duty of the State to take charge. If the next year does not afford better results, then a new law must be made for Charleston. I am satisfied, however, from present indications, that we will have nothing to complain of. Convictions of violators of this law have been promptly had in nearly every County in this State where tried except in Charleston. This is encouraging, and shows that the stubborn resistance to the law has gradually subsided. You will readily see that the protection given by Judge Simonton to persons importing liquors into this State for personal use, and the burden of proof being placed upon the Constables to show that the same is not for personal use, makes our task indeed a hard one. In fact, it prevents us from seizing imported liquors except where it is consigned to persons convicted for violating the law, and even these can always find a friend who will allow the use of his name to shield a criminal. In order to comply with the interpretation of the inter-State commerce law by this United States Judge, I would respectfully recommend that the law be amended by declaring that all alcoholic liquors, except when analyzed by the State Chemist and found to be chemically pure, are detrimental to the health, morals and welfare of the citizens of this State, are contraband and liable to seizure wherever found, without a warrant, and when seized shall be forwarded to the State Commissioner and by him destroyed. This would cover the objection of Judge Simonton, and would relieve the law of the continual warfare by the whiskey ring.

AMENDMENTS.

I will endeavor to point out to you the amendments to the law which have suggested themselves to the Attorney General and to myself in our efforts to enforce it during the last year, and which we believe absolutely necessary for its perfection and perpetuation. The State Board of Control should be composed of five members, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State, Comptroller General, *ex officio*, and two members to be elected by your honorable body who hold no other office and are of the business people. These two members should be elected for a term of four years, and so arranged as to require the election of one every two years. The object of this must be apparent to you. As the Board is now constituted, three of the busiest State officers are required to look after this stupendous business of more than a million dollars a year. They elect a State Commissioner whose term of office expires with that of the next Board. The Comptroller General is the busiest man in the State House, and is required to be absent from the Capital a great deal by reason of his settlements with the County Auditors. Our terms of office expire every two years; and if the two additional members are not furnished, the Dispensary affairs are liable to be placed in new and inexperienced hands every two years. The incoming Board would in all probability elect a new Commissioner, and the institu-

tion would be greatly embarrassed by inexperienced officers. By the plan I have suggested, there would be two Directors always in office who will be familiar with the business and not dependent upon State officers for their appointment. The responsibility for the success of this business rests upon the Board of Control, and it is unfair to the Governor and his associates upon the Board to compel them to vouch for every check that is signed and every purchase made and every dollar expended. The duties of their offices render it impossible for them to do justice to this business and to even know what is going on. Fortunately we have had Commissioners so far in whom we have had confidence; but should this officer prove to be corrupt or incompetent he could in a few weeks wreck the entire business. The inducements for corruption in this business are exceedingly great, and the men with whom the Commissioners are compelled to deal are often unscrupulous.

It is useless for me to enumerate the many ways in which the Board of Control can be imposed upon, and unless the most stringent regulations are thrown around the business to protect it I fear the results. It is made the duty of the Governor as Chairman of the Board of Control to approve every warrant drawn by the Commissioner upon the State Treasurer, and I have approved as high as thirty thousand dollars in one day without having any evidence as to how it was to be applied except the signature of the Commissioner and the draft of the firm for whose benefit it was drawn. This is too much responsibility to place upon the Governor, and he should be relieved of it. I would therefore recommend that all accounts of the State Commissioner be first approved by the State Board of Control, and the consent of the Board be first obtained before the Commissioner is allowed to incur any debts, and that such bill before approved be presented to the Governor for approval and payment. I would further recommend that the Clerk of the Board be paid a salary of fifteen hundred dollars per annum, and his duties be enlarged, and he be required to certify all bills approved by the Board, and check off the merchandise purported to be covered therein. In this manner the Board will be enabled to know what they are doing, and the Governor relieved of the responsibility that should not be placed upon him. This would also relieve the Commissioner of any insinuation or charge of favoritism, and remedy the weakest feature of the law, and thus place it beyond the criticism or reproach of its enemies. Of one thing you may be certain: if any degree of corruption is ever discovered at this institution the people will destroy it as quickly as they inaugurated it, and should corruption be practiced it will sure to be unearthed sooner or later. It is your conscientious duty to so frame this statute as to guard against any contingencies that may arise in the future by the election of State officers hostile to the law or from its careless enforcement by its friends.

There are other amendments of minor importance, but which are necessary for the enforcement of the law, but I am sure they will appeal to your good judgment without further hint from me. The system of operating the County Dispensaries since the inauguration of the Scruggs form of bookkeeping is as near perfect as you can make it. During the past year we have discovered three defalcations among our County Dispensers. They have been reported to the Attorney General and he has entered suit upon the bonds and commenced criminal process against the Dispensers. It is

but just to state that these defalcations occurred during the year previous to the inauguration of the Scruggs system of bookkeeping. I apprehend no further trouble on this line. I would recommend that the County Supervisor be taken off the County Board of Control, as under the new Constitution he is ineligible, and, besides, the duties of his office are inconsistent with those of the Dispensary, and if he attends to them properly he will have but little time to devote to the business. I desire to impress upon you the advisability of divorcing the Dispensary from any other office or State institution, so that the responsibility for its management and success may not be divided, but rest entirely upon the shoulders of officers appointed to look after it exclusively.

In conclusion, permit me to say that I feel a peculiar anxiety and interest in the success of this institution by reason of my connection with the enactment of the law while a member of your honorable body; and without any hesitation or apparent egotism on my part, I do not believe that any future Governor will feel toward the law and guard it as scrupulously as my predecessor and myself. For these reasons I have endeavored to talk to you plainly and point out what I sincerely believe necessary to perpetuate a law so wise and salutary.

JNO. GARY EVANS,
Governor.

APPENDIX.

The following letter was addressed to the various County Boards of Control in the State, and their answers, so far as received, are given in substance below. In some cases the reply was not received from the Board of Control and the Senator or the delegation was asked to furnish the reply. The replies marked with an * were had from Senator or the members of the House:

OFFICE OF STATE BOARD OF CONTROL,
COLUMBIA, S. C., October 29th, 1895.

Mr. _____,

County Board of Control.

DEAR SIR: You will greatly oblige me by answering the following questions at your earliest convenience. This is important:

1st. Has drunkenness and crime increased or decreased in your town and County since August 1st, 1894, to the present time? If so, by what per cent.?

2d. Has the number of plain cases of drunkenness tried before your Mayor or Intendant increased or decreased since August 1st? and, if so, by what per cent.?

3d. Has the consumption of whiskey increased or decreased since the establishment of the Dispensary? and, if so, by what per cent.?

4th. What has been the effect of the Dispensary law upon the general good order and peace of your town or city?

COUNTIES.	HAS DRUNKENNESS AND CRIME INCREASED OR DECREASED IN YOUR TOWN AND COUNTY, AND BY WHAT PER CENT.?		HAS THE NUMBER OF PLAIN CASES OF DRUNKENNESS TRIED BEFORE THE MAYOR INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE AUGUST 1, 1894, AND BY WHAT PER CENT.?		HAS THE CONSUMPTION OF WHISKEY INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DISPENSARY LAW, AND BY WHAT PER CENT.?		WHAT HAS BEEN THE EFFECT OF THE DISPENSARY LAW UPON THE GENERAL GOOD ORDER AND PEACE OF YOUR TOWN AND COUNTY?
	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	
Abbeville.....	70	70	70	Good order promoted.
Aiken.....	75	90	60	Peace and good order promoted greatly.
Anderson.....	75	75	50	Good as compared with saloons.
Barnwell.....	75	75	50	Very salutary.
*Beaufort.....	90	90	50	Wonderfully good.
*Berkeley.....	75	75	50	Very good.
Charendon.....	50	90	25	Wonderfully good.
Colleton.....	20	20	Good.
Chester.....	25	Morals improved.
Chesterfield.....	10	30	50	Good.
Charleston.....	No report.
Darlington.....	75	75	20	Morals wonderfully bettered.
Edgefield.....	50	50	50	Good, and good only.
Fairfield.....	40	50	40	Good order promoted.
*Florence.....	50	20	Good effects very marked.
*Georgetown.....	50	50	No cases.	Good.
Greenville.....	50	50	Decrease.	Great improvement.
Hampton.....	50	75	50	Peace and quiet improved.
*Horry.....	25	Decrease.	10	Good.
*Kershaw.....	50	50	20	Good order greatly promoted.
*Lancaster.....	50	90	25	Great improvement.
Laurens.....	60	60	100	Very good.
Lexington.....	50	100	50	Good.
*Marion.....	No change.	No change.	No change.	No change.
Newberry.....	25	40	30	Very good.
*Seneca Township.....	50	25	Good.
Oconee.....	Increase.	Increase.	Increase.	Not good.
Orangeburg.....	50	Decrease.	50	Very good.
Pickens.....	No change.	No change.	No change.	No change.
Richland.....	No report.
Sumter.....	Decrease.	50	Decrease.	Improvement; much less crime.
*Spartanburg.....	50	Decrease.	50	Pleased with the effects.
*Union.....	25	25	Effects better than saloons.
Williamsburg.....	90	90	Decrease.	Improved peace and order.
York.....	33	50	23	Excellent effect.
Average for State.....	52½	63¼	42½	Good.

The same letter that was addressed to the County Boards of Control, as shown above, was sent to the Mayors of the principal towns of every County in the State, and resulted in about twenty replies, which are given in substance below. The replies there marked * were had from the Senators or members of the House, who were asked to supply the information in cases where we failed to get reports from the Mayors, and their replies apply to no particular town.

OFFICE OF STATE BOARD OF CONTROL,
COLUMBIA, S. C., October 29th, 1895.

Mr. _____,
Mayor.

DEAR SIR: You will greatly oblige me by answering the following questions at your earliest convenience. This is important:

1st. Has drunkenness and crime increased or decreased in your town and County since August 1st, 1894, to the present time? If so, by what per cent.?

2d. Has the number of plain cases of drunkenness tried before your Mayor or Intendant increased or decreased since August 1st? and, if so, by what per cent.?

3d. Has the consumption of whiskey increased or decreased since the establishment of the Dispensary? and, if so, by what per cent.?

4th. What has been the effect of the Dispensary law upon the general good order and peace of your town and County?

Some time ago we had replies to these queries from your Board of Control, but the letters have been disposed of, and it is important that we hear from you. Please number your answers to conform to the number of the questions above.

JOHN GARY EVANS,
Governor, per H.

COUNTY.	TOWN.	HAS DRUNKENNESS AND CRIME INCREASED OR DECREASED IN YOUR TOWN AND COUNTY SINCE AUG. 1, 1894, TO THE PRESENT TIME; AND IF SO, BY WHAT PER CENT.?		HAS THE NUMBER OF PLAIN CASES OF DRUNKENNESS TRIED BEFORE YOUR MAYOR INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE AUG. 1, 1894; AND IF SO, BY WHAT PER CENT.?		HAS THE CONSUMPTION OF WHISKEY INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DISPENSARY LAW; AND BY WHAT PER CENT.?		WHAT HAS BEEN THE EFFECTS OF THE DISPENSARY LAW UPON THE GENERAL GOOD ORDER AND PEACE OF YOUR TOWN AND COUNTY?
		Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	
Abbeville...	Abbeville...	No report.				50		
* Alken	Alken	* 50	About the same.	Decrease.	About the same.	About	the same.	Beneficial.
Anderson.....	No report.			About	the same.	About	the same.	About the same.
Barnwell.....	No report.							
*Beaufort.....		* 90		90		50		Wonderfully good.
*		* 75		75		50		Good.
Berkeley.....	Mt. Pleasant.	Decreased.		No c	ases.	Less dr	inking.	Very good.
Colleton.....	Walterboro.	20		30		25		Beneficial.
Colleton.....	Jacksonboro.	50		50				Drink and crime decreased.
Colleton.....	Walterboro.	15		10		20		Beneficial.
Chester.....	No report.							
Chesterfield..	Cheraw		20		20			Disorder increased.
Charleston.....	No report.							
Darlington.....	No report.							
Edgefield.....	Edgefield.	33		50		33		Not noted.
Fairfield.....	No report.							
*Florence.....	Florence	50		30				Good; very marked.
Georgetown.....	Georgetown.	Decreased.		No c	ases.	50		Good order impr'd. Dispensary grow'g in favor.
Greenville.....	Greenville.			12				Don't know.
Hampton.....	Varnville.	50		50		50		Ten times better than saloons.
*Horry.....		25		Decrease.			10	Good.
Kershaw.....	Camden	33		50		60		Beneficial.
Lancaster.....	Lancaster	25		25		50		Good.
Laurens.....	No report.							
*Marion.....		50		75		50		Good.
*Marlboro.....		No ch	ange.	No ch	ange.	No ch	ange.	
Newberry.....		50		50		50		Not much improvement.
*		50				75		Good.
Oconee.....	Seneca		Increased.				Increased.	Bad.
Orangeburg.....	Livingston.	About	the same.	About	the same.	About	the same.	Better order.
*Orangeburg.....	Orangeburg	50		Decrease.		50		Very good.
Pickens.....	Pickens		25				45	Bad.
Richland.....	No report.							
Sumter.....		90		90		50		Good.
*Spartanburg.....	Spartanburg	50		Don't	know.	50		Better than saloons.
*		25		Don't	know.	50		Good.
Union.....		See no di	fference.	No ch	ange.	Same.	Same.	Same.
*Williamsburg.....	Greelyville.						50	No change.
*		33		50		33		Excellent effects.
York.....	Tirzah.....		100		100		500	Don't blame Dispensary.

