THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

TWENTIETH YEAR. OMAHA, WEDNESDAY MORNING, JULY 9, 1890. NUMBER 21.

THE GREAT DEBATE.

Arguments Made by Small and Webster at Beatrice Monday Morning.

A FEW PERSONALITIES INDULGED IN.

The Reverend Sam Lays Great Stress on Iowa's Election Figures.

JOHN L. REFUTES HIS STATEMENTS.

The Prohibitionist Breaks in Several Times and Finally Backs Down.

MRS. GOUGAR ALSO INTERRUPTS.

But When People in the Audience Began to Join in the Debate, the Chairman Calls Them to Order.

Below are given full stenographic reports of the arguments made by Rev. Sam Small and Hon. John L. Webster at the Beatrice Chautauqua Monday forenoon. The four arguments of the afternoon will appear in subsequent issues of THE BEE.

SMALL ANSWERS ROSEWATER.

The Arguments of Monday Forenoon at Beatrice.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In the midst of the general amazement which strikes my colleagues in this debate I want to assure you at the outset this morning that I am not amazed at anything that comes from the other side of this question. If I were capable of being astonished I would be in a state of chronic astonishment at the facts and figures, so-called, which they present. But in taking up the discussion, so far as my part of it is concerned, this morning, I desire to go back to some of the features of the discussion of Saturday, because, with reference to these statistics and figures, I recognize how burdensome it is to an audience to carry these things as they are thrown out in this manner. It is hard to grasp them when you put them in tangible lines upon a blackboard or in the columns of a newspaper. It is equally impossible to understand their full significance when they are simply spoken from the platform.

Now, I want to say this: I see by the published report—for I was not able to hear all of the speech—that the Hon. Mr. Rosewater started the discussion on his part on Saturday with a reference to the blue laws of Connecticut. What has that got to do with prohibition in the state of Maine or prohibition in the state of Iowa? Or what has it got to do with prohibition in the state of Nebraska? The question which we are here to discuss today before you, and on which you are to render a verdict, not here so much as at the ballot box on November 4, is the question of whether you desire prohibition in the state of Nebraska, and whether, having had the conscience to vote it, you have got the sand in your gizzards to enforce it. That is the question before us—whether prohibition prohibits in Kansas in that phenomenal way which the saloonkeepers demand that it shall, whether it prohibits in Iowa in that superhuman manner, that perfect condition of affairs that Mr. Rosewater insists that it must do in order to be of practical utility. If he thinks we have got an act of legislation in any part of the country that is going to do do away with the voice of the eternal God and of the regenerative power of the Eternal One himself, taking vicious appetites out of men and transforming all the brewers and distillers and bums of the country into a grand army of red-nosed angels by a presto change process he is mistaken. We are not advocating anything of that kind. We know the material we have got to work on too well. [Applause.] As long as the devil is loose and men are mean I expect men will get liquor and go to the devil on account of liquor.

Now what we are here to decide is this question. Take it home to the bar of clean conscience and faith in God and our brother man and say whether we are willing for the sake of a paltry old buzzard dollar to help license that business and put the sanction of our consciences and our manhood and our Christianity behind every saloon in the state of Nebraska and commending it to our fellow citizens and having to carry its defense to the judgment seat of Christ. [Applause.] I say you gentlemen and the good women of this state are not willing to underwrite and endorse the saloon, the breweries and the distilleries of this state, and we had better ten times have the blue laws of Connecticut back in this country than to have a further perpetuation of the red laws of the brewers and the distillers and the devil. (Applause.) I will take the blue ones instead of the red ones every time.

The gentleman referred also to the Masonic rite of laying the corner stone in the city of Omaha the other day of the city hall. Well, it was very appropriate that they should stain the corner stone of the city hall in Omaha with wine. I do not know of a city in the country where wine ought to have entered into the proceedings any better than in Omaha. But I recognize the fact that the scattering of the corn and the pouring of the wine and the oil have been symbolical features of the Masonic ceremony of laying corner stones in that grand old order from time immemorial. I recognize that that is true, and it is used by them with the same solemnity and with the same sanctity surrounding it and with the same language of reverence towards God and of goodness towards men, blessings and happiness, that we use with the wine at the sacrament table in the sanctuary of God. And when I take these Masonic ceremonies and look at them I see no defense in them for the breweries and the distilleries and the saloons of Omaha and the state of Nebraska, and you know, sir, as well as you know your name, that it is a prostitution of the sacred rites of Masonry to bring them in here and stand them up as a defense. [Applause.] And if I were the worshipful master of the lodge you have anything to do with I would indict you before the body for it. I would turn to the Masons of Nebraska and ask them what they think about the saloons. What do you think they think? [Laughter.] I have here the action of the grand lodge of the Masons of the state of Nebraska, and I see that that ancient and honorable order, with its care for the sick, with its help for the helpless brother, with its care for the dying, and with its care for the widow and the orphan, and afterwards I see that they say that it is the sense and doctrines of the grand lodge that the vices of intemperance, gambling and profanity are unmasonic in the highest sense, derogatory to the best interests of the fraternity, hence it is hereby made the imperative duties of the masters and wardens of the several lodges to prefer charges against any member who persistently indulges in either of said vices, and try them in the regular form for such offenses. And it goes further and says, Resolved that the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage is a gross violation of the Masonic obligation [Applause] and should in all cases subject the offender to reprimand, and if persisted in to expulsion from the fraternity. [Applause.]

And yet the ceremonies of that order are brought up here as a defense to the dirty distilleries and the sweet smelling breweries and the stinking saloons of Omaha and the other cities of this state. [Applause.] I tell you that that action of the grand lodge and of the subordinate lodges of the state of Nebraska among the anchient and honorable order of free and accepted Masonry, I tell you that every Mason in this state almost stands pledged today to vindicate that action by marching up to the polls and showing himself a true Mason by putting in his vote for prohibition. So much for the Masonry of the business. [Laughter.]

That is not all, the Odd Fellows have done the same. The Ancient Order of United Workmen have done the same. You know that all the bay windowed brewers in Milwaukee wanted to withdraw their subscription for the Knights of Pythias because the state of Ohio says no saloon keeper shall be permitted within the hall of the knights [Applause], and these men bound together in the interest of society and charity and benevolence and for the protection of the weak and for the saving of the widow and the orphan from want, disgrace and imposition—these men, the noblest outside of the church of God, who are in these orders, stand today throughout the union putting the emphasis of their damnation upon the damnable business and everybody engaged in it. [Applause.]

Talk about decrease in crime in Maine, Kansas and Iowa. I reckon the people who have got to deal with it know a little better than the man sitting up in the seventh story of the great BEE building in Omaha. As between the judges and the journalists I will take the judges on my side of the question. They have to deal with it, and as my brother says he has shown you by the statistics, which I do not care to repeat, and which I had accepted, that crime has been decreased. It is the natural logical sequence, and it would be a reversal of the law of nature and all government if it were not true. The supreme court of the United States said so in its decision, and the supreme court knows about as much about it as you do I reckon [Applause.] Though, since their last decisions, I have had my doubts about it.

Maine is a pretty good state. Maine is made up of a pretty sharp class of people. I have been up there and traveled with them. I lecture three weeks every fall and spring in Maine and the Yankee is a pretty cute sort of an individual and he don't hold on to the hot end of a poker any longer than the ordinary citizen. [Laughter.] They can see as far through a millstone with a hole in it as anybody, and when you catch the Maine Yankee holding on to anything forty years without letting go you had better take stock in it. They have kept this law forty years, not only kept it but love and respect it notwithstanding the fact that they have pauperism and criminalism, and they come up every election and say: We will stick to prohibition whatever else we do. They have furnished some of the grandest men in the country. The premier of the president's cabinet today is Hon. James G. Blaine, one of the grandest men of the continent [applause]; a man that is supported for president by the newspapers, and yet you want to impeach his testimony here on the subject of prohibition. [Applause.] I think James G. Blaine will get a verdict out of the average American jury about as quick as you will [Applause.] The state of Maine furnishes Thomas B. Reed, the speaker of the house of representatives. The state of Maine furnishes a couple of senators, Messrs. Frye and Hale, who stand about as well in that august body as the senators from Nebraska. I think they have been heard of a little oftener, that is in reputable places [Applause.]

Things are getting along first rate there When the republican state convention met the other day they reaffirmed their adhesion to prohibition and nominated their candidate. Let me tell you a more remarkable fact than that. On the 4th day of June of this present year of grace 1890 a democratic state convention assembled in the city of Augusta, Me., and demanded the rigid enforcement of the prohibitory law [Applause], and when a committee presented a resolution favoring the resubmission of the amendment question to the people of the state, a democratic convention snowed it under and refused to adopt it. [Applause.] Let me tell you when a thing during forty years approves itself to the consciences, the Christianity, the patriotism and the integrity of those people of Maine until both the democratic and republican parties stand up for it, it is a good thing for anybody to invest in. [Applause.]

They say it has impoverished and ruined those poor people over there, but if it has I want Mr. Rosewater or anybody else to stand up here and tell us why it is that while poor Maine has been impoverished and ruined by prohibition and dragged down to the very doors of the poor house, why is it that the state of Maine nevertheless today owns millions of dollars worth of mortgages on your western farms. [Applause.] Where did they get the money? I will tell you where they got the money—they got it by their sturdy sobriety and by putting their money down into the toes and legs of their socks instead of in the saloon, and they save enough in forty years of prohibition to carry millions upon millions of dollars' worth of mortgages upon your high license farms in the west.

Talk about what prohibition does for the state. Look at Iowa when she adopted prohibition. She had a public debt outstanding, and since she has had prohibition she has paid every dollar of it off. You had a public debt in Nebraska too when you adopted high license in this state, and you havn't paid a dollar of it. [Applause.] That is what is the matter with you. [Applause.] Iowa is not only out of debt, but she has got money in her treasury to lend. You had better go and borrow some. Yes, and the state of Kansas has a public debt, and she has reduced it since she has had prohibition.

The state of Minnesota adopted high license, following Nebraska, and her debt has increased every day since she adopted high license. This is where the milk in the cocoanut comes in.

You talk about your taxation and all that. Let me give you a figure or two. Take the state of Nebraska. The wealth of this state which is assessed for taxation amounts to 31.24 per cent of the whole wealth of the state. You pay taxes on 31.24 per cent of every dollar's worth of property in the state of Nebraska. In the state of Iowa they only pay taxes on 28 per cent, and yet their taxes are 25 cents on the dollar and yours is 65 cents for state purposes. I notice he never touched on that this morning. You have 1,200,000 people in Nebraska according to the last returns, and they have 1,875,000 in the state of Iowa. You raise $1,500,000 a year off the people in this state to carry on your state government, and they only $1,187,000 in the state of Iowa' How is it they get along there on about 80 cents a head and it costs you about $1.30 over here? O, yes, he didn't say anything about that. He did not tell you why it is that you farmers and you mechanics and you working men—meaning you men who have to get your bread according to the dictates of Almighty God out of the sweat of your brow and not out of the sweat of your 'mouth' or your pen! He did not tell you why it is that you have to pay more taxes on $200 worth of property in Nebraska than the same sort of a man in Iowa has to pay on $500. He did not tell you why your government over here, with a population of 1,200,000 people, costs $1.30 a head when in Iowa it is 82 cents a head.

He tells you it costs so much to convict criminals over in Iowa. What sort of criminals are they over there in the state of Iowa? The most of them are the bandy shanked, bowlegged, boot leggers from this state and other states, running around there trying to sell liquor contrary to the law. I will tell you right now, if you and your saloon friends will call off your boot leggers and dogs from Iowa, we will save dollars over there by the million. It costs a great deal more to run down game of that sort than it does to just grab it out of their holes in Omaha like you do up there. All you have to do there is to spread your net and catch them as they run out, but in Iowa they have to hunt them down where the fellows have no legal name, habitation, place of residence or settled run. [Applause].

These are the facts and the figures. Three men in the state of Nebraska pay more tax than five men in the state of Iowa. Why didn't he give you something about that? Why does he keep on reading those garbled extracts from a great number of papers here that comes from God knows where? [Applause.]

They tell you about the state of Kansas. He tells you it is such a ruinous place, and it is in such a terrible condition that you would think the sheriff was going to hang the flag out of the state capitol and sell it out at auction. But Prof. Dickie says that Kansas has been "getting there Eli," and it has been with a good deal of Eli too. Not only that, but let me tell you one thing. The preachers in Kansas tell me they have been getting along better, they have supported their preachers and churches better, they have got more money for churches and charities than ever before, and the preachers generally get their salaries in full now, an unheard of thing in almost any other state in the union. When the state is impoverished and the people are poor, they generally cut off their luxuries first and the preachers feel it before anybody else in the community. And when the preacher is full-handed you can stake your last dollar, my friends, that things are getting along in a very good condition. [Applause.] We know how that is, for we have been there. The state of Kansas alone in 1888 spent more money in Young Men's Christian association work than the state of New York, and they had it to spend. More children per capita are in the public schools, in the Sunday schools in the state of Kansas than in any other state in the union, according to the population. Talk about your jails. I want to talk about the schools and the churches, about the happy homes and the workshops, instead of the jails to imprison men in.

Then our friend goes along and tells more things. He says if you had been ill for a long time and you had tried a certain remedy for a long time and it didn't cure the disease, would you keep on trying it? That is what is the matter with Nebraska now. She has been trying Rosewater's high license for ten years and she has been getting beautifully worse, and she is going to quit trying it. That is what is the matter with this agitation. It has not cured the disease, it has only aggravated it, and they are going to have some of old prohibition from one end of the state to the other, and they are going to get all the vermin out of the state and see whether cleanliness does not mean wealth, health, peace and prosperity. [Applause.]

Mr. Rosewater says that the people of Iowa have resented the arrant knavery of the prohibitionists by turning Mr. Larrabee out and putting Mr. Boies in. Yes, I know they have been trying to make you believe that, but that is all bosh. I have got the returns right here before me now from the state of Iowa, my friend, and I want to call your attention to this significant fact: That Mr. Boies, who was elected governor last year, only got 224 votes more than Grover Cleveland had the year before when Harrison beat him 30,000 votes. How is it that Boies, with the high license scheme, commended himself so highly to the people of Iowa that he got 224 votes more than Cleveland? That was a big hoist, wasn't it? How did he get elected? I will tell you. You know that he got elected governor because 38,010 republicans who voted for Harrison in 1888 stayed at home and refused to vote for high license and because he was the tool of the railroads and in their pay and against the interests of the farmer. [Applause.] If you will scalp a few of these fellows in Nebraska who are in the same pay—of the brewer, the saloon and the railroad—and give the farmers a chance, they will not only have prohibition, but they will have living rates for their corn. [Applause.]

My friend says they were selling liquor over in the state of Iowa when he was over there, openly by secret sale. [Applause.] They were openly violating the law by secret sales out of a load of hay. And he found the hay. [Laughter.] You know what kind of animals live on hay. [Applause.] But he was not looking for hay, he was looking for beer, and he found it, and you know what kind of animals live on beer, too. [Laughter.] It reminds me of a little anecdote. When I was in Ireland, going down to Blarney Castle with a party of friends, we saw an ass on the road nipping at the thistles. One of the party said: "Look at the ass eating thistles." The driver says: "Boss, do you know why the ass eats thistles?" He said "No." "Why, because he is an ass." [Laughter.]

Now, my friends do you know why Brother Rosewater found that beer? Because he is one of those kind of fellows. When he is inquiring round, I will bet my bottom dollar, if I was a betting man as I used to be, that he could smell up through the corners and around the back alley and up the rickety steps. That is where they have to go to find it in Iowa. He says that he read you some statistics, statements or documents, whatever they were. But he said they send all the money away from Kansas to foreign places to buy liquor and are impoverishing and ruining the people. Go down the streets of Beatrice and look at the beer signs. Where do they get the beer they are selling here? There is Mr. Schlitz—do you know Mr. Schlitz? There is Mr. Pabst. Do you know Mr. Pabst? There is Anheuser-Busch. I notice you did not give away Mr. Anheuser-Busch's little scheme for evading the law in Kansas. You closed at the right place, my boy. [Applause]. They might have been sending a subpœna duces tecum after you from Kansas. Did you notice how Mr. Rosewater stopped as soon as he saw he was about to give away Anheuser-Busch? Why, it is absolutely along the streets of Beatrice, and I ask you to testify if it is not true, that these saloons are hanging out the signs of foreign breweries—breweries of other states—right on their outer walls and showing you the fact day by day that the dollars of workingmen and of the poor debauched citizens of this town that are being poured into the greasy tills of these places are being sent to the banks of Milwaukee, St. Louis and elsewhere to pay for the beer. From $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 a year go out of the state of Nebraska, according to the calculation, simply for the purpose of paying for the beer which is brought in here, and it does not come back either. These fellows have no interest here. They have most of their interest on wheels so they can get out. [Applause.]

WEBSTER'S REPLY.

He Defines High License Amid Frequent Interruptions.

Hon. John L. Webster spoke as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen: I suppose that I am fully justified in the presumption that I am speaking to a people that are assembled for the purpose of considering this question fairly and honestly, and not for the mere purpose of being entertained by amusing stories, because when the question comes of voting prohibition into the constitution of this state you come to exercise one of the most serious privileges accorded to American citizens. When you come to put your ballot into the box, it is not a matter of fun or of entertainment, but you express your will on a written piece of paper whether your state shall go onward to prosperity or whether you want to blast her forever. What I have to say this morning shall be in the line of the discussion argued to this people on Saturday, and to bring your minds back to the seriousness of the proposition under consideration, and appeal to your honest judgment by statements of facts, by arguments and by logic, which are not to be wafted about as the dust that is picked up from the streets by every breeze that comes along and carried and lodged somewhere else, to the soiling or injury of another.

For the first fifteen or twenty minutes of the argument by Mr. Dickie this morning, I listened to him read something from a little circular which had been issued in the state of Kansas during a political contest in favor of prohibition or against it. They were extracts from a pamphlet published upon one side of the question; they were the gatherings and the clippings from the little journal which would never let get into it one sentiment from a man who blieved in high license. Never did there appear upon its pages the sentiment or the expression of the opinion of one man that is opposed to the doctrine of prohibition. It was a one-sided, garbled document. He might just as well have read from a last year's almanac. I observed that he did not tell this audience when he read those manuscripts where they were taken from.

Mr. Dickie—Every one of them.

O, they were familiar to him. I know what you told this audience when you stated something; it was the expression of the opinion of A. B. or C. D.; but who was A. B., who was C. D.? I want to tell you when I answer that that they were some of the people whom the prohibitionists as a political body went to as their friends, and asked their opinion, and had it all printed, and it is within the lids of a little pamphlet which is culled by my brother from this platform, and read to this audience as an argument. He might just as well have asked you people who disagree with me, who are prohibitionists, what you think about it, and after gathering about twenty of your statements to put them in shape and read those statements as an argument. They are simply the expressions of individual opinion upon one side of the question.

Down in the state of Kansas, don't you know at the same time there were issued documents upon the other side, flooding the state? I have them in my room at the hotel, but I have too much respect for an audience of this kind to bring before you and read gatherings like that, gathered by a political body for a political purpose, gathered from one side as the judgment of a great people, and as an argument upon which the people of this state are to decide a great political question. When he had finished reading from those things, from this little pamphlet from the state of Kansas, he began then reading the sentiments and the declarations of a few people from the state of Iowa. For whatever they are worth, accept them.

I want to say to these people that there is another side to that question, but in the course of half an hour's discussion time is not permitted me to read to this audience or recite to this audience the individual opinions of citizens of the state of Iowa. I want to give to this people on that question one general answer that bears with a greater power than all the individual declarations that they could read in the entire day from the rising to the going down of the sun. What is that? It is the election which my my friend sought to belittle by a kind of an explanation. But let me tell you as one who knows something about the campaign in the state of Iowa, that the question in the campaign when Governor Boies was elected was a pure question between prohibition and high license. It was a question looking to the prosperity of the state.

Mr. Small: I deny it.

I understand he denies it. He sits here and says it is not true. I will admit the fact that whenever an argument comes from the voice of a great people that sits down and repudiates your doctrine, you will get up and deny it as quick as anybody else; but a denial proves nothing. What is the result? When they voted on the question in the state of Iowa, that man Boies ran on a ticket in favor of high license as against the other side, and he received a majority of the votes of all the people in the state who voted at that election.

Mr. Small—How about those that did not vote?

I hear my friend say further, as he sits in that chair beside me, that he wants me to tell him about those that did not vote, and I will tell him about those that did not vote in the state of Iowa, and why they did not vote. The statement is that Boies, when elected governor of the state of Iowa, received but a small number of votes more than Cleveland received in Iowa in the election in which he ran for president of the United States. I will tell you two facts: Every man who is a politician knows it, and my friend Small here, when he picks up that New York almanac and carries it around as one of his documents, knows the same fact that, when you are voting for the president of the United States, you always poll more votes than in any election held in any state of this nation for the purpose of merely electing a governor. Don't you know it? That gives you an explanation why there were not so many votes cast in the election when Governor Boies was elected as there were cast at the presidential election in the state of Iowa.

Mr. Small—There were more.

Not more than that cast in the last presidential election.

Mr. Small—More for Boies.

No, sir; more votes were cast at the presidential election in the state of Iowa than were ever cast in that state in a gubernatorial election. If you have any documents to refute me, produce them. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. Small—I will give you the evidence. I said, and I repeat it right here now, that there were more cast on the democratic ticket in the gubernatorial election than there were at the presidential election; that is, 224 votes more than Grover Cleveland himself had the year before.

Mr. Webster—That is a different proposition from the one I stated. That sustains me in my statement when I declare the proposition that more votes were cast in the presidential election than were cast in a gubernatorial election in any state.

Mr. Small—Never said that.

And now he says he did not say that. Backing out of that, he says another thing. He says that Boies received 224 more votes than Cleveland received. In other words, that the democratic candidate for governor got more votes than the democratic candidate for president of the United States. That is an entirely different proposition, certainly. I will admit that fact and explain why he got it. He got that because the people of Iowa had learned under the prohibition law of that state that the state was not making its march to prosperity with the same growth that the other surrounding states were making, and 30,000 republicans in the state of Iowa, whose consciences would not permit them to vote for a democrat, and not having a republican candidate they could vote for without voting against their judgment and against their consciences on the question of prohibition, they stayed at home and did not vote at all. If my friend will read down the column on the other side of that same almanac, he will find that when they elected a governor two years before, that the state of Iowa had a republican majority, but when Mr. Boies was elected by reason of the evil influences of prohibition, the republican party in that state was snowed under and a democrat was elected, because the republicans believed prohibition to be wrong and were unwilling to go to the polls and vote for the republican candidate and would not prostitute their consciences to vote for the democratic candidate for governor. Those are the true statistics of the politics of the state of Iowa. The result was what? Your doctrine of prohibition was repudiated by a majority vote of the people of the state of Iowa who voted at that election; and I proclaim it that that vote which repudiated that sentiment of the people of Iowa is worth more to the people of the state of Nebraska than the individual opinion of any one man—I don't care where he comes from.

Mrs. Gougar—Mr. Webster, it is one-half of the people, not all the people. Only half the people voted on that question.

Mr. Webster—Mrs. Gougar will not be content until I tell this audience that that vote represented one-half of the people; that is to say, that the women did not have a chance to vote on it. [Applause and laughter.] And I have a little statement to make, that whenever the people of the state of Iowa ever vote upon the question of giving Mrs. Gougar and the followers of the doctrine that she teaches what she wants, it will be repudiated a hundred times more than was prohibition. [Loud applause.]

Now, I am talking, as I hope, to the citizens of the state of Nebraska, and I want just a minute to call your attention to one thought, because I do not want the people who live in this state to disgrace themselves or the state they live in; I want to call your attention to one thing that I listened to on Saturday, and I listened to it this morning: That when any man outside of this state comes before you and abuses your state, or your metropolitan city, you share in it, and the greater the abuse, the greater the slander, the louder you give the applause. [Faint demonstration.] If you people live in this state, and love this state as I do, I would like to have you, when your state is slandered, or your cities are slandered, instead of applauding that slander, not to hiss it, beg your pardon, but to sit mutely by and listen in simple quietude. [Loud applause.]

The very last speaker undertook here not only to slander your state and the city of Omaha, but not content with that, he sought to drag into the mire the great senator of this state, living in the beautiful city of Beatrice. [More applause.] Not only that, but he coupled it with the name of that other honorable gentleman, who won for himself a career of fame and of honor throughout the battles of the war, fighting for the life of the republic, and since then as a statesman sitting in the halls of the United States senate—I mean General Charles F. Manderson. [Applause.] Has it come to this that a man may stand on a platform before a Nebraska audience and drag down the names of Senator Paddock and Senator Manderson as persons of ill repute, and this audience shall applaud such vile declarations?

Mr. Small—I didn't do it.

Mr. Webster—I appeal to the pride and sentiment of every man and woman here to resent any such insinuation as was made from this platform against your republican senators. [A voice: "That's right." Applause.]

I am sorry, ladies and gentlemen, that time travels so rapidly, because the things which I have to say to this audience in behalf of the position which I maintain would stretch out through a week of discussion. Coming back, therefore, to the thought I started out in this discussion on last Saturday, asking this people, what have you to say as to where the state, as a state, as a political body, is to be benefited by prohibition? or where is it to be injured by maintaining high license? and up to the present minute I have not heard one man undertake to answer that proposition. I shall have to go on myself. I undertook to prove last Saturday that in all the states where you had prohibition, stagnation had struck the prosperity of the states; I gave you their population to show it; and when I stepped from this platform a prohibition friend, with honest purpose and honest intentions, for which I thank him, said to me, "Mr. Webster, why do you compare Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire with Nebraska in the line of prosperity? There may be other causes to account for the prosperity of Nebraska. Why don't you compare it with some of the states in the immediate vicinity, that surround Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire?" I said, "Suppose I do that, and that it was universally the same thing, then what?" The result was, after a moment's conversation, that the prohibition friends would have to explain to satisfy this audience as to the stagnation in Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire, or they would lose their case.

I will undertake to prove my side of it by going a little further. Some man may say to you, perhaps, that the states of Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire, being old states, are already filled up and there is no room for any more growth down there. A man stated to me the other day, in debating that question: "One reason down there why they don't have any more people there is because of the foreigners landing down there and decent people had to leave." I presume that the friend that made that statement did not know the fact that foreigners do not land in the state of Maine, or New Hampshire, or Vermont at all and their population does not increase, for the emigration goes entirely to other states of the union.

Go a little further: In Maine they have a population of 21 to the square mile, in Vermont 36 and in New Hampshire 38. In Massachusetts, where you have the great Berkshire hills running all across it just as rugged as in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, they have a population of 221 people to the square mile; or, in other words, in the state of Massachusetts, right down in New England, there are ten families living to the square mile to where there is one family living in prohibition Maine. In New York, which borders on the westward, they have 105 people per square mile, to 21 in the millenium state of Maine that the prohibition friends talk about. If New York can accommodate 105 and Massachusetts can accommodate 221, why is not there room for a few people to come up in that God-favored state of Maine? After all that is said about Vermont and New Hampshire, how comes it that those highly intelligent people of Maine, who know how to drop a hot poker as well as anybody else, as my friend says, have not dropped that hot poker and undertaken to get some people down there to build a few fires to keep them warm in winter?

Out in Illinois, half way across the continent, you have fifty-five people per square mile. In Indiana, the old Hoosier state, you have fifty-five; and then in the bright old state of Iowa you have seventy-eight; in Pennsylvania, you have ninety-five per square mile. Don't you see when you come to think it over, that Maine, Vermont, and New Hamshire come pretty near being depopulated, and it is no wonder that you have no prosperity down there! I put to you a proposition, and I want you to answer it: My proposition is that in every state where you talk prohibition you drive out the people, you drive out capital, you destroy your manufacturing industries, you destroy your commercial industries. If you cannot explain it on any theory, I have a right to draw the conclusion that it must be the result of prohibition, which is the only discriminating characteristic between these three states and the other states of the union.

Mr. Small—O, my. [Laughter.]

My friend says "O, my," as if that were an answer.

Mr. Small—'T'ain't an answer.

We will go a little farther: With the state of Vermont, that only increased its population by one half of one per cent from 1870 to 1880, the average increase of population percentage was more than 20 per cent in all the high license states of the union, and down in old whisky producing Kentucky it was 24. In wine-growing California it was 54 per cent. Now, mark what I say: In the high license state of Nebraska, to which you people belong, in this state where they ask you to affix prohibition to your constitution, the increase of percentage of population for the same ten years was 267 per cent, and from 1880 to 1890 it was more than 300 per cent; a record which cannot be pointed out by my prohibition friends in any other state within the limits of the United States government.

Here is another fact about your old prohibition state of Maine: In 1870 there were 5,550 manufacturing institutions in that state, as reported by the census of the United States government for that year. In 1880, in the same state of Maine, there were about 4,481 manufacturing industries. Therefore, in ten years of prohibition in Maine, you destroyed and wiped out 1,069 manufacturing industries, and I want to say to you that there was not one of them a brewery or a distillery, either.

Mr. Small—No, sir; didn't have them.

In New Hampshire you destroyed 161 manufacturing industries; in Vermont you destroyed 396 manufacturing industries. I tell you that in the states surrounding Vermont, Maine and New Hampshire, where you had high license, and did not have prohibition, that the manufacturing institutions increased in every one of them instead of decreasing. I will give you a state or two: In Massachusets, for the same ten years, its institutions increased in number 1,140. In the state of Wisconsin, 651; in the state of New York, 6,533; in Maryland, 975; in Illinois, 1,952; in Minnesota, 1,223; and in the little, as they say, state of Nebraska, cursed with high license, you increased your manufacturing institutions to the number of 733. [Applause.]

Allow me, in conclusion, to say that in every prohibition state that I have named, by your prohibition doctrine I contend it to be, you destroy your manufacturing industries in the state; by which I mean to say you drain upon your financial prosperity; and in every state of the union where you had high license the manufacturing institutions increased in number and, therefore, furnished employment to more men; therefore paid out more money and more wages; therefore secured more for your product; therefore put more money in circulation, and therefore paved the way to universal prosperity, which stands face to face with the depreciation which you put upon the financial industries of states where prohibition exists. Now, if my friends upon the other side can explain that away by argument, let them explain it. It is for me to state facts, and this intelligent audience can draw conclusions from them.

A voice: How about Kansas?

The President—I want to remind the audience that only the four speakers will be allowed to take part in this debate.

Mr. Webster—Had it not been for the enforcement of the president, I should have answered the gentlemen from Kansas at once. But out of respect to the order of the president, I shall not allow myself at this [illegible] to engage in altercation with any individual outside of these debaters. In the course of the discussion, I shall deal with Kansas, and I will dispose of that question with about the same general result proportionate to population as exists in the other states. Let that suffice upon that subject for the present.

It was said that prohibition was one of the things that stopped idiocy and insanity, and so forth. I want to make a suggestion that my friends in this discussion seem never to be able to discriminate between the regulation of the business and the running of open saloons; or, in other words, they cannot discriminate between legitimate temperance and absolute drunkenness. That is not the discussion at all. No high license friend is here to advocate drunkenness and intemperance. We are here for the purpose of debating how to reach the best manner of dealing with a conceded evil, and that is the only thing we have to talk about.

I want to go to Maine a moment, where they say that, because they have prohibition down there, prohibition saves everything. I got this right from a prohibition book, that three-fifths of all the idiots were either drunkards or the direct descendants of drunkards. Down in Maine according to the census of 1880, they had 1,325 idiots. Either prohibition don't prohibit, or else prohibition don't stop producing idiots. If idiots are the result of drink, they drink more bad whisky in Maine than in any other state with the same ation. In New Hampshire they had 703; i mont, 893; and in prohibition Iowa they 314. Up here is Minnesota, which has hi nse, with a greater population than Ma s, a greater population than New Ham e, a greater population than Vermont, y has 729, or one-half the number of idiots, ps, in Maine, out of the same populatio ow about high license in West Virgi and Florida, and Connecticut, and ever er state. The proportion is a great deal er than in the state of Maine, New Ham e, Vermont, or Iowa.

W R Lambert

I can answer, if you will allow me time to get through a table. In a half a minute! I cannot do it. I will simpy conclude with the statement that there were in the insane asylum of Maine, in 1880, after thirty years of prohibition, 403 insane persons, and in the state of Nebraska but 175. Or, in other words, in the high license state of Nebraska, where you say liquor is likely to cause insanity, you have but one-half the number of persons in the insane asylum that were brought there in the prohibitory state of Maine.

My friends can take which horn of the dilemma they please—either admit that whisky does not produce insanity, or else admit that prohibition in Maine does not prohibit, and more people are made insane by the drinking of liquor in prohibition Maine than are made insane under the high license laws of the state of Nebraska. [Applause.]

THE IOWA INJUNCTION.

Arguments in the Case of the B., C. R. & N. Against the Commission.

IOWA CITY, Ia., July 8.—Arguments over the joint rate case were concluded today. In the latter part of May the Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern road sued out an injunction restraining the railroad commissioners from promulgating a schedule of joint rates, alleging the law unconstitutional. Attorney General Stone filed a motion to dissolve the injunction and a hearing was set for Monday this week. Upon the opening of the case the railroad company filed an amendment to the bill asserting that the railway act of 1888 is also unconstitutional. The attorney general amended his motion so as to dissolve this new situation and thus the question presented to the court involved the constitutionality of the entire railway rate legislation of the state. The attorney general, in his argument, said there was ample foundation for the states made in the interest of fair dealing transportation reasonable compensation for service performed by common carriers being provided for. On this basis it was as competent for the state to regulate the business and duties of the different companies, one with another, as it was to regulate like matters between carriers and shippers.

Counsel for the railway company denied these assertions and insisted it was unconstitutional to enforce business relations between companies against their consent.

At the close of the arguments today Judge Fairall said, in his view, the decision must depend on whether sufficient machinery was provided by the joint rate act to provide for the sure payment to the carrier of its share of compensation for the joint haul. He took the case under advisement.

An Elevator Burned.

DES MOINES, Ia., July 8.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—A dispatch from Sheldahl, a small station a few miles north of this city, states that Lockwood's elevator and six cribs of corn, containing about fifty or sixty thousand bushels, burned about 4:30 this morning. The cause is unknown. The total damage will probably be $30,000; fully insured.

Bottles Are Original Packages.

MASON CITY, Ia., July 8.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—Judge Sherman held a special term of court here today to hear injunction proceedings brought from Winnebago county to restrain John Hartman, Sr. and Jr., from selling whisky and beer in original packages. The injunction was not granted, the judge considering that the bottle, not the case, was the original package.

A Servant Girls' Union.

FORT DODGE, Ia., July 8.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—A movement is on foot for forming a servant girls' union here. All the hired girls of the city are interested. The object is more wages, lighter work, and more liberty.

A STRONG BOARD.

It Will Direct the Destinies of the Baptist University.

CHICAGO, July 8.—The board of directors of the new Baptist university in this city, toward which John D. Rockafeller of Cleveland gave $600,000 and the Baptist denomination and its friends $400,000 more, has been appointed. They are: E. Nelson Blake, for many years president of the Baptist theological union; F. E. Hinckley, the well known railroad builder; A. Mackleish, a member of the dry goods firm of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.; F. A. Smith, president of the Chicago law institute; C. W. Needham, a prominent attorney; E. L. Sorthell, the well known civil engineer; Rev. A. K. Parker, pastor of the Centennial Baptist church; H. A. Rust, a well known business man; J. W. Midgley, chairman of the Western Freight association; Edward Goodman, one of the proprietors of the Baptist paper, the Standard; H. H. Kohlsaat, proprietor of a large bakery; Ferd W. Peck, president of the Auditorium association; Hon. J. N. Bailey, chief justice of the Illinois supreme court; George C. Walker, president of the Chicago academy of sciences; C. C. Bowen, Detroit, Mich., and member of the firm of D. M. Ferry & Co.; E. B. Felsenthal, a lawyer of this city; Prof. W. R. Harper of Yale; Martin A. Ryerson, a prominent business man of Chicago; George A. Pillsbury, of the great flour firm, Minneapolis; Hon. Daniel L. Shorey, an old resident of Chicago. Mr. Rockefeller declined membership on the board.

FRANK HATTON.

The Ex-Assistant Postmaster General Visits Chicago.

CHICAGO, July 8.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—Frank Hatton, ex-assistant postmaster general, is in the city and was today interviewed regarding the proposed federal election law. "I do not think that it will pass the senate," he said, "and had it received two weeks' discussion in the house, long enough for the members to have heard from their constituents, it would not have passed the house.

"I do not dispute the right of every man to be protected in his right to vote, but the republican party is fifteen years too late. Then it was needed, and as the republicans had absolute control of the government its passage would have been efficacious. But at that time the republican party served notice on the southern voters that it did not intend to do anything for them—they must look out for themselves.

"One of the most peculiar things of the present measure is that some of its principal advocates are men who most violently opposed any interference in federal elections when Grant was president. Some of the statesmen at that time denounced Grant as a tyrant, a usurper and a dictator for his efforts in the line of protecting the republican voters in the south."

Pensions for Nurses.

WASHINGTON, July 8.—Representative Belknap today reported favorably from the committee on the invalid pension bill granting a pension of $12 per month to all women who served as army nurses in the late war for a period of six months or more, and who rendered services to the sick on the battlefield.

A Bicyclist Dead.

CHICAGO, July 8.—Word has been received that W. M. Woodside, the well known bicyclist, died recently of yellow fever at Rio de Janeiro.

VAN WYCK AND MARQUETTE.

The Question of Railroad Rates Ably Debated at Crete.

A TERRIFIC WIND STORM AT FAIRBURY.

A Farmer Near Ponca Set Upon and Terribly Beaten By Two Neighbors—He is Not Expected to Live.

CRETE, Neb., July 8.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—The Van Wyck-Marquette debate began this afternoon at 2 o'clock. The question was:

Resolved, That present railroad rates, both interstate and local, are just and equitable for both the producer and carrier.

The tabernacle was crowded, large delegations of visitors having arrived from all parts of the state. Hon. F. M. Marquette first took the platform. Briefly summarized, his arguments were as follows:

"It has been said that the people of Nebraska are too prejudiced to listen to a defense of the railroad. Such is not the case. A system of state railroad rates is like an intricate machine. At first glance we may have difficulty in comprehending the reasons for it. To gain a good knowledge of a system of rates we must consider the system in its entirety. As to interstate rates, the first complaint is in reference to corn. The average freight rate from Iowa to Chicago is the lowest in the world.

"The question of interstate rates has been adjudicated. Omaha and Lincoln complained of interstate rates, but the body of interstate commissioners declared them just. The duty of the board of transportation is to find out everything in regard to railroads. This board affirms that the B. & M. makes only 6 per cent on its actual outlay. Other roads make even less.

"The mileage of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy ten years ago was 2,239 miles. Since then the road has increased in mileage, but profits are only half as much as they were when the mileage was less. This results from the reduction of rates. Corn put into live stock, the live stock being shipped, returns to the farmer a large profit, but to the railroad almost nothing.

"Figuring on only part of the rates a case is made against railroads, but considering rates as a grand system the conclusion is changed. As compared with Iowa rates, those of Illinois are 33½ per cent higher than hers, because in Illinois good business principles apply. The same remark applies to Missouri. Nebraska's interstate rate is lower even than Iowa's. Iowa rates, which are complained of as less than Nebraska's, are those on drugs, clothes, etc., where the burden does not affect the consumers. Nebraska's interstate rate on corn is less than Iowa's. We have cultivated corn; Iowa the drugstore. [Laughter.]

"The managers of Iowa roads affirm that the state has deprived them of profit on local rates. If we cut down local rates in Nebraska, we embarrass the roads to such an extent that they are unable to give us a better rate on corn. Iowa desires a local rate; Nebraska wants a low interstate rate. Each has had its wish gratified. Nebraska is benefitted by her wise system of low interstate and high local rates.

"Nebraska's system is building up larger cities in her borders than there are in Iowa. Within the last five years she has led the world in prosperity. There are some little wrongs in Nebraska's system of rates, but they are unavoidable. Taken as a whole, the system is admirable."

In his first address, Mr. Van Wyck made the following statement:

"The question is whether the rates, both state and interstate, are higher than they should be. Under our present rates Nebraska farmers have been working on shares, the railroad fixing the shares. Railroad magnates could not have grown rich had not rates been unjust. Gould's career has been one of theft from the American people. His valued property at the last census was more than the assessed valuation of Nebraska and Iowa combined. [Hisses]. The money made in Nebraska and the northwest goes into eastern cities. The producer is not growing richer; the wealth created by him goes to the railroads. The Nebraska farmers have been compelled to burn corn because railroad rates were so high that they could not sell it at a profit.

"Judge Mason has mastered the subject of railroads as well as any man in the United States."

At this point a person from the audience arose, and stated that in 1874 Bradstreet reported VanWyck worth $2,000, and in 1880, $60,000, and he asked the ex-senator how he had amassed his wealth. VanWyck explained that he had husbanded the money left him by his parents, but had not tried to make a fortune raising steers in Nebraska. [Cheers.] He then explained that his Washington property was worth between forty and fifty thousand dollars and was mortgaged for $16,000. [Cheers.]

"Judge Mason says in 1887: Minnesota and Dakota pay less freight per mile than is paid in Nebraska. Nebraska rates cannot be defended. The rate from Lincoln to Ord looks like highway robbery. The railroads deal injurious blows to the commerce and prosperity of the state, and in the end to the corporations themselves. There will be no turning back from the demand for a material reduction of rates in the state, even if legislative action is necessary to secure the end sought. Judge Mason has never repudiated this opinion.

"The present board of transportation which is a friend of the railroad, affirms that today's rates are too high. The board recently affirmed that if the corn rate was not reduced local rates would be. A reduction of 10 per cent in corn rates resulted, but the price of corn dropped at the same rate. After the reduction Laws affirmed that the rates were still too high. Governor Thayer recently condemned railroad rates as too high. (And he is not a demagogue). The governor says that farmers and others dealing with railroads are on the verge of bankruptcy.

In his second address Marquette spoke as follows: "Mr. Van Wyck has taken the word of politicians for his arguments, but has not investigated the rates themselves. We fall into the error of assuming that railroad rates are robbery and pursue our investigations from that point. Railroad magnates have not made their money running railroads. Four per cent dividend will not make a man rich. Judge Mason's statements are colored by his political aspirations."

"Jay Gould has not made his money out of railroads, but by dishonest operations in the board of trade. The men who know nothing of railroad rates shout the loudest against them. The views of railroad rates of Thayer and Laws, given by Mr. Van Wyck, were those expressed when the gentlemen were running for office. The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy is stocked up in round numbers to $40,000 per mile, although a portion of the road has cost $100,000 per mile."

Mr. Van Wyck in his second speech said among other things the following: "Laws and Thayer, at the time they gave their views on railroads, were not desirous of an office. The interstate board of commissioners was certainly not actuated in giving its views by a desire for office. The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy receives interest on stocks and bonds amounting to $57,000 per mile, although the road cost only $14,000 per mile.

"Rates are higher on the B. & M. railroad now than they were five years ago. The state board of railway transportation affirms that a rate of 17 cents per hundred is excessive. Mr. Marquette considers 20 cents too low."

Mr. Van Wyck then read a few extracts from Charles Francis Adams' book, showing the alarming prevalence of stock watering.

"Railroads cannot afford to reduce rates, yet they expend thousands of dollars in supporting a legislative lobby in their interests."

Mr. Van Wyck read extensive extracts supporting the preceding statement.

"The freight rates from the Missouri river to Chadron is four times the rate east of the Missouri. Nebraska railroads have relentlessly robbed our people of thousands of dollars, forcing them to disgorge for railroad