

Prohibition Makes Gains

[Associated Press Correspondence.]

A canvass by the Associated press of legislative activity this year in the state law-making bodies of the country, most of which have adjourned for the summer, shows that among the subjects which received notable attention was that of the prohibition or the regulation of the liquor traffic.

The legislatures of two states enacted statutory prohibition to become effective this year, and eight voted to submit the question of state-wide prohibition to a referendum of the people. Of the latter, two established statutory prohibition to become effective in the meantime. Four states where prohibition is already effective passed additional restrictive laws, and two of the five states, where, under constitutional amendment, prohibition is to go into effect next year, enacted necessary statutes for its enforcement. In six of the so-called "wet" states, state-wide proposals met defeat. In others questions of local option, transportation and licensing were acted upon.

The two states where direct prohibition laws were passed are Florida and Alabama. Those whose legislatures voted to submit the question to the people are Idaho, Iowa, Montana, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont and the territory of Alaska. In Iowa the legislative resolution, according to the state constitution, must be passed by the next succeeding legislature, before the people can vote on it, but the state returned to statutory prohibition meanwhile, through the repeal of the so-called mulct law. Idaho was also made "dry" meanwhile through statutory enactment. In Utah the bill was vetoed by the governor after the legislature adjourned. In South Carolina the vote will be taken at the election this year; in Montana, South Dakota, Vermont and Alaska, in 1916; Idaho in 1916.

It will be thus seen that as a measure of the progress of the cause of prohibition the fifteen states already

CLAIM NO. 59

Robert E. Neitzel was one of the early policyholders in THE MIDWEST LIFE, his policy being 996. It was dated October 28, 1907. He was then cashier of the bank of Waterloo, located at Waterloo, Nebraska. Later he moved to Murphy, Idaho, where he met his death by drowning on the 12th day of June, 1915.

Mr. Neitzel had paid the company \$213.42 in premiums and the company paid his wife, as beneficiary under his policy, \$1,000, or nearly \$5.00 for every one received by it. Through the expenditure of a small sum each year, Mr. Neitzel created this estate for his widow. It was a wise and thoughtful act on his part as it is on the part of everyone who has others depending upon him for support.

THE MIDWEST LIFE
OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA
A STOCK COMPANY SELLING
GUARANTEED COST LIFE INSURANCE

in the ranks have this year been enforced by four, and the legislative way cleared for four others, including Alaska, to join. In the latter event nearly half the country will have placed the ban on the liquor traffic.

The new Florida law goes into effect October 1, and prohibits the sale of alcoholic beverages except in sealed packages of less than one-half pint each, nor can liquor be drunk on the premises where sold. This applies to restaurants, hotels and clubs as well as saloons.

The Alabama law was passed over the veto of Governor Henderson. It became operative July 1. In addition, the legislature enacted an anti-shipment law, which forbids the shipping to an individual of more than one gallon of liquor or sixty bottles of beer a month. Its validity was taken to the supreme court for test. There was also passed, over the governor's veto, an act forbidding the publication of liquor advertisements in newspapers and periodicals, on billboards or in saloons. This was also taken to the courts.

In Iowa, the repeal of the mulct law, under which communities by a majority petition were allowed to have saloons operated under a mulct tax, had the effect of returning the state to the statutory prohibition which prevailed prior to the law's enactment twelve years ago. Content neither with this nor the passage of the resolution for a constitutional prohibition amendment, the legislature also enacted eleven prohibition enforcement bills.

IDAHO'S IS DRASTIC

In adopting statutory prohibition, pending the constitutional amendment vote, Idaho enacted a provision conceded to be more drastic than any ever attempted in the United States. It makes even ownership of liquor a misdemeanor, and on second offense, a felony.

The Montana legislature decided to refer the question to the people at the 1916 election, in the form of a statute, after rejecting a proposed constitutional amendment vote. The law would permit the use of wines for sacramental purposes and in lodge ceremonial work. If approved, it will become effective December 31, 1918. In connection with the measure, the legislature enacted early closing and Sunday-closing laws for the saloons.

The general assembly of South Carolina took up a large part of the session in discussing prohibition. Besides drafting a state-wide law for submission to a referendum at the election of September 12, 1915, the assembly enacted a statute which makes effective in the state the provisions of the Webb-Kenyon federal act against the shipment of liquor from "wet" to "dry" territory. South Carolina being now local option. The statute also forbids the shipment of more than one gallon of alcoholic liquors to any one person in the state during any one month.

The South Dakota legislature decided to submit a state-wide constitutional amendment to the general election in 1916. If carried by a majority of the votes cast it will become effective July 1, 1917.

The state-wide prohibition measure which the governor of Utah vetoed after the adjournment of the legislature of that state had been passed by large majorities in both houses. The legislature, however, placed on the statute books a law modeled after the Webb-Kenyon law and imposing heavy penalties for the shipment of liquor from "wet" to "dry" territory in the state.

Vermont's prohibition proposal was in the form of a law which will

be submitted to the people at the municipal elections in the spring of 1916. If passed, its effect will be drastic, as it makes no provision for the sale of liquor for medical and mechanical purposes.

The four prohibition states which decided to strengthen their present laws were Kansas, North Carolina, Tennessee and West Virginia. The Kansas measure approach the unique in prohibition legislation. Two were passed, one providing that the municipality where liquor is sold is liable for damage for injury to persons or property resulting from intoxication. The other, which is aimed at those who permit so-called "keg parties" to be held on their premises, imposes similar liability upon the owner of property where liquor is sold or given away.

North Carolina passed an antishipping act, known there as the "anti-jug act" which forbids the shipment to and receipt by any one person of more than one quart of spirituous liquors and five gallons of malt beverage every fifteen days.

TENNESSEE OUSTER LAW

Tennessee, where the prohibition laws have not been strictly enforced in the larger cities, it is said, passed an ouster law, modeled after a Kansas statute, which provides for the removal from office of state, county or city officials (other than holders of constitutional offices) who fail to enforce the laws of the state. The legislature also enacted measures forbidding social and fraternal clubs to dispense liquor or maintain lockers for members; placing the supervision of soft-drink stands under the pure food and drug department and forbidding them to sell beverages containing more than ½ per cent alcohol and prohibiting drug stores from selling intoxicants except on bona fide prescription given to persons who actually are ill.

West Virginia enacted amendments to the Yost prohibition law limiting shipments of liquor into the state and forbidding a person to have liquor in a public place even for his own use. Nor hereafter can any one in West Virginia give a drink to another except in his own home, home being specified as a permanent place of residence, not a hotel or other public place.

All attempts to revise the prohibition laws of Oklahoma were defeated.

In Oregon, where prohibition becomes effective in January next, as the result of previous action by the voters on a constitutional amendment, the legislature enacted a law to enforce the amendment. The law prohibits the manufacture of intoxicating liquor in the state and its sale except on physician's prescription or for scientific, sacramental or mechanical uses. It allows a limited amount to be imported by the heads of families.

A law for a similar purpose was enacted in Colorado, where a prohibition amendment goes into effect the same date. The Colorado law forbids the buying, selling and giving away of liquor except for medical or sacramental purposes and prohibits common carriers from transporting liquor into the state except for lawful purposes—this includes the transportation to individuals who must sign a receipt that the liquor is for their own use. The law contains a search and seizure provision and gives the governor \$10,000 yearly for its enforcement.

The legislature of Washington, where prohibition is also effective in January next, ignored Governor Lister's request for an appropriation of \$50,000 to enforce the law.

The liquor traffic in Arkansas, having been banned by the previous legislature with a law which likewise takes effect in January, was not

up for consideration this year. Virginia, which goes into the "dry" column in November, 1916, held no legislative session this year.

SEVERAL DEFEATS

State-wide prohibition proposals met defeat in Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York and Wyoming. The question was before the general assembly of Connecticut as a proposed constitutional amendment, which the legislators declined to send to the next assembly for ratification. The legislature, however, increased the cost of retail liquor licenses 66 2-3 per cent., and for the first time placed social and fraternal organizations serving liquors to members under excise regulation. In Indiana a state-wide measure died in a committee of the lower house.

In Michigan the question promised to be one of the features of the session, but nothing came of it. A bill was introduced into the senate providing for the submission of statutory prohibition to the vote of the people at a general election next year, but the prohibition leaders themselves voted against it after the liquor faction has attached certain amendments to it which, in the opinion of the "drys," defeated the purpose of the bill.

While a strong effort was made in the New Mexico legislature to secure action on a constitutional amendment resolution, the issue was not allowed to come to a vote in either house. In New York all measures designed to have a state-wide effect on the liquor traffic were killed, and in Wyoming the issue was twice before the legislature in proposals for a constitutional amendment, and twice defeated.

Both "wet" and "dry" measures failed of enactment in Illinois. They were all killed by the house. The temperance measures introduced provided for residence district option, for stricter enforcement of the anti-liquor laws in prohibition territory and against treating. The "wets" did not push their bill providing for home rule in the handling of the liquor problem, and their bill repealing the township option law.

In New Jersey and Pennsylvania county local option met defeat, but was established by Minnesota. The latter state also enacted a "road house" bill, prohibiting the issuance of saloon licenses to establishments outside of cities and villages.

The only action taken by the Ohio legislature was the passage of a law making state and county licensing officials elective instead of appointive, thus "decentralizing" the licensing system. The law was opposed by the so-called "liberal" interests. The Massachusetts lawmakers passed a bill to prevent the shipment of liquor from license to no-license communities, but it was vetoed by the governor. A bill forbidding the use of inclosed booths in restaurants where liquor is sold became a law.

California, a local option state, passed a measure forbidding the sale of liquor to persons with Indian blood in their veins or white persons associating with them. The legislature defeated, however, a bill creating a mile "dry" zone around normal schools and universities.

Governor Ferguson of Texas, having been elected on a platform opposing all liquor agitation, the question was left practically untouched in that state. He vetoed the only liquor bill passed. The measure would have reduced the tax on wholesale druggists selling alcohol. In Delaware the anti-shipment law passed in 1913, which prohibited the shipment of liquor into Kent and Sussex counties, which were "dry," was repealed. The court having decided that the law could not keep out interstate shipments, the result was that dealers outside the state could make shipments into