

had 373 licensed saloons, but 339 government liquor licenses were held by persons other than saloonkeepers; Hall county had thirty saloons, but thirty-four government liquor licenses were issued there to persons other than saloonkeepers; Lancaster county had thirty-one licensed saloons, but fifty-seven persons held government licenses other than saloonkeepers; Dodge county had twenty-eight licensed saloons, but sixty-five government licenses were issued. In other words, the total licensed saloons in the four counties named were 462, yet 929 government liquor licenses were issued to parties therein, or an excess of 467 government licenses over the number of licensed saloons. These figures tell their own story. Doubtless, some of the persons to whom government liquor licenses were issued held druggists' permits, yet I challenge you or any one else fighting for a continuance of saloons in Nebraska to furnish proof that the 467 persons to whom government licenses were issued other than to saloonkeepers in Douglas, Hall, Lancaster and Dodge counties were authorized to make legal sales of intoxicating liquors. It is only fair to presume that men who take out government licenses not only intend to, but actually do, make sales, and it is found that many more government licenses are issued in proportion to population in counties where licensed saloons exist than where they do not. York county and Hall county have nearly the same population. Hall county has saloons, York county has none. One government license in 1915 was issued to York county, while sixty-four were issued to persons in Hall county, or thirty-four in excess of the number of licensed saloons. In the light of such facts, do you pretend to believe that clandestine sales are not made in licensed places, but that they are to be found only in prohibition localities?

That "Economic Blight"

I have read with much interest and some surprise the invidious comparisons you make between Nebraska and Kansas, favorable to the former and prejudicial to the latter, and your attempt to account for the disparity between the two on the ground that Kansas is under prohibition and Nebraska is under high license. You say that the answer is: "That the policy of statewide prohibition places an economic blight upon Kansas." As evidence of this so-called "economic blight" you say that the value of farm lands in Nebraska is greatly in excess of the value of farm lands in Kansas; that the number of cattle in Nebraska and their value are in excess of the number and value of those in Kansas; that the number of hogs in Nebraska and their value are in excess of the number and value of hogs in Kansas; that there are more building and loan associations in Nebraska than in Kansas, and that the assets of these exceed the assets of those in Kansas; that the bank deposits and capital stock of banks in Nebraska are in excess of those in Kansas, and you make comparison of those enterprises and industries between the one and the other state. Whether your figures and comparisons are correct or incorrect, I have not attempted to verify, as it must be apparent to anyone that they fall far short of proving what you attempt to prove, namely, that the economic differences in favor of Nebraska are due to the fact that Kansas is under statewide prohibition and Nebraska under high license, local option laws. I am disposed to admit that the people of Nebraska in thrift, frugality and enterprise are equal, if not superior, to the people of any other state in the union. I am willing to concede that Nebraska surpasses Kansas in all the enterprises you mention and to the extent

you show, but I deny most emphatically that the advantages of Nebraska over Kansas in the number and value of their cattle, the number and value of their hogs, the value of their farm lands, their bank deposits, the number of their loan associations and their capital stock and assets are in any manner due to the fact of the high license liquor laws of Nebraska and prohibition laws in Kansas. If the people of Nebraska, their wealth, enterprises and resources surpass those of Kansas, it is so in spite of high license liquor laws of Nebraska and not by reason of them. The logic of your position, if it has any, is that the distillery, the brewery and the licensed saloons are an economic blessing without which the number of hogs and cattle and loan associations and the amount of bank deposits would be diminished and their value and that of farm lands retarded.

Prosperity Due to Booze

From the array of figures which you marshal and the comparisons you make between Kansas and Nebraska one would be led to believe that you believed and were endeavoring to show that Nebraska's superiority over Kansas in enterprise and resources is due alone to the fact that prohibition obtains in Kansas, while license laws exist in Nebraska—because one state tolerates the distillery, the brewery and the saloon and the other does not. Of course, you do not mean this, for, in the sop which you throw out to the farmer and stock raiser in Nebraska, on page three of your document, you say: "These two great industries, farming and stock raising, have made Nebraska what it is today. All wealth comes from the soil. Towns-men prosper only as the farmer prospers." Is that so? Do you really mean it? If so, I greet you, for here we meet on common ground. One would have thought from your labored effort in presenting government statistics and other data that you were trying to show that the manufacture and sale of liquor in Nebraska under high license has made Nebraska, "what it is." But now you admit after all that it is the farming and stock raising industries and not high license that accounts for the greatness of Nebraska. Here your admission of fact outruns the deduction of your logic and entirely supercedes it.

In your document you go as far as to say that many of the counties in the eastern part of Kansas have decreased in population during the last ten years. Do you want your readers to understand that this decrease in population is due to prohibition? If so, can you explain why the population of the state of Iowa decreased between 1900 and 1910, during a period of high license liquor laws in that state?

You say that the percentage increase in the value of farm land in Nebraska between 1890 and 1910 was 306.4; while the increase of the value of farm lands in Kansas during the same period was only 188.6. Do you want your readers to understand that the large increase in Nebraska is due to the fact of high license liquor laws here and prohibition in Kansas? Do you not know that in the last ten years Nebraska has been rapidly coming to be a dry state, that thirty-three counties and 378 towns and cities of the state of Nebraska are now under practical prohibition? If the blight of prohibition has retarded the increase in farm land values in Kansas to the extent you mention, are you not forced to the conclusion that, in the counties in Nebraska which are now under practical prohibition, land values would also have been retarded? Do you imagine or do you think you will succeed in making anyone believe that the value of farm land in York

or other prohibition counties in Nebraska has been retarded or has fallen-off by reason of prohibition there? Clearly the logic of your argument would necessarily lead you to that preposterous conclusion. You must know that such is not the case, but that in the counties under practical prohibition in this state the increase in land values has kept pace with the increase of land values in any of the counties where saloons abound.

Nineteen States "Blighted"

If statewide prohibition is an "economic blight" is it not a little remarkable that nineteen states, after years of experience under liquor license laws, have voluntarily adopted the "blight" and that eleven of the nineteen have done so within the last two and one-half years?

The people of Maine about four years ago, after having tried statewide prohibition for sixty years, voted to continue it.

The state of Iowa, whose people are fairly enlightened, having the lowest percentage of illiteracy of any state in the union according to the national statistics of 1910, from which you seem pleased to quote, adopted statewide prohibition by act of its legislature after that state had tried both statewide prohibition and high license for many years.

These facts would naturally lead one to conclude that the people of those states did not look upon the license system as a great unmixed economic blessing, at least. They might even cause one to conclude that the people of these states preferred to take chances on the possi-

bility of an "economic blight" of prohibition than to suffer the consequences of the social and economic cancer of high license.

Candidly, Mr. Haynes, don't you believe you will have to put up a little more consistent and convincing argument to the lawyers, bankers and business men than that which is contained in your document entitled "Twenty-eight Years of High License, Local Option in Nebraska vs. Thirty-five years of Prohibition in Kansas," before they will take fright at the advent of statewide prohibition in Nebraska?

With kindest personal regards, I am
Yours sincerely,
W. T. THOMPSON,
Chairman Nebraska Dry Federation.

HE DIDN'T WASTE IT

A little boy went to Sunday school for the first time. His mother gave him a nickel to put in the collection box. When he returned he had a sack of candy.

"Where did you get the candy?" asked his mother.

"From the stand around the corner."

"But what did you buy it with?"

"With the nickel you gave me."

"But that was for Sunday school!"

"Well," replied the boy, "I didn't need it. The minister met me at the door and got me in free." — The Christian Herald.

The average girl would rather hear a young man say he is jealous of her than have him tell her she inspires him to great deeds.—Chicago News.

BARGAIN OFFER

For Limited Time to New or Renewing Subscribers

THE COMMONER and Thrice-a-Week NEW YORK WORLD, both One Full Year for Only \$1.15.

Address Orders to THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Nebr.

Trade in Your Old Typewriter On The Light Running Fox



We have in stock about 200 Fox Visible Typewriters that have been very slightly used for exhibition purposes. These typewriters are no more to be classed as second-hand stock than could goods on display in the shop windows be called second-hand. They are late models with special features, such as a tabulator, back spacer, two-color ribbon, card holder, stencil-cutter, etc., that have made Fox Typewriters famous in all the civilized countries of the world, and are complete

with fine metal cover and hardwood base.

Let us send you one of these typewriters on trial—you can buy it or send it back as you choose. If purchased pay us a little down—just whatever you can spare—and pay the balance monthly, or in all cash as you prefer.

LOCAL FOX AGENTS WANTED. SAMPLES AT WHOLESALE

If we do not already have a local representative we will let you have an absolute new, latest model, visible typewriter at our regular wholesale price. This will give you a typewriter for your own use and to use as an occasional sample to show. You can pay us for it in small monthly installments.

Write today for catalog and ask for Local Agency offer. Be sure and mention The Commoner.

Fox Typewriter Company

6407-6457 Front Ave., Grand Rapids, Mich.



From The Commoner for July

Name.....
Address.....