THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

TWENTIETH YEAR. OMAHA, TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 8, 1890. NUMBER 20.

FACTS AND FIGURES.

They Prove Beyond a Doubt that Prohibition is a Failure.

YESTERDAY'S DEBATE AT BEATRICE.

Dickie Confines Himself to Generalities and Gross Misrepresentations

WHILE SMALL DODGES THE ISSUE.

Rosewater and Webster Prove Their Statements by Indisputable Authorities.

A CONVINCING ARRAY OF STATISTICS.

The Incomparable High License Local Option Law of Nebraska Shown to be the Only Means of Regulation and Prohibition.

BEATRICE, Neb., July 7.—[Special to THE BEE.]—In the opinion of the oldest citizen of the beautiful city of Beatrice it never before since its incorporation contained such a vast concourse of people as were gathered here yesterday. People flocked in from neighboring towns and more distant points until the hotels, restaurants and other places of accommodation for the visitors were filled to overflowing and the late comers had to put up with whatever they could get. At the leading hotels crowds of hungry prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists patiently waited for hours for an opportunity to refresh the inner man. Every bed in the hotels and restaurants was occupied and in many cases the prohibitionists and the antis found that fate had willed it that they should pass at least one night together in close proximity.

The large gathering of people were all very good-natured and disposed to make the best of the situation. Quite a number found it necessary to sleep outside with the starry canopy of heaven as their only roof. In spite of several other big attractions in the city the great topic of conversation everywhere, in the lobbies of the hotels, on the streets and on the grounds, was the now celebrated prohibition versus high license debate.

This morning at an early hour vehicles of every description were seen wending their way to the grounds and long before the hour announced for the debate to commence every available space in the tabernacle was occupied.

As the debate proceeded the enormous crowd increased until it numbered fully 7,000. The audience was much better behaved than on Saturday, although Prof. Davidson found it necessary to again remind them that interruptions could not be permitted during the progress of the debate.

The irrepressible Mrs. Gougar could not keep quiet for two consecutive hours and had to put in a word now and again.

PROF. SAMUEL DICKIE.

He Makes Strong Claims and Proposes to Back Them Up.

Ladies and Gentlemen—I desire at the outset to call attention to the criticism passed upon a point in my opening address in which I laid down the proposition that civilization was marked by no one thing more clearly than by the transfer or concession of the personal liberties of the individual that he might enjoy something richer and better—the civil liberties of organized society. But I cannot restrain the expression of my surprise that these gentlemen so utterly failed to distinguish between the personal liberty of the savage and the civil liberty of the cultivated citizen. Prohibition does not intrench upon any man's civil liberties, but prohibition, so far as it does debar the drinking man from the practice of his former habits, is a perfectly proper and altogether reasonable and an entirely defensible intrenchment upon the abstract personal liberty of the individual that the self-same individual may have his civil liberties enlarged.

I want to address myself this morning to the answering of one or two questions. First, does prohibition prohibit? Now, this is a question of fact, not a matter of theory. It is to be answered not by falsely juggling with statistics, but by the presentation of the truth and by receiving the testimony of those persons most qualified to speak with authority. I am here to affirm that if human testimony is capable of proving anything it can be proved to the satisfaction of this jury that prohibition does prohibit. The case is on trial. I am not here to address you, but simply to call the witnesses and let them speak in your hearing, and I call first in this case the Hon. John A. Martin, ex-governor of the state of Kansas. Hear him: "Fully nine-tenths of the drinking and drunkenness prevalent in Kansas eight years ago has been obliterated, notwithstanding the fact that the population of the state is steadily increasing; the number of criminals confined in our penitentiary is steadily decreasing; many of our jails are empty, and all show a marked falling off in the number of prisoners confined.

Some of you have heard of the gentleman from Maine, the gentleman who defeated St. John in 1884—Mr. Blaine. In a speech delivered in Farmington on September 11, 1888, Mr. Blaine uses these words: "Maine for the last thirty-seven years has been under a prohibitory law. The state has derived great advantage from it. I think the state is far richer and far better because of that law than it would have been without it." I wonder if these gentlemen will tell you that Mr. Blaine is an untrustworthy witness in this important case.

Hon. Charles Danforth of Augusta, Me., judge of the supreme court of that state, says these words: "I can very well remember the condition of the community in regard to temperance before and at the time the prohibitory law was passed. Financial evils were prophesied, but so far as can be perceived none of them have come to pass. It is evidently true that more wholesome business is done now, and it is true that taxes are less under prohibition than they were formerly."

Hon. William Larrabee, ex-governor of Iowa, next takes the stand and testifies as follows: "Thousands of those who voted against the constitutional amendment and believed that such a law would prove a dead letter are now convinced that it can be enforced and demand its retention. Sioux City, Des Moines, Cedar Rapids and Ottumwa have banished the saloon and yet are among the most prosperous cities of the state. The benefits which have resulted to the state from the enforcement of this law are far reaching indeed. It is a well recognized fact that crime is on the increase in the United States, but Iowa does not contribute to that increase. While the number of convicts in the country at large was in 1850 one to 3,442, it was in 1880 in the country at large one to 860, but in Iowa it was one to 3,130. The jails of many counties are now empty during a good portion of the year, and the number of convicts in our penitentiaries has been reduced from 750 in March, 1886, to 604 in July, 1889. It is the testimony of the judges of our courts that criminal business has been reduced from 50 to 75 per cent. The poorer classes have better fare, better clothing, better schooling and better houses. Breweries have been converted into oat meal mills and canning factories and are operated as such by their owners."

Now who knows more about this question in Iowa, the ex-governor of Iowa or the editor of THE OMAHA BEE? [Applause.]

I give you another. Governor Larrabee also says: "It is safe to say that not one-tenth and probably not one-twentieth of the liquor is consumed in the state now as was consumed five years ago." Larrabee says that probably not one-twentieth, and yet you will find some on this platform before the day is done trying to make you believe that Iowa drinks more liquor today than she did before the passage of the prohibitory law.

Another, Hon. Mr. Humphrey, the present governor of Kansas! "Prohibition is neither a farce nor a failure. The open saloon is outlawed, the avocation of the barkeeper is gone. Since prohibition was enacted in the state it has increased in wealth, in population and in prosperity, and crime has greatly diminished."

Hon. J. J. Ingalls, United States senator from Kansas. I am too good an attorney to stop and impeach the testimony of my own witnesses or I might say something to him, but here is the testimony: "Kansas has abolished the saloon; the open dram-shop is as extinct as the sale of indulgences. A drunkard is a phenomenon, the barkeeper has joined the crusaders and the mound builders. The brewer and the distiller, and the bonded warehouses are known only to the archeologist. An archeologist very likely edits THE OMAHA BEE." [Applause].

Some more very specific testimony, R. H. McClure, clerk of Osage county: "There is no saloon in the county, drunkenness has been entirely done away with, the population of the county has doubled since prohibition began, business has kept pace with the population and capital can be had from the east with greater ease and at about two-thirds of the former rate of interest."

M. F. Wood, treasurer of Montgomery county, Independence, Kan.: "The law is a great success. There is not one barrel of whisky or one keg of beer sold in the county for ten of each sold before prohibition."

I want you to note the representative character of these men. County clerks, county treasurers, judges and public men.

Charles M. Hovey, teresurer of Thomas county: "Prohibition has been enforced as well as any other law in the state. There is not a saloon or drug store in the county where liquor can be bought for drinking purposes. I do not believe prohibition has driven away a single capitalist and I know that much money has been spent in the payment of debts that would have been spent for liquor without prohibition. Our people would be poorer were it not for prohibition."

The next is J. A. Beeman, treasurer of Osborne county: "Prohibition is a glorious success and is enforced as well as any other statute. We have no saloons or joints. The disappearance of drunkenness and drinking for beverage purposes is almost totally abolished. The tax rate has been decreased 2 per cent. Our property is assessed at about one-fifth in value. Pauperism has been decreased. We have a better class of people. Hundreds that used to spend their money for liquor are now sober, honest and industrious."

W. H. Smith, treasurer of Marshall county: "Our experience with prohibition is that it drives out the men we do not want and brings in those we do want." [Applause.] Hear this: "It sends our worst citizens to Nebraska and brings us their best people." [Applause.]

B. F. Adamson, treasurer of Jackson county: "Our business interests are on a firmer basis. Capital is coming uninvited. Money that used to find its way to the saloon tills is employed to feed, clothe and educate the children."

I have not time to read all the extracts along this line, but I wish to call your attention in passing to the testimony that comes to us from unfriendly sources. Let me read a letter from Sol Miller, editor of the Troy, Kan., Chief, who was a violent opponent of prohibition. He says: "If we had the power we would not repeal the prohibitory law. It has done great good. Even with the drinking that still exists we can see the good effects of prohibition."

Percival M. Lowe, a democratic member of the state senate in Kansas, a violent opponent of prohibition at the beginning, says: "I opposed prohibition and voted against the amendment. I advocated resubmission. The sentiment, however, is growing every day. Demagogues may sneer at the law, but I tell you it is as fixed as the law of the Medes and the Persians. Hundreds of men who believed this law would prove impracticable and work more evil than good would not now vote for an open saloon for anything under the sun, and I am one of those men."

I noticed in THE OMAHA BEE of February 24 a paragraph that reads as follows: "The sentiment of the judges of the courts of Iowa on prohibition has undergone a radical change in two years, a change no less remarkable than that registered at the ballot box last November. A majority of the judges concede that the enforcement of the law is impossible and urge the substitution of high license as the only effective means to suppress the hideous joints with their hordes of free sharks."

Now, I want to be respectful. I shall impeach no man's veracity. Newspapers sometimes make mistakes, and that statement is utterly false in every particular, and I have no doubt that on the morning after that statement saw daylight that Ananias turned over in his grave and grew green with envy. [Applause.]

We took great pains to get at the facts in the case and so sent out from New York to every one of the judges in the state of Iowa asking the truthfulness of this paragraph and giving them a copy of the same. We received responses from twenty-four persons. Out of the twenty-four judges of the district courts all of them are in favor of retaining prohibition in Iowa. [Applause.] Of the entire number but three favor repeal, and of those who have changed their sentiments there seems to be only one, and he formerly opposed but now sustains prohibition. [Applause.]

I want to ask a second question: Does prohibition injure business? It is said that prohibition has ruined Iowa. On June 30, 1887, there were thirty-seven savings banks, with total assets of $1,290,000. In two years of prohibition they have increased to fifty savings banks, with assets of $1,718,500. During the same period state banks increased from sixty-five to eighty-one and their assets from $10,776,000 to $13,170,000. In other words, the last two years, while prohibition has been ruining Iowa, we have had an increase of twenty-nine banks and an increase in their assets of $,900,000. [Applause.]

Governor Larrabee says further: "More mortgages have been lifted in Iowa last year than have been placed, a fact which cannot be stated of any previous year in the entire history of the state." [Applause].

The Topeka Capital, whose editor at the outset was unfriendly, on January 2, 1890 uses this language: "Kansas has a population today four times as great as it had in 1870. The population of the state in 1880 was 996,096; today, 1,464,000, an increase in nine years of a trifle over 50 per cent. The assessed valuation of all property in 1870 was $91,000,000, and for 1889, $160,000,000, an increase in ten years of 76 per cent. But from 1880 to 1888 it mounted up to $353,240,000, an increase in eight years under prohibition of 120 per cent." [Applause].

I have here the sworn statement of Thomas H. Benton, auditor of Nebraska, and of Timothy McCarty, auditor of Kansas. I want to give you the figures in 1889. The total valuation of Nebraska was $99,499,000, of Kansas $100,579,000; in 1889, of Nebraska $182,763,000, of Kansas $209,815,000, that is an increase in Kansas under prohibition of $290,236,000, and an increase in Nebraska under high license of $82,263,000, a difference in favor of Kansas over Nebraska of $107,970,000. [Applause].

I have carefully gone over the tax figures. I want to read to you the report on the state taxes for a number of years in these two states. I begin with 1880 and give you first Nebraska and secondly Kansas: Nebraska 39½ cents, Kansas 55 cents (notice Kansas higher in 1880 than Nebraska); 1881, Nebraska 61 cents, Kansas 50; 1882, Nebraska 67 cents, Kansas 45; 1883, Nebraska 78, Kansas 42; 1884, Nebraska 76 9-10, Kansas 45; Nebraska 77, Kansas 39; Nebraska 76, Kansas 40; Nebraska 83, Kansas 40; Nebraska 75, Kansas 34; Nebraska 63, Kansas 40, the last two being for 1889. Grouping the last five years in each state, we find an average rate of taxation upon the $100 assessed for state purposes to be as follows: In Nebraska, 74 9-10 cents; in Kansas, 38 6-10 cents, a trifle more than one-half.

I read again, from the Philadelphia Press of May 10: "A Kansas company which has negotiated $7,000,000 of loans since 1887 has foreclosed less than one per cent of its loans. A solid fact like this is worth tons of blather about the debt ridden farmer." That is what the Philadelphia Press says now, but it talked about the debt ridden farmer during the Pennsylvania campaign.

I have another from that remarkable sheet, THE OMAHA BEE. [Laughter.] On the 7th day of last April THE OMAHA BEE published an unsigned letter from Exeter, Neb., which aimed to show that during two years of no license the town had suffered greatly; business was paralyzed; property declined and industry was prostrated. The anonymous letter closed with these words: "Our business men and all dependent on county trade have been solid for high license." A number of reputable gentlemen prepared a lengthy reply and handed it up to me to read, giving the lie to the anonymous letter of April 7 in THE OMAHA BEE, and closing with this language: "That the false statements may be corrected and the truth known, we, the citizens of Exeter, would respectfully ask you to publish the above. H. G. Smith, president First National bank; C. A. Wullbrandt, general merchandise; C. A. Songster, coal and lumber; W. H. Wallace, cashier Exeter National bank; Sanford Williams, hardware and implements; Jacob Pflug, agricultural implements."

As a rule, when you find an anonymous letter in THE OMAHA BEE, or anywhere else, there is some scoundrel at the back of it that knows he is not telling the truth. [Applause.]

The Omaha World-Herald tells us that the taxes in Omaha last year were $894,000, and further than that, the said tax has therefore increased, says that paper, 30 per cent over the year before. Is it not time to call a halt?

I have another: I rather like to quote from THE OMAHA BEE. [Laughter.] I want you to hear all this because the reporters will reprint it:

"Peter Kuhlman wanted to start a saloon at No. 117 North Ninth street, next door to an evening paper. The business men in that neighborhood protested, and the fuss came up when the protestants were given a hearing. Every business man in the block, except the owner of the building where the proposed saloon was to be located testified the saloon would kill their trade. The license was refused." I am astonished that this paragraph found its way into the columns of THE OMAHA BEE. [Laughter and applause.] And I can only account for it on the theory that Mr. Rosewater was out that afternoon having his photograph taken for "Bab." [Laughter. Renewed laughter.]

Don't consume my time. On the 16th day of last February Hon. William Larrabee, ex-governor of Iowa, in a lengthy letter, uses this language: "As to the depreciation in value of real estate, occasioned by prohibition, it is sheer nonsense." Now, who knows best, ex-Governor Larrabee, or the editor of a newspaper willing to sell its space to public falsehoods concocted in Louisville, Ky.? [Applause loud and prolonged.] Values have, I believe, been sustained in Iowa as well as adjoining states where prohibition is not the rule. Money is now spent for the necessaries of life and for legitimate uses instead of being spent at the saloon. The banking business of the state is a fair barometer.

"The number of banks in the state has greatly increased, and their capital rapidly multiplied. I think more than half the jails of the state are entirely empty at the present time. There are ninety-eight less convicts in one penitentiary than there were three years ago. Expenses in criminal courts have decreased very largely during the last few years." And all this from Governor Larrabee, who declares that the talk about the decreased values of real estate in Iowa is the sheerest nonsense.

I have not time to take up the next item now. I desire to call your attention to a remark made by my friend, Mr. Rosewater, who affirmed that in the state of Nebraska there are 51 jails—or rather, he said, 51 counties—that have no prisoners in their jails. And Mr. Rosewater is a very forgetful man and he does not remember to tell you that of those 51 counties 35 of them have no jail at all. [Loud laughter.] He forgot to remind you that Adams county, with Hastings as its chief city, is yet entirely without a jail. It has prisoners, but it boards them out in the jails of surrounding counties. Butler county, of great prominence in your state, has no jail, but sends its prisoners to adjacent counties.

Now, gentlemen, I call your attention to these facts—the testimony of the most reliable and the most competent witnesses in Maine, Kansas and Iowa, and I have them here from New Hampshire and from Vermont, and in the judgment of these persons prohibition is profitable and in no place has prohibition depreciated values or infringed upon business interests. I shall this afternoon present criminal statistics showing the utter and confessed failure of high license and prove it by testimony as conclusive as the testimony presented here this morning.

HON. EDWARD ROSEWATER.

The Operations of the Nebraska and Iowa Laws Compared.

Edward Rosewater spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It amazes me that the gentleman who has scarcely touched the soil of Nebraska, who has scarcely been here more than two or three days, undertakes to question the statistics that I presented here on Saturday about the jail inmates of the state of Nebraska. He tells you that there are thirty-five counties in this state in which there are no jails. If that were true, it is the highest testimonial that high license could get. There are not thirty-five counties in the state of Iowa that get along without a jail. There are not thirty-five counties in the state of Kansas that can show that they are without a jail. But the truth is that there are about six counties in this state that have no jail, and one county that has a jail has never had an inmate in it. That is Banner county.

We have heard so much here as to the Hon. ex-Governor Larrabee and his testimony with regard to the operations of prohibition in Iowa; but Governor Larrabee, like Ben Butler, sees both ways at the same time, and he sees very remarkably out of line when he looks at figures. I have here the official publication by the secretary of state of the state of Iowa representing the criminal statistics of that state, and the expense incurred in prosecuting criminals in each of the several counties for the last four years, and I will show by them that the expenses of prosecuting criminals in Iowa have increased by more than $200,000 within the last two years. The county of Polk, in which the governor lived so long, in which Des Moines, the capitol city is located, spent over $50,000 last year in the prosecution of state criminals, and $32,000 for the prosecution of police court offenses—over $90,000 in one county—when the whole state of Nebraska spent only $167,000 for prosecuting criminals. But I suppose that an ex-governor is no better than a governor. I suppose that the governor of Iowa who has been made the successor of Larrabee by the people of Iowa who resented the hypocrisy and the arrant knavery which these prohibitionists have sought to impose upon the people of their own state and states generally—I say that his testimony ought to be considered as good as that of Mr. Larrabee, and when I prove Mr. Larrabee to have falsified the record in regard to criminal courts, all his statements fall to the ground.

Let me call your attention to last fall, when Governor Larrabee was delivering a lecture or an address lauding prohibition in the town of Ottumwa, in which he, I suppose, was electioneering; and while he was talking that prohibition was a great success a wagon load of hay stood within twenty yards of him full of bottles of beer and beer was being dealt out to the crowd. That is a fact. I was in Iowa at the time myself. [Long and loud laughter.] It is not necessary for me to say that I was in Sioux City when this happened. [Laughter.] And Mr. Larrabee was there on the occasion of the reception of the Pan-American congress, and men came over from Ottumwa to receive the Pan-Americans—eye witnesses, that were present at that very time.

Now, here is a letter from Governor Boies:

DES MOINES, IA., June 28, 1890.—E. Rosewater, Esq.—Dear Sir: The practical operation of prohibition in this state seems to lay, according to the political standpoint from which the question is viewed; our republican friends insist it is a success, the democrats that it is a failure. The conservative element in both parties reach the exact truth when they declare that in the rural districts the law is fairly well enforced and that in the large cities it is openly and totally ignored, or constantly violated by secret sales amply sufficient to meet the demand. This has been the true situation in Iowa since the law was enacted. Occasionally some of the cities will make a temporary effort to enforce the law, but such efforts are spasmodic, and in a little while the business is resumed either openly or secretly.

I feel certain that more distilled spirits are used as a beverage in Iowa under the present law than ever have been or ever would be under a license system, but on the other hand there is less malt liquor used. I am equally sure that the spirits used are the worst kind. Taking the state together there is no doubt but that prohibition has failed to lessen the evils of intemperance, has retarded immigration into and hastened emigration from the same, and that it has destroyed most of the capital invested in breweries and distilleries, great laughter), ruined those industries and is constantly draining the state of immense sums of money sent to other states for the purchase of intoxicating liquors.

Let us say one word here. My predecessor has stated that all the breweries in Iowa have been converted—or rather, perhaps Governor Larrabee said it—that all the breweries have been converted into oat meal factories, and they are run by the men who own them. I for one will say that I know at least one party that went from Council Bluffs and located in Chattanooga and is running a brewery there, and the Council Bluffs brewery has not been converted into anything in particular, so far as I know. [Cries of "Good," "Good."] It is a pretty difficult thing to convert a brewery, I suppose. [Great laughter.]

I will read here:

I do not believe that crime has been diminished or criminal expenses by this law, or that criminal convictions are less now than they were before the law went into effect. Instead thereof, if we count prosecutions, convictions and expenses incurred under this law they have been greatly increased.

The cry that our jails and penitentiaries are being emptied is premature. We never needed but one penitentiary in this state, and when we built two more, we had one more than was actually needed. This was so before prohibition was enacted and is so still to a large extent. More wives and children have been impoverished by exorbitant fines imposed by this law than have ever been relieved in this state by all the evils of intemperance combined, [laughter] and through the same means more families have been separated and disgraced by the imprisonment of husbands and brothers. The state is full of cases of such extreme hardship that my predecessor was constantly compelled to extend executive clemency to save whole families from the poor house, and I can do nothing less than follow in his footsteps. The more I know of the practical workings of this law the more thoroughly convinced I am that its enactment was a stupendous blunder that Iowa will not recover from in years. Very truly yours,

HORACE BOIES.

While I was sitting on this platform a letter was handed to me this morning voluntarily, signed by a banker from the town of Logan, and I will read it to you. It is directed from Logan direct to Beatrice:

LOGAN, Ia., July 7, 1890.—Hon. E. Rosewater, esq., Beatrice, Neb.—Dear sir: Will you pardon a suggestion in regard to my idea of "prohibition?" I would like to have you ask the temperance folks what they are going to do with the "billiard halls" and "temperance pool rooms" after they get a prohibitory law. Our experience is that these so-called temperance billiard halls are as bad as the open saloon. A prohibitory law will not close the loafing places where temperance drinks are sold, and it is my opinion that a plain saloon, without "games" of any kind, is better than billiard saloons or rooms where temperance drinks are alone sold. As you can see the idea better than I can explain it [laughter] I will not bother you with a long letter.

Yours, CHARLES F. LUDE,
Proprietor Logan Bank.

Now, I want to say right here that so much has been said about the wonderful increase of banks and barber shaving shops in the state of Iowa, you will be very much rejoiced to hear that the state of Iowa has got more money than the state of Nebraska; but that is not true, for all that. There has been twice as much increase in bank capital in the state of Nebraska during the same period as there has been in the state of Iowa. As I expect to talk on the state of Iowa more fully, I will devote myself to the state of Kansas.

Kansas business men favored prohibition, not from a moral but from a business standpoint, believing that the moral phase of the question would attract the most desirable character of emigration. At first this was true, but seven or eight years of actual experience has knocked all the sentiment out of even the prohibitionists themselves when they see the saloon supplemented by the joint, which is the most damnable form yet assumed by the demon of intemperance. The only consistent temperance state officer in office in Kansas today is Attorney General L. F. Kelleg. All the rest from the governor down are consumers of intoxicating liquors. This is a fact, and can be verified. The present governor disgraced himself and state last summer while in Colorado and was advertised as a drunken bum in Colorado.

About three weeks ago that wonderful attorney general of Kansas, who has said so much upon the prohibition question, and made a living out of it by lecturing in other states also, hired a plumber to look after some trouble or leak in his house, and the plumber struck two or the boxes of ale and beer lying in his cellar, and presently the whole town became aware of it. This is what a great many others are that advocate prohibition on one day and do their drinking on the next day.

It is said here again that prohibition has absolutely eliminated the liquor business in the state of Kansas. I sent a man by the name of Thompson, a thoroughly sober, reliable man, out of the city of Omaha and he spent three weeks in Kansas and got back only last week. I have a great many of the reports that I propose to read now.

"In many towns in Kansas the express companies have built additions to their warehouses for the express purpose of caring for the jug trade, and have put on extra wagons of a peculiarly low build in which these beverages are delivered at night to joints, clubs and private houses.

"A brewery in Milwaukee ships three car loads of bottled beer into Kansas every day, which alone would amount to more than what the prohibitionists claim is the total consumption in the state.

"The Anheuser-Busch bottling company——"

Well, I won't go further, because it is not necessary to detail all. [Laughter.] Well, it simply refers to other breweries, and I am not going to advertise them. [Laughter.] It costs money. [Renewed laughter.]

"The drug business is prostituted so that the good men are cut and poor ones in. Some druggists sell over three gallons of the extract or essence of jamaica ginger, three ounces a dose. The druggists buy one barrel of alcohol and a barrel of whisky, or rather twenty-three of alcohol to one of whisky. Bay rum is 50 per cent alcohol. The sales are to people of prohibition proclivities who cannot get access to clubs.

"A car load of beer was closed out between 12 m. and 9 p. m. of the same day by an original package man in Topeka. The express companies of Topeka earn during some months of the year $2,400 per month each. (There are three of them, or $7,500 per month.) Supposing the express charges to represent 20 per cent of the cost of goods, we would have not far from $40,000 spent for intoxicating liquors, or about $1 each per year for every man, woman and child in Topeka, Kas., population about forty thousand.

"Topeka is full of club houses, which include among their members boys from fifteen years up to gray haired men, who are supplied by the jug houses of Kansas City. Drinking to excess is common, hundreds of young men are becoming demoralized and lost. In Monmouth township, this county [Shawnee county] four young boys ranging from twelve to fifteen years, entered a church during service reeling drunk and spewed all over the floor, seats, etc., of course supplied from Kansas City. 'The boys have caught on.'

"A number of respectable Swedish young men whom the prohibitionists had denied or deprived of beer, took to more portable whiskey and are today confirmed drunkards. In North Topeka the boys and men chip in 25 cents to Kansas City, get a keg of beer which is stored in a stable or butcher shop and at night drank by this embryo club. About fifteen kegs per week is the average from the North side.

"Shawnee county, Kansas, is called the banner prohibition county of the United States. A careful investigation on the ground proves that prohibition is not affecting the morals of Kansas a particle, there being as much if not positively more crime now than formerly. Since the adoption of the prohibition amendment in 1881 the criminal cases have more than doubled. This statement is verified by the court records. The cost of criminal prosecution has been kept a profound secret with a prohibition auditor's aid by a committee on suppression during the present campaign. However, he will be compelled to either make a correct statement or refuse to, either of which would be an admission of guilt. About one year ago it was published in the prohibition papers of the land, including Voice, New York, that in Shanee county, Kansas, in other words, in Topeka, there were no criminals for trial.

"The naked truth was that the old county attorney was going out and the new county attorney was going in. The out-going attorney did not have the cases docketed. There was the usual number ready for trial. At the last term of court in 1889 there were eighty-nine criminal cases on the docket, several of which represented more than one prisoner, making over one hundred prisoners ready for trial. Of these over forty were felonies and at least two were murder cases. Since January 1, 1889, there have been 240 cases on the docket of the district court in Shanee county, Kansas, and at least thirty-five have been sent to the penitentiary."

We have been told that prohibition does not injure business. I will read the following upon that subject:

"The following capitalists and prominent business men in the state, after having almost ruined their home town of Topeka, have left for more congenial climes and have sought more promising opportunities for investing their wealth: B. M. Davies, vice-president bank of Topeka, gone to Chicago because of the depression in business in Topeka caused by prohibition; Dr. Malvane, violent prohibitionist, wealthy, gone to Chicago; ex-Mayor Metsgar of Topeka, gone to Sedalia, Mo., same reason; John Morse, lime, cement and brick business, gone to Denver, Colo., same reason; on Kansas avenue, Topeka, over one mile long, five out of six business men and clerks declare for resubmission.

"The old republican prohibition party held a convention June 10 for the purpose of sending delegates to the congressional convention at Emporia June 24, next introduced a resolution favoring prohibition and against the original package business. The wild-eyed prohibition republicans tabled it promptly, not daring to discuss the subject in open convention."

Now, while Mr. Thompson was in the city of Topeka, he went to work and passed up and down the main street of the city of Topeka with this proposition: A ballot box was presented to every person, and each business man was asked to drop into that box a ballot, whether it was for or against resubmission; and we have here the affidavit of the man who took that ballot. And he makes this certificate (reading):

State of Kansas, Shawnee county, ss.

W. H. Kenny, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I was employed to take the vote of Kansas avenue, in Topeka, Kan., on the question of prohibition and resubmission.

On the 5th and 6th days of June, 1890, I visited all the stores and offices on the ground floor on Kansas avenue from the river to Eighth street, with the exception of the Rock Island depot and one hardware and one grocery store, and presented the ballot box to the employers, those actively engaged in business, and their employes, and requested them to deposit a ballot either for prohibition or resubmission. The vote was secretly indicated and after I had finished I opened the same in the presence of Hon. J. B. Crouch of Florence, Kan., Mr. C. D. Thompson of Omaha, Neb., Mr. Hibbard of Topeka, Mr. Beecher Stearns and A. L. Allen, and the ballots were taken from said box and carefully counted, and the vote was announced in the presence of the said gentlemen. The result is as follows:

Three hundred and three votes for resubmission and one hundred and sixty for prohibition. Only about twenty persons refused to vote, and I gave all the employers and employes at the places visited the full opportunity to deposit the ballot of their choice.

W. H. KENNY.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 6th day of June, A. D. 1890.

O. T. MCCABE, Notary Public.

We come now to the operations of prohibition as found in the different cities in Kansas:

"Lawrence, Kan.' is a college and church town of 17,000 population, chiefly from New England. Prohibition has been fostered with a jealous care. In 1882 there were ten or twelve open saloons and there were no holes in the wall or boot-leggers, now there are fully twenty places where liquors are clandestinely sold. Ex-Governor Charles Robinson, the war governor of Kansas, an able man and having large interests here, stated to Mr. Thompson that he knew that liquor was sold in from seventeen to twenty-five places in Lawrence, for, said he, 'I own a large farm just near this city, I employ a number of men; among them is a man, a capable fellow, whom I dare not send to Lawrence for fear he will get drunk. Today, June 19, I sent him to town with two loads of wheat; it is now near 5 p. m. and I have not found him yet. He is in some hole in the wall drunk. He has a family and is totally dependent on me for work to support them. But I will be obliged to turn him out of doors on account of rum-holes in the city of Lawrence. When this man finds one of these places, and they are not hard to find, he seems to be afraid he may not get in again and drinks to drunkenness. Yes, there are clubs to ruin the boys and they are making use of their opportunities. I have not use for liquor; I am a tetotlar, but I have no use for Kansas prohibition. It is a farce, breeding hypocrits.'

"The negroes and the least self-respecting young men patronize the joints, the 'bloods' have formed clubs where liquors of all kinds are kept. Each member owns a key and goes at will to the common stock. He is entirely without restraint; his ruinds only a matter of time.

"A younger class of boys procure a flask of whisky which they carry in their pockets. They meet in barns and dark alleys and drink it, and thus acquire an appetite for the strong beverage. Prohibition in Kansas is simply supplanting beer with whisky, the more portable. It is causing men to drink to drunkenness who were satisfied with a glass of beer before.

"The proprietor of the Eldridge house, the best hotel in Lawrence, a Mr. Cohn, runs an open joint in his house, presided over by his colored porter. He sold to minors, to negroes, to drunkards, to everybody. He was arrested, convicted and sentenced to pay a fine of $100 and imprisonment, but just as soon as sentence was passed his friends, prohibitionists, who were in telegraphic communication with Governor Humphry at Topeka, received a pardon for him. The poor negro, who was only his hireling, still languishes in jail because forsooth his master will not pay the fine which was not remitted.

"Business is stagnant and whole rows of business places can be found empty in Lawrence. It should be borne in mind that Lawrence is pointed to as a place where prohibition is a success. It is naturally a quiet town and the conditions are good for its success, but in proportion to population and its class of citizens taken into consideration there is as much liquor consumed in Lawrence as in any city in Kansas. I counted eight cases of beer and four kegs before the express office on the sidewalk and was told that entire wagon loads of beer came through the express office."

Now, her is Leavenworth. When I was in Leavenworth in 1886 it was also prohibition time. There were 150, and probably more, saloons running wide open. There was no effort made to enforce prohibition. At that time, if I remember right, the city of Leavenworth was quoted with a population of over 30,000, in 1887. By the election of a new city government they got in some very rigid regulations and they closed the saloons to all intents and purposes. [Applause.] Now, what is the result? The present population of Leavenworth is 20,558, a falling off of over 10,000 from the census of 1880.

I want any prohibitionist to explain that to me and show why the city of Leavenworth has decreased 10,000 in her population. In 1887 this city had a population of 31,210. It was during that year that the saloons were closed up at the front door and business driven to the joints, where it has since been going on with much success for the benefit of those engaged in the traffic, but to the injury of business and the revenues of the city.

The effect of prohibition on business and property values has been very destructive. Real estate is a drug on the market. At no time in the history of the city have there been so many empty store houses in the business streets of the city. Such a condition of affairs did not exist prior to 1887, before any attempt was made to the enforcement of the law which is not enforced.

I met Mr. Byers of Leavenworth two days ago at Omaha. He owns $150,000 in real estate and has been a resident of Leavenworth for more than twenty years. Mr. Byers fought for prohibition, and he told me the thing was not only a failure and an imposition, but it had been a [illegible] to his city, and has destroyed more property values than if the city had been struck by a cyclone.

Now, how is it in Kansas about breweries? In the county of Atchison a brewery has been in operation without let or hindrance since the operation of the law. In Leavenworth all that class of business has been stopped. [Applause.]

From January 1 to July 1, 1890, for five months, the arrests for drunkenness in the city of Leavenworth were 213, by the official report of the public court. And now we come to Atchison.

In the city of Atchison the police court shows that during the year 1889, 1,171 arrests were made, of which 278 were for drunkenness and disturbances.

Atchison has been just like Leavenworth. It has been a dead town, paralyzed by prohibition. Business is languishing, and all improvements are at a standstill. I counted twenty-five empty store houses on Commercial street, and saw but one building in the course of construction.

The city of St. Joseph, Mo., has been enjoying undue prosperity at the expense of Atchison and Leavenworth. There are sixteen drug stores in Atchison county, and fourteen of these are in the city of Atchison. Their reports of sales show all the way from 20 to 400 for each store per month.

There are eleven places on Commercial street where liquor is sold. On ordinary days, a load of beer is distributed on this street, and on Saturday night four wagon loads are left at dives along this street. There is one butcher, who sells about two pounds of meat a day, has a joint in the rear from which he gets his revenue. Farther up the street there is a large cave which is utilized as a saloon. There is a beer garden with shade trees and a merry-go-round. It is said that two wagon loads of beer are disposed of there alone. Down along the railroad tracks there are dives where murderhas been committed frequently, and, of course, by reason of there being no regulative requirement by the police, the worst class of men are dealing out the deadly poison.

Now I want to read you some testimonials:

O. H. Bentley, senator of the Twenty-ninth district of Kansas, residing at Wichita, says: "I have experienced nine years of prohibition in Kansas. It is a delusion and a snare. It increases taxes and cuts off entirely the natural immigration of a new state. Had Kansas never been afflicted with prohibition Wichita today would have 100,000 people. Prohibition drains the state of ready cash. It has driven 100,000 people out of Kansas and has lost several hundred thousand in immigration to the state. It is a greater curse to the state than hot winds or grasshoppers. It is only a question of time till Kansas rids herself of prohibition. In my judgment no greater calamity can happen to Nebraska than to adopt constitutional prohibition. Prohibition has cost Sedgwick county during nine years of prohibition $800,000.

"If the state of Nebraska wishes to lose population, to destroy her immigration, to paralize her present city and farm values, let her adopt prohibition. The cry that prohibition is the moral side of the question is all humbug; prohibition means free whisky."

Small and Webster.

The Rev. Sam Small followed Mr. Rosewater in a rambling dissertation on Mr. Rosewater and very little reference to the main issue. Mr. Webster closed the morning debate with a masterly argument sustaining his side of the question. He said he had heard nothing from Mr. Dickie except his reading from a little pamphlet prepared to further one side of a political campaign in Kansas. He questioned the value of such testimonials. The audience was enthusiastic in its applause at every antiquated point that Mr. Dickie or Small made. In one instance a Mr. Green interrupted one of the high license speakers and was directed to keep quiet by Prof. Davidson, which he did very reluctantly.

THE AFTERNOON DEBATE.

Rev. Small Speaks His Piece and is Followed by Mr. Rosewater.

The debate was resumed at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Some question arose as to who should speak first. The matter was finally settled and Rev. Sam Small ascended the rostrum. He was greeted with applause and upon its subsidence he waded into his subject with his usual vehemence.

He stated that he had hitherto paid the most attention to Mr. Rosewater, but this afternoon he would make Mr. Webster the general subject of his references. "Brother Dickie and I did not import this question of prohibition into Nebraska, neither were considerations of purity, home and prosperity imported into Nebraska by me."

He elaborated on the McNickle incident in the last Nebraska legislature, wherein that gentleman concluded to betray his constituents because of his boy's blue eyes. He then devoted considerable time to Mr. Webster in an effort to impeach his evidence by plain denials. The clergy know that the bible teaches prohibition. He did not slander Omaha and Nebraska, he only held aside the curtain and showed the photograph.

He denied slandering some of these public speakers and representatives of Nebraska. "In all due respect to Senator Paddock, who has represented your state in Washington for years, I say there is no reflection in the east which would indicate that he has set the Potomac on fire, and yet Senator Paddock permits to be sold in his building in this city the damnable stuff that makes drunkards."

Mr. Rosewater, following Mr. Small, said:

"A few years ago there appeared in this country a great lecturer from Great Britain, whose theme was 'Why Don't God Kill the Devil?' and I have been almost compelled to ask in the past few days, why does he permit a clown to be a preacher?"

The reverend gentleman was so severely scored that the audience was compelled to applaud a little. His argument was able and convincing, and he was in turn followed by Mr. Dickie and he by Mr. Webster.

The general verdict of the public over the debate tonight is that Messrs. Rosewater and Webster are the masters of