THE OMAHA DAILY BEE.

TWENTIETH YEAR. OMAHA, FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 11, 1890. NUMBER 23.

THE DEBATE AT BEATRICE.

Webster Closes the Arguments in Favor of High License.

STRONG ANTI-PROHIBITION FACTS.

More Government Liquor Licenses Issued in Iowa Than in Nebraska —Frequent Interruptions by Small and Dickie.

Below is given a full stenographic report of the argument of Hon. John L. Webster at the Beatrice Chautauqua assembly Monday afternoon. This is the concluding argument on the part of the high-license advocates. Prof. Dickie's closing argument will appear in tomorrow's issue of THE BEE.

WEBSTER'S LAST TALK.

He Uses Government Records to Defend High License.

Ladies and gentlemen: The president makes the announcement that I have forty-five minutes to talk in favor of high license. When this meeting opened this afternoon that same president said, when he introduced the first speaker, that he should have forty-five minutes to talk in favor of prohibition. I listened to him for the forty-five minutes, and I did not hear anything said about prohibition or the constitutional amendment. I heard a good deal said about John L. Webster. I furnished this "original package" quite a subject for discussion. And I came pretty near to the conclusion that if I had not been here Mr. Small would not have had anything to talk about for the last forty-five minutes of this debate. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say simply to this people that the original package decision that he talked about broke the backbone of prohibition in the state of Iowa, in the state of Kansas, and everywhere else; and if this little original package which sits at my left hand shall keep running on, he shall break the backbone of the state of Nebraska. [A voice: Yes, sir.]

Do you know what an original package is? It is one of these little things that you put up in a great big bottle, with the cork in it sealed up, that you ship around the country as a sealed package, and when you want to know the contents, all you have to do is to pay the price and pull the cork and let the lasses run. So this great prohibition Maine has hired this "little package," and shipped you out to Nebraska [applause], and I suppose at the rate of about $50 or $100 a day, and you can pull the cork for forty-five minutes and let it run. [Laughter.]

But, ladies and gentlemen, I have something more serious to talk about this afternoon than to waste my forty-five minutes in talking about and advertising my little friend. I like him, I would like to entertain him, I would like to advertise him; but I came down here to talk about a great subject which he seems to run away from, and I want to talk to you a little while. He did talk about manufacturing about two minutes, after I had shown his audience of intelligent people that prohibition had wrecked manufacturing industries in the three prohibition states of New England; and my friend here thought to escape my argument, not by answer, but to talk about ship building, as if to tell this audience that 1,059 ship building institutions had been driven out of the state of Maine! Why, great God, don't you know that they never had but two ship building institutions in the state of Maine in thirty years! Where did they go to? Driven out. Has he named you one? Why, no; but he throws out the remark as if they had all gone down in the southern states there as soon as the war was over. Have you got a ship building institution in the state of Georgia? I want to tell my friend that I know one thing to be true: thank God for the personal liberty of the north; we have gone down into some of those states in the south after the war was over, we have given you manufactories, we have given you industries, we have given you banks, and increased the high civilization of the people; but we did it after we had taken personal liberty down there at the end of the bayonet first. [Applause.]

My lady friend who sits here on this platform told me after the adjournment at noon that this Chautauqua assembly had granted her one hour after this talk was over, and she proposed to use it in roasting Mr. Rosewater and myself. [Laughter.] (Mrs. Gougar—Just you.) Just myself. [Laughter.] (Mrs. Gougar—Much obliged for advertising me.) She tells me now that she proposes to give that hour solely to me. [Laughter.] I do not know that I shall have an opportunity to reply to that, and I simply ask of this audience that when Mrs. Gougar speaks here for one hour and roasts John L. Webster, that you will listen to her kindly, and remember also when it is over that it is a woman's gracious privilege. [Laughter.]

Another word about this great state of Georgia, from which was shipped this little original package [Laughter], and I want to speak of it simply because I see that he and this lady are so closely linked together. I suppose it is a mutual understanding and a combination to roast me; one speaks for prohibition and the other for woman suffrage, and neither one of them ever speaks unless they link both subjects together, like a piece of dress cloth. But, down in that great state of Georgia, with which Mrs. Gougar, from the state of Indiana, would link the little package—down from the state of Georgia, that Governor Gordon that you talk about, patriot that he is, talking to the confederates and the fedgrates together at that same ceremony—was the same Governor Gordon who, in the month of last April issued a commission from his office as governor of the state of Georgia, under the state capitol that I talked about, appointing a man down there as whipping master, whose duty it was to go out and whip the women who were sent to the penitentiary as convicts. And if they violated the prison rules of the state of Georgia, the whipping master appointed by the great Governor Gordon inflicts the lashes upon their backs. If that is the kind of woman suffrage you want (turning to Mrs. Gougar), and if he is the man to defend it, you are welcome to him. [Applause.]

[Mr. Small—We are going to change all that when we get woman suffrage.]

I want to talk against prohibition a little while; that is the thing that I was brought down here for, and I expect to go home with the declaration and a clear conscience that I have at least talked about it a part of the time since I have been down here, as much as these people would let me. For the two periods of time which were allowed to this discussion and which have already gone by, we have been talking about everything, perhaps, except the simple question whether prohibition prohibits.

I do not believe there is any sensible man or woman here that wants to vote prohibition into a constitution if you believe that it is going to be a dead letter when it is there and is not going to do anybody any good. If you are going to put it there simply for the sake of the idea, without accomplishing any result, then I want to tell you that you are trifling with the great fundamental instrument by which your government is maintained. I tell you prohibition is wrong in principle. And when my friend talks about prohibition being a law of nature, I have listened here for two days to have some man tell me where he finds prohibition in nature, or where he finds prohibition in the bible; but I am met with the very general declaration that had no meaning, they never tried to find it, and have no evidence of the truth of the statement. My friend Small in the last talk he gave you came about as near giving an illustration as anybody has since the discussion opened, when he was appealing to the farmers of this state against railroads, and rung in with it a little about the tariff proposition, as if that was to carry prohibition!

Have you ever heard or read of an act of congress which prohibited the importation of commerce into the United States? I tell you no. What you read is the great tariff laws of the country was simply a production, and if you import a certain article you should pay a certain revenue upon it in the form of a tariff. What was it? Why, I tell you it was simply a regulation fixed upon the importation of merchandise, just the kind of a regulation we put upon the man who sees that in our high license city if you run a saloon you shall pay a license to the government for the privilege of doing it. Why, it is regulation, not prohibition.

Go a little further: The thought was thrown out that because somewhere in the bible, during the time of Moses, that certain things were prohibited, that that was prohibition. Let me see just a minute about that sort of thing. We have in the bible a great many things which are denounced as wrong. Among these is larceny, lasciviousness, drunkenness, and a host of other evils, but nowhere, I tell you, Rev. Samuel Small, within the lids of the bible, do you find laid down any law by which it is declared that you shall be prohibited to the extent of carrying on all these things out of which those evils come. You are talking about the prohibition of the manufacture and the sale of liquor. I tell you the man cannot lay his finger upon the words where there is a prohibition against the manufacture of wine in the bible. Drunkenness is denounced, crime is denounced; just precisely as the civil law of this state denounces crime, it denounces larceny, it denounces forgery, it denounces theft, it denounces burglary, and these are simply punishments inflicted upon the man who commits the crime itself under process of regulation.

Let me illustrate the fact a little: We have it put down in our statutes that the man who steals property and is convicted of the crime, shall be sent to the penitentiary. It is made a penitentiary crime—and why is larceny committed? It is because the man who steals my property has no right to it; he wants it for his own use. He misappropriates it; he takes it from me without any equivalent. We punish him, and because he loved the money which he stole, have we any law in the great state of Nebraska prohibiting a man from having money.

When a man commits the crime of forgery he is sentenced to the penitentiary. If he forges a check upon the bank upon which I happen to have a little deposit, does the law step in with the constitutional amendment, and say that you shall not write checks for fear that a man who is disposed to criminality will commit forgery? We convict persons of passing counterfeit money, and for the correction of it, and because they love money, too, do we prohibit the use and having of money? I tell you, gentlemen, if you prohibit the use and having of money by constitutional amendment or otherwise, and you could not pay it out for services, your little "original package" from the state of Georgia would not be here at all. [Applause.]

Mr. Small—I will come for nothing whenever you are up.

Why, the thing is wrong in principle from beginning to end. I ask the people simply to consider any suggestions which may be made by those who follow me in this prohibition camp meeting which I am advised will last for two or three days after I go away, for fear I shall have converted some of your people, and you want to get them back in the fold. In that great prohibition camp-meeting, when they give their illustrations about prohibition, I want you to probe them and see whether or not they are simple matters of regulation.

Does it ever prohibit? Somebody in this audience was anxious on one or two occasions to ask me about the state of Kansas and the state of Iowa. At that time I could not say anything about those two prohibition states, as I did not have sufficient time. I want now to give you a little table on that subject, and I will commence with the state of Iowa. You had prohibition, constitutional prohibition there beginning in 1884, and you had constitutional prohibition in the state of Iowa for a great many years prior to that time. Well, they have down here in the city of New York a newspaper; they call it the Voice; they ship it here to the state of Nebraska to convert these people in favor of prohibition and as against high license. I will turn to the paper called the Voice, under date of July 3, and find in it a pelated table showing the amount of liquors and beer consumed in the states of the union, except that the man who got it up forgot to put in Maine, but they got Iowa in there.

Mr. Dickie—It was published in THE BEE.

Mr. Webster—Well, that is worse yet. My friend Dickie here asserts that it was published in the interest of the liquor dealers. Has it come to this, that the only prohibition organ you have on God's green earth has sold out to the liquor interest? [Applause.]

Mr. Dickie—You don't want to be responsible for that!

Mr. Webster—I am responsible for the statement that that paper published it, and it is a prohibition paper, and I have a right to accept it as proof that you endorsed it as true.

Mr. Dickie—Yes, it is.

Mr. Webster—Then don't kick about it and try to get out of it. What did you publish it in the liquor interest for?

Mr. Dickie—We did not do so.

Mr. Webster—Let me tell you what the results are. That paper says that in 1886 there was sold of malt liquors in the state of Iowa 197,372 barrels. And in the state of Nebraska for the same year there were sold but 84,838 barrels of beer. Put it down in gallons: Thirty-one gallons to the barrel, and here is the table: There was sold in the state of Iowa in 1886, under constitutional prohibition, 6,118,000 gallons of beer. In the high license state of Nebraska—and you little "original package" man listen to this—only 2,629,000 gallons; or, in other words, in that little package state of Iowa, under prohibition, you drank 3,488,000 more gallons of beer than the people of our state. [Applause].

Let us take that same little bit of a table and get another thing out of it. I want to see what they were doing in New Hampshire at the same time, in 1886. They brought down there, according to that same table, 32,960 barrels of beer; that is about a barrel to the man, because you have only a little over 30,000 people down there. Reducing it to gallons, you have 1,019,760 gallons of beer sold in that little bit of a state of New Hampshire. While in the state of Nebraska, with four times the population of the state of New Hampshire, four times as big as New Hampshire, we consumed but 2,629,970 gallons of beer. Or, in other words, in prohibition New Hampshire, one-fourth the size of the state of Nebraska, they drank 7,680,782 more gallons of beer than did our high license people out here. [Applause.] I want to tell you, fellow citizens of the state of Nebraska, that you are living in a virtuous, well behaved state, if you only knew it. [Applause.] If they transferred some of you good prohibition people of the state of New Hampshire, or over in the state of Maine, where they drink so much beer, you would lose your identity in about twenty-four hours. [Applause.]

I want to give my friend over here the benefit of another table. I want to say to these same people that Senator Blair, from the state of New Hampshire, wrote a book giving the history of the temperance movement covering over six hundred pages, and put the same table in the book from which I gather this statement and from which I can give precisely the same computation, and Mr. Blair vouches for its correctness. He tells you in that book that he had a statement prepared for his own use; he tells who prepared it, got it at his solicitation, and of late years the Voice publishes the same thing; and when I use that against them, they come back and make complaint against that paper as if it was published in the liquor interest. In that same book of Senator Blair's there is another table that is very interesting reading. Mark you, I am taking this from the prohibition side; I am not taking anything out of a pamphlet; I am not taking it out of any circular; I am not gathering it from any Kansas prohibition campaign.

My friend did say that in Dakota they had an argument that is pretty near as good as the one I made up here. I want to thank these people for their intelligence in finding out so much truth. [Laughter.] The only thing I had observed about it was that if that little "original package" had known about that thing so long he did not try to answer a thing that was not true.

Mr. Small—There was nothing in it. [Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. Webster—That's all right; the laugh turns around, you know. So this fun can go on; the fun can't end until Small and I leave here. [Laughter.]

Let me take another table here. There is another table published in that same book, and vouched for by Senator Blair, which is found on page 155. I give the page so that Mrs. Gougar may find it any time. [Laughter.] On page 155 is a table giving the number of saloons in the various states of the union in proportion to the number of inhabitants in these states. Now, look at good, old prohibition Maine a minute: According to this table by Blair, for the purpose of showing the great evil of the saloon business, and I admit the evil, I admit it is a horrible thing in Maine, if this table is true. Senator Blair in that table which is put in that book figures it out that in the state of Iowa there is one saloon for every 377 persons. Pretty good prohibition isn't it? Yes, that is getting it around pretty near every man's door isn't it? Down in New Hampshire there is one saloon for every 376 people. Over in Kansas they have done a little better. They have only one saloon down there under prohibition to 877. They have not had prohibition quite so long as they have had in Maine. I think when they have had it as long as they had in Maine they will have more saloons. In Maine they have one saloon to for every 731 people; in Iowa they have one saloon to every 377 New Hampshire, they have one saloon to every 376 people.

Now, good people, let me talk to you a minute about Nebraska. I have tried to hold up the banner of the state from this time I began this discussion, and I am ready to hold it up now; I am ready to prove from prohibition arguments that, notwithstanding all this howl about the benefits of prohibition there are a less number of drinking places in the state of Nebraska under high license proportionate to the population than you have got in your old prohibition states, and I read it from that same record which shows that in Nebraska there is only one saloon to every 487 people. [Applause.] How do you like that? I tell you with that number of saloons, one to only 487 people, we are not hunting for little original packages like they are in Kansas and Iowa. [Applause.]

Another thing; the government of the United States keeps a record of all the licenses which are issued by the government for retail saloonkeepers. They qualify them under the head of retail liquor dealers, and that is the character of the stamp. Any man who sells liquor without that stamp is liable to be arrested. If he has that stamp he is protected from arrest. Well, I have that report issued by the commissioner of internal revenue, and I want to say to you that it is the only authentic report accessible to any man, determining the number of licenses which are sold by the government to retail liquor dealers throughout the United States. Well, what does it show? It shows this: On page 35 of that record—and I want to tell these people where to find it, if they think I am not telling the truth about it—on pages 35 to 37 of that record will be found a table which shows that in the year 1889, which is the last completed year, mark you, there were issued to the state of Iowa under the prohibition constitution, under the same doctrine that you advocate, which you say does prohibit, 3,575 licenses as retail liquor dealers. Very good, isn't it, for prohibition Iowa? Yes. It is no wonder they have got down there one saloon to every 400 or 500 people, according to that. It proves what Senator Blair said to be true.

Mr. Small—You fellows have got them and run away with them.

Mr. Webster—Mr. Small must say we run away with them or something like that. We fought for fun, I reckon, and took them down south.

Mr. Small—Yes, yes. [Applause.]

Mr. Webster—That reminds me of the remark that Mr. Small made about Maine. He said if it was not because you had scoundrels in office, and they didn't enforce the prohibition law, there would not be any drinking down in Maine at all. Substantially that; those are not the words, but that is the idea. The officers were scoundrels and would not enforce the law. When you have had prohibition in Maine for thirty-four years, and you have controlled every election, you have put it in your platform at every election, you have elected all your governors, all your officers, from the prohibition party—has it come to this, that prohibition officers, elected by prohibition people, have all turned out to be such scoundrels as that? [Applause.] Do not blame that on us high license people, because we are not in power down there.

I want to compare Iowa licenses a little bit with Nebraska: Nebraska and the territory of the Dakotas in 1889, before Dakota became a state, were linked together in one, representing the northern district, so that there was kept but one record, and the whole number of licenses for that same year, issued to what now constitutes the two Dakotas and the state of Nebraska all combined, amounted to 3,663; or, in other words, less than one hundred more than in the state of Iowa alone. We took the pains, knowing Mr. Peters, the collector of internal revenue, who keeps the records in Omaha, to ask him for our convenience to seperate the territories of Dakota from the state of Nebraska, and we find that that the licenses issued to Nebraska for 1889 were less than eighteen hundred; or, in other words, less than one-half of the liquor licenses sold to the prohibition state of Iowa. [Applause.]

Now, I want to give you a little astonishing record, because some of you people tell me that high license does not regulate or tend to prohibit. The state of Iowa in 1889 had four times as many licenses for retail liquor dealers as in the state of Alabama; twice as many as in the state of Michigan; more than in the state of Colorado; nine times as many as in the state of Florida; twice as many as in the state of Georgia; more than Minnesota; more than Montana; four times as many as South Carolina; twice as many as Tennessee; more than the great state of Texas; more than Virginia; five times as many as West Virginia; and one and a half times as many as Oregon. Does not it appear from the official records of the government of the United States that in your high license states there are less saloons, according to the official report, than in your prohibition states of Iowa and of Kansas? I put that before this people for the purpose of telling you that high license is a better regulator than prohibition; and if you are a temperance man, as I believe you are (speaking to Rev. Small), come out of that camp, come out on our side, and we will preach temperance where it will do some good, and don' preach prohibition which ruins some men, but—[Loud applause compelled the speaker to stop.]

I must not forget the little state of Kansas down here with its retail liquor dealers in 1889, numbering 1,614. I must not forget New Hampshire, Maine and Vermont with 2,200. And comparing them again to the state of Nebraska we find only 1,800. I want to tell you good prohibition people that you have been misled in this great doctrine of yours. You have listened to men talk like this little original package who talks for money. [Laughter.] Who absorbs his ideas without knowing whether they are true or not. [Applause.]

But my Kansas brother around here wants a little more information, and I want to give it to him. I want to tell him about the effect on Kansas of your prohibition. I have told you it increased the liquor traffic; I have proved to you it increased the sales of beer; and I want to tell you it retards the prosperity of the state and drives out the population.

In Kansas, I have got the statement taken from the returns of the election of the president of the United States of he electoral vote cast in 1884 compared to the electoral vote cast in 1888. I find that the state of Kansas increased in those four years but 24 per cent. While the good state of Nebraska, in which you live, increased under high license more than twice the number; or in other words, as 50 per cent to 24 per cent in Kansas. Go to Iowa, and we have the electoral vote of 1884 compared to the electoral vote of 1888; and the state of Iowa in four years gained but 8 per cent in her electoral vote, while Nebraska gained 50 per cent. How is that? Grew six times as fast as Iowa; while Minnesota, with high license, grew twice as rapidly as the state of Kansas and five times as rapidly as the state of Iowa.

I tell you that whatever you do for the state of Nebraska, if you let these people hem you in with prohibition all around you, and you plant prohibition in the state of Nebraska, that the tide of immigration, the tide of prosperity, the march of progress will go clear around your borders, and you will be driven back just as the states of Kansas and Iowa, and Minnesota, Wisconsin and Wyoming and the Colorados will be looming up with prosperity, waving the banner of the republic in the air so high that you prohibition people cannot get a glimpse of the stars on it. [Applause.]

Let me tell you what Judge Foster said of Kansas—that federal judge to whom I alluded the other day—and it was put in print and over his own signature he authorized its publication. He says that in 1885 the state of Kansas had a population of 1,268,562, and had a prison population, mark you, produced, I suppose, as you good people say, by the use of liquor, of 673; or, in other words, one person out of every 1,885 of all the people of the state of Kansas was in the penitentiary.

In Nebraska during the same year we had only 259 people in the penitentiary; in other words, one out of every 2,860. Or, in other words, in prohibition Kansas, where they do not drink liquor, but follow the good millenium law which you preach, you had two men in the penitentiary to one up here in honest high license Nebraska.

So it was in 1888. But mark you: here is a statement that I want to read to this people of the state of Nebraska, where that same judge said that in Nebraska the estimated population is 1,200,000, by the census just completed, and yet we have but one person out of every 3,100 in the prison, compared with the state of Kansas where they have one out of 1,900. The Argument that I make is that in Nebraska under high license you have less people in your penitentiaries, fewer people in your poor houses, fewer in your insane asylums, fewer idiots, fewer saloons, fewer liquor licenses than you have in any prohibition state anywhere under the stars and stripes of this great republic. [Applause.]

Another thing about high license. I tell you that high license is a regulator, reducing the number of saloons, and I want to take this likewise from the official report of the commissioner of internal revenue of the United States; and my friends can find it on page 40, if they want to look for it. The decrease in liquor saloons and liquor licenses for retail dealers. From the year 1880 to the year 1889, the decrease in Alabama was 1,044; in Arkansas, a decrease of 337; in Florida, a decrease of 226; in Georgia, 648; in Kansas, 567; in Kentucky, 671; in Missouri, 814; in North Carolina, 624; in Ohio, 2,345; in your great state of Pennsylvania, which defeated prohibition, a decrease of 7,010. In the state of Tennessee, where they defeated prohibition, under high license, a decrease of 1,310. I could go on, but my time is short. The license duty of the government of the United States, I don't care what it is, it is not prohibition. It is where prohibition is defeated.

Mr. Small—It is local option.

Mr. Webster—It is where they defeated prohibition, and snowed you under, and you know it.

Mr. Small—It is prohibition by local option, and you know it. It is local option prohibition in every state you have mentioned but Pennsylvania. [A Voice—Shut up.] I won't do it.

Mr. Webster—O, let him talk; he can't help it; don't find fault with him. [Laughter.] I want to remind my friend when he made that statement that in the present state of Nebraska where we have worked pretty well, we have got local option, too. If it is so good in all these states as to accomplish good results, it is good enough for us here. That is why we reduced the number of saloons up here. We are getting to be a moderately virtuous people here, and if the people outside would let us alone we would get along pretty well.

I will give another illustration from Mr. Blair's book to see about some of the exaggerated statements which these people make to prove that prohibition amounts to something; and when they want to talk about prohibition they always commence to make a temperance speech, as if it were a distinct individual proposition. Mr. Blair puts into his book a remarkable table gotten from some insurance book, and found on page 107. He wants to give the rate or ratio of deaths out of every 1,000; he has got the people who do not drink at all, the prohibitionists; he has the temperance drinkers who only take a glass socially and he has classified the intemperate fellows. Well, here is the table; before I give those who die between the ages of sixty and ninety, I will say that you and I will be lucky if we ever get to the first landmark. Well, I have a better chance than you have—when I read this table. I will show it to you: This table says that of the people between sixty and ninety years old that die of intemperance and by hard drinking there were 56,178. That is over half of the 100,000. The moderate fellows were 33,260, which only left out of the 100,000 about 11,000 prohibitory fellows. If that table proves anything it proves this: That the men who drink the most live the longest. Of course I do not believe that table; I think it is all nonsense; but I think it is not a bit more nonsense than I hear coming from some prohibition orators. That statement is vouched for by the great senator from a prohibition state, New Hampshire, printed in his book as authentic, and yet in his foolishness he forgot the fact that it proved that intemperate people were the long lived fellows; and I tell you that is the class that I want to belong to, because I am not in a hurry to go. [Laughter.]

To give you another thought: I will not refer to data and figures because my time is too short. Time keeps running along, and judging from the look of admonition I got from the president I do not think I have more than five minutes. I want that five minutes to make some general statements in answer to some of the great hobbies that these people put forth. These people tell us that in these great United States the consumption of liquor has increased from about four gallons per capita to twelve in 1889. Now, as a general statement, I have to admit there is some sort of truth in that proposition; but I want to analyze it a little bit. If these people will look into the records they will find that it is just two gallons per capita. We have today learned not to get quite so drunk, and we quit on whisky and have taken something moderate, like beer. We only drank just half the amount of whisky that we did ten or twelve years ago; but we have taken more beer, and he adds beer onto it, and computes it as if it were so much whisky consumed. Any temperance man knows that, any temperance preacher knows that; and if he did not explain that to you and tell you that when he talks, he is simply deceiving you or fooling you. And on that matter, I have heard so much said about this great United States of ours going to hell at a great rate, simply because of this liquor traffic, I want to tell this audience, and in that I want to speak for America, that this great nation of ours stands today the peer if not the superior of any other nation on the top of God's foot-stool. [Applause.] I tell this same people that over in Italy they drink over two gallons per head of liquors where in the United States they drink one. Go over to England, and where you get twelve gallons of drink you have got thirty-three over there. Go to France, and when you have but twelve gallons per head here you have twenty-three gallons per head over there. Go to Germany, go to Austria, to France, to Italy, go anywhere without the boundaries of the United States, where men can live and where commerce spreads its white sails, all over the world, and you will find that every people consume from twice to three times the amount of liquor consumed in America; and yet they have brains in their heads, they have vast armies, they have statesmen and they have not yet gone to ruin.

If my friend went to Omaha to go the opera house to hear a grand opera, he would probably hear it rendered by some company from wine drinking Italy. If he looks for a piece of fine art or sculpture he would be apt to find some Frenchman who drank twice as much wine in order to make it. If he wanted to get an iron ship to sail over the dark seas, since they have all fled from little Maine, the prohibition state, he would go and buy it from England, where they drink three times as much beer and whisky as we do. History has recorded the fact and no man can intelligently refute it, that in Austria, in France and in Germany and England there are great, brainy statesmen equal to any we have got in America. There is Gladstone, in whisky and beer drinking England; there is the iron man, Bismark, in beer drinking Germany; there was the old historian, Guizot, in the wine drinking France, and the great novelist, Victor Hugo. When you go for literature, for art, for poetry, for beauty and for civilization, when you step outside the lines of the borders of the great republic of the United States and go beyond the shadow of the stars and stripes, you have to go to a country where they drink three times as much as you do, and they do not have any prohibition there.

They Have Been Seen.

LONDON, July 10.—[Special Cablegram to THE BEE.]—The steamer Normanic, from New York for Hamburg, passed Scilly this morning. The steamer Brittannic, from New York for Liverpool, passed Fastnet this morning.

Want a Million.

NEW YORK, July 10.—Kidder, Peabody & Co. have ordered $1,000,000 in gold for shipment to Europe.

HE LEAVES IT TO THE CAUCUS

The President Declines to Interfere in the Elections Bill Legislation.

IT WILL OPEN UP THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Senator Paddock's Amendment to the Sundry Appropriations Bill—Lambertson's Strong Argument The Speaker's Dry Remark.

WASHINGTON BUREAU THE OMAHA BEE, 513 FOURTEENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10.

An attempt has been made to secure the influence of the president in support of the federal elections bill. Several republican senators who are earnest in their desire to pass that measure before the adjournment of congress called at the white house yesterday and today to discuss the subject and endeavor to convince him that the passage of the elections bill was not only necessary to secure a free ballot and a fair count in the senate, but was good politics in the north. The president is quoted as saying that he recognized the importance of some such law as that under consideration, but he was not sufficiently familiar with the terms of the bill to give it his unqualified endorsement. So far as he was able to judge from a casual reading of the printed text he thought it was a little too complex and radical in some of its provisions and that some modifications would give it greater popularity in the north and make it less offensive to the south. It cannot be learned just what modifications he suggested, but it is known that he prefers the bill originally prepared by Mr. Rowell of Illinois, which was simply an extension of the supervision system to the pending measure, which is a combination of the Rowell and the Lodge bills, going a good deal further than the one and not quite so far as the latter. He is, however, reported to have positively declined to interfere in the legislation and to have said that the consideration of the bill was a matter to be decided by the republican caucus and not by the executive.

MR. PADDOCK'S AMENDMENT.

The sundry civil appropriation bill which has just been reported to the senate from its committee on appropriations contains, as anticipated in these dispatches, Senator Paddock's amendment increasing from $200,000 to $300,000 the appropriation for topographic surveys in various portions of the United States. The amendment says: "One-half of this sum shall be expended west of the one hundred and first meridian; and so much of the act of October 2, 1888, entitled 'an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes' as provides for the selection of and location of reservoirs and canals upon the public lands and the reservation of irrigable lands is hereby repealed. Provided, that reservoir and canal sites heretofore located or selected small remain segated and preserved from entry or settlement until otherwise provided by law." This will result in the repeal of the law which practically withdraws from entry the entire public domain in the northwest and southwest and most of that in the west beyond the Missouri river, and which law has made much complaint on the part of far western congressmen this session.

A DRY REMARK.

By an oversight the flag on the side of the capitol was run up to the masthead upon the assembling of congress today. It caused considerable comment, and General Wheeler of Alabama, who at one time commanded the entire cavalry of the confederacy, arose and called Speaker Reed's attention to it. The speaker dryly replied: "The chair is very glad to learn that the gentleman from Alabama now manifests an interest in the subject. The omission will be corrected."

STATUS OF THE CENSUS.

It is very probable that in the matter of population New York will be the most disappointed city in the union when the official returns to the census bureau are made known. It is expected that the count of New York will be finished tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon, and it is generally believed that this official count will show that the rough estimate by the supervisors of New York placing the population of the metropolis at 1,700,000 was no less than 200,000 above the number. In other words New York's population will only be about 1,500,000. Chicago and Philadelphia are still nip and tuck for second place. Their population will be in the neighborhood of 1,200,000, with a slight variation for the third place. Brooklyn comes fourth with some 800,000 population, St. Louis fifth with 448,000. Boston with 437,000 comes sixth, Baltimore seventh with 433,000. It is likely that Cincinnati will be eighth and San Francisco ninth. Strange as it may appear the metropolis of the Pacific slope is hard pressed for the ninth position by the comparatively insignificant town of Buffalo in New York. Buffalo's increase in the last ten years has been phenomenal, and it is by no means improbable that it has outstripped San Francisco. It is almost too early as yet to indulge in comment on the general result of the census, but it may be stated that while the rate of increase in the northern and Atlantic slope states has been about the same the western states have increased at an almost fabulous rate. Of the southern states, Alabama, Georgia and Texas will show a marvelous increase of population, but the other southern states will remain about the same. In this connection it may be mentioned that it is very probable this census will show that the rate of increase among the blacks has fallen far behind the rate of increase of the whites, a fact which will go to disprove many of the statements regarding the fecundity of the colored race. The census bureau is now enumerating the returns at the rate of one million a day. As a matter of fact two millions a day are being counted, because on each day, beside the one million of new names counted the million counted the previous day are recounted to insure absolute accuracy. It is believed that the population of the United States will be about sixty-six million. On this basis it will take at least sixty days and possibly seventy to complete the entire count. As the count was begun more than two weeks ago it is reasonable to believe that it will be concluded about the first of September. The question now suggests itself whether or not it may be feasible for the present congress to determine the reapportionment. The outlook is that it will be distinctly possible and certainly desirable to determine the reapportionment at the present session. There is every prospect that congress will be in session until after September 1 if the federal elections bill is taken up, and there is no reason why the house committee on the census should not be determining the reapportionment. This has been suggested as one reason why the democrats in the senate may consent to an early adjournment, as it is manifestly to their disadvantage to let a reapportionment bill pass at this session. It is generally conceded that the increase in population being principally in the western states, the increase in the representation in congress will also come up from these states, and as they are mostly republican the reapportionment cannot but be favorable to the republican party.

GENERAL MORROW WILL BE CONSIDERED.

Today Mr. Dorsey called upon the president and urged the appointment of General Morrow to the vacancy occasioned by the retirement of General Grierson. He presented a tabulated record of General Morrow as a civilian and soldier. The president made no promises, but spoke very kindly and encouragingly of General Morrow, and said he was conversant with his splendid record and would give it the consideration which it commanded.

LAMBERTSON'S ARGUMENT.

Yesterday a hearing was had before the interstate commerce commission on the question of whether the proposed reduction of the commission for the transportation of corn from the Missouri river to Chicago to 17 cents should be put in force by an order of the commission. It will be remembered that this investigation was begun pursuant to a resolution offered by Senator Paddock instructing the commission to find whether or not rates were reasonable for the transportation of food products from Nebraska and Kansas to Chicago and the seaboard. Mr. Walker, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Railway association filed an argument against the jurisdiction of the commission to make an order in the absence of a complaint and in the absence of an opportunity being given for a hearing. The other side was represented by Mr. Dausman in behalf of the board of trade of Chicago and G. M. Lambertson, who appeared at the request of Governor Thayer and on behalf of the farmers' alliance of the state of Nebraska. The state of Iowa was represented by Messrs. Babcock and Smith, on behalf of the board of transportation of that state, and the state of Kansas by Judge Humphrey and ex-Governor Anthony. Mr. Lambertson delivered an argument of over an hour's length, very thoroughly covering the position assumed by him at the hearing given by the commission at Lincoln, Neb. He produced a very important series of statistics showing that the proposed reduction was reasonable from the standpoints of the rates at present in operation. He showed that the roads interested were now carrying corn at a secret rate of far below the proposed rate to be put in. Several members of the commission, at the conclusion of Mr. Lamberson's argument, asked him to have it printed for distribution. Senator Paddock was present at the hearing as an interested listener, as were also several members of congress from the state of Iowa.

WESTERN ABSENTEES.

There are now in Washington but few more than half of the members of the house of representatives—perhaps 175 in all—and it is impossible under this state of affairs for any business to be transacted. Among the absentees from the western states are Messrs. Henderson, Hill, Lane, Springer and Lawler of Illinois, J. B. Brown, T. M. Browne, Copper and O'Neill of Indiana, Brewer, O'Donnell, Tarsney, Wheeler and Whiting of Michigan, Kelley and Turner of Kansas, Struble and Kerr of Iowa, Hayes of Ohio, Clark of Wisconsin, Carter of Montana, Gifford and Pickler of South Dakota, Hanshrough of North Dakota, Hall of Minnesota and Townsend of Colorado.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Upon the advice of his physician Senator Manderson left this morning for a week's stay at the coast of Maine.

PERRY S. HEATH.

DESTROYED BY THE FLAMES.

A Disastrous Fire at Fort de France Makes Thousands Homeless.

PORT OF SPAIN, June 29.—The details concerning the destruction June 22, of the town of Fort de France, in the French Island of Martinique, have just reached here. Immediately after the catastrophe Governor Casse of Martinique sent an appeal for assistance to the government of Trinidad, assuring him that three-quarters of the town had been burned and that more than five thousand persons were without homes and food. The legislative council immediately voted $2,000 in aid of the sufferers.

On the morning of June 22, on the receipt of the news of the fire at Fort de France, two steamers, with men and pumps on board were sent from St. Pierre, and on their arrival at Fort de France at about half past one, the whole seaboard was in flames. The fire had destroyed everything within a space of over one hundred yards up to the river Madame. It was not until the woodwork of the president's office had caught fire that the pumps arrived and organized measures were adopted to save the buildings, which, after hours of hard struggle, was accomplished.

Meanwhile the cathedral was in flames and was soon in ruins. The panic now became general. Women and children were screaming and running hither and thither, and furniture was being thrown out of windows into the streets until they became almost impassable. At the last moment, when it was too late, dynamite was employed to arrest the progress of the fire. Terrific explosions were heard and blocks of buildings were seen to fall, killing some and wounding many persons.

At night the fire had consumed everything between the Rue de Fosse and the sea, and between the savanna and River Madame. At about 10 p. m., the houses at the bottom of the Rue du Government were attacked and only by strenuous efforts were the presbytery and gendarmerie saved. Had they fallen the whole town must have been consumed. It was right there that the progress of the flames were stayed.

The sight the next morning was pitiful and harrowing in the extreme. The savanna was strewn with odds and ends, in the midst of which were camped the whole population, suffering from hunger, thirst and cold, for near morning rain had fallen, chilling to the bone those of the unfortunate people who had no other shelter than that offered by the trees.

The loss is very considerable, 1,700 houses having been destroyed, valued at 12,000,000 francs ($2,400,000), and furniture valued at 3,000,000 francs, making a total loss of $3,000,000.

It is impossible at this moment to tell the number of victims. Twelve bodies have, however, been recovered, many charred beyond recognition and others fearfully mutilated. Fifteen soldiers are receiving attention at the hospital, many of them being seriously and one it is said fatally wounded. The number of civilians injured is considerable.

Fully three-quarters of the town is destroyed and seven-eighths of the inhabitants are homeless. The various British West India Islands have added with grants of money their afflicted sister colony.

To Inspect American Cattle.

WASHINGTON, July 10.—The department of state, at the suggestion of Secretary Rusk, has effected an arrangement for the appointment of three veterinary inspectors for the purpose of inspecting all American cattle landing in Great Britain.

The secretary said today that the restrictions of the British government upon the importation of beef cattle from this country on the groundless plea of continued exposure to contagious cattle diseases in the United States were unjustifiable and had lasted long enough. He now proposed to prove to the satisfaction of the British authorities that no disease exists in this country to warrant these restrictions. If the restrictions are maintained in spite of this evidence some other cause must be assigned for them.

Surveyors at Work.

YANKTON, S. D., July 10.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—A semi-official announcement of the intention of the Chicago & Northwestern railway company to build eighteen miles of road from Hartington, Neb., to Aten, opposite Yankton on the Missouri river, was made here today. A party of surveyors is at work between Yankton and Randolph, Neb., ostensibly for private individuals. Randolph is on the Union Pacific and the surveyors are believed to be in the employ of that road.

Down Goes the Beer.

CHICAGO, July 10.—A local paper says a big fight is on among the brewers of this city. It lies between the English syndicate, which has bought up a number of the largest breweries in the city, and some of the smaller breweries, and the result of the fight so far has been the dropping of prices from $8 to $3.50 per barrel. Outside brewers are inaugurating cuts.

An Eight-hour Day.

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Mr. Bliss, from the committee on labor, today reported favorably with amendments the bill constituting eight hours a day's work for all laborers employed by the government.

Brakemen and Switchmen Strike.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., July 10.—About three hundred Louisville & Nashville brakemen and switchmen have gone on a strike here. Traffic is blocked and about one hundred cars of fruits and other perishable goods are in the yards.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS.

After a Long Debate the Senate