ALL NEWSDEALERS.

Between Messrs. Rosewater and Webster (for high license) and Messrs. Dickie and Small (for prohibition)

# Just as it Appeared in The Daily Bee

From complete stenographic reports, without abridgment or alteration,

# IS NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

This debate has attracted special attention, not only in Nebraska, but all over the United States. It is conceded on all hands to be the greatest debate upon the prohibition issue on record. Adherents of both sides

## READ JUST WHAT WAS SAID

by each speaker. Not a word has been changed. While prohibition organs garbled the anti-prohibition arguments when printed at all, THE BEE prints every word of argument presented in the great debate.

## Forward Your Orders at Once.

Newsdealers throughout the west will be supplied on order. Orders for one to a thousand or more copies will receive prompt attention.

# Price 5c a Copy; \$3 a Hundred

Remittance should accompany order in all cases. Address:

THE BEE PUBLISHING CO., Omaha, Nebraska.

FOR SALE BY ALL NEWSDEALERS.

# THE CHANCE Of a Lifetime.

If you haven't already subscribed for THE BEE and the "Americanized Encyclopædia Britannica" you should do so at once. Such a bargain was never offered by a newspaper before.

If you haven't time to call, telephone us (No. 238), or drop a postal card and a representative will call on you.

## HERE IS OUR PROPOSITION:

THE OMAHABEE offers a year's subscription of the daily paper including the Sunlayissues-delivered at your address-and a complete set of THE AMERICANIZED EN-CYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA for \$2.50 per munth. The first five volumes delivered on payment of \$2.30 and the balance payable \$2.50 per month. The other five volumes to be delivered within four months.

ALL OUR PRESENT SUBSCRIBERS are entitled to all the advantages of this

People living outside of Omaha can avail themselves of above liberal offer by having the monthly payments guaranteed by some responsible banker or merchant in their

Send for descriptive circular.

### MASSACHUSETTS TRIED IT.

The Old Bay State Tested Both Prohibition and High License.

HEN SHE REPUDIATED THE FORMER.

Protest of Leading Clergymen, College Presidents and Professional Men Against Constitutional Prohibition-Facts and Figures.

Massachusetts had prohibition for ten cars before 1865, when it was repealed. It was resubmitted in 1889 and defeated by 44, 000 majority. What were the results under the two systems! This question so perplexed the legislature at one time that a resoluti on was passed directing the bureau of statistics of labor to investigate the subject and report to the general court. The report was made in 1881 and caused much surprise both among the advocates of prohibition and of license. According to this report the arrests, convictions and sentences for drunkenness during the five years of prohibition and the follow-ing five years of license were as follows:

DRUNKENNI	ESS PROBLI	RELON YEAR	169.
Year. 1879	28,833 29,238 29,761	Con- victions, 19,420 20,581 23,889 24,106 \$2,943	Sen- tences, 18,880 20,381 21,587 21,842 22,748
Toties	147,603 NESS -LAUE	110,839 NSR YE. 38.	109,440
Year, 1845 1876 1877 1878 1879	No of Arrests, 20,080 20,002 24,000 24,000	Con- victions. 21,100 19,784 18,808 17,581 17,579	Sen- tences. 23,533 18,103 17,614 16,735 16,211
Totals	133,020	0.8,882	92,280

The startling fact is revealed that during the prohibitory period there were 110,830 convictions, or 25,007 more than under license. And during the license period the state had

increased largely in papulation.

What a terrible showing!

The statistics of arrests reported for the principal counties further show where the

The arrests in Suffolk county were 18,400 in 1874, and 15,267 in 1876. In Middlesex county, 4,063 in 1874, and 2,864 in 1876. In Essex county, 3,165 in 1874, and 2,513 in 1876.

ARRESTS IN THE CITIES. The following official table speaks for itself, he reader bearing in mind that the years 1870

ad 1874 were prohibitory 1 79 was a license year:	en en en		
Anna	1870.	1874.	18
dams	44	98	14.
1131 1. (44) b. t. t. m. a. t.	18,678	18,099	14,
all River	365.8	1,665	
Otto 142-122 11 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	34	34	
ow Bedford	181	242	
MILEON	305	573	
loucester	413	405	
avernin	415	330	
ynn	485	518	
dem	640	507	
deopee	104	246	
imbridge	816	849	
Wrence	1,455	2.055	1.
atertown	160	170	- 7
oburn	129	91	
altham		370	
ielsea	3116	400	
tenburg	245	2233	
llford	900	319	
OPPOSITOR	1.000	1.500	

Worcester 1,222 1,5:8 905

When prohibition was before the people of
Massachusetts last April its most outspoken
opponents were clergymen and professional
mon. Six out of eight college presidents of
Massachusetts opposed the amendment.
President Fliot of Harvard, said: "I shall
vote avainst the constitutional amendment. vote against the constitutional amendment concerning prohibition. First, because I think that the constitution ought not to deal with such matters; and, secondly, because for promoting temperance I prefer the combi-Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard, said:

"The adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors would, in my opinion, be a public misfortune. The amendment is I believe, wrong in principle and mistaken in policy. Its adoption would be a heavy blow to the cause of temperance and good order, and it would tend to weaken in the community that spirit of obedience to law on which the public welfare depends."

Ex-tovernor Gardner said: "The result of the former modelliture law with the result of e former prohibitory law—which by way I rned while chief magistrate—was so unsat-factory in its results that it was repealed by isfactory in its results that it was repealed by decisive majorities in a succeeding legislature, and does not encourage the re-enactment of similar provisions in the organic constitution of the commonwealth. Experience of the past seems to teach that local option and high license furnish a practical system regarding this vexed question as admirable as frail and imperfect humanity can devise." Said Hon, James S. Grinnell: "I very willingly answer that I intend to vote 'No.' I think the present laws are quite sufficient, if they were thoroughly enforced, to control and measurably to suppress the use and abuse of casurably to suppress the use and abuse of texteants, while with the passage of the measurably to impress the use and abuse of intoxicants, while with the passage of the amendment the same legal machinery must be employed. If the violent and often intemperate advocates of prohibition would bring to the stringent choreoment of a proper license law one half the activity, the zeal and the pertinacity which they display insisting upon absolute prohibition, which has never seen effective, and never can be so long as men are controlled by the passions and appeties implanted in them—we should have a more temperate community."

Ex-Governor Rice is quoted as follows:
"In reply to your request, just received, for my opinion on the expediency of the constitutional amendment prenouncing prohibition and the sale of intexicating liquors the organic law of the state, I say that I do not favor such an amendment, for the reason that I am in favor of the most efficient means of suppressing drunkenness, and I believe the adoption of such an amendment would lead to an increase in drunkenness. Whatever may have been the effect cleavhere, statutory prohibition has not been a success in Massachusetts, according to the cridence which I have been able to find, and I can see and reason why constitutional prohibition should be more effective."

One hundred and twenty-seven physicians of Boston signed and published the following

"We, the undersigned physicians of Massa-chusetts, while advocating temperance among our people, and all appropriate measures to promote it, believe that the adoption of the proposed amendment to the constitution pro-nibiting the sale of intexicating liquer would not accomplish its intended purpose, but would lead to the surreptitious sale of info-

over eighty prominent clergymen of Boston and vicinity, and of other cities in the state, placed themselves on record as follows:

The undersigned, clergymen of Massachusetts, while strongly advocating temperance among our peopls, and all appropriate and ef-fective means to promote it, believe that the adoption of the proposed amendment to the consitution, prohibiting the sale of intextconsitution, problibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor, would not accomplish its intended purpose. The adoption of the amendment repeals all high license and local option legislation, and takes the regulation of the sale or manufacture of liquor wholly from the legislature and the people in local communities, and makes such regulation wholly dependent upon the power to enforce absolute general problibition throughout the commonwealth.

wealth.

Probibition is effective only where the local sentiment will enforce it; and were to local sentiment enforces it, it exists under our present law. To exchange the present right of each city and town to vote "no license," and

comes under the restrictive acts of the legisla-ture for the charge of enforcing absolute pro-hibition everywhere in the commonwealth ir-respective of the local sentiment, is, in our outsiden, more likely to result in greater free-dent han in greater restriction in the sale and use of intexicating liquer.

(Signed)
Francis G. Peabody, Cambridge,
Andrew P. Peabody, Cambridge,
J. Henry Thayer, Cambridge,
O. B. Forthingham, 118 Marlboro street,
William C. Winslow, V15 Beacon street,
Edward A. Horton, 531 Boylaton street,
George J. Presentt, 218 Trement street,
Solomon Schinger, 34 Berwick park,
Joseph Shoninger, 211 West Newton
street,

George E. Ellis, Marlboro street, Frederick Lindemann, 200 Shawmu, av

Francis C. Williams, 58 Highland Park

Arthur A. Hall, 44 Temple street.

Arthur A. Hall, 44 Temple street,
Edward Osberne, 44 Temple street,
C. H. Brent, 44 Temple street,
Thomas R. Lambert, Hotel Oxford,
H. Bernard Carpenter, Hotel Glenden,
Minot J. Savage, 25 Concord square,
Edward H. Hall, Cambridge,
Edmund B. Wilson, Salem,
Charles Arey, Salem,
Paul Sterling, Lynn,
William Lawrence, Cambridge,
Edmand B. Palmer, Cambridge,
Edmand B. Palmer, Roxbury,
Joshua P. Bodilsh, Canton,
E. B. Schmidt, Lynn, Joshua P. Bodiish, Canton.
E. B. Schmidt, Lynn.
Samuel B. Stewart, Lynn.
W. H. Lyen, Roxbury.
George S. Conyerse, Roxbury.
Sumner U. Sherman, Jamaica Plain,
B. J. R. Koren, 34 Rutland square,
Austin S. Garver, Worcester,
Alexander H. Vinton, Worcester,
Arthur W. Hess, Worcester,
Francis G. Burgess, Worcester. Francis G. Burgess, Worcester, Lungdon C. Stewardson, Worcester, George S. Paine, Worcester, Francis B. Hornbrocke, Newton, W. Saltonstall, Dorchester. Crawford Nighting Charles T. Whittemere, Dorchester, Arthur H. Wright, Dorchester, James Reed, 12 Louisburg square, Alfred F. Washburn, South Boston. Dorchester. Walter E. C. Smith, 13 Warren avenue, Albert Eugene George, rector St. Matthew's

church, South Boston. Nathan H. Chamberlain, rector St. John's church, East Boston.
Aug. Prime, Brighton.
William F. Frisby, Boston.
William Creighton Spincer, Boston.
Alden Welling, Boston. Edward M. Gushee, Cambridge, Henry Ainsworth Parier, Cambridge, James Field Spalding, Cambridge, F. W. Merrill, Chelsea,

Horatio Gray, Beston, Adolf Biewend, 716 Parker street, Samuel Hobart Winkley, Bullfinch Place chapel,
Philip S. Moxom, 326 Westchester park,
Alfred W. Martin, Chelsea,
Fred C. Hurl, 67 Havre street,
William J. Harris, St. Paul's church,
Henry Freeman Allen, 30 Beacon street,
David Green Haskins, Cambridge,
Howard N. Brown, Brookline,
Roderick Stebbins, Milton,
George A. Gordon, Boston,
Ameng others the following raysed classes

Among others the following named clergymen have also expressed themselves as averse to the amendment, either from their pulpits or through the columns of the press:

Rev. Dr. Phillips Brooks, Rev. Dr. C. A. Bartol, Rev. Brooke Herford. Rev. Henry M. Dexter. Rev. Henry M. Dexter. Rev. Percy Browne. Rev. W. R. Low.

Rev. Andrew Gray. Rev. Father Thomas J. Consty. Rev. Edward Atbott.

abstinence from all intoxicants as a beverage except on medical prescriptions, and I regard prohibition as the ideal method of any community which welcomes and is ready for it from the dreadful carse of the saloon; but I gravely doubt whether any police regu-lation may wisely be made a part of our or-ganic law, and I seriously fear lest the adop-tion of the proposed prohibitory amendment in Massachusetts at the nesses line. in Massachusetts at the preser time may in crease rather than diminish evils against which it is aimed.

Rev. Dr. Bartol-A prohibbory law would be no wiser or stronger in a constitution than under it. Let us introduce only what we can Temperance must be maintained as wirtue if we would promote it as a cause. We cannot prohibit or prevent what we must either use or abuse.

Rev. Brooke Herford-I believe such sump tuary laws to be entirely victors in principle and never more than temporarily practicable. The present state of things-local option-enables prohibition to be carried out wherever there is a prevailing sentiment in its favor, and where there is not such a prevailing local sentiment it could not be caforced, even if enacted. As far as I can see, what is needed is not new legislation, but the more effective use of what we have. It is not either prohibition or specially high Respect which I lead use of What we have. It is not either prohibition or specially hish license to which I look for the lessening of the saloon power and of the saloon temptation, but more effective supervision, both by the police and by the friends of temperance. With such effective supervision we have already laws enough to accomplish what haw can rightly do; without it more laws, unenforced, would, I fear, be a pure mischief.

pure mischief,

Rev. E. A. Horton-It is not the best method of promoting temperance. It is aimed at the final national goal of a national amendment, and I am opposed to that. It looks toward the abolition and disuse of alconol in any form (as its originators confess), and that is utopian. It is of a character to scatter and sadly divide the temperance forces. It has come to be a test, a shibbotch among temperance extremists, which they harshly apply and vinderively use, and I for one desire to make an earmest protest I for one desire to make an earnest protest against the arrogance. It holds out fallacious against the arrogance. It holds out fallacious hopes to the well-wisher of mankind, and this misdirects the trie work of moral progress and reform. Its kindred laws in other states have not borne satisfactory fruits. Those who yote for its adoption have the appearance of accepting all the extravagant claims and wild assertions of its ultra advocates. I love sobriety and temperate temperance and Christ's methods too much to yote for the constitutional amendment.

Rev. Emory J. Haynes—The public outpion

Rev. Emory J. Haynes—The public opinion of a great commonwealth, expressed by majority vote, has proved itself of such force generally that it eventually winds all opposition practically into accord with itself. Local option is dependent upon a smaller public opinion, even when favorable to the demands of temperance. A consistence of a smaller public opinion, even when favorable to the demands of temperance. opinion, even when favorable to the demands of temperence. A constitutional amendment has proved itself, in my adgment, to be the most troublesome form of legislation in the way of the liquor traffic. I do not hope for utoplan results from any legislation. I have a growing conviction that the old gospel method of correcting men one by one is our only hope. Perhaps it is true that the law of the survival of the fittest is to be wrought out of this department of morals, if not in any other, the drankuris perishing and childhood alone being salvable.

Rev. Leighton Parks I trust that the pro-Rev. Leighton Parks—I trust that the proposed amendment to the constitution will not be adopted. Under the grasent statutes those towns which are able to enforce "prohibition" are at liberty to provent the sale of alcohol. The city of Boston cannot even pass a prohibitory vote. Suppose prohibition is imposed upon the city by the country, what ald will we then receive in an attempt to enforce the law? Of course now. In which case the question before us is between restricted sale under high license and unrestracted under "prohibition." As a temperate man and an enemy of the "saloen" I hope for a continuance of the present law until we can pass one requiring so high a license that only men who have an interest, in its enforcement, will be able to energe in the second second according to the present the saloen that only men who have an interest, in its enforcement, will be have an interest in its enforcement will be able to engage in the sac of intexicating liq-

Rev. Hillary Bygrave-While deploring the evils caused by intemperance, I find myself unable to work or yote for the proposed

where the vote is for license to regulate the Hcoase under the restrictive acts of the legislature for the chance of enforcing absolute proholding to chance of enforcing absolute procrty and degrelation which drunkconess

H. Freeman Allen-I shall vote ngainst the proposed constitutional amond-ment. As respects the great end of the re-pression of intemporance, all carness men are as one. But with regard to the means of that repression there may be honest difference of opinion. I do not think the means new pro-posed will secure the end desired. Prohibi-billon never has and sever will prohibit.

The opening arguments of the Beatrice Debate will be found on the second page.

THE SLOCUMB LAW.

The following is a synopsis of the Nebraska. high license local option law: Section 1 provides that the county board of each county may grant license for the sale of malt, spirituous and vinous liquors, if deemed expedient, upon the application by petition of thirty of the resident freeholders of the town if the county is under township organization. The county board shall not have authority to issue any license for the sale of liquors in any city or incorporated village or within two miles of the same. Section 2 provides for the filing of the ap-

plication and for publication of the applica-tion for at least two weeks before the granttion for at least two weeks before the granting of the license.
Section 3 provides for the hearing of the
case if a remonstrance is filed against the
granting of a license to the applicant.
Further sections provide for the appealing
of the remonstrance to the district court; the
form of the license; the giving of a \$5,000
bend by the

bond by the successful upplicant for the li-Sections 8, 9 and 10 make it an offense, pun-ishable by a fine of \$25, for any licensed liquor dealer to sell intoxicating liquor to minors or Indians.

Section II provides that any person selling

liquor without a license shall be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$500 for each fense; and section 12 provides for the trial of such offenders.
Section 13 makes it an offense, puntshable by a fine of \$100 and a forfeiture of license, for any licensed liquor vender to sell adul-

terated liquer.

Section 14 makes it an offense punishable by a fine of \$100 for any person to sell or give away any liquor on Sunday, or on the day of any general or special election.

Sections 15 to 23 inclusive, define the liability of allocations are for during sessioned. bility of salionikeepers for damages sustained by any one in consequence of the traffic and provide the steps necessary to collect such

Section 24 relates to the issuance of druggists' permits.

The local option feature of the law is contained in section 25, the salient part of which

"The corporate authorities of all cities and The corporate authorities of all cities and villages shall have power to license, regulate and prohibit the selling or giving away of any inexteating, malt, spirituous and vinous liquors, within the limits of such city or village. This section also fixes the amount of the license fee, which shall not be less than \$500 in cillages and cities having less than \$500 in villages and cities having less than 10,000 inhabitants nor less than \$1,000 in cities having a population of more than 10,000. Sections 26 and 27 relate to druggists registers and penalties for violation of the rules governing the same.

Section 28 makes drunkenness an offense punishable by a fine of \$10 and costs or im-

prisonment not exceeding thirty days.

Section 29 provides that the doors and windows of saloons shall be kept free from screens

Who is Responsible? Prohibition agitators never tire of cuarging the opponents of prohibition with the re ment upon the fegislature, and they try to make people believe that the license amendment was tacked on to the prohibition amendment by the supporters of high license. As a matter of fact, the double header originated with the prohibitionists in the legislature. They found themselves short of votes in the house and induced two straddlers, who were good lord and good devil, to vote with hibition should be submitted at the same

The following is the record of the two amendments as it appears in the senate and house journals: The prohibition amendment was introduced The prohibition amendment was introduced by Lindsay January 11. Referred. Reported favorably January 24. Considered in committee of the whole and passed by the senate January 25. Reported to house January 25. Considered in committee of whole house January 30. Reported back with recommendation that it do pass. Yeas 60, nays 39, absent 1.—Pages 527 and 528 House Journal. Thereupon immediately Mr. Cally offered

Thereupon immediately Mr. Casy offered the following amendment: And there shall also at said election be separately submitted to the electors for their ap-proval or rejection, an amendment to the constitution of the state in words as follows: "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intexicating liquers as a beverage shall be licensed and regulated by law."

The year and mays were called for, and the motion was agreed to, 58 to 40, two absent,

Fuller and McNickle.
Those voting in the affirmative were: Those voting in the affirmative were: Abrahamson, Baker, Bailey, Ballard, Berry, Bortis, Brink, Burnham, Cady, Christy of Clay, Coleman of Autelope, Corbin, Cruzen, Dempster, Diller, Dann, Elliott, Everett, Farley, Featon, Fieldgrove, Gilbert, Gilchrist, Hall, Hampton, Hama, Hauthorn, Harding, Hays, Hill of Butler, Hill of Gage, Johnson, Lash, Lee, Majors, Patter, Rayner, Rhodes, Robb, Sargent, Satchell, Scoville, Seed, Shephard, Stirk, Sweet, Truesdell, Webber, Weller, Wells, Westever, Whitehead, Whiteford, Whyman, Wilcox, Williams, Winter. ford, Whyman, Wilcox, Williams, Winter,

Yutzy, 58. Those voting in the negative were: Beck-These veting in the negative were: Beckman, Berlin, Hisbee, Behacek, Brancht, Cameron, Caidwell, Christie of Dodge, Coleman of Polk, Collins, Cushing, Delancy, Denman, Dickinson, Fenno, Gardner, Gates, Green, Hahn, Hooper, Horn, Hungate, Hunter, Keiper, Larson, Ley, Mattes, Jr., McBride, McMilliman, Mecker, Morrissey, Neve, Olmstend, O'Salilvan, Severin, Snyder, Swartzley, Towle, White and Mr. Speaker, 40.

Page 529, house journal, Mr. Rayner to amend the title as follows:

"An amendment to the constitution of this state to license and regulate the manufacture.

state to license and regulate the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating ilquors, as a beverage, and providing for the The amendments were engrossed January

31 (pages 547 and 548 house journal) and re-ported back to the house and passed on the same day, the vote being 60 yeas and 3s mays and two absent, Fuller and Hungate. The only changes on the final passage of the double header, and in its favor were Bisbee, Cameron, Hanter and McNickle. The latter was absent when the vote was taken sefore. Dunn and Lee are the only support ers of the senate bill who recorded themselves against the double header.

70, 371 senate journal). The senate voted to

Concur.

These voting in the affirmative were: Burton, Conner, Cornell, Funck, Gallogly, Howe, Haover, Hurd, Jewett, Kockly, Lindsay, Linn, Manning, Neshitt, Pickett, Polk, Pope, Robinson, Roche, Shanner, Suther-Voling in the negative: Beardaley, Dorn, jums, Maher, Norval, Paulsen, Paxtos, Rauson, Raymond and Walbach—10. It will be seen that the opponents of pro-hibition, with the exception of two men in the house and one in the senate, voted against the license amendment from first to last.

### A Grand Work.

THE OMAHA BEE has been doing a grand ood work for the people of Nebraska in pub-shing the arguments of the disputants in the question of high license or prohibition.

The question is of importance this year, and thousands of readers will be instructed by being able to read the arguments they could

### THE PROBLEM OF PROHIBITION

Iowa's Experience Should Bo a Lesson and Guide to Nebraska.

A PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE SITUATION.

Probibition Has Led to Hypocrisy and Deceit, and Been a Huge Burden Upon the Taxpayer.

DES MOINES, Ia., July 10.-At this time, when the people of Nebraska are considering the problem of prohibition, and will be called upon in a few months to decide by their votes whether they will or will not amend the constitution of their state so as to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous and malt liquors, it might be well for them to study the situation in Iowa. These two states for many miles adjoin each other and possess many characteristics in common. It is proper that the experience of Iowa should be a lesson and guide to Nebraska, and especially so upon this vexed and vexing question of prohibition. In this brief article, and any others which may follow, it will be my carnest endeavor to write down facts as to the situation in years passed, and give a plain statement of the facts as they exist today. Those only partially pested as to these facts must admit there have been gross misstatements made and garbled facts stated in relation to the operation and political effects of prohibi-

the operation and political effects of prohibitory laws in Iowa. Supporters, as well as opponents of prohibition, have been more or less guilty in this respect.

First, there have been many misstatements as to the history of prohibition in Iowa. For instance, many believe that Iowa for years tried license, high and low, as a means of regulating the liquor traffic, and finding this method to be a failure some eight years ago abandoned license and adonted prohibition. method to be at failure some eight years ago abandoned license and adopted prohibition. This is true only to a very limited extent. The new historical facts are that Iowa never did give or make a fair trial of license. Prior to 1855, as a territory and state, lowa had made brief trials of crude and imperfect laws to regulate the traffic, having what was then called the "drain shop" and the "live-gallon sewer." Neither of these laws proved entirely satisfactory in their practical workings, though, from conversations with them.

sewer." Neither of these laws proved entirely satisfactory in their practical workings, though, from conversations with them, I should judge a large majority of the "early settlers" consider that, crude as they were, they were much better adapted to the weifare of the people and the state than the prohibitory laws subsequently enacted.

It will be remembered that along in the '50's prohibition came as a new remedy for the evils growing out of the liquor traffic and like many other newly discovered se-called infallible remedies, had a great run for a few years. Many states east and west, adopted the new remedy, but nearly all of them subsequently threw it aside. Theoretically prohibition may have been good medicine for the body politic, but practically it was more injurious than beneficial to the patient. The remedy was found to be worse than the disease. The general assembly of Iowa, at the session of 154-5, enacted the first Iowa prohibitory law. But the members were afraid to take the entire responsibility of its enactment and to escape a portion of the responsibility provided for its submission to a vote of the people at the spring election in April 1855. The yote taken gave a majority of 2010. bility provided for its submission to a vote of the people at the spring election in April 1855. The vote taken gave a majority of 2,910 for the law. Shortly after the election op-ponents of the law commenced legal proceed-ings to test its validity and subsequently two of the three judges of the supreme court held the law to have been properly enacted, while the third ladge of the validity and subsequently

the third, Judge G. G. Wright, now a resident of this city, held that the general assembly was the sole law-making power of the state, and could not legally submit a proposed law to a vote of the people, and hence the law was null and void. This first prohibitory law went into effect uly 4, 1855. It had what was then termed a "county grocery" attachment; that is, a pro-vision that each county should appoint an agent to sell all kinds of liquors for medicinal mechanical, culinary and sacramental pur-poses. This grocery attachment soon became oo popular with many of its patrons and very apopular with the people generally, and in a year or two was knocked out of the law. year or two was knocked out of the law. Then in 1858 came another amendment which the true prohibitionists claimed further weakened and made it of little account as a prohibitory measure. At that time there had been aheavy influx of Germans into the state. They had made the best of citizens and had done much toward building up the prosperity of the state. Politically they naturally, because of their dislike to slavery, affiliated with the young, but strong and growing re-

cause of their dislike to slavery, utiliated with the young but strong and growing republican party. They cared little for whisky and the stronger drinks, but they would and must have their beer and wine they had been accustomed to all their lives. Their numbers, determination and independence made them an important political factor in this then new state. They held the balance of power between the rival republican and democratic parties. To please them, and perhaps others, the general assembly of 1858, the republicans having a majority in both houses, amended the then prohibitory law by adding thereto "the wine and beer law by adding thereto "the wine and beer clause." This exempted wine and beer from prohibition, and the manufacture and sale of beer and wine was again legalized.

This "wine and beer clause" caused the establishment of many breweries and vine-yards in Iowa, and in due course of years hundreds of thousands, finally running up to millions of dellars, were invested in these industries. The state also appropriated money and appointed agents to encourage immigration, and is the "boom" circulars, pamphlets and newspaper articles of that day, especial care was taken to impress upon the minds of care was taken to impress upon the minds of foreigners, particularly Germans, the al-lered fact that the manufacture and sale of beer and wine was and would remain free in lowa, and that the state would encourage and foreyor protect these manufacturing and producing industries. And thousands of foreigners, regood faith, came here, made their homes, labored and toiled and invested their hom-estly carned money, and added greatly to the wealth and prosperity of the state. And when diated and broken is a durk page of lows his

law the city of Des Moines charged \$1,000 per annum for a Heense to sell beer and whoe, it was well understood by all parties that, so far as the city was concerned, he licensed person could and would illegally sell whisky and the stronger drinks. He could not affect to pay this \$1,000 for the mere sale of beer and wine. This was an understood agreement between the licensed saloonke per and the city authorities. It was clearly liberal, and hence many responsible, respectable men declined to engaged had fewa had a genuine, honest, straight-fordard high license has never proven a failure in fewa. The state never had a trial of genuine high or low license. However, looking should before five years or probably a leas number of years roll around, flowa will make a fair trial of high license. The drift of public opinion is all in that direction now. of public opinion is all in that direction now.

Then in five years after the commencement of that trial the people of lowa will pro-

The friends of license are not rafraid

\$3 A HUNDRED.

tempts were made to materially change the law, and in some respects it was made more stringent, but they generally failed. Then we come to the period of constitutional prohibition. But thus article has already reached beyond the limit assigned, and the history from 1882 to 1800 most general assembly of 1881 agreed to the prohibitory constitutional amendment, it having been previously account to by the general assembly of 1881, agreed to the prohibitory constitutional amendment, it having been previously account to by the general assembly of 1880, and the respect been compiled with, the proposed attendances was submitted to a sole of the people at a special election ordered to be held on Tuesday, June 27, 1882. The result of that election is well known. The amendment was adopted by a majority of over twenty-mine thousand of those voting at that election, though over 30 per cent of the voters of the state failed to appear at the poils.

Then this vote has been, from that date to the state failed to appear at the poils.

State failed to appear at the polls.

Upon this vote has been, from that date to this, based the claim that a large majority of the voters of lows are in fayor of prohibition and have so expressed themselves at the polls. Do the facts bear out the assertion Prior to this election the friends of prohibition had perfected an almost perfect organization. They practically had the support of the republican party in three fourths of the counties of the state. They have in addition the support of more than three-fourths of the churches and of the preachers and priests in charge of the same. They had a widespread sentiment in their favor and they utilized this temperance sentiment in every possible way. It was almost wholly in every possible way. It was almost wholly a sentimental campaign. Facts, figures and logic were thrown aside as unworthy of consideration. The experience of other states with prohibition much characts and laws, though often cited, were unheeded. The cry was raised that it was a battle between "the home and the saloon." Those who opposed the amendment home. the amendment, however pure and temperate their lives, were openly charged with taking sides against the home and in favor of the saloon. The mothers, wives and daughters of the state were urged to take an active part in the canvass, and thousands of them did so. Nearly every church, pulpit and school house was utilized in this preal bitlom crusade. Lending and local new papers were many of them actually forced into the support of prohibition, while others, whose nominal controllers were really opposed to the amendment and to the principles of prohibition, were forced into neutrality or half-support of the measure. the amendment, however pure and to

support of the measure. On the other side there was no thorough organization or cencert of action. In 1882 the lemocratic party, with its organized body of veteran politicians and workers, could not be united as it could be in 1890, in solid opposition to prohibition. Thousands of equilicans who were in their own judgment opposed to prohibition, and especially to the sonstitutional amendment, were incapable of resisting the pressure and were forced to give it their support or at least abstain from any open opposition. Those not present during that noted campaign can form but a faint conception of the then situation. It is true many of the opponents of prohibition made a gallan the opponents of profilintion made a gallant and determined fight, but they were not supported by the other opponents of position either inside or outside of lows. As is always the case in these fights it was reported that the brewers and "whisky men" threw tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars into the state for the wayses. of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars into the state for the purpose of defeating the amendment. It is hardly necessary to say these canagerated statements were grossly untrue, though many honest men and women may have believed in their truth. The writer knows of his own knowledge that the aggregate of money contributed to carry on this anti-prohibition campaign was ridioulously small compared with the impresse of the question involved and the impresse of the question involved and the impress of the money expended, and it was expended in an entirely legitimate manner, was contributed by citizens of the state and much of it by men who had no luterest what

much of it by men who had no interest what-ever of a pecuniary nature in the manufac-ture or sale of liquors. Another cause aided materially in the adop-Another cause aided materially in the adop-tion of the prohibition amendment. For years the democrats of Iowa had been in an almost hopeless minority. They had become despondent ever the outlook. But when they saw the prohibitionists seeming control of the republican party and dictating its action their hopes revived. They did not believe in prohibition had they are prohibition, but they did believe that it was the rock upon which the republican party of Iowa might be wrecked. Hence thou

democrats in Iowa remained entirely passive or inactive during this campaign, and there is for the amendment. A few hundred of the voted probably conscientionsly, being willing to give prohibition a further trial, but many thousands of other democrats voted for prohibition not because they loved or believed in position but because they hatest the republican party more. They wanted prohibition as the club with which to beat down the republican party. They reasoned well as to the effect it would have upon the republican party. The repub-have upon the republican party. The repub-lican party has been badly bruised and in-jured and weakened in Iova by and through this prohibition club, but the democrats this prohibition club, but the democrats themselves have not escaped harmless therefrom. They have suffered in common with the other people of the state from the evils, the other people of the state from the evils, control of the state from the cylister of the other people of the state from the cylister of the control of that heldess prohibitory vote of 1882. Not one of any one hundred democrats who then voted for prohibition would be willing to repeat that vote. It was too be willing to repeat that vote. It was too costly and mischievous an experiment to be repeated. It did not and will not pay the

And here let me remark, as an Iowa demo crat, that if any of the democrats of Nebraska are disposed to vote for or in any manner aid are disposed to vote for or in any manner aid in the adoption of the proposed prohibitory amendment in their state, for the purpose of their by injuring the republican party of their state in the future, I think I but voice the carnest sentiment of all straight lowa democrats when I say emphatically—don't. It will not pay the costinis year, or act year, or at any future date. In this, most emphatically, "honesty is the best policy." This fact thousands of lowa democrats have learned, and had it branded into them, during the past ten years. They will never do it again. A burned child dreads the fire. And lowe democrats are now firm in the convio own democrats are now firm in the convic-ion that none but fool democrats will vote for argive even the slightest support to proble

tation of Nelsracka, the "booming" citizens of Iowa can say to prohibition emigrants; "The Palacins of the northwest, Nebraska of the west, and Kansas of the southwest, all baye prohibition in their state constitutions. They cannot rid themselves of it for years, there in lowa we are free of constitutional prohibition. We have only statute law prohibition. We can rid duracters of it at any time. There need be no delay. Come to lowa, settle here, aid us, and prohibition is dual." A few years age thousands of the citizens of Iowa left because of prohibition, and many became citizens of Nobraska. You will return to lows, and aid us in the good work of repealing our prohibitory laws and building up the state. You can take prohibition. We will gladly take your high teense.

O Manager, a Perry la , saloonkeeper, is on trial for selling three pints of whisky to five