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 84,858 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, 832,960 barrels of beer; that is about a barrel to the man, because you have only a little over 330,000 people down there. Reducing it to gallons, you have 10,310,760 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 know 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 Senator Blair's table 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 it 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 fun can't end until Small and I leave

[illegible] other table here. There is [illegible] in that same book, [illegible] of Mr. Blair, which is [illegible] 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 356 people. Over in Kansas they have done a little better. They have only one saloon down there somewhere 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 1880, 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 1880, before Dakota became a state, were listed 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 1880 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 1880 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't 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 2,260. 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 bat 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 1,268,502, 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 starred 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 fifty 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 50,178. That is over half of the 100,000. The moderate fellows were 32,260, which only left out of the 100,000 about 17,000 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.

THE WIND-UP.

Prof. Dickie's Closing Attack on High License.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am in such bad voice that it will be difficult for me to make myself heard. These two gentlemen who have discussed this question from the standpoint of high license are afflicted with the disease of knowing a great many things that are not true [applause], and I cannot refrain, although it is my purpose to abstain altogether from unpleasant personalities, from expressing my surprise that a gentleman of professional standing should have stood upon this platform for the last forty-five minutes and consumed nearly his entire time with the intentional effort to deceive this intelligent audience. I want to give you the reason for the opinion that I entertain.

Mr. Webster has been unfair in dealing with the tabulated statement published under date of July 3 in the New York Voice, and when I called his attention to the fact that it was simply a reprint of the official document issued by the beer brewers' national organization he undertook to play the trick of the police court lawyer and have me say to this audience through him that the Voice was publishing it in the interest of the liquor dealers. Furthermore that this table before him, a strong, elaborate and satisfactory demonstration of the triumph of prohibition in both Kansas and Iowa, ignores the strong points of the table and drops into a single column for the year 1886 which does preeminently give a bad showing for Iowa as compared with Nebraska. Now I want simply to give you the truth. Here are the facts in the case. Comparing 1880 with 1890, that is the fiscal year ending April 30, 1880, with the fiscal year ending April 30, 1890, and there has been for the state of Iowa, as reported by the beer brewers themselves, a decrease of 135,477 barrels. I want to repeat that number—a decrease of 135,477 barrels in the state of Iowa. [Applause]. Whereas in the state of Nebraska for the same period of time upon the same authority there has been an increase of 59,013 barrels, so that the difference in prohibition Iowa and high license Nebraska as reported by this beer brewers' organization is a difference in behalf of prohibition of something like 215,000 barrels. Now, I ask in the name of all fairness why didn't my friend who has so gracefully retired from the scene give this audience the actual truth in the case and not undertake to practice a dishonorable deception? My good looking, genial brother from Omaha, who is editor of the so-called newspaper that does not tell very much of the news after all, undertook to mislead this audience. I trust in all charity unintentionally, by telling you that in Nebraska the assessment on property valuation is from one-seventh to one-tenth of its real value, whereas in Kansas the assessment was very much higher, and in that way he accounted for the much more rapid increase of property value in Kansas. I have here the official statistics, obtained like the statement of the old almanac from the financial officers of the two states, and the result is that property is assessed 28.17 per cent of her real valuation, Kansas 27.98 per cent and Nebraska 31.24 per cent [applause], so that in the state of Nebraska, being assessed at a valuation lower than Kansas and Iowa, it is actually assessed at a higher ratio than either of those two prohibition states; but, nevertheless, we find the actual valuation according to the assessment in Kansas doubling up and more than doubling upon the gain in Nebraska.

The question was asked why God does not kill the devil. I suppose it is so that THE OMAHA BEE won't have to go out of business. [Great applause.]

Allow me to call your attention to another thing which I must denominate, in all charity and kindness from Mr. Webster as a trick of the police court shyster. Standing on this platform, and with his vigorous voice well at command, Mr. Webster undertook to deceive you intelligent people by quoting the number of United States revenue stamps sold in these various states, and using in express terms the language that would convey to you, if you knew no better, the idea that every revenue stamp sold in a prohibition state stands for an open saloon. Now Mr. Webster knows better. Mr. Webster either knows nothing at all, which I cannot conceive to be true, or he knows that every drug store is required to take out of these United States licenses as he calls it, which is no license at all, but simply a tax receipt for the payment of $25 exacted from the drug store precisely the same as from the ordinary saloon. Mr. Webster knows another thing that every bootlegger, every man that goes across the line from Nebraska into Kansas or Iowa to sell liquor out of his satchel, and there are a great many of them, is required to take out one of these same United States internal revenue stamps or receipts, while in Nebraska such a receipt stands for a place of this character open the year round. In the state of Iowa and in the state of Kansas the bootlegger or the joint dealer, unwilling to risk the chances of apprehension by the United States authorities, pays his $25, but it may be that the payment of the $25 represents one day, two days, one week or two weeks in the business, and scores and hundreds of men take out these internal revenue receipts who do not open saloons and who do not keep even joints, but; who sell from bootlegs and from satchels, and do a very limited business in a very small and criminal way.

I was rather astonished at the theological lecture that my friend, Mr. Webster, bestowed upon Brother Small, explaining to Brother Small that the bible nowhere prohibits the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits. Why, ladies and gentlemen, I defy Mr. Webster to show me a single place in the bible where crime or arson is prohibited or where the crime of forgery is prohibited. The bible is not specific; the bible is general, and when it thunders its anathema, "Woe unto him that putteth the bottle to his neighbor's lips," I ask Mr. Webster if that means free whisky or high license. [Applause.]

We are told by the gentlemen that prohibition is wrong in principle. What a lamentable fact that the legal talent of Mr. Webster of the state of Nebraska, has not been substituted for that indifferent and very common place gentleman of the same name, that Daniel Webster who argued this very subject before the United States supreme court sustained by no less a man than Rufus Choate, and yet that court without a dissenting voice in a Massachusetts case declared it both right in principle and in harmony with both national and state constitution. [Applause].

I simply desire to call your attention to one more trick, because I cannot go over the entire field. A large amount of statistical statement has been made that I freely confess that I have not at my command the statistics to refute, but I want to go on the very well grounded legal principle that false in part false in all. Mr. Webster this afternoon, standing on this platform with remarkable suavity of manner, undertook to make you believe that the state of Nebraska had 175 persons in her insane asylum. I noticed that he did throw in a saving clause, almost under his breath, saying that was in 1889. It was true, but the impression very likely remaining in your minds was probably false. I have some telegrams here. We have rapid ways of obtaining information in these days and do you know—yes, you do—that in the last six years two new insane asylums have been necessary in your state? I have a telegram from M. W. Stone, from the asylum at Hastings, saying "the total number of patients in this institution is 350;" another sent by the superintendent of the insane hospital located at Norfolk—"The total number of patients is 175; another report from the superintendent of the asylum located in Lincoln giving the number at 300. And so you have in this state at the present hour, in your three insane hospitals and asylums, a total of 6[illegible] instead of 175. [Applause.] There has been an increase in the last ten years of 185 per cent in the population of your state, and an increase of 468 per cent in the number of your insane unfortunates.

I want to call your attention to some more very pertinent testimony upon this proposition that high license is not a success. I know that Mr. Webster objects to despise the testimony that comes from these men, but I want to inform him that I was reading from no Kansas pamphlet and no political document issued here. The information that I read was from reputable persons, giving their names and their postoffice addresses, as well as their official positions. That information was secured by correspondence directly from New York with the individuals themselves, and they come in here and undertake to offset the statements of Governor Larrabee, of James G. Blaine, of Judge Danforth, of Judge Marshall and of a long list of distinguished gentlemen, by reading statistics manufactured very likely on the seventh floor of THE BEE building in Omaha. [Applause.] Listen to this quotation: "No one can deny that the license system as now existing in our city has been a source of corruption and irregularity. It has had a demoralizing effect upon the members of the city council and upon the city clerk; it has exacted political support from the low dives and bummers; it has compelled the orderly liquor dealer to support with money and influence the very worst element of the city, and has used the liquor men to do the dirty work at primaries and election."—OMAHA BEE. [Great applause.] Satan rebuking sin. [Applause.]

I read again. Listen. This is from Chicago. "The dives and dens, the brawl houses and thieves' resorts are as bad and as frequent in this city after five years of high license as they were with our high license what it is. It is an easy way to raise a revenue from vice but let there be an end of endorsing the high license as a temperance or reform measure." Chicago Daily News, the cleanest daily newspaper in that rather unclean city. [Applause.]

Listen to another from Philadelphia, Pa. Now, of course, because I am reading them from a printed document they have no significance, in the language of Mr. Webster. He would rather manufacture his own statistics and draw on his imagination for his facts than to take them from reliable sources. "Six murderers in Philadelphia during the past four months and all of them directly the results of drink. It is evident that high license will have to be made very much higher before murderers' row will feel the effect of it."—Philadelphia Evening Telegraph, a prominent representative newspaper.

I have them from St. Louis and a large number of sources which I cannot take time to read. I will read one so rural in its character, I must be pardoned for passing a moment to say. Do you all you know Hon. S. S. Kretzinger, and would you think his [illegible] were weighty than [illegible] for statistics brought [illegible] the Lord knows where? I think you would. Hear him, the mayor of Beatrice Neb.: "I am certainly not mistaken when I say that for the $10,000 yearly obtained from the saloon licenses the city annually loses $5,000. Four years of careful investigation of the subject lead me to conclude first, that the people lose more than they make out of the saloon licenses; second, that high license does not decrease the amount of liquor consumed; third, that any drunkard, minor or other person who wants liquor can get it under the high license system; fourth, that three-fourths of the arrests made are for drunkenness; fifth, that high license is a practical failure as a temperance measure, and sixth that high license is known and considered a con[illegible] farce by those who honestly admit its true workings."

I will not take time to read numerous other statistical points which I have. I simply desire to call your attention to the fact that the most competent persons, such as the editor of THE OMAHA BEE and the mayor of Beatrice, are entirely agreed that high license has been a dismal and a miserable failure in the state of Nebraska. [Applause.]

But I object to high license for another reason. I object to high license because it is eminently satisfactory to the liquor men themselves. [Applause.] I want to back up that information by reading some of their utterances. The Hotel Keepers' Journal says this? "The liquor dealers do not oppose high license." The Nebraska distilling company: "High license has not hurt our business; it does not decrease the consumption of either liquor or beer." The Besser-Lauferan brewing company of Chicago: "We cannot say that high license lessens the consumption of liquor." Metz Brothers of Omaha: "High license has been of no injury to our business. We at first made a bitter fight against its enforcement, but since it is well enforced we would not do without it." Henry H. Schufeldt distillery, Chicago: "We think the trade in the state should favor high license, a just restriction, and that is the only solvent of the question." Hon. Peter Iler—"In al ny twenty years' experience previous to high license and since, I believe high license is one of the grandest laws for the liquor traffic and for men interested, as well as the people at large, that there is." Now, what silts Peter Iler and Metz Brothers and the Chicago distillers in God's name don't suit me. [Applause.]

Now I have an objection to high license because of the corrupt proces used by its advocates for the purpose of carrying the day. Why, you have in this state an organization known as the B. & B. association. I suppose that means the Brewers and Bummer's association. [Laughter.] I don't see my friend Mr. Roggen with his pretty horn around here, but he represents the B. & B. M. association, and I need not tell you what you all know, that that association is an organization gotten up for the purpose of perpetuating the liquor traffic in the state of Nebraska and defeating prohibition, and yet it does not dare use the true name of the business it comes to defend or even state prominently the names of its leading members. Then they are scattering throughout this state an alleged farm pader called the Rural Age. It is a fraud, and any man who is a party to the dissemination of the Rural Age dare not look a fellow citizen in the eye and claim to be an honest man. They are publishing the Farm Herald. And where does the Farm Herald hail from? Louisville, Ky., under the editorship of C. C. Turner of the Liquor Dealers' National association. No, gentlemen, I cannot endorse the measure for the perpetuation of high license which must do its work in the dark and pursue the methods of the sand-bagger and the foot-pad and dare not come in the open day and present its case before the people.

Then I have another objection to high license. I believe my friend Mr. Rosewater is doing very well in refraining from smoking. I am glad to have him parade what few virtues he possesses to this audience. [Applause.] I heard a gentleman friend of his say that was his best argument. O, no, he presented some strong arguments along the line of having done something to increase the population of Nebraska [applause], and just swept the field by the declaration that he had drunk beer with Abraham Lincoln. If he prints that, I want him to put an interrogation point after the statement. I would not if I could say anything against the personal character of these gentlemen. They have done exceedingly well. They have done vastly better than either Rev. Small or I possibly could have done with their side of the case. They come down to make you think black is white and up is down, but the misfortune of the whole case is that my very estimable friend Mr. Rosewater and his companion, Mr. Webster, are surrounded by a very bad gang. [Applause.] I know it is hardly fair for me to appeal to anything like public prejudice, because it is evident that the majority of this audience is on the side of prohibition. But pray, after all, why, Mr. Rosewater! Here we have people gathered without reference to political party, without reference to church or creed. These are the people of taste, of refinement, of culture, that is as a rule are what you would call the best type of the citizenship of the state of Nebraska, and here we find the prohibition sentiment vastly in the majority. Now, I want to say to you that if this debate had been held in any 10-cent variety theatre in Omaha, or conducted from the platform of any dance hall in the state of Nebraska, Mr. Rosewater and Mr. Webster would have all the applause. [Applause.]

I am not here to say that all the men who sustain high license are bad men. Far be that from my utterance. There are good and pure and true, but in my judgement badly mistaken men, who love purity and peace and righteousness who will yet go to the ballot box and vote for license next November. But I will say since that every thug and plug ugly and blackleg and outcast and bummer and scalawag and horse-thief in all the state will go and do the same thing. [Applause.] I am not here to say that no decent men will oppose prohibition, but I am here to say that the bartenders, the saloon-keepers and the prostitutes will oppose prohibition to the last man, and woman, too. [Applause.] I want to remark to my good looking friends Webster and Rosewater that when I find myself pursueing a course of conduct and advocating a line of public policy that has the hearty endorsement of the criminal and outcast classes I will call a halt and go into seclusion and privately study the foundations of my faith. [Applause.]

Now I ask if this prohibition amendment shall be beaten next November, where will the rejoicing be? Will it be in the churches? Will the Sunday schools hold a praise service and thank Almighty God for the defeat of the prohibitory amendment? No. But down in every low dive where bad men are clinking midnight glasses with bad women amid the revels of the dance houses and the houses of assignation there will be rejoicing. I hope neither Webster nor Rosewater will participate, but will conduct their rejoicing in a very much more elegant and gentlemanly fashion. I will tell you there is something wrong when these men reputable in society and having won honorable places for themselves come here to defend a line of policy entirely in accordance with the sentiments of the criminal classes. But suppose the prohibition amendment shall prevail, where will the rejoicing be then? In all the homes of this great state the light of love will come back into the eye of many a woman from whose eyes it has long since fled. Rejoicing will come back again into the home of many a miserable drunkard who has been powerless in the presence of temptation to break the bonds that bound him. The church bells all over the state will ring out and carry paeons of praise, ministers and Sunday school superintendents and the people everywhere will go down upon their knees in devout expressions of thanksgiving to Almighty God for his wonderful deliverance from this accursed traffic in the land. [Great Applause.]

Now I had rather be on the side that causes the good women and the baby children to praise God than on the side that receives the jeering smiles of the painted prostitutes. I tell you there is not a disreputable woman in all the state of Nebraska but if she could vote would go to the ballot box and vote with Rosewater and Webster on this question—not one. [Applause.] And so I appeal to you by your love for your homes, by your love for the financial prosperity of your state, by your love for good order and sobriety, by your love for Almighty God, to go to the ballot box and register your convictions, whether you triumph or not, in behalf of prohibition. [Applause.]

High license, according to the testimony of its best defenders, including my friend, Mr. Rosewater, has proved a miserable farce and a make-shift. I challenge, as my brother, Rev. Small did, high license from the standpoint of its constitutionality. High license, utterly un-American, undemocratic, unrepublican—what is high license at the best? High license is practical prohibition for forty-nine men out of every fifty, and so far I do not object. What else is it? It is that most offensive of all things in the nostrils of the American public, a purchased monopoly of a money-making business of the fiftieth man. [Applause.] High license says to this man, "No, you cannot sell grogg." Why? Bad men? No such claim is made. He is poor and it is poverty. He annot lay $1,000 in the palm of the public tax gatherer, but high license says to this man, "You may debauch your neighbors, you may break the hearts of the women, blight and blast and damn the lives of the children." Why? Because he is a better man than A? Nothing of the sort. High license bars out A on account of his poverty and permits B on account of his wealth. [Applause.]

Then I have another objection to high license. It partakes of the nature of a cowardly compromise. I want to say that it is a cowardly compromise. The liquor traffic is either right or wrong. Even Mr. Rosewater and Mr. Webster will say that. The liquor traffic is either good or bad. It requires no philosopher to lay down that proposition. If the liquor traffic is a good traffic, if it creates wealth and contributes to the health and happiness of our people, then it is a piece of outrageous tyranny to levy this tax of $1,000 on these men. If this business be a good business then I take my stand by the side of these liquor men, and I propose to lift up my voice in earnest protest against this tyrannous course of compelling them just because we can, to pay $1,000 into the local treasuries. But if this business be a bad business, if it do not do good, if it create no wealth, if it sow the seed of discord everywhere, if it breaks the hearts of our women and leaves the mildew of its accursed power wherever it goes, and then I want to ask in the name of modern civilization how much money paid into the local treasury can make so bad a business good?

Then I have another objection. High license is made possible only by the cowardly confession of guilt on the part of the liquor men themselves. You undertake to levy a $1,000 tax on the dry goods dealers of Nebraska and you would have a pretty buzz about your ears. You try to make the grocers pay a $1,000 tax for the purpose of ruining their business and discriminate against the traffic and you could not collect it from one grocer in the whole state. The would contest it in the courts, and the liquor men dare not do it. Why do the liquor men pay the tax. Every time they walk up to the captain's office and lay down $1,000 in the state of Nebraska, they write a certificate of their own criminality and their own cowardly lack of manhood. Against what other business do you find such laws of discrimination? None.

I have one more objection to high license. It debauches the public conscience whereby the people for a money consideration consent to the continuance of a bad business. Am I mistaken? No, right in the city of Omaha, from which Mr. Rosewater and Mr. Webster come, so debauching has been the effect of high license of the liquor traffic that that city, be it spoken everywhere to its shame, has consented to the license system practically as applied to prostitution, so that the landladies and the inmates of these houses of infamy go on the first or second day of each month to the office of the city clerk and pay a prescribed sum, which as a matter of record I presume appears as fine and cost, but which to all intents and purposes is a license system. So far has high license debauched public sentiment in the city of Omaha. Now hear me—for many of you will doubt the soundness of my statement, but I know whereof I speak—so far has high license debauched public sentiment in the city of Omaha that prostitutes advertise their street and numbers in the columns of the daily newspapers. I have that information from a reliable gentleman here who gives me all that is needed to substantiate it if it is called in question. I tell you you cannot go into this business of licensing one iniquity, but the devil will spread that license idea over another.

I want you then to think about these things. Consider them calmly, intelligently, and then in the very sunlight of Almighty God, and before the star chamber of your own consciences settle this question, and I know you will settle it right, and go to the ballot box on November 4, and declare that the liquor traffic of Nebraska must die the death. [Applause.]

A MERITED REBUKE.

Mr. Dickie Scored For His Ungentlemanly Conduct.

I regret exceedingly to be compelled to take exception in a posteript letter to Prof. Dickie's course as a spokesman of the supporters of the prohibition amendment. He was represented to me as a high-minded, courteous and honorable gentleman. He ha shown himself to be an unprincipled and cowardly blackguard. It was my endeavor throughout the discussion to avoid all personalities and to accord to my opponents the presumption of sincerity, veracity and honesty of purpose. All who were present and those who have read what I said will find no provocation for the insulting inuendos and vituperation in which Mr. Dickie and his colleague indulged from first to last. And the fact that not one syllable of their uncalled for abuse, and villification has been omitted from the report made by THE BEE affords striking proof that the prohibition side has been treated as fairly as any political combatant expects to be treated by opponents.

Almost at the very outset Mr. Dickie indulged in a most cruel, unprovoked and cowardly attack upon Francis Murphy, whose only offense was that he was billed to deliver a temperance lecture in Beatrice last Sunday night and happened to be in the audience during Mr. Dickie's opening address.

It was agreed before the debate had begun that the prohibition side was to take the affirmative, and the four debaters were to rotate for thirty minutes each until the debate closed. This arrangement gave Mr. Dickie the opening and Mr. Webster the closing. But when the closing speeches were about to be made on the afternoon of the last day Mr. Dickie deliberately lied into my teeth and asserted that I had agreed to let them have both the opening and closing. After delaying the audience for thirty minutes he finally succeeded in bulldozing us into a concession which gave him the closing speech. Having thus secured leave to have the last word, Mr. Dickie took advantage of his opponents, and devoted most of his time to insulting and lampooning me and Mr. Webster and imposed upon a credulous and emotional audience by libelous inuendos for which he had no proof and misquotations of what had been said by us during the debate. He had the audacity to call in question the reliability of the statistics which I had quoted by intimating they were manufactured for the occasion. As a matter of fact every citation made by me was either from official records in my possession and within reach or from letters and telegrams sent to me by state officers, sheriffs, police officers, county and city clerks of the various counties in this and other states. He purposely distorted Mr. Webster's statement regarding the number of insane in this state in the face of the fact that the official figures had been quoted both by Mr. Webster and myself in previous speeches. And he knew that he was imposing upon his audience in accusing Mr. Webster of falsifying the record.

With a knowledge that he would be proved a libeler he reserved his attack on the Business Men's and Bankers' association and called them bummers and beats when nobody could contradict him there. Every intelligent citizen of Nebraska knows that this association comprises among its members the most reputable and responsible business men in the state. They are not only men in good financial standing, but men standing high socially and morally in the communities in which they reside.

And Mr. Roggen, the secretary of this association, was referred to by this mercenary agitator as if he were a bloated saloon loafer, when as a matter of fact Mr. Roggen had for twelve years occupied the position of deputy secretary of state and had twice been elected by the citizens of Nebraska to the responsible and honorable office of secretary of state, a position ranking next to that of governor. Mr. Roggen has also been adjutant general and has a good record as a union veteran.

Prof. Dickie quotes from THE BEE to prove that the high license law is not enforced in Omaha, but he takes care not to quote the date of the editorial, which appeared years ago, when our city council controlled the police and issued the licenses. Everybody in Nebraska knows that we have now a board of police commissioners appointed by the governor, which has no conn