KANSANS ON PROHIBITION.

Prominent Citizens of St. John's State Forcibly Express Their Views.

A HARD BLOW TO TRUE TEMPERANCE.

The Legalized Saloon Succeeded by the Lowest Dives—Business Stagnation and Other Dire Results—A Repulsive Picture.

Owing to the limit which had been put upon the time of the debaters, and the omission of the morning debate on Saturday, a number of very interesting and instructive letters from citizens of Kansas as regards the liquor traffic in Kansas and the effect of the law upon the material welfare of the state had necessarily to be omitted. These letters are well worthy of perusal.

Many citizens of Nebraska are doubtless acquainted with ex-Senator J. H. Sterling. He represented Fillmore and York counties in the senate in 1887, and was a staunch supporter in that legislature of Senator Charles H. Van Wyck. He was an uncompromising advocate of prohibition and voted for statutory prohibition in that legislature, and his vote is also on record in favor of a constitutional amendment to prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor in the state of Nebraska.

Mr. Sterling moved to Kansas in the fall of 1877, and is still a resident of that state. His testimony should therefore, have some weight with the sincere friends of true temperance.

The other letters are all from leading citizens of Kansas and men whose veracity is unimpeachable.

Flagrant Violations of the Law.

GOODLAND, Kan., June 30.—Hon. E. Rosewater—Dear Sir: I have resided in this county since November, 1887, and during that time I have had the means of observing, and have carefully observed the practical working of the prohibitory liquor law, and as I have always desired to see the liquor traffic eliminated from the land, I may have been somewhat prejudiced in favor of the law, but I have endeavored to know the real operation of the liquor business and true situation under the law here.

While I am well aware that many of the citizens of this state regard the law and its effects very differently from what I do, yet I feel warranted in frankly stating that the sale of intoxicants here, has not been, and is not in any degree reduced by the law. The alleged friends of the law vociferously assert that there are no saloons in our midst to allure the young and invite the old into the paths of intemperance; that sobriety and morality now obtains where intemperance and vice formerly existed.

Such assertions sound well and I wish they were true, but I know the facts do not warrant them. While you will rarely, if at all, see the sign, "Saloon, imported wines, liquors," etc., on the glass front of any business house here, you will, however, find in its stead "Temperance hall," "Billiard parlor," etc., wherein can readily be had all of the meaner and villainous varieties of intoxicants.

These "temperance halls," etc., flourish here, although they are nothing other, or better, than the lowest and meanest class of saloons and gambling dens, and their true character is well known. These places are open to the young and middle aged alike, and are freely frequented by both. Intemperance, nay, absolute drunkenness, obtains here to a greater extent than in towns of similar size in Nebraska.

The "drug store" is an institution here, both multitudinous and pestiferous. It flourishes like a green bay tree, and under the law as well as in the eye-shot of many ranting temperance workers and prohibitionists the "Kansas drug store" is a reputable, moral institution, worthy the endorsement of ardent temperance men and women, although the fact is patent that its very existence offers a premium to perjury and begets contempt for the law.

The means employed to conduct the liquor business, and the methods adopted by the patrons of the bowl, to obtain it, are more pernicious to the individual and community, than is the worst feature of intemperance.

The liquor business has been and still is being conducted exclusively and with a most flagrant disregard for the law, and it is usually conducted by parties wholly irresponsible, both morally and financially, so that neither the victim of the traffic, his family nor the community has any remedy against the dealer for any damages resulting from his illicit and dangerous business. In other words, the community here suffers all the evils attendant upon the presence of the most depraved phase of the liquor traffic, without deriving any benefit from, or any protection against its presence.

There are at this time, at least five different places in this city, where intoxicating liquors are extensively dispensed, and of course none of them pay anything into the public treasury for the privilege of conducting such business, neither do they give any bond for the protection of the individual or community, for damages resulting from the liquor business.

The condition of things here is a fair index to the operations of the law generally. The sentiment of the public generally is not in favor of the enforcement of the law, and it is not enforced, neither is there much, if any, honest effort made for its enforcement. The prohibitory law has bred an indifference for the solemn sacredness of an oath that is simply appalling, and this deplorable feature is increasing in enormity.

The judiciary of the state is able, honest, and very numerous, and I might add, expensive. Thirty-five district court judges, at a salary of $2,500 each and three supreme court judges and three supreme court commissioners, at a salary of $3,000 each. Every county has a county attorney, whose special duty it is to see to the thorough enforcement of the prohibitory law, yet the law is openly and boldly defied, and daily most flagrantly violated.

The county attorney of this county is a teetotaler, an ardent temperance advocate, and a consistent member of a Christian church. Yet, only one party has ever been convicted in this county of a violation of the prohibitory law, although more than a score of persons, during my residence here, have openly been engaged in the liquor business in this city.

Yours, etc., J. H. STERLING.

A Chapter of Horrors.

WASHINGTON, Kan., July 4.—The issue of constitutional prohibition in Nebraska is watched in this state with much interest. While Kansas has been under such laws since 1881, there have been only six years of practical enforcement of the law in any of the towns and cities of the state, and it can safely be said that it has never been enforced in the larger cities. During the months and years devoted to the work of closing the open saloons, no feature of prohibition was noticed beyond the tenacity with which the liquor seller clung to his business and the fact that he was a rebel against law. All good citizens gave aid in enforcing the law against the selling of liquor, and it can safely be said that in 1885 the open saloon, except in the larger cities, was a thing of the past.

In Washington the closing of the last saloon was hailed as the dawning of the millenium. The after conditions of prohibition were as yet unfolded. When they began to develop, the republican party of this state was tied hand and foot to the prohibition machine, and all the evils of the drink habit were relegated to lawmakers for remedy. Temperance organizations no longer met to call in the young man and point out the evils of "putting that in the mouth which stealeth away the brains;" the drunkard was no longer urged to reform for his sake and the sake of his family; but they met to resolve in favor of more stringent legislation, to select delegates to semi-political conventions, to demand the selection of county attorneys and executive and judicial officers.

This may seem an ultra statement, but it is a fact not only true of Washington, but equally true of all of Kansas. The women of Kansas, untrained in statecraft, unread in history, were given municipal franchise at the demand of the so-called temperance people that the law might be enforced and sobriety forced by statute.

What the result has been is a chapter of horrors to the man or woman possessed of average human sensibilities. I care nothing, for man, in the aggregate, w ho has passe the prime of life—his habits have become fixed, and whether they are good or bad they are seldom changed by moral suasion, never by human statutes. But the hope of Kansas and of the nation is in the boys and young men. Now, what is the effect of prohibition on the boys? No gilded sign attracts them to invest a nickel at a polished bar. Everybody, in Washington at least, admits it is wrong to have saloons for the sale of liquors and that temptation is removed. But the boys do see business men and farmers receiving kegs, cases and jugs of all kinds of liquors from the railways and express companies; they see many a suspicious box delivered to professed abstainers and they learn that Mr. X and Mr. Y and Mrs. Z always have liquors in the house for "medical purposes" and they occasionally notice that the alleged illness of these good people seems to require large doses frequently; they see sports, bums, laborers and others "chipping in" and sending away for cases, kegs and jugs which duly arrive and are opened and consumed in stables, cellars, alleys, and other convenient places; and the result is that the boys raise a quarter each and they send for cases and jugs. The woods along Mill Creek could tell terrible stories of debauchery on the part of boys from fourteen to twenty years old, under cover of night. Kansas is today under an era of free whisky and it is beginning to be recognized by hundreds and thousands of men who voted for the prohibition in good faith. There is no way to stop the inflowing current of intoxicants which is spreading to the homes and firesides. The country is full of misguided women who have taken up the crusade and are aided and abetted by white-handed men who obtain money from the prejudices of humanity against the rum traffic. The cry is legislation! legislation! Women attend meetings in the interest of more legislation, spend half the night discussing ways and means to punish jointists and bootleggers, while their sons are assembled about a nocturnal co-operative beer keg accumulating a jag of monumental proportions. Tell them of this and they will promptly call you a liar, and point with pride to the fact that not a saloon can be found in Washinton.

Whether this sort of thing is common to other prohibition states or not I do not know, but it seems to me that it must result the same everywhere. It is a natural and logical result of prohibition. Some of our people claim that the same facts would exist under license. They could not. Minors would be barred from the saloons, and not a wholesale house or brewery in the country would ship a single package of goods in competition with a local saloon any more than a wholesale grocer would accept a single order in competition with a retail grocer.

Sunday "beer drinks" are another feature of prohibition. Half a dozen farmers "chip in" and buy two or three kegs of beer and the whole neighborhood meets at some one house and have a Sunday social with beer and whisky as the chief feature. It is no uncommon thing for half a dozen of these meetings to occur within ten miles of this town, and in the aggregate the beer and whisky thus drank would stock two saloons a week. The stuff comes every day, but Saturday is the big day. I have seen the time when a freight car was added to the passenger train from Wymore to Concordia in order to carry the express packages of liquors. The worst feature about the whole matter is that while every town along this branch in Kansas is decreasing in population, this jug business is increasing.

Prohibition in Kansas has made perjurers by the hundreds, and liars by the thousands. Even in so law-abiding and moral a county as Washington it is almost impossible to convict a whisky seller and that in spite of the reversal of all rules of criminal prosecution, yet this county has plenty of men and women who freely write outside of the state that liquor drinking has largely decreased under prohibition and that the law is rigidly enforced.

The experience of cities and the absolute failure to enforce the law is a matter of history so well established that I need not say a word about it, but I wish to refer such Nebraska voters as are not already fixed in their convictions to the things set forth herein as true; and for proof I ask them to come to this city of 1,629 people and stay one week and keep their eyes open, asking no questions, taking no second hand opinions.

G. E. HATHWAY.

Will You Do It?

WICHITA, Kan., June 20.—Prohibition does not mean temperance. If the people of the great state of Nebraska desire to lose all control over the sale of intoxicants, let them vote for prohibition. If they desire free whisky, let them vote for prohibition and their desire will be accomplished. If the people desire to remove the licensed saloon and have two or more dives take the saloon's place, where boys as well as men can go and drink the vile liquor kept in these dives, let them vote for prohibition, and all this and more will be yours to enjoy. If it is an increase of taxation that the people are longing for, let them vote for prohibition. If the people of Nebraska desire to stop all immigration into their state, let them vote for prohibition and you will not be bothered further with looking after immigrants.

If it is the wish of the people to have a host of soft-handed cranks, who were never known to produce anything, not even a house to live in, to control their great state, vote for prohibition. If the people desire to remove the saloon from where it now is to the cellar of the average prohibitionist, vote for prohibition.

Much more could be said by any person who has carefully investigated the working of prohibition laws in Maine, Iowa and Kansas, but I expect I have covered all the space I should in your valuable paper.

W. R. PAYNE.

A Terrible Blow to Temperance.

WICHITA NATIONAL BANK, WICHITA, Kan. June 20.—Prohibition is not true temperance. There has been no Good Templar or blue ribbon society, no true temperance lecturer in the state since the law was enacted. Fanatics, relying entirely on the strong arm of the law to reform people, have been here, and the result is there are fewer teetotalers than before the law was enacted. There is more drunkenness in the home, as can be demonstrated by the trail of beer and express wagons all over the towns of the state, and the office, and the shop, and the hotel. It has become far more respectable to drink in Kansas than before the law. Seven-tenths of the officeholders elected on a ticket that had prohibition in the platform, celebrate every event of their lives by a drinking bout. There has been more cant, more hypocrisy, more sneaking, more perjury, more lying, more moral degradation than from any law that any people were ever cursed with, and has cost the state of Kansas, as it will cost any state that adopts it, hundreds of millions of dollars, and cursed the state besides.

Prohibitionists claim that all the moneyed element is with them. So far as the agitation of the prohibition question in Kansas is concerned this is not true. There has not been a speech made, with one or two exceptions, in favor of prohibition in the state of Kansas since the agitation for re-submission, that was not made by a preacher, who was ready at any moment to swap the pulpit for some position or office that paid a larger salary. The leader of prohibition in Kansas is an ex-preacher now holding a federal position that pays him $4,000. For years he was a political striker, a lobbyist, and the most untruthful man in the state of Kansas. He never opens his mouth on prohibition that he does not wilfully and knowingly utter as many falsehoods as he thinks his listeners will swallow. Rev. B. Kelly is his name. No practical, fair minded man, who has lived in a town of over 5,000 people in Kansas can truthfully claim anything for prohibition. I do not think that a dozen open saloons are capable of the serious injury of one secret joint. Minors, lewd women, thieves and thugs alike can visit them with impunity. The proprietor, even if disposed, dare not open his mouth as he is afraid that if he offends any of his visitors they will enter a complaint against him. But he has little if any compunction of conscience in the matter as he is an irresponsible person at all times and prefers to do business upon the prohibition plan and votes that ticket because it allows him to do business on little or no capital and no license.

A. W. OLIVER, vice president.

Ruined Business in Kansas.

WICHITA, Kan., June 14.—You ask my opinion of prohibition. It is beyond question the greatest delusion of the nineteenth century. The idea of putting an end to liquor drinking and all its attendant evils meets the approval of all right thinking people and so takes possession of the intellects and judgments of many good Christians that they have come to regard it as a part of their religion and would be greatly shocked if told that prohibition was not a bible doctrine. While they adore it as though it was one of the ten commandments, they are totally blind to the fact that there are two places now where liquor is sold to one before prohibition came to curse our state. True, the word saloon has been changed to "lunch counter," "short order restaurant," "meals at all hours," and a multiplicity of names, the meaning of which is well known to the initiated, but the advantage of the change has never been apparent to me, as the business carried on under cover of these various names is the same as before the name was changed. Indeed, I think the open saloon preferable to the secret dive. In the one case you can control the business and in the other you cannot. Boys and habitual drunkards cannot obtain liquor over an open bar, while all can obtain it in the "joint" or secret den. Then the revenue derived from the regulated or licensed saloons helps to bear the burden of municipal taxation and to pay the expenses incurred in prosecuting violators of the law. There is another phase, or rather result of prohibition you would hardly have suspected. It is the number of private cellars this law converts into veritable wine cellars. It is safe to say that four-fifths of all the men in the United States occasionally drink a glass of wine, beer, ale or possibly whisky. It may not be once in a year, or it may be once in five years, but my experience is that most people sometimes take a glass of some kind of liquor. This class, while respectable and temperate, will have what they want, and in order that no embarrassment may arise they constantly keep in stock in their cellars a variety of such liquors as are most palatable to them. Being constantly in the house with it the tendency and temptation is to drink more than formerly, when they slipped into a saloon only when a strong craving drew them there.

But it is when you consider its effect upon the business interests of the state that the average man becomes deeply interested in the matter. A large class of industrious, thrifty and altogether desirable people can never be induced to voluntarily settle in a prohibition state. From my own experience of its workings I would never settle in a state where prohibition laws prevail, unless I was assured of their speedy repeal. You can have no great and influential state without one or more large cities or business centers. To build and sustain a large city in a state where prohibition prevails is an impossibility. Liberal customs and laws attract population to cities while prohibition drives population away. Massachusetts cannot keep prohibition and Boston too, and so prohibition had to go. Providence is of more value to Rhode Island than prohibition and prohibition had to go. Philadelphia is worth more to the state of Pennsylvania than prohibition and prohibition was voted down there by 180,000 majority. In Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Iowa, Kansas and the Dakotas, no one of which contains a city of over fifty thousand, the incubus is still bearing down and sapping the energies of the state, and virtually impoverishing their people. If you people in Nebraska want to know all the beauties of prohibition, in heaven's name come and live in some city in Kansas for four or five years and you will have enough of it.

But in Kansas the republican party committed itself to prohibition before knowing what a monumental humbug it was. The churches, most of them, did the same, and it has been preached so much, that, as I said before, many good people consider it of divine origin. If they were told that Neal Dow of Maine and John Peter St. John of Kansas had each made comfortable fortunes out of this hobby they would not believe it, but brand it as an invention of the liquor interests to injure prohibition.

A. T. CARPENTER.

PROHIBITION SHAM.

Ex-Governor Robinson of Kansas Makes a Strong Arraignment.

A short time ago ex-Governor Robinson of Kansas published a letter in the Kansas City Times criticising the prohibitionists and saying that liquor could be openly purchased in Lawrence, Kan. A number of prohibitionists replied to the article attacking Governor Robinson because he had the manhood to speak the truth. To these attacks Governor Robinson replied as follows: "The law so far concedes that every citizen of sound mind and mature age has a right to buy what he pleases and all he pleases. Does the law make provision for educating these old and young men as to the right and wrong, proper and improper use of liquor? Does it provide for temperance organizations and temperance instruction, such as existed under local option? No, none of these things are provided or contemplated. How, then, does this law propose to make temperance men? There is but one way and that is to make it impossible for liquor to be bought by punishing its sale. In other words, so far as the law is concerned and so far as prohibition preaching and talking is to have any effect, it is to deprive the people of the power to get intoxicants, or deprive them of free agency in a purely personal matter of liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

"The law of the universe has made the development of character in any direction without free agency an impossibility, as all thoughtful men well know. If so, then this law must be nullified or failure will result.

"To test my sincerity I will agree to give to any citizen in Douglas county $100 who will bring proof that there is any man of sound mind in the county who can not get all the liquor he can pay for, from a bottle of beer to a bottle of whisky, and he need not apply to a 'supreme court saloon,' either. Then where is your prohibition, if I am right?

"D. White says he has resided in Lawrence for ten years and knows of no drinking saloons. I recently made the statement to Mrs. A. Diggs that liquor was openly sold here. She concluded to investigate the matter and some dozen jointists were found without difficulty and convicted. I don't like saloons any better than you do, especially I dislike these unregulated saloons that know no law; but really what can we do? You say there are none, as Mrs. Diggs said. Well, where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise, and I wish I could believe as you pretend to, but I had a little experience which I can't quite get over. A friend of mine lost his balance and fell overboard in these saloons and was there for some two or three weeks before I found him. I took him home and after about ten days he recovered so as to give a report of himself. He had personal knowledge of seventeen saloons and information of some eight others. His statement is corroborated by an official, a drinking man, besides abundant indications from general appearances. It is true some have been prosecuted and convicted, but for what good? There are indications of there being saloons enough to supply every citizen of Lawrence that will patronize them. To prosecute only piles up costs for the taxpayers to meet and does no good.

"I have seen that a committee of fifty has been appointed to fight the decision of the United States supreme court, and they have commenced several cases which lawyers say will cost the county $15,000 to prosecute. Some of this committee don't want their drug business interfered with, and some want to make political capital for the republican party and have old Douglas county foot the bills. Yes, the people have seen what has been done at these so-called temperance meetings, but they have not learned of a single man or boy who could not get all the intoxicating liquor he can pay for in Douglas county without going to the original package saloon.

"I have heard of the wry faces and terrible straining at these meetings at the little original package, while whole wagon if not carloads of liquors are unloaded at the depots and delivered at the saloons, men and boys club rooms and private residences all about town. The little original package gnat causes many contortions, while carloads are swallowed at a gulp and lips are smacked for more.

"Yes, I hear of frequent meetings in parks and churches and Women's Christian Temperance union parlors and of much prohibition, not temperance, talk, yet the first year of so called prohibition seventy Good Templar's lodges expired and 3,000 members left the order, while soon after not a lodge could be found in the state. In 1881 nearly all the young, and many of the old, had their names on the total abstinence pledge, while for years the pledge has been unknown, and it is fashionable for young men of means to tipple. A young business man of Topeka, graduate of an eastern college and universally popular and a favorite, declares he knows not of a single total abstainer among all the young men of his acquaintance. An old resident and highly esteemed railroad employe says that the parents and community would be astounded if they knew how much liquor was shipped by express to young men and boys for their clubs and personal use."

FREE WHISKEY IN DAKOTA.

The Effect of "Prohibition" in the Black Hills District Described.

SALOONS RUN WITHOUT REGULATION.

Original Packages Houses Rampant—An Omaha Man Tells His Experience on a Visit to Hot Springs.

HOT SPRINGS, S. D., July 18.—To the Editor of THE BEE: Dakotans have watched with interest the great debate at Beatrice on the question of prohibition or high license. A visit to the Black Hills at the present time would convince any unprejudiced person that prohibition is a dismal failure in that part of South Dakota. Original package houses are in full blast all over the country and whisky of the poorest quality is more plentiful than ever known in the history of the Black Hills. Leaving out the matter of revenue, the country is a great loser because of the entire inability to regulate the sale and enforce police regulations thereof. Under our former system of high license saloonkeepers were prohibited from selling to minors, drunkards, etc., under severe penalties. They were under bonds to keep an orderly house and were generally prosecuted if the law was not complied with. Now if there is any law the prohibition officers fail to enforce it.

I venture the statement that in the city of Hot Springs there is twice as much liquor sold as there was before prohibition, and this too, in one of the best communities in South Dakota, a community of colleges and churches.

If Nebraska is wise she will hold to her high license system, under which you can control the evil and bring it under strict police regulations. Save your state from the evils of free whisky which invariably follows in the wake of prohibition. No honest man will deny the evils of intemperance, but do not enact a law or amend your constitution whereby you will open the flood-gates for free whisky, over which you will have no control and leave you powerless to stay its devastating influence.

I speak whereof I know. As a member of the state senate of South Dakota of the session that passed the present prohibitory law of the state, I am in a position to know that the anticipations of the friends of prohibition have not been realized. They were honest but were mistaken. They have found out that no law, however severe, can change the appetite for drink or reform a drunkard. Only the power of Almighty God and the determined will of the poor unfortunate will avail. Educate the boys to shun all evil and inculcate pure morals and success will crown the effort. Nebraska should not make the mistake that South Dakota has.

A. S. STEWART.

ORIGINAL PACKAGES RAMPANT.

Scenes in Prohibition South Dakota as Seen by an Omahan.

HOT SPRINGS, S. D., July 9.—To the Editor of THE BEE: I spent the Fourth of July here in this glorious prohibition state of South Dakota, and in company with several Omaha men we followed the crowd, and before the day was over saw more men beastly drunk than I ever saw in any one week on the streets of Omaha. Men were walking on the streets carrying a bottle in each hand and shouting and yelling as only drunken men can do. Beer in original packages is kept on ice, and the dealer is so kind as to pull the cork and furnish glasses just as an accommodation for the customers, and rotgut, which they call whisky, is put up in bottles holding from two ounces upward. In the part of South Dakota that I have been over there is not a village large enough to have a postoffice where liquor and beer are not kept for sale. I wish the constitutional prohibition advocates of Nebraska would take a trip through the Black Hills, and if seeing is believing surely they would not want this kind of prohibition.

Hot Springs is at present filled with visitors to its full hotel capacity, and the town is growing rapidly. Stores and dwellings are going up in all directions. Here are already one private bank, one state bank, and a national bank has just been organized by F. T. Evans, A. S. Stewart, C. G. Fargo, V. T. Prentice and Petty Brothers. The $50,000 capital is all subscribed and they will be ready to start business in a few days.

The Fourth of July was celebrated in regular spread eagle style on the Chautauqua grounds just outside of town, which is as beautiful and aesthetic a piece of ground as the most romantic would wish to see. The mountain side, with top projecting out some twenty feet overhanging the green valley, and running water below, makes a picture that is very pleasing in its majestic grandeur. Fall river, made up almost exclusively of these hot springs, flows through the town and four miles below forms a fall of seventy-two feet, where the water goes over the rocks with a deafening roar. A good road along the river banks forms a pleasant drive which the tourists seem to enjoy very much, and furnishes good business for three livery stables.

The entire country is tributary to Omaha, and traveling men from the different wholesale houses can be seen here every day. Omaha seems to be to this country what Chicago is to eastern Iowa.

Rum and Gospel Unity.

COZARD, Neb., July 10.—[Special Telegram to THE BEE.]—There has been considerable excitement caused here over an application which has been laid before the town board by Charles Depew asking for a license to run a saloon.

There is already one saloon in town, the proprietor of which immediately came to the same conclusion as the prohibition party, or "Church league," viz., that one saloon in a town of this size was quite sufficient; so both the league and the saloonkeeper, apparently hand in hand, girded on their armor and entered the fight. A remonstrance signed by quite a number was handed in, and consequently a public meeting was held in the opera house in order that the question might be publicly argued by the attorney's on both sides. Judge Connor of Kearney represented Depew, and Smith of Lexington appeared for the Unity. The meeting was well attended and some very amusing arguments and sarcastic remarks indulged in by both attorneys. Mr. Smith on behalf of the combination endeavored to prove that Depew had not acted according to the requirements of the law, by not having his application placed on record in the county office before the notice appeared in the local newspaper, and also pointed out that all the signers on the applicant's petition were not bona fide real estate owners. The board decided not to grant the license, but consented to consider another application if laid before them in a clearly legal manner. Mr Depew again went to work and without difficulty secured more than the required number of signers and has in every way acted in accordance with the advice of his attorney; so the board will consider the second license on the 19th. It is generally supposed that they will grant the license, although Mr. Smith said in public that his clients intended to make it as warm as they could, and if they did not gain their point they would delay it as long as possible by taking the case to a higher court. The whole community is greatly aroused at the saloonkeeper being hoodwinked by the league, as their object is to prevent the opening of the second saloon and then turn their attention to getting rid of the present one. That fact has been stated from the pulpit of one of the churches, but as the saloonkeeper does not attend that church he is not yet acquainted with this fact. The general opinion is that the saloonkeeper supplies the funds and the league does the shouting.

THE KANSAS WAY.

Original Package Joints Flourishing on All Sides.

Jailer Joe Miller returned Thursday from a trip to Ottego, Kan., and a wild tale he tells of affairs in that state. While there Mr. Miller visited several towns and in each one he found the saloon bar closed, but the original package flourished in all of its original glory. Hotels, drug stores, groceries, hardware stores, and in many instances dry goods stores had their little rooms partitioned off where the packages were sold. The streets of most of the towns were full of drunken men and every other man had an original package in his pocket.

In regard to crops, they are poor, small grain being almost a failure, while the corn has suffered greatly from the hot winds that blew during five days last week.

An Original Package Victory.

TOPEKA, Kan., July 17.—Judge Phillips has handed down an elaborate decision in the original package case argued before him recently. He granted an injunction to the agents of the brewing firms in St. Louis and Milwaukee who had engaged in business in this place against County Attorney Welsh and Sheriff Wilkerson restraining them from further interference with the plaintiffs' business.

Less Beer, More Whisky.

Washington Post.

Like most impractical reformers, who are ever prone to bolster up their unreliable theories with untrustworthy figures, the prohibitionists show a disposition to place an undue reliance on one-sided statistics. Thus the New York Voice, the organ of the prohibition party, in a recent issue publishes a great array of figures to show that in Iowa and Kansas the present consumption of beer has greatly decreased from what it was in those states ten years ago. This decrease is claimed, no doubt with perfect accuracy, to be directly due to prohibition.

But this claim, well established though it may be, fails so furnish a satisfactory answer to the question, "Does prohibition prohibit?" It fails to show that there is less drinking and drunkenness in the prohibition states than there were at the beginning of the decade. It is not difficult to see that a prohibition law, which would change licensed saloons into secret and irresponsible "speak easies," and turn drug stores practically into liquor shops, would, in the very nature of things, diminish or, indeed, entirely do away with the more bulky potations of beer, while it might drive beer-drinkers into the more easily concealed and far more pernicious habit of whisky drinking.

That, in the several prohibition states, this has been the precise result seems established by abundant testimony. A few months ago a leading clergyman at Portland, Me., stated publicly that he had seen far more deplorable cases of utter inebriation and a greater number of them of them in Portland in one day—the previous Fourth of July—than he had seen in Milwaukee during the whole of week his attendance at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, although beer was abundant on every side and all sorts of liquor could be had openly. The evidence of reliable citizens of Kansas and Iowa is to the effect that in every city, town and village throughout these states whisky may be had, though for the most part of inferior and dangerous quality; that because it must be taken in bulk the tendency is to excessive drinking, and the drunkenness resulting is of a particularly violent and malignant type.

If this statement of the matter in some measure approximates the truth, how can prohibition be held to be successful? What gain is it that beer drinking has been diminished or even driven out if it has been replaced by whisky drinking under secret, illicit, cowardly and utterly demoralizing circumstances? Whisky contains 50 per cent of alcohol, while beer has only 3 or 4 per cent. There is more perilous and mischief-producing drunkenness in one gallon of whisky than in a whole keg of beer. Where, then, is the advantage of driving out the more harmless beverage, in regard to which the Voice boasts that prohibition has largely diminished its consumption?

If, therefore, it is true that in prohibition states the difficulty of obtaining beer leads to an increase of secret whisky drinking, at once degrading to the man and demoralizing to the citizen, may it not be justly claimed that prohibition is in a great measure chargeable with so deplorable and dangerous a result.

The Only Legitimate Conclusion.

Fred Benzinger in Lincoln Courier.

Sitting in front of the Capital hotel the other evening A. G. Wolfenbarger, the prohibition advocate, conversed on the all prevailing topic in a temperate, sensible way. He spoke in complimentary terms of the ability and energy of Editor Rosewater of THE OMAHA BEE and expressed the opinion that that paper was being paid by the liquor interest for its fight against prohibition. He added with unmistakable sincerity that THE BEE was earning every dollar the liquor men are likely to pay, that Mr. Rosewater is throwing an influence and a power into the campaign with results that the anti-prohibitionists could not secure in any other way with an expenditure of a like sum of money. There is nothing startling in these statements, but it is a bit noticeable that such testimony should have come from such a source.

The truth of the matter is that Mr. Rosewater is a much misunderstood man. By thousands of people every utterance of THE BEE on state affairs is supposed to be loaded with mystic meaning. If a quarter of the surmises were true they would keep Mr. Rosewater awake nights laying plans to boost this or that politician into office. If a half of these guesses were facts Mr. Rosewater's time would be engrossed with a thousand schemes of assorted sizes and colors. The fear of small fry politicians conjures up shadows that never had any substance in Mr. Rosewater's plans. The prejudice and the ignorance of narrow-minded people attribute mean actions and qualities that would become themselves, but are foreign to him. I do not mean to hold up the Omaha editor as a paragon, but I do believe he is not a quarter as bad as he is painted. He has stepped on the schemes and ambitions of a thousand men, and they have turned on him with bitter reviling. Hence the prevailing opinion.

Take the recent debate at the Beatrice Chautauqua assembly between Sam Small and Prof. Dickie for prohibition and Mr. Rosewater and John L. Webster against it. THE BEE employed three stenographers to make verbatim reports, and it published both sides without abridgement and without any attempt to color the affair. It is not likely the liquor interest would pay to have prohibition speeches reported and published, and if the men in the business are really putting up to THE BEE they would undoubtedly have given a good round sum to prevent these prohibition speeches having the benefit of THE BEE's great circulation. The only legitimate conclusion is that Mr. Rosewater published this debate on his own motion and at his own expense. And if you will look back over his record you will find that that sort of thing has not been uncommon with THE BEE. Such cases make me feel prouder of journalism and of the men in it. The spirit of fair play manifested by THE BEE is a newspaper virtue beyond the comprehension of the average man, and Mr. Rosewater is even more of an enigma to the bigotry and stupidity of the common herd.

Badly Worsted.

Wisner Chronicle.

It has been some time since a public discussion has attracted so much attention as has the debate between Prof. Dickie and Rev. Sam Small on the side of prohibition, and Editor Rosewater and Attorney Webster on the negative. It is the general opinion that the advocates of prohibition were badly worsted in the battle, their sentimental exhortations being completely wiped away by the sledge-hammer logic and unanswerable statistics of their opponents. It was noticeable that the prohibition organs had no use for reports of the speeches of Rosewater and Webster.

The Ranters Worsted.

Grand Island Independent.

The free whisky prohibitionists should have stood off the taking of the census until after the election this fall, as the figures give the lie direct to the paid prohibition papers and platform ranters who have been talking about prosperity following the pestilential path of prohibition. It is bad for the figures that they dispute the direct testimony of these great reform ranters. Facts are stubborn things and no amount of ranting can controvert facts when once well established, and this is where the ranters have the worst of it.

The Facts and Figures.

Superior Times.

The great debate on high license vs prohibition at the Beatrice Chautauqua on last Saturday and Monday exceeded the expectation of the most enthusiastic and sanguine. Thousands of people went to hear gifted and talented men discuss the pro and con of this important question and were not disappointed in the result. Some of the ablest speeches made in our state for years were delivered there. The most notable feature the debate was the number of facts backed up by statistics taken from official records that could not be disproved that were presented by Rosewater and Webster. The prohibition advocates took the only course left them, that of heaping anathemas and abuse upon the supporters of high license. These gentlemen should learn that a few facts and figures taken from reliable records are worth more in a debate of this kind than all the abuse and vituperation at the command of even a Sam Small. Such an argument as the prohibitionists endeavored to advance, may gain applause from those whom logic and reason will not reach, but any unprejudiced man or woman who listened to that debate or will carefully read it can draw but one conclusion, and that is that the prohibs were badly worsted on their own ground and they did not, with their important speakers, bring forth one argument to prove that their position was tenable.

When the growth and prosperity of high license Nebraska was compared with the advancement of prohibition Kansas, Iowa, Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire by official records and indisputable facts, Nebraska was found to be far in the lead. But the worst black eye given the prohibs was when it was proven without doubt that according to the population we had in this state a less number of convicts in the penitentiary and lunatics in the asylum than those states where prohibition has been tried.

Keep It Before the People.

Grand Island Independent.

Keep it before the people that there is not a state in the union with so few convicts in prison as we have in the license state of Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union in which the percentage of illiteracy is so low as in the license state of Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union with so few liquor dealers in proportion to the population as we have in Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union that has so few people in jail in proportion to population, as we have here in Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union where the public school facilities are as good, in proportion to the population, as here in the license state of Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union with so few inmates in its insane asylums as we have in the license state of Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union where the moral standard of the people is so high as right here in the license state of Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union where the commercial prosperity has been so great for the past ten years as right here in Nebraska.

Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition st[illegible] the union where the increase in population in the past [illegible] years has been anything like as great as here in the license regulat[illegible] state of Nebraska.

These are facts worthy of consideration in the prohibition controversy and should be carefully pondered over by every citizen who is anxious to do the right thing, according to his best judgment.

The Great Debate.

Niobrara Pioneer.

The debate on prohibition vs high license at the Beatrice Chautauqua, in which Prof. Dickie of Michigan and Rev. Sam Small of Georgia espoused the prohibition cause, and Hon. Edward Rosewater, editor of THE OMAHA BEE, and Hon. John L. Webster, one of Nebraska's ablest lawyers, espoused Nebraska's state policy of high license, closed on Monday. The arguments on both sides were generally good, though the prohibition side is weak in its great stickler to principle without policy. There is no question in the mind of any respectable man but that the various animal passions of men should be regulated by educated custom and decent regard for one's self-respect. The state makes proper provision for the brutes of humanity. It is not that any of the intelligent citizens in this state opposed to prohibition are so wedded to the saloon that they can see no danger in its freedom, but rather that the policy of high license, with a proper regulation, has proved more satisfactory than the free saloon or the private bottle. Moral sentiment positively enforced would soon regulate the worst features of the dangerous saloon element. The Pioneer is by no means upholding the saloon business as an elevating one, but there is a demand for such places or there would be no room for them. Put them out of the way and the private house will have its private bottle where it was never known before, and the towns and cities not morally strong will have holes-in-the-wall. Messrs. Rosewater and Webster had the practical points on their side and handled the subject with remarkable ability. It is a remarkable fact that there is no prominent prohibition orator in Nebraska, but all have been imported from other states to insult its citizens, to cry down Nebraska's general prosperity, and to paint pictures of hell, damnation and discontent, none of which xist.

The Fourth in Portland, Maine.

Cor. New York Evening Post.

The Portland papers announce that with the exception of the ceremonies in connection with the Army of the Potomac reunion, the Fourth was celebrated as usual. If such be the case, the sooner the state of Maine does away with its farcical pretense of a prohibitory liquor law the better, for the number of intoxicated persons met about the streets during the day and evening, in a city where the sale of liquor is illegal, was to a stranger astonishing. Many of the people from the surrounding country, prohibited possibly from obtaining liquor while at home, seemed to make the celebration of the day the excuse for a drunken debauch, attesting by the act their defiance of the law and their contempt for the law-enforcers.

$50 a Night.

Sioux City Journal.

Ex-Governor St. John is stumping Nebraska for God and home and native land. His terms, unless he has changed them, are "50 a night and expenses." The prohibition leaders are cranks indeed or they would hire John P. St. John to stay out of the state till after the amendment election, even if they had to pay him "$50 a night and expenses."

Sentiment vs Figures.

Davenport Tribune.

Sam Small is in Nebraska talking on the liquor question instead of religion. He says in prohibition Iowa property is only taxed 25 cents on the $100 valuation of assessed property. Come over, Sam, and get some "figgers" before you say any more.

PROHIBITION FOR PLUNDER.

Some Very Startling Figures Printed by the Iowa State Register.

THE PUBLIC TREASURY ROBBED.

Enormous Expenditures in a Fruitless Effort to Enforce the Law—Mercenary Officials Feather Their Own Nests.

The Iowa State Register has had tabulated articles showing what a system of plunder is going on there under the guise of prohibition and with the aid of the prohibitory law.

What is being done at Des Moines is being done in a less degree in other Iowa localities.

The Register makes this summary of the facts it has collected:

"We print in another column this morning some figures that will startle the people of this city and the whole state. They show how the prohibition law is being used by a gang of mercenary officials to plunder the public treasury. A Register reporter has very carefully examined the official records, and he finds that during the six months of 1890 there has been taken from the treasury for the criminal costs of the justices' courts in this city alone the sum of over $30,000. Of this amount over $11,000 was paid to five justices, the remainder went to their constables, witnesses, jurors, etc. This enormous expenditure was nearly all for the searching business, or such criminal business as incidentally grew out of it. The city has a police court where ordinary criminal cases are disposed of that do not come before the district court, so that the most of the costs of these justices' courts was for alleged enforcement of the prohibitory law.

"But if this great expense had resulted in closing the places where liquor is sold and suppressing the illegal sale of liquor in this city, there are many people who would not feel that the cost was too great. Unfortunately that result has not happened. The $30,000 dollars expended on the justices' courts has gone into the pockets of the justices, constables and their favored gang of assistants, without any honest attempt being made to stop permanently the sale of liquor. The constables who make these searches don't want the traffic suppressed, for they are getting rich by it. The justices who issue the warrants and get large fees don't want it suppressed for they are making thousands of dollars out of it every year. And so the whole machinery of these petty courts is worked to perpetuate the business and yet punctuate it with lucrative interruptions nearly every day, and sometimes several times a day."

He Could Rake in $400 a Week.

Cedar Rapids, Ia., Gazette.

Deputy Sheriff Pollins' attention was called to an article from a Des Moines paper, exposing the work of Pierce and Potts and other constables in that city, respecting their raids on liquor dealers and original package joints and their utilizing the machinery of the justices' courts and prohibitory law for the rich yield of fees that it afforded. It is understood by the public that they were making no honest effort to either permanently or temporarily close any of those places where liquor is sold in violation of the statutes. "Well, a man can grow rich out of it," said Mr. Pollins. "If I wanted to do it I could lift the mortgage off my house in a very short time. Guess I will do it. No I won't either. It could be done very easily. [illegible] w[illegible]ed every day in the week and served where liquor is sold. In this proceeding it is unnecessary to do anything further. The officer would receive $2 for the writs, $1 for serving notice to the owner of the liquor to appear within forty-eight hours and show why the liquor should not be destroyed, and $1 for destroying the liquor, making a total of $4 in fees for each and every seizure. The law requires the officer to do this and county boards of supervisors are required to pay the bills. Say there are one hundred places in Cedar Rapids where liquors are sold. If writs of seizure should be issued against them once a week the officer would make $400 per week, quite a comfortable living, a veritable picnic. Then it is possible for the officer to be in league with the liquor sellers themselves. He could post them when he would call, and when he did serve the writ it would not be necessary for him to seize all the liquor in the establishment. He could take one bottle of beer or whisky, proceed with the confiscation process and become under the law entitled to his fees. Even if he destroyed a thimbleful of whisky he would be entitled to a fee of $1 for destroying it. So you see how easy it would be for a dishonest constable or officer to earn large fees without accomplishing any results, with no purpose of honestly enforcing the prohibitory law and without seriously discommoding the liquor dealers, or destroying much of their stock in trade.

The Maine Prohibs Acknowledge It.

The Nation.

The prohibitionists of Maine have just held a state convention which is noteworthy for its frank confession of the fact that prohibition does not prohibit in Maine. The platform contains the following statement: "That the republican and democratic parties each contain a liquor element sufficiently large to prevent any thorough or determined enforcement of the prohibitory law: their declarations are therefore meaningless and adoptions well understood by the liquor interests and by the officials upon whom enforcement depends and at whose hands the law is practically nullified in the cities and large towns in Maine." This is precisely what the opponents of prohibition have always contended to be the truth, and, now that its advocates concede the fact, there is no room for further argument on the question.

They Watched Him.

Des Moines Leader.

One of our constables was in Chicago recently and registered at the Palmer house. The clerk assigned him to a room on the sixth floor and whispered to the house detective to keep an eye on that fellow or else he would jump his bill. "On what floor are you putting me?" asked our constable. "On the top floor," was the answer. "I guess you don't know me; I am a Des Moines constable." "Show the gentleman to parlor A," said the clerk in his most affable tones to the bell boy, and then turning to the detective he whispered, "He can pay his bill all right enough, but he'll steal everything that has two loose ends if you're not careful."

Badly Worsted.

Fremont Flail.

The prohibitionists were fairly worsted at Beatrice on Saturday. Mr. Rosewater's stubborn facts swept away the web of sentiment that had been woven by the opposition and Mr. Webster fairly clinched the arguments advanced by his colleague. That Omaha has been one of the most slandered of cities is very plain, and it is well for the metropolis that it has a champion that can confound its enemies and put its revilers to open shame. Every one should read the arguments in full, as they will doubtless be published in pamphlet form. It may be well to suggest that the prohibitionists will never spend the money sent them from the east to publish any part of them, but what is to their interests.