lation of Polk county, the expense of the criminal courts was less than $50,000. He presented further statistics showing that the jails of Kansas and Iowa have more inmates, according to population, than in Nebraska. He showed an array of statistics from the county officials showing that crime has not decreased in Iowa and Kansas under prohibition, but had actually increased, and was far in excess of Nebraska in ratio to the population.

He met Governor Larrabee's picture of prosperity at Des Moines by telling of a visit made to Iowa's capital city a week ago. He gave the number of fifteen vacant store buildings on the principal streets which were for rent at a figure greatly reduced over that demanded before the prohibitory law went into effect. He quoted letters from business men of Des Moines relative to the depreciation of property, and presented similar statistics from Kansas.

He closed by promising to show in his evening argument how prohibition does not prohibit.

General Bradford's Speech.

General Bradford was then introduced. He was not in a good humor. He had sulked in a corner or walked to and fro in front the entrance during the progress of the other speeches. He was nursing his wrath, and when introduced announced with more warmth than grace that he had made it a rule of his life never to speak where he was not welcome. He felt very sore over the scorching he had received at Mr. Rosewater's and Webster's hands last night, and he explained that he had come under protest and in response to the Grand Island committee's invitation. He said he wanted to refute the slanders that had been uttered about Kansas. He had the facts, he said, volumes of them, to show that the state had grown wonderfully greater under prohibition, and he wanted to present them.

They (the audience) waited for them, but they were disappointed. Instead of facts, Mr. Bradford launched forth into a political speech, which occupied his entire time. He proved to his own satisfaction that the only chance for the republican party in 1892 was to adopt prohibition as a national issue, and go into the campaign on that issue alone. He told the history of republican growth and his own political success as a prohibition republican, his majorities and how badly the other fellow was left until time was called. Then he said he was sorry he did not have twelve hours to talk, so he could get a chance to offer the statistics he had with him.

Hon. John L. Webster's Speech.

Hon. J. L. Webster met a cordial reception when he opened his reply to Bradford by stating: "I did not come here to make a political speech, and was not invited here for that purpose. I came here to talk of the dangers of this nefarious policy of prohibition which some gentlemen from abroad are seeking to force on the people of this state. These two ex-state officials have told you of the great growth and success of the two states and the prosperous condition of the republican party under prohibition. Yet the republicans of Iowa repudiated prohibition and elected a democrat to succeed Governor Larrabee. The republicans of Kansas repudiated St. John and elected a democratic governor. The prohibition political heresies of both have been refuted, and both have been politically swamped under the glorious policy of prohibition. We, in Nebraska, have not got prohibition, and we never had a democratic governor." [Applause.]

Mr. Webster then apologized for dragging politics into the debate, and said he would not have done so had not Mr. Bradford compelled it by his political speech. Mr. Webster then went further into the line of argument commenced at last evening's debate, to show that crime of all kinds, and drunkenness in particular, is more prevalent in the prohibition states than in states where a high license law is enforced. He closed by repeating his assertion that prohibition, as it exists in Iowa, Kansas and Maine, is a greater drunkard maker and generator of crime than high license saloons. He said he had waited for an answer to this statement, and had waited in vain. If any of the prohibition advocates had with them any of the statistics they had been harping about he was anxious to hear them.

EVENING SESSION.

Ex-Governor Larrabee's Speech.

The final meeting of the debaters on the prohibition issue drew an immense audience and aroused a great deal of enthusiasm. When the programme was announced "Colonel" Rankin made a roar. He wanted to speak. The gate receipts were large, and he wanted a share in it. He protested, he gesticulated, but to no avail, and he took his dishes and went home, refusing to play any longer.

Ex-Governor Larrabee of Iowa opened the evening discussion. He could not reconcile the statements of high license advocates, he said, when they claimed in one sentence that prohibition was ruining the state and in the next that the prohibitory law was not enforced. He referred again to Iowa's prosperity, and claimed that much of this was due to the successful suppression of the liquor traffic. He denied Mr. Rosewater's figures quoted at Beatrice, on the expenses of criminal prosecutions in the state, and explained that the increase in the expenses was due more to a change in the judicial system rather than to an increase in crime. He said he used to travel the same road on the prohibition question that Mr. Rosewater was now traveling, and was sure that he could convince him of his fallacy if he had time. He explained the low rents in Des Moines by saying that rents had been too high in Des Moines for years, based on a boom, and had only recently been reduced to a reasonable rate. The speaker referred to "Stormy Jordan" of Ottumwa, the proprietor of the saloon called "The Road to Hell," as to whether or not prohibition could be enforced in Iowa or not. Jordan fought the law and carried a case to the supreme court of the United States at an expense of $20,000, and was finally forced to close his place.

The brewers of Iowa could tell, he said, whether or not prohibition was enforced. References were made to the proprietors of the various breweries in Iowa who had closed up and had gone into other business and had been highly successful. "There are a few breweries in the state, but there are not many of them," he said, "and they can be closed if the officers of the law do their duty. High license reduces the number of saloons, I confess, but the trouble is it legalizes them. It makes the business respectable. I would rather have a doggery than a gilded place. I am not afraid of my boys visiting a doggery. If we had gilded saloons I should be afraid. It is the legalizing of the business that I oppose."

Governor Larabee made a calm, logical exposition of his views. He cited quotations from the reports of the Forty-first district judges of Iowa, tending to show that prohibition had resulted in the decrease of drunkenness and the crimes consequent thereon. His speech was better received than that of any of the prohibitionists who have spoken at these meetings.

Hon. Edward Rosewater's Speech.

Mr. Rosewater followed Governor Larrabee, and repeated his expression of the afternoon in thanking the governor for his courteous and gentlemanly address, something unusual in prohibition speakers. Mr. Rosewater stated that there was reason for the favorable reports made on the prohibition question by the district judges of Iowa. Most of them were republicans and were pledged to support prohibition, and could not well give any but a favorable report. Mr. Rosewater then directed his attention to General Bradford. He showed up the falsity of many assertions that were made by the Kansas lawyer. Bradford stated that the reform schools of Kansas were empty, while Nebraska's were crowded. Mr. Rosewater in reply read an advertisement inserted in all of the Kansas papers by the superintendent of charities and corrections, in which sheriffs and county officials were informed that there was no room in the reform schools for boys, and that offending youngsters would have to be kept in the jails. Mr. Rosewater reviewed Bradford's wild statements, and dissected them to the evident satisfaction of the immense audience. Answering Governor Larrabee's statement, that the prohibition law was as well enforced in Iowa as any other law, Mr. Rosewater said he would feel very sorry for the state of Iowa if all her laws were as badly enforced as the prohibitory law. He presented figures showing the large number of licensed liquor sellers in Iowa and Kansas.

He referred to his experience in prohibition Iowa last week. He arrived in Des Moines at midnight and started out to see how prohibition prohibited. He visited a hotel and found a barroom without any difficulty, and procured whisky without any question. He went further, and found a number of grog shops running open all night.

He created an immense sensation by producing a half pint of whisky which he had purchased in a Des Moines barroom after 1 o'clock in the morning.

He made a further investigation later, and found that the liquor traffic was carried on almost openly. He found in one of the places, next door to the Register office, accommodations for drinking and gambling, and he produced a bottle of beer which he had purchased in an alleged tea store. He found that one drug firm had sold 7,200 bottles of beer in August.

The records of the city marshal showed that the total of arrests in Des Moines for the half year ending July 31, 1890, was over four thousand, of which over four hundred were in one month, more than for six months in Lincoln, in whisky Nebraska.

Mr. Rosewater also told of his trip to Kansas, where, in Leavenworth, he purchased beer in a saloon directly opposite the city hall, in front of the mayor's office.

Mr. Rosewater also told of his experience in Topeka, where he found numerous places where liquors were freely sold. He contrasted this condition of affairs with the workings of the liquor traffic under the license regulations of Nebraska.

Referring again to Bradford, Mr. Rosewater presented an affidavit of a Topeka plumber who found and drank beer in Bradford's cellar while he was attorney general of Kansas, and that when Bradford was prosecuting attorney he was reproved by Governor St. John for being in alleged collusion with the whisky interests. Mr. Bradford was also found to have written a letter in which he told the governor that the law in Kansas could not be enforced. Mr. Rosewater said he admired honest prohibitionists, but he detested men who were hypocritical in professions and are anything for political preferment."

Bradford Refuses to Speak.

General Bradford was billed to follow Mr. Rosewater. He probably got an inkling of what was in store for him and when Mr. Rosewater finished his address Mr. Bradford could not be found. He had gone away with Rankin and they were holding a mutual admiration society in their rooms at the hotel, engaged and paid for by the committee they had insulted by their schoolboy peevishness.

In Bradford's absence Governor Larrabee was called upon to take Bradford's time. The governor continued his line of arguments on the school phase of the prohibition issue. He claimed that the license system was wrong, and taxes for school purposes should come from property holders. The saloonkeeper should not be set up as a tax-gatherer. He does not collect from the property owners. He gets it from the laborer, the poor man. It is a system of tax shirking. It enables heavy property owners to get out of paying their share of the taxes properly due from property owners.

Governor Larrabee, referring to Mr. Rosewater's Des Moines experience, humorously advised Mr. Rosewater to be a little more careful about going into such temptations. His report was only in confirmation of the governor's former charges, that whisky men resorted to all manner of means to evade the law. He assured Mr. Rosewater that there was no danger of being slugged in Des Moines, and created a laugh in the Omaha contingent by turning to Mr. Rosewater and asking him if he had ever been slugged in Omaha.

Hon. John L. Webster's Speech.

The debate of the evening and of the occasion was closed by Hon. John L. Webster. "Governor Larrabee," said Mr. Webster, "is entitled to the kind consideration of this audience for his manly and honest discussion of the question. He nowhere took the time, however, to tell the people to answer my charge that prohibition as a political doctrine is a greater drunkard maker than the high licensed saloon."

He explained the manner in which he had agreed to meet the prohibition speakers in debate, and showed that Rankin and Bradford were kicking without cause or reason. Mr. Webster stated that he and Mr. Rosewater were present without compensation and under the auspices of no organization. They were present to defend the high license law of Nebraska under which the state had grown and was growing greater. He reviewed the penitentiary and criminal records of prohibition states, and showed conclusively that the offenses resulting from abuse of the liquor traffic were on the increase, and were greater in proportion to the population, than in high license Nebraska. He presented an array of statistics showing the ratio of drunkenness to the population in the Iowa cities to be far in excess of that in Omaha and other cities of Nebraska, and enlivened the showing with illustrations and forcible hints that kept the enthusiasm of the audience at a high pitch. He was accorded an enthusiastic ovation at his masterly close of the great discussion.

THURSDAY'S DEBATE.

A. C. Rankin's Opening Address in Favor of Prohibition.

Mr. A. C. Rankin opened the high-license-prohibition debate at the Grand Island sugar palace Thursday evening. His argument in support of prohibition is given in full, from stenographic notes. He spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I greet you here tonight in defense and in support of the prohibitory amendment to your constitution. This palace is suggestive of the new enterprise in the west, and I trust that the day will soon come that these broad acres that we have stretched out before us here will produce and there be manufactured enough sugar to sweeten all of us people in the eastern states. I shall not detain you with any preliminaries. My time is limited and the subject is one that is very hard to do anything like justice to it in the space of forty-five minutes.

I am here, then, in support of the adoption of the prohibitory amendment to your constitution and to oppose the present license system or any license system. I hold to the position that the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage is right in principle and justified upon moral, social and business grounds and is sustained by the highest authority in this great republic.

Second: I affirm that a license, high or low, is wrong in principle, does not regulate nor protect society and is a sin against God and a disgrace to this state and to our nation. When a great question of this kind comes before the people we are met with opposition, some of it honest and some of it dishonest. One of the first things that suggested itself to us as disputative is the argument that it is the abuse of intoxicating liquors, and not the use. This argument has served more persons and longer time as an excuse for the moderate use of intoxicating drink.

Then perhaps another; I read in the public press that the distillers of Peoria, Ill., in their convention adopted this as one of their planks, that it was the abuse and not the use.

I am here tonight to accept that as literally true; it is the abuse and not the use. The evil of this traffic is admitted; it is admitted by the distinguished gentleman that is to take the opposite of this question. I have their admission before me. I have before me the address of Mr. Rosewater and Mr. Webster at Beatrice and for convenience I have taken their admission of this business down and will read it.

Mr. Rosewater in his address at Beatrice says: "The distressing pictures of the suffering and misery by reason of liquor we all admit; we know that men have made beasts of themselves; we know that men have gone down to their graves and we know that hundreds of thousands of people are impoverished. The question is not, shall we by one fell swoop, stop the drunkard factories, but are we able to keep the drunkard factories closed. I am not here representing the drunkard makers, I am not here representing the saloon or defending the whisky shop."

I wish to call your attention to this fact: That he here distinguished the saloon as a drunkard factory and those who manage it as drunkard makers, and if I should feel inclined to use that term in speaking of this business, I hope to saloon keeper or any one engaged in the business will feel offended when my friend can use such terms as that.

Mr. Webster says, "I am not here to advocate the saloon interests, but of regulating a sort of evil that cannot be wiped out of existence."

I don't suppose that either one of them are here to deny their position upon this question.

It is the abuse of intoxicating liquors, we accept that as literally true; if no one had ever used intoxicating liquors, and the abuse of them, we would never have had the proposed movement, there would have been no necessity for it.

We accept this as literally true; this came from our friends, and we both agree upon it. The question naturally arises in our mind, who should correct this abuse? Those engaged in the business, or those outside? I affirm that this admitted abuse should be corrected by the parties engaged in the business; that they should have corrected this evil they admit; and the question arises, why hasn't they done it? Why hain't they done it? I would like to have either of the distinguished gentlemen tell us why! They have had time enough. They commenced the regulating of this traffic over four hundred years ago; we have given them over a hundred years in this republic to, by a system of license or various forms of law, protect society from the evil of this business, but failure is written over every effort.

And today we stand confronted with the enormity of the evil of this traffic, and we are asked to allow it to go on and only deal with the abuse growing out of this business. I say it is their place to correct it, but they have failed. Why? Because they can't. It can't be done. You might as well undertake to regulate the devil as to attempt to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors publicly and prevent the public from the evil growing out of such sale.

If the railroad company here should put down a large number of new rails between here and Omaha and they should prove to be faulty, and when the train run over them one broke and the train was thrown off, and upon investigation it was found that that order of rails was at fault, what would the company do? Take every rail from the railroad bed and put down new ones in order to protect the public from the danger of that ride.

I say the liquor men admit that evil. Why hain't they protected us and our homes? It is because they can't, and they gave it up more than twenty-five years ago. They have not only failed, but they have almost, with but few exceptions, secretly and openly violated every effort of the people to protect themselves against this evil.

And in the face of this they ask us to close our eyes and stop our mouths to permit this business to go on, provided they pay us the paltry sum of $500 or $1,000.

The second thought suggested to me is that you can't make men stop by law—you can't legislate morals into a man; the way to reform a man is to at them with the gospel; you can't reform a man by taking a policeman and going at him with a club, and that prohibition is wrong in principle because it tries to legislate morals into a man, and it can't do that. This is another of their objections to prohibition, and it is a principle I know that good men preach. Yes, sir. Brother Murphy preaches this doctrine. God bless the old man; he is doing a good work to rescue men who become victims to the rum drinking habit, and I say amen to that, but when ever Brother Murphy steps over the line from the "malice toward none and charity for all" and brotherly love and throws insinuating slanders over the men who are in favor of legal prohibition he is out of his element, and I do not say amen to that.

Again: Law makes conditions. We are not going for the drunkard to reform them with a policeman's club; we are going after the business; we are going for the breweries and the saloons, not the individual man. Law makes conditions. This truth is one that has always been applied to civilization. In the last presidential campaign we discussed the tariff, one party siding against high tariff to make business good in the country and the other said we must have a low tariff to make business good in the country. Neither one of these parties proposed to plow a field of corn by law, nor make a ton of iron by law, nor make a pair of shoes by law, but they proposed to change the conditions by law. Conditions first, results afterwards. This campaign for the amendment is a campaign for the establishment of the new condition of things and not particularly and directly to legislate upon the drunkard.

Conditions always precede results. This is divine notice of the application: "The pure in heart shall see God, and not every man that says Lord, Lord, Lord shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of the father which is in heaven it shall be due to receive the reward.

It is true in mechanics, it is true in agriculture; there are certain conditions required. The farmer must plow the field and plant the seed and cultivate the corn before he gets the crop. How we look after the conditions around our home so that our children are not thrown into contaminating influences, to know that the conditions around conduce to a sweetness of life and that our children may grow up noble men and women.

Law makes and changes conditions. We see this truth verified in the original package bill. When the supreme court decided against us at once the conditions were changed by law in the prohibition states and the original package saloons prospered at once, but when the president had written his name to the Wilson bill away over in Washington city, the conditions were changed in the state of Iowa and Kansas and the original package men got out in double quick.

Law changes conditions, and we ask for a prohibitory law; we ask for the law to take away the saloon, to take away the brewery, and as a result make the condition that surround our homes, that surround society, that surround our communities, that will conduce to sobriety, by which boys can grow up to be men without becoming drunkards, and the men who are drunkards can have a chance to live a sober life.

Is there anything cranky or fanatical about this proposition? It is a grand thing to reform men, to be the instrument of leading men into the path of sobriety, but it is an infinitely more glorious thing to destroy the agency that produces drunkards and save the nation and generation to come from ever being drunkards, and that is what we purpose. The prohibition of the liquor traffic to be used as a beverage is sustained by the highest legal tribunal in this nation. This question has been settled in the supreme court of the United States and it has settled the question of personal right or the personal liberty of the citizen as respecting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

Let me quote you a few extracts from the supreme court of the United States. Men talk about us legislating what we shall eat and where to go to church and all that kind of thing. The supreme court of the United States, I have its opinion before me, the supreme court tells us that not every act ostensibly for the protection of public health and public morals and public safety is to be accepted by them as a legitimate exercise of the police powers of the state, but they tell us that an act ostensibly for that purpose that had no real or substantial reason to those things, that was a palpable fraud on the rights of the citizen, it was the duty of the court to so declare.

You can not prohibit what you please. The supreme court, the highest tribunal, the only court removed away from the party influences,—the men upon that bench put there for life so we can go to that court removed from influences and furthest from all in this line, we can go to them with questions of constitutional right to have them settle it, and they settle it. The state had the right to prohibit the sale of liquor as a beverage and no constitutional right of the citizen was interfered with.

Why did they settle it that way? Two reasons are assigned by that court: The first is, "We can not shut out of view the fact within the knowledge of all that public health, public morals and public safety may be endangered by the general use of intoxicating liquors." Second, and I want my friend on the other side to pay attention to this, "Nor can we ignore the fact shown by statistics, accessible to every one, that the disorder, pauperism and crime prevalent in the country are in a large measure directly traceable to this evil."

You may pile up your complicated statistics to show that these crimes are not attributable to this evil, but you can't play that trick on the supreme court. The supreme court here distinctly declares that public morals, disorder, pauperism and crime prevalent in the country are largely traceable to this evil.

If, therefore, a state deems the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within her limits for other than mechanical, medicinal or scientific purposes, to be necessary to the peace and security of society, the courts can not without usurping legislative functions override it and the will of the people.

As to the declaration that the state has no right to prohibit a man manufacturing it for his own profit and use, they declare that no such right inheres in citizenship,—a step the whisky men never dreamed the supreme court would take. Talk about the constitutional right of men to engage in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor! And that is what these personal rights leagues are for. I hope them from what they do and not from what they say. They are organized for the perpetuation of the saloon. The supreme court has decided that the right to prohibit this is sacred to us and that no right of the citizen is interfered with. Now, gentlemen, let us hear no more about personal liberty.

Again, the evil of this is so great and so injures society that the supreme court decided they didn't owe them anything for their losses and they couldn't legally collect one dollar from the people when we closed up this business and drove them out by law. They said we only abate a nuisance.

It seems to me that with such authority behind us there is very little room for talk about personal liberty being interfered with in the adoption of prohibition. And if we deem the prohibitionists cranks and fanatics, then the supreme court of the United States is cranks and fanatics, too.

Should the prohibitory amendment be adopted? I answer, Yes. But some are ready to oppose it upon the ground that it will injure the business of the state; that it will destroy or ruin the business interests of this state and there is an organization organized in this state upon that principle. Now, my hearers, I have gone over the arguments that are presented by the two distinguished speakers here tonight from Omaha to take the license side of this question. I say I have gone over their speeches carefully at Beatrice. My distinguished friend Mr. Webster promised us on Saturday that he would show that prohibition always injured the business of the states. I have gone over his speech line by line and I have figured out to my judgment the most clear pointed and forcible argument that he presented, and I wish to call his attention to his here tonight in the opening address in order that he may have an opportunity and due time to make reply to what I am going to say. I have his speech here before me and I want to call your attention to what he said. You remember that he talked about the prohibition states on a business line of argument and he took up the state of Maine, he took up the state of Vermont and he took up the state of New Hampshire. He took up those three states and then went back to the census of 1870 and 1880 in order to prove how disastrous prohibition was in those states. I will find it in a minute here. I want to read his own words and I want your very careful attention. This to my mind is the clearest, and if he has any more forcible argument than he presented in his three speeches, I want him to point it out to me. Here is one more liable to catch the unsuspecting public than any other utterance he made on the business phase of this question: "Here is another fact about your prohibition state of Maine. In 1870 there were 5,550 manufacturing industries in that state, as reported by the census of the national government for that year; in 1880 in the same state of Maine there were but 4,481 manufacturing industries, therefore, in ten years of prohibition in Maine you destroyed and wiped out 1069 manufacturing industries. I want to say to you there was not one of them a brewery or distillery.

"In new Hampshire you destroyed 161, and in Vermont you destroyed 396 manufacturing industries. I tell you that in the states surrounding Vermont, Maine and New Hampshire, where you had high license and did not have prohibition, that the manufacturing industries of every one of them increased instead of decreased. I will give you a state or two. In Massachusetts in the same ten years its institutions increased 1,140; in the state of Wisconsin (you see that adjoins Maine), 661; in the state of New York, 6,553; in Maryland, 975; in Illinois (that is another eastern state), 1,902; in Minnesota, 1,223, and in the little, as they say, state of Nebraska, under high license, you increased your manufacturing industries to the number of 733. [Applause.]

"Allow me to say, in conclusion, that in every prohibition state you have named by your prohibition doctrine I contend it to be that you destroy your manufacturing industries, and by which I mean to say that you drain upon your financial prosperity. In every state in the union where you have had high license the manufacturing industries have increased in number, furnishing employment to more men, paying out more money for your product, putting more money in circulation and therefore paving the way to universal prosperity, which stands face to face with the depreciation which might be done in financial industries where prohibition exists. Now, it is for me to state the facts and for this intelligent audience to draw conclusions."

I submit to you that this is more calculated to catch an unsuspecting public upon the business phase of this question than any other ever presented in all that discussion, and Mr. Rosewater there, I wish to call your attention very carefully to this argument. In the first place, I wish to call your attention to the fact that he says where he had high license and did not have prohibition the business increased, and in Nebraska, little Nebrassa, cursed with high license, your industries increased 763. I want to call your attention to the interjection of high license into this argument. I want to call your attention to the fact that he made this comparison from 1870 to 1880, and there wasn't one of these states that had high license in them until after 1880, not a single one of them. [Applause.] Not even Nebraska. Nebraska didn't get her high license law until 1881, and there is no man knows it better than John D. Webster. [Applause.] Yet he injected it into that speech to play upon the credulity of the people of this state. I want him to write that down.

Now, my friends, these figures in regard to the reduction of manufacturing are literally true. The are correct. I have gone over the original census reports and they are correct verbatim. But, my friends, I have another paper over here that I prepared, and I want to say to you right here tonight, now the assumption is that it was only Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont that lost manufacturing establishments. These three prohibition states. What are the facts! I have the official copy of the census that I made from the books yesterday in Lincoln. There were eighteen states of this union that lost in the number of their manufacturing establishments from 1870 to 1880. Pennsylvania, my own native state, stands at the head of the list, a license state. In the state of Pennsylvania she lost 5,963 manufacturing establishments from 1870 to 1880. If prohibition knocked out over one thousand in the state of Maine, I want Mr. Webster to tell us what knocked out nearly six thousand in the license state of Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

When he gets done with the state of Pennsylvania I will take him back to the east. He said all the states surrounding Maine and Vermont, those three states, increased in manufacturing. I must emphatically deny this. The state of Connecticut lost 640 manufacturing establishments from 1870 to 1880. Take the state of Ohio, the grand old buckeye state of Ohio. What did she do from 1870 to 1880? She lost 2,074 manufacturing establishments under her license system from 1870 to 1880.

Then I will bring him a little further west; go down into the old state—ah, yes, take the state of Indiana; she lost 669 manufacturing industries from 1870 to 1880. I will give him a worse close yet, and a good deal nearer home. Go right down into the state of Missouri, right down into the license state of Missouri and she lost 3,379 manufacturing industries under the license system. I would like Mr. Webster to tell us if prohibition knocked out over one thousand in Maine, what knocked over 3,000 in the western state and the license state of Missouri if not rare. [Applause].

Then he can take this whisky Kentucky and tell us of the great reduction down there, and then go through Delaware and tell us about it there, and then go to West Virginia and tell us about it there, and go the whole round of fifteen license states, and after he has explained the conditions of these fifteen license states then we will commence to think something about his argument about prohibition in the three prohibition states.

I tell you here tonight prohibition had no more to do with the reduction of factories in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont from 1870 to 1880 than the distinguished attorney from Omaha had with the writing of the ten commandments, not a bit more. [Laughter and applause].

I say here tonight that notwithstanding that the factories were reduced in the state of Maine, she had more men employed in manufacturing in 1880 than she had in 1870, notwithstanding the reduction of the number of factories. [Applause]. And New Hampshire had more than eight thousand more in 1880 than she had in 1870. I tell you here that when a man of his intelligence and ability will come before the people and present such an argument in defense of the cause, in defense of the institution, he is afraid to champion it upon its merits; and when he presents such an argument he ought either to make it good or apologise to the state of Nebraska for presenting such an argument to deceive and mislead them on this great question.

We will talk about the business phase of this question a little further on. I don't wish to spend all my time tonight on the business phase of this question.

We are told that prohibition don't prohibit. This is the Hamlet of their play. Their Hamlet is to prove that prohibition don't prohibit, and then prove it destroys business in these different states. How do you reconcile that?

But again we are told that prohibition don't prohibit. Here is another of their assumptions. An assumption—it assumes that prohibition has had a fair and impartial trial. I say this is an assumption and they can't prove it. Do you mean to tell me that an evil so great, so far-reaching, so deep-seated as that of intoxicating liquors, that it can be tried on a little city or a county, or a state even of this union, with all the surrounding states licensed states, and then the general government still permitting it to go in there in original packages—do you mean to tell me that is a fair and impartial trial of prohibition, and you are to be ready and arraigned to pronounce judgment and condemn it on the ground of that trial. An evil so great and broad and deep as this is cannot be tried fairly and honestly upon such premises as that.

Why, sir, we have just got out of the legal battle about the question of exporting liquors in the states. They told us the original package decision had broke the back bone of prohibition, and the Wilson bill has broken the back bone of license and the liquor traffic. [Applause.]

Well, we are told that prohibition is wrong in principle, and when Mr. Dickie presented that argument on the frame inside the fire limits, and when he presented that about the fast horse, fast driving, etc., they answered this with the most beautiful nice trimmed-up argument that it was regulation and wasn't prohibition at all. "We regulated it." "We regulated it." I don't care whether you call it regulation or prohibition; we won't be any ways particular about terms. They say a rose by any other name would smell just as sweet, and so would Rosewater by any other name smell just as sweet too. [Laughter.]

I have only got five minutes yet, but I have just got started. I wish to say that the principle is one and the same. So far as the building of the frame houses within the fire limits is concerned, it prohibits it; it forbids a man to build that house, but he says it don't forbid the building of houses.

The prohibitory amendment does propose total prohibition of the liquor traffic. It permits the manufacture and sale of it for medicinal, mechanical and scientific purposes and only forbids its manufacture and sale for beverages because the the use of it for beverages injures society. The analogy is complete; the only difference is the lines outside are a little wider; in the case of the city limit it is not very far distant to the far boundary but in the case of prohibiting the sale of liquor for beverages we have to put it outside the borders of the state. It is a little further to go but the principle is the same.

My time is about expired, but I wish to discuss first their argument that prohibition don't prohibit. This is founded on the assumption that license regulates and I propose before this debate is through to tear the mask off the rotten, damning license system of the state of Nebraska and show you it is broken and trampled under foot, and I will prove it out of THE OMAHA BEE and other sources of that kind, and it never has been kept in this state for the last nine years.

We may have our defeats in carrying these campaigns forward; no good movement ever succeeds at once. We had our Bull Run; yes, we had our Cold Harbor, but the day came when we had our Gettysburg, the day came when we had our glorious Appomattox. So it will be with prohibition. We may have our Bull Run and we may have our Cold Harbor, but the day is coming when we will have our Gettysburg right in Nebraska on Lovember 4, and I believe it is coming when we will have our glorious Appomattox, when the power of rum shall be crushed and this nation shall be a brave and free people. God hasten the day.

MR. ROSEWATER'S ARGUMENT.

An Array of Facts in Support of High License.

The second argument of the series was delivered by Hon. Edward Rosewater, editor of THE BEE, in favor of high license, and in full was as follows:

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Citizens: A grave problem confronts the people of Nebraska. The proposition has been submitted to the voters of this state to imbody into the fundamental law of our commonwealth an amendment to prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquors and malt beverages, excepting they may be used for medicinal and mechanical purposes. I hold that it would be a great blunder and a disastrous calamity to the people of this state to do anything of that kind. I maintain that it is an extraordinary proposition to put into the constitution of any state the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of any commodity—whisky, gun powder, dynamite or anything else. I maintain that it is an extraordinary proposition to put into the fundamental law of a state the prohibition of any act that can be defined as a crime, and I ask you here tonight to simply consider this question: Has there ever been a proposition submitted to the people of any state to insert into its constitution an amendment or a clause forbidding forgery, forbidding the theft of property, forbidding murder or forbidding any other of the acts that are defined as crimes in the statutes? And why should any particular acts that are defined as criminal be placed into the constitution? Our constitution like that of all the other states is simply an outline of powers delegated to the representatives and officers that carry on our government, and all the other rights that we do not delegate to them are reserved for the people. Is there any good reason why any proposition either to license or to prohibit should go into the constitution? That is the question. Mr. Edward Tuttle, an eminent writer from New York, has a very brief article in Belford's Magazine for the month of August from which I will read: "A natural right is an inherent property of personality as weight is of matter; it is not even created by legislation, it is irrevocable, thereby natural rights can neither be delegated nor divided. Hence the person is the sole judge and arbiter of his own life and conduct. A natural right cannot be abrogated even by its possessor; nevertheless it is self-limiting as to its exercise by the fact that the right of one is equally the right of all. Constitutional rights are not natural rights, thus self-limited. The written instrument defines these limitations but does not create them. Constitutional rights being founded upon natural rights are the conservators and not the destroyers of personal liberties. Constitutional law cannot invade the domain of individual sovereignty. It concerns only the boundary lines between sovereigns. It concerns not individuality but mutuality."

Now, we have been told here tonight that the supreme court of the United States, the highest tribunal in the land, has declared prohibition to be a proper subject of legislation. Of what legislation? Of police regulation. And my friend here will admit that the only reference made by the supreme court in all its decisions only refer the powers exercised by the state in its police regulation, and there is the end of the domain of prohibitory legislation. Now, then, we are told that the judges of the supreme court—and I have due respect for them—have said that a large percentage of the crime, pauperism and wretchedness of this country springs from the liquor traffic. Grant it. But I venture to assert that not one of those judges on the supreme bench that has given this matter one-half the time and study that I have, and has never looked into the statistical features to ascertain the difference in crime in the prohibitory states and in the states that have regulation and limited prohibition called local option where high license prevails. These judges have never troubled themselves to investigate the facts that stare us in the face, and they have never been able to ascertain the exact truth as to what percentage of crime, of insanity, of pauperism is due to intemperance of the immense amount of crime and immense amount of suffering and the immense amount of wretchedness and poverty is due to intemperance and what is due to other causes. But how will you eradicate intemperance? That is the question. Now, I repeat it would be folly for this state to embody in its constitution a provision that it could not remove from it for four years; and I will say furthermore that out of the forty-two states of this union only four states have prohibitory provisions in their constitutions. The state of Iowa has simply a statutory law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor. Now, I take it that the people of Massachusetts, the people of that grand old commonwealth that gave us Bunker Hill, that gave us Lexington, that gave us the heroes of the revolution, the state in which personal liberty and constitutional rights and laws are held more sacred than in any state in the union, I think that state ought to have arrived at the proper conclusion as to what is the right thing to put into a constitution and what is improper and impolitic. The state of Massachusetts had that proposition before it last year, in the spring of 1889, after they had tried prohibition and had given it a fair and impartial trial.

Now let us see what eminent men in Massachusetts have said said with regard to that: Prof. Charles Elliott Norton, one of the ablest men in the state of Massachusetts, connected with Yale college, says: "The adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors is, in my opinion, a public misfortune. The amendment is, I believe, wrong in principle and mistaken in policy. Its adoption would be a heavy blow to the cause of temperance and good order and it would tend to weaken in the community that spirit of obedience to law on which the public welfare depends. I am, sir, yours truly, C. E. Norton, Cambridge, Mass., March 6, 1889."

President Elliott of Harvard college, certainly not a rum boodler, says: "I shall vote against the constitutional amendment concerning prohibition; first, because I think that the constitution ought not to deal with such matters; and, secondly, because for promoting temperance I prefer the combination of local option and high license to prohibition."

Ex-Governor Gardner, the man that signed the first prohibitory law in Massachusetts, says: "The result of the former prohibitory law, which by the way I signed while chief magistrate, was so unsatisfactory in its results that it was repealed by decisive majorities in the succeeding legislature, and does not encourage the re-enactment of similar provisions in the organic constitution of the commonwealth. Water will not run higher than the source; laws cannot be successfully enforced unless the decisive majority of the popular opinion sustains them, and a law upon the statute book constantly violated, much more a constitutional provision constantly violated, is amenace to popular opinion and the weakening of it. Today every municipality in the state, each of its towns and cities, possesses the power, and many of them exercise it, to vote total prohibition within their own boundaries. In such cases, as the law has public opinion behind it, it is generally well executed. In other municipalties where public opinion does not sustain such a restriction the sale of intoxicants is permitted under rules that hedge around such sale by restraints which the wisdom of the governing power imposes, and under high license it produces large excise taxes. Experience of the past seems to teach that local option and high license furnish a practicable system regarding this vexed question as admirable as frail and imperfect humanity can devise." Henry J. Gardner, Boston, Mass, March 19.

The Rev. Frederick Palmer: "I disapprove the constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and for the following reasons: The constitution of the state is not the place for legislating such a matter. A constitution should contain principles of government, not rules, aims and causes of action. Legal prohibition could only be enforced by the body of public opinion being behind it when that opinion is in favor of prohibition. The present excellent local option law renders prohibition possible. That is under the circumstances entirely practicable, the condition of this town plainly shows, for here each year an overwhelming vote prohibits the sale of liquor and the prohibition is excellently efficacious. An attempted reform enforced upon the unwilling surely produces a reaction against the reform. The old abuses are restored, and when restored are far more overwhelmingly established than before. The present local option law by bringing the question before every town educates the public opinion which is to enforce it. The constitutional amendment would not necessitate this local agitation and consequent education. The present high license bill of Philadelphia has the first year of its operation reduced the number of saloons from 5,789 to 1,340 or 77 per cent. There has been no reaction so far as I know; no increase in the number of saloons, since a constitutional amendment could not hope to approach this. Frederick Palmer, rector, Christ church, Andover, Mass., March 19, 1889.

Here is a rather specific statement by Rev. Sanford Nightingale: "The worst rum holes are men's mouths. So long as these holes are open to receive it rum will find its way into them. Can these holes be closed to rum by constitutional prohibition? No, it can be done only by convincing and pursuading their owners to do so of their own accord and free will. That was the method of Father Matthew, the method by which he won the grandest success which the temperance cause has yet gained."

Now, we have been told here tonight, and it has been repeated from many rostrums, that the sale of liquor is a sin and a crime, and that the use of liquor is sin. Upon these propositions very many ministers of our Christian churches still agree, and hundreds of thousands of good Christians hold it as their creed, but upon the other side fully as many ministers and hundreds of thousands of good Christians hold that there is nothing in the bible or in the gospels that authorize any such construction. Permit me to quote from them. There is in the city of New York now a society known as the Church Temperance society under the auspices of the Episcopal church, and its secretary, Robert Graham, makes this statement in one of the church tracts which they are circulating in the city of New York in the interest of temperance and sobriety and high license and against prohibition and free whisky: "To sell intoxicating liquor is not a crime. To use intoxicating liquors temperately is not a sin. Their excessive use debases manhood and womanhood and is a sin. It may be granted that in this nation and many others the practically unlimited sale of liquor has brought about a grave national peril and that unrestrained personal use would wreck individuals and families. The aim of true temperance is by legislative enactment to restrict and minimize the one and by voluntary total abstinence and the power of good personal example to rescue and save the other. We recognize liquor selling as a dangerous trade; dangerous to the man who sells, doubly dangerous to the man who buys. We recognize the uses of gun powder, but knowing its explosive power we do not prevent its manufacture, but regulate its storage in or near our populous cities. We license its sale, and by licensing we control and restrict it. Dynamite is to be tenderly handled lest in blasting rocks it wrecks houses and destroys lives; recognizing its use we do not prohibit its manufacture and sale, but surround it with safeguards and stringently regulate its use. If the state argument be used why not license, regulate and control houses of ill fame as well as liquor! We answer, there is no parallel