IT MAKES DRUNKARDS.

Baneful Effects of Political Prohibition Where it Has Been Tried.

A STARTLING INCREASE IN CRIME.

The Ratio of Inebriates in Iowa Cities Greater Than in Omaha.

PENITENTIARY RECORDS SHOW IT.

High License, on the Contrary, Puts a Check on the Evil.

WEBSTER PROVES THE ASSERTIONS.

Governor Larrabee Continues His Line of Argument on the School Phase of the Issue and Its Alleged Evils.

The series of debates at Grand Island was closed on Friday evening by ex-Governor Larrabee of Iowa and Hon. John L. Webster of Omaha. The arguments are given in full below from stenographic notes by BEE reporters:

HIGH LICENSE ALL WRONG.

That is the Gist of Governor Larabee's Closing Argument.

I supposed I had finished my talk for this evening, but it appears that General Bradford and Mr. Rankin who were invited here were not satisfied from the first on account of the arrangement that was made. The general claims that Rosewater and Mr. Webster had made the programme to suit themselves, that they should have the opening and closing of every meeting and they were displeased with it as I understand. I am surprised that they have left me here to speak again because I didn't expect to have anything more to say to you again, so far as I am concerned.

When I enlist I mean to be a subordinate, and if anybody can disprove what I may say I am willing they should. I intend to tell the truth just as it is, and if any gentleman expects by any hook or crook in following me to take any advantage I have no objection to their doing it. I am sure General Webster is too much of a gentleman to do any such thing. There is a young gentleman from my state who intends to come over and go in his office as an assistant and I can assure the gentleman that I think he will find a strong prohibitionist in this young man from my state.

I was speaking of the ladies when I closed before and I want to say one word more. The ladies of Iowa don't have the privilege of voting, either at school, municipality or other elections. Some of them desire it and I have told them that their influence should be no less whether they cast the vote themselves or whether their husbands and sons cast the vote. I have not been able to convince them of it, but I expect the gentlemen to be able. I want to say, ladies, you have the training of the next generation and you have the advantage of the men, and the men can vote this time as they please if you let them, but you direct the vote of the next generation.

I can say for Iowa that a large proportion of the young men are for prohibition; you can hardly find a boy or girl of sufficient age to understand this question but what is in favor of prohibition. I want to say to the young men of Nebraska you cannot be too cautious in this matter. The competition for a livelihood, even in this country, is going to be closer and closer each year as time progresses. We double our population about once in twenty-five years by natural increase whether we have any immigration or not. There is going to be more and more competition for livelihood; business is more and more complex each year and a little higher standard of workmanship is required. I care not what line of workmanship it is, whether on the farm, in the shop, the printer's office, the lawyer's office or the doctor's office, a little higher standard of intelligence and integrity is required each year. I am a good deal of an optimist and I believe the people are getting better and better each year. I say we cannot afford to patronize the saloon; the young men who do not touch liquor will have an advantage over him who does.

Take two men of equal ability, one pays an occasional visit to the saloon and the other does not, which would you prefer! whether as a printer or a reporter! I presume if you (addressing Mr. Rosewater) were going to employ a reporter to send out to smell out joints you would prefer the man who takes a drink occasionally.

Now, is a man more, or less, finished for being a patron of a saloon! These gentlemen have told us that it hurts business. Is the farmer's boy a better workman if he patronize the saloon! Is the merchant's clerk better or more reliable if he patronizes the saloon? Is the lawyer's assistant a better clerk if he patronizes the saloon, or I can say the same thing of the doctor. Wouldn't you in every case, if you were going to employ one of two lawyers and they were equal in ability and every other respect, but one takes a glass frequently and the other does not, is there any question which one you would employ! This statement that it hurts business is merest bosh and no reasonable man ought to believe it.

Now, as to high license, it legalizes the business and tends to give it respectability; and that is a great objection to it if it does diminish the places where it is sold. I was discussing this matter not long since with Mr Medill, the editor of the Chicago Tribune. He takes the same view as Mr. Rosewater and it shows that men are influenced by surrounding circumstances. Mr. Medill said that high license had reduced the number of saloons in Chicago about fifty per cent and when I asked him how much it had reduced the consumption of liquor he says, "I don't know, but I think from five to ten per cent." I said in answer to Mr. Medill that a measure that would not reduce the consumption of liquor more than ten per cent in Iowa would hardly be called a temperance measure, and it would not.

Now, it seems these gentlemen are solicitous about getting a revenue from the saloons. They carry the idea that the question of sustaining the public schools of Nebraska depends upon the revenue received from the saloon. We have sustained probably the best, or as good as the best school system in the United States. I don't want to overreach in this matter, but I feel proud of our school system. We have about 14,000 schools in session, I suppose, just about this time and we have a large army of children in attendance. We teach the evil influences of the use of liquor in almost every school in the state. These school teachers, I believe four out of five, and I am inclined to think that nine out of ten, of the school teachers in Iowa are in favor of prohibition. We started our schools without any revenue whatever from the saloons. The people of Iowa thirty-five years ago declared they would take no part of the profits in the retailing of liquors, and we spend more than a million dollars each year for the support of our schools, and we have the grandest results that can be shown.

This money that goes to the support of your government, are you entitled to it for that purpose! Is it a noble thing for you to receive it! What is the theory of our taxation in this country! The theory is not that the individual should pay the tax, not that the person should pay the tax; the theory is that the property should pay the tax. A man who has $10,000 should pay ten times as much tax as the man who has $1,000, and the man who has $100,000 should pay 100 times as much as the man who has $1,000. Now that is the theory although I know it is not enforced strictly speaking, and if we carried out the strict reasoning of my friends on the platform, you should repeal the laws in regard to taxation because they are not enforced strictly in accordance with the law and the spirit of the law.

This law in regard to taxation is perhaps enforced reasonably as well as other laws; we do as well as we can to collect the tax from the property holders, but you propose and are setting up the saloon keeper as a public tax gatherer. You are setting him up as a publican as it was called in scriptural times. Is this the proper thing to do! Let us inquire into this and see from whom this publican collects his tax. Does this publican or public tax gatherer collect it from the property holders! Does a man who owns as much property in Omaha as my friend Rosewater does, does he contribute his share to this source! Do you pay your share of the money collected by this publican! And now is it with my friend Webster, who I take it is a large taxpayer in the city of Omaha! You have some women who pay taxes. You have some wealthy widows there, I understand. Do those wealthy widows pay their share of the tax through that source and do your wholesale merchants and your large retail merchants pay their share of this tax? How is it with your railroad companies! I understand you assess property in Nebraska at a less proportion than we do in Iowa, and I want to know if the railroad companies pay their share of this tax to the public tax gatherer. Not one dime. Neither do the railroad employes because the railroad employes are requested and expected not to patronize the saloon. It is becoming more and more the custom of railroad companies, I notice in the Independent in the reports from the railroad companies for the last thirty days, and they discourage their employes from patronizing the saloon, and I believe there is not a more temperate class of men in the nation than our railroad employes as a rule, and when my friend Rosewater says that nine-tenths of the temperance people of Kansas are frauds I don't believe a word of it. He may think so, but I don't believe it. And I can say this: The railroad men, as a rule, are thorough temperance men, a large proportion of them.

If the wealthy merchant, if the wealthy real estate man, if the wealthy lawyer, if the wealthy doctor don't pay their share to the public tax gatherer, who does pay it? Will some one tell me who you think pays the larger proportion? Who does, Mr. chairman? The laboring man and people of small means, as a rule, pay probably nine-tenths of this tax to the public tax-gatherer. Now then, if the laboring man pays his money to the saloon keeper, understand it, the merchant, the butcher, the grocer, the lawyer, the doctor, and whoever is in the employ of this poor man, don't get the money that goes to the saloonkeeper. Now then, who is deprived of the money taken from the laboring man to support this institution! The women and children are entitled to the earnings of the husband and this laboring man should pay his money over for the support of his family; his disposition is good to do it, but the temptation is before him and the chances are he pays the money to the public tax-gatherer. Now, you propose to rob the women und children of Nebraska, and for the purpose of carrylag on your government, do you! It is a standard of government which I think you should not establish. This great Missouri Valley was given us for a different purpose. And I tell you we have something else to do besides to eat, drink and be merry in this country. In Iowa if a man worked only one day in the week he could earn enough to eat drink and be merry perhaps, but he works six days in the week, and he can't even get away with all the money he earns in six days.

Now, that is all I have to say so far as this tax is concerned. I don't believe you want it. I don't believe the women want it. The women are just as much interested in this question as the men, and you men should remember that you do the voting under our laws, and these gentlemen on the platform with me understand well that all the standard writers on political ethics lay it down as a rule that those who do not cast a vote should be represented just as well as those who do cast the vote. I say standard authors on political ethics lay that down as a rule.

Gentlemen, you should consult with your wives on this question. I know that many think that women are foolish and that women are governed by instinct, but I tell you that their instincts are oftener right than wrong and you can rely on that, and the man that consults his wife freely is apt to get along very much better than he who does not.

As to the character of the men that support prohibition in Iowa. We have a vast number of preachers in Iowa. My friend from Kansas claims that they have more churches in proportion to the population than any one else, but I am incined to dispute the ground with him. In Iowa our churches are supported, I believe, about as well as any place you can find in the country. We have a host of Methodist preachers there, and I believe 999 out of every 1,000 are prohibitionists. They are zealous, intelligent class of workers, and you can't buy them nor you can't scare them. What I say of the Methodist ministers is largely true of other denominations.

My friend Rosewater still insists that prohibition don't prohibit and it seems has been taking a little trip down into Kansas and Iowa recently and he was giving us an account of his travels. I think if he would publish them they would be interesting, and part of them would be like Baron Munchausen stories I think. His experience in the city of Des Moines is very different from mine. I have visited Des Moines many times in the last four years and I never carried a revolver or even a walking cane and I never had any fears in visiting any part of the city in the whole four years I was in the executive office, and I want to tell him that his the danger, so far as being slugged is concerned, is all moonshine. Don't you ever have any fear. (To Rosewater): I would like to ask you if you was ever slugged in Des Moines? I think not. Now I would like to ask you if you was ever slugged in Omaha? [Great Laughter.]

You know that article I read from THE OMAHA BEE. You know what it said about those who came in contact with liquor influences, that it was demoralizing and corrupting, and I certainly think it is, and I would advise my friend Rosewater to be a little more careful in the future and avoid temptation. [Laughter.] What he says approves what I said before. They are unscrupulous and often some of the druggists are not sufficiently law-abiding. As a rule, I thing our druggists are pretty good men and they compare favorably with any other state. But it seems his statement corroborates what I said, and in relation to that I want to say to my friend Rosewater that I know what the law is so far as druggists are concerned, and I believe that honest face of his would get a bottle of whisky if he looked sick at most any drug store in the city of Des Moines. I really believe that honest face of his would get it, but I know a great many men who have tried that thing on the drug stores and failed. So far as the sheriff of Des Moines is concerned, he is a democrat and is not in sympathy with the law and does not do his duty with regard to it unless forced to. When I was in the executive office I presume this law was more strictly enforced than it has been under Governor Boies.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to urge on you again, as the opportunities of the evening have offered, when you go to the polls vote for prohibition. I don't care what your politics are. I am a republican and have always been a republican. I became a voter and voted the republican ticket about the time of the Kansas-Nebraska bill and I have voted the republican ticket ever since. I am not one of those who condemn everything that the democratic party does, and I can see many good things in what they do; and I want to say to the democrats, When you go to the polls vote for prohibition. And this to the democratic farmers and laborers: Vote for prohibition.

I have no more fear of prohibition being repealed in Iowa than I have of our law against gambling, and I say to my republican friends, Don't you have any fears of it defeating the republican party. If the republican party don't serve the people's interests, and the best interests, we don't have any use for any party that don't serve the best interests of the people of this country, and I say to you all, Don't have any doubts whatever, and if you have a doubt, give the benefit to prohibition and you will never regret it. I thank you again.

DRUNKENNESS AND CRIME.

Webster Quotes Statistics Showing Prohibition Increases the Evils.

My Fellow Citizens of Grand Island: Believe it very becoming of me at this time to make a statement and you will perhaps agree with me that Governor Larrabee is entitled to our favorable consideration for the honest and earnest, and I believe, faithful manner in which he has endeavored to present his side of the question. I must say to you freely and frankly that I admire the manner in which he considers the question, and I am firmly satisfied that in what he has said to you he has stated that which he earnestly believes and talked to you of such facts as came under his observation; and when he tries to persuade the people of Nebraska to adopt the prohibition amendment to our constitution he tells us what he believes to be for the welfare of our state. All the time that he talked, however, I was constantly reminded of the fact that he nowhere took the time to tell the people in what respect or in what particular or to furnish any degree of evidence to satisfy a listening audience that the crime of drunkenness had been diminished in his state under his prohibition doctrine.

On two meetings upon this platform have I challenged my opponents in this debate to produce evidence that prohibition as a political doctrine, statutory or constitutional, had diminished crime or drunkenness, and up to this, the closing speech of this two days debate, no prohibition orator has stepped forward to tell the people and to furnish the proof that drunkenness had diminished in Iowa, in Kansas, in Maine, in New Hampshire or in the state of Vermont by reason of prohibition, statutory or constitutional.

When I was invited to come here to enter into this debate, it was by a letter written by the manager of this institution to meet as opponents Governor Larrabee and Governor St. John of the state of Kansas. I answered that invitation by letter stating the terms and conditions by which I should come here and they were simply, as I believed, fairly stated, that Mr. Rosewater and myself would meet these two gentlemen as the representative men of the two prohibition states of this union; that they should affirm that prohibition as a constitutional amendment was to the welfare of the state, and that Mr. Rosewater and myself would deny it; that they should hold to the affirmative of the proposition and open the discussion, to be followed by us, and that that manner of debating should continue from the opening to the close of it. Shortly afterwards I was informed by the managers of this sugar palace that for some reason or other Governor St. John could not be secured, and they asked my consent that they should substitute some other person to represent the state of Kansas. They presented for our consideration the name of Attorney General Bradford, and after some little consideration, we agreed to accept it. A little later we were told that by reason of some other political engagement that Governor Larrabee would not speak yesterday. They then asked us to agree that some other gentleman might be substituted in his place.

Finally, as you observed in the discussion of last night, we agreed to that. After last night's debate was over (and I leave it to the audience to judge how it was conducted and as to its result,) Mr. Rosewater and myself were notified this morning that complaints were being made by the prohibition orators that we were treating them unfairly, and tonight when his debate was about to be opened, and when the presiding officer had announced to this waiting audience the order of the debate for tonight to continue, just as it had been agreed, with no variation and with no unfairness, Colonel Rankin and Attorney General Bradford came upon this platform and told the presiding officer that they would not speak in this debate unless we changed the order of the proceeding and gave them the closing discussion, for fear that I might say something against them or their cause which they would not be permitted to answer. And they were notified by the presiding officer that the programme should be carried out; and they left the hall and forsook this debate, and I leave this audience to answer the question whether it is because they were afraid to meet us in the discussion or whether it was because they were unable to answer the arguments which we have produced to show that prohibition did not prevent drunkenness, and the very thing which I have challenged them on two previous occasions to answer me. [Great applause.]

My friend, Governor Larrabee, under these circumstances, is doubly entitled to our credit because by his remaining here he has helped the show to go on, and we have been somewhat advertised by his presence [applause] and the public in a measure entertained. However, I must therefore necessarily pay my respects to the governor of the state of Iowa touching the prohibition in his state; and it was a remarkable circumstance that when the governor, standing before this audience telling them about the benefits of prohibition in the state of Iowa, reading here the opinions of judges of his state, failed to read to this audience a written letter over the signature of any judge in his state that undertook to tell the people that drunkenness had been decreased under prohibition; and let it be remarked that the letters which were read were letters in general terms, without passing into detail, without furnishing any evidence, without pointing to the proofs that they did not think that prohibition ought to be repealed. But what I purpose to do despite the letters of these judges is to call their attention to facts, if they never knew it before, that in the cities of the state of Iowa, under their prohibition law, that drunkenness has increased. It is not a question whether the consumption of liquor has increased; but the question is, whether prohibition does away with what we all agree to be the thing that lies at the foundation of this question. Mr. Rosewater and myself, I apprehend, stand before an audience agreeing on the general proposition that temperance is right. We are not here as the advocates of drunkenness—as the advocates of the saloon. I want to say to this audience for Mr. Rosewater and myself that we are here before the people of Grand Island without compensation for our time or our services from this or any society or from any class of people. [Applause.]

We are not here representing any organization. Mr. Rosewater and myself have given our own personal time to gather the data and the statistics that we might come out and talk to the people of this state of that which concerns their welfare just as it concerns ours; to tell them what we believe would advance the welfare of the state just as we want it to build up the state in which we live; that as our lives run along with the lives of our fellow-citizens in the years which are yet before us, that we could witness the growth of our state merging on in prosperity from year to year, hoping that in a few years there should come to it the crowning glory of 2,000,000 of people, equal to the population of the state of Iowa, and at the same time preserve our people from the curse of drunkenness in a measure, at least, by maintaining our present license regulating system, which, in our judgment, is of more benefit to us than the prohibition laws of the state of Iowa, or the state of Kansas. [Applause.]

I cannot, however, forego in this discussion inviting particular attention for the benefit of the judges of the state of Iowa, as well as my friend Governor Larrabee, to a state of historical facts. We have been told in general terms by these judges that prohibition had tended to decrease crime in the state of Iowa. Let it be remembered that in the state of Iowa statutory prohibition has failed since 1855. (Am I correct as to the year, Governor Larrabee?)

By Governor Larrabee—That is correct, Mr. Webster.

By Mr. Webster—If that be true, if the law is the remedy, since 1855 you have been making the march to prosperity, and to virtue, and to sobriety, and to fair dealing, and to honesty, and to the diminution of crime, yet when I examine the reports of the state of Iowa published in its records of convictions of criminals in a bound volume which I have in my hand here, and others which I have at my command, I find that in 1881 there were 341 persons in the penitentiaries of the state of Iowa; in 1883, 378 (mark the increase); in 1887, 673; in 1889, 619; in 1890, 619. Now mark the comparison. From 1881 to 1890 the number of inmates in the penitentiaries of the state of Iowa had increased nearly 100 per cent, while in the state of Nebraska, under our regulating system, the people in our penitentiaries numbered 345. Now mark the comparison. In our state, without prohibition, we had about one-half the number of criminals in our penitentiary that were resting in the cells of the penitentiaries of the state of Iowa when my friend Governor Larrabee as governor was seeking to enforce its prohibition laws. [Applause.]

I find a little further, that in 1889, of his 619 penitentiary convicts that it represented one out of every 1,321 people of his state, while in the state of Nebraska that our number of penitentiary convicts was one to 3,333. So, therefore, my dear governor, as according to population, we have a less percentage of our people in our penitentiary than you had over in Iowa; and please explain to me how it is if prohibition, if you had it backed up by the written opinion of 100 judges, diminishes crime over there. [Applause.]

Now I want to say one word to the governor before I get into details about expenses over there. The governor tells you that the expenses have diminished of running the government so far as, I believe he stated, in the prosecution of criminals; but look at the expenses at large as a sum total. The state expenses according the report of the state auditor for June 30, 1887, was $2,921,000, while in the state of Nebraska for the same period of time our entire state expenses were $1,872,000. Or, in other words, it cost to run the state of Iowa during the same period of time $649,000 more than it cost to run the government of the state of Nebraska. That does not look to me very much as if prohibition was a matter of state economy. I remember during the session of the legislature of this state at its last sitting, Governor Larrabee honored the state of Nebraska by making it a formal visit in his capacity of governor, and in that official capacity he was invited to address the legislature of our state. Among the things which he then stated to the people of Nebraska and to its law-making officers was that criminal business in many counties of the state of Iowa had decreased fully one-half. Mark the startling fact. In 1888, on the 31st day of July for that fiscal year, there were convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary in the state of Iowa 888 persons. The governor tells this people that that covers a period of but ten months. Granted. I will add, therefore, one-sixth more to cover the other two. That would make a year; that would make 140 more; that makes a total, then, of 978. When I turned over the records of 1889 I found, however that there were convicted in the state of Iowa 1,108 persons. Now mark the fact that while the governor was proclaiming to the governor of the state of Nebraska and to our lawmaking officers that the crimes were diminishing and criminals were being diminished as to the number of convictions, the official report shows during the same fiscal year the number of convictions in the state of Iowa had increased from 978 to 1,108. [Applause.] That was a very peculiar presentation of the prohibition subject by Governor Larrabee. It was in the attitude rather of an apology for having a prohibition law. I admired the gentleman's honesty when he confessed to you that prohibition was not enforced very much in Iowa up to the time when he became governor; yet it had been there as a law from 1855. Let me put to you the simple sensible question: Is it right for this people to be requested to incorporate into our state constitution, a law which prohibits the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, if the state of Nebraska is to be what the governor concedes it was to the state of Iowa, to remain as a part of your constitution for a long period, and then without ever being enforced. Why, furthermore, he confessed to you during this discussion that prohibition never was enforced in many of the large cities of the state of Iowa. It was a confession therefore, that the law, when incorporated into the constitution of the state could not be enforced. When you admit to me the proposition that prohibition cannot be enforced statutory or constitutional, you have given me one of the grandest arguments that could fall from human lips against its adoption. It stands in the nature of an appeal to every citizen of the state of Nebraska that your law cannot be enforced, and therefore do not vote for that, but let us regulate the liquor by the legislature so that we can have some reasonable control over the liquor traffic.

Over in the little town of Davenport, in the state of Iowa, they kept arresting drunkards right along. In 1885 there were 50; in 1887, 24; in 1888, 34; in 1889, 52; but in 1890, according to the report which I have over the signature of the chief of police, Frank Kessler, the number of arrests for drunkenness was 107. When I went to make a little comparison, I found that the number of arrests for drunkenness in the town of Davenport had increased from 61 to 107 in one year; and when I came to compare that with the population of Davenport, I found there prevailed in that town a degree of drunkenness, according to percentage of population, greater than in the town of Grand Island; greater than that in the city of Lincoln; greater than that in the city of Omaha, and greater than that anywhere within the limits of the license system state of Nebraska. [Applause.]

I turned over to the city of Dubuque, with but 35,000 population, and I found under a report signed by John O'Connell, city clerk, that there are 180 saloons in that city. It is a startling fact that prohibition, and with an honest man like Governor Larrabee trying to enforce that prohibition law, that the city clerk of that city of his state sends us a certificate that there are 180 open, running public saloons. Furthermore, that same city city clerk certifies that in 1889 there were 446 persons arrested on the streets for drunkenness, and that the whole number of arrests were 815. Does that look very much as if crime was being diminished anywhere over in the state of Iowa?

Over at Burlington another of their largest towns I found that in 1889 there were arrested 1,035 persons. I found over in the town of Council Bluffs, the third largest city in the state of Iowa, and where I supposed the governor's influence ought to have been felt, that there were arrested in 1889, 598 persons for street intoxication, and according to the report of the city marshal for 1890, which lies on my table, the number had increased to 868. Look at it: in that city of 29,000 population the number of arrests for drunkenness was one for every thirty-six of its inhabitants; while in Omaha, under our license system, were only arrested one to sixty-nine; in Lincoln one to seventy-eight; in Grand Island you arrested one as to sixty-four. So the proof is that in Council Bluffs, in prohibition Iowa, there were arrested for intoxication upon its streets 100 per cent more people than were arrested in any one of the cities in the state of Nebraska. [Applause.]

What is the conclusion? Why, it simply is that prohibition as a doctrine, as it is administered, instead of decreasing crime and drunkenness does increase both of these classes of evils.

Over in the city of Council Bluffs, by their prohibition law they have lost absolutely all control over the liquor interests, and under the present municipal administration they have undertaken to license saloons. They do it in this way: They have an arrangement that any man who sells liquor in Council Bluffs shall pay a fine to the city each month of $27.50, and if does that, he can run right along without having a license system such as we have in Nebraska, and without having any law which compels him to close up at midnight, or to close on Sundays. They run without any restraint whatsoever. But a little while ago the mayor of the town of Council Bluffs concluded that he had learned something of morality from the city of Omaha and issued an order to close the saloons on Sunday. The board of fire and police commissioners of the city of Omaha learning of this fact, passed a resolution which I want to read, because it is a most instructive lesson to prohibition Iowa and the friends of prohibition everywhere. It reads this way:

Resolved, That the board of fire and police commissioners of the city of Omaha, Neb., sends its congratulations and thanks to his honor, Mayor Macrae, of Council Bluffs, Ia., for the enforcement of his recent order closing on Sundays the fifty-four more or less saloons in his city, thus stopping the rush of Omaha Sunday trains, Missouri river patronage and the consequent returning tide of drunkenness into our streets and into our jails. [Applause.]

Resolved, That the secretary be requested to send to his honor, the mayor of Council Bluffs, a copy of these resolutions. [Applause and laughter.]

Why, I will tell you good people of Nebraska, the people over in Iowa and down in Kansas can draw from our good conduct and our well-regulated government a good many lessons that may be profitable to them over there, and the great lesson we want to teach them is, that when our election shall be over in November, that they over in the state of Iowa can wipe out their prohibition law so that they can enact something in the nature of a regulating license system to control the saloon interests and then by force of law close your saloons at 12 o'clock at night and compel them to be closed on Sundays.

Not very long since there was held in the city of Des Moines a public convention, to which had been invited a large number of the representative people of the state to consider the question whether the prohibition law of the state of Iowa should not be repealed as being destructive to the interests and welfare of that people. Among the number of persons who addressed that convention was one, Captain O'Keefe, from the town of Creston in the state of Iowa. I believe that is the blue grass region to which my friend, the governor, alluded today in one of his addresses as being a city where it could not be charged that the saloons or the rum interests was going without restraint; yet Captain O'Keefe living in that same town of Creston made a speech to that convention in which he said:

"We have seen the workings of prohibition in Iowa for I have traveled a great deal over the state and the more I see of it, the more I become disgusted with the present state of affairs. I say to you that I am the representative of a little city which is the pride of Iowa. She is the capitol of the blue grass region, the city of Creston. Six years ago that little city paid the highest license of any city in the country. We have lost $36,000 of revenue from that source, and I stand before you tonight, gentlemen, with my hand up, knowing, as I do, the citizens and people of that place, I could tell you that after that great sacrifice of money and that long trial, it has failed to convert one solitary individual. It was left for Francis Murphy, with his splendid idea of reform, to bring about in our city the greatest reform that has taken place within the last ten years. At that time we had eight saloons paying $1,600 a year, and I must say a large portion of them were partly respectable, and today it has thirty-two. People will say, 'Why don't you enforce the law?' We have tried it, gentlemen. We have sat up nights watching them, and I say to the logic of these people, we might as well try to stop Niagara Falls in its course, or the Salvation Army at a reunion as to stop these people from selling liquor under this prohibition law." [Laughter and applause]. So much for the little city of the blue grass region, my friend, Governor Larrabee.

I am afraid, as I do not know anything about the judges there, I am afraid that the judges may be something like yourself. If you walked down through the town of Creston, looking for a saloon, the people, knowing your prohibition proclivities, knowing your prohibition teachings, knowing your prohibition experience, knowing that it would not be very well to tell you it was liquor, it would be offensive, you would find the doors would be closed when you walked by as an honest man and a temperance advocate, as we know you to be. Dio Lewis, walking through the city of Portland at midnight, said he did not find a saloon open, but walking into his hotel, picked up the state prison report and saw the fact that 17,808 persons in the state of Maine were arrested in one year for drunkenness, and the appalling truth came upon him; so, if you had a friend to go with you like Mr. Rosewater, he could find the place at night. [Great applause.] The appalling truth would come home to you that Captain O'Keefe knows more about Creston, Ia., than you do.

There is another very venerable gentleman in the state of Iowa who has a reputation that is not hemmed in by the Missouri river on the west, nor by the Mississippi river on the east of him. There lives in the state of Iowa a gentleman whose reputation has extended over the broad limits of the republic. There lives over there a citizen who honored the office of governor of that state, who held office in the cabinet of this great republic, whose name was a shining light among eminent politicians everywhere. I refer to none other than the Hon. ex-Governor Kirkwood; and yet I find in a letter written by Governor Kirkwood on this subject of prohibition in which he states: "It appears to me that those who framed our present prohibitory law and who have thus far sustained it have made a grave mistake." So, as to you, Governor Larrabee, I put the opinion of ex-Governor Kirkwood that, in his judgment, prohibition in the state of Iowa has been a grave mistake. Further down I find that ex-Governor Kirkwood said: "Personally I am in favor of local option and high license, with stringent regulations." Why, bless you, that is just what we have in Nebraska, and that is what we want to keep. [Applause.] "I favor this policy because I believe it will better promote the public welfare than the present law does."

I say to the people of the state of Nebraska that I would give more for the opinion of that eminent statesman of the state of Iowa, speaking of public welfare and prosperity, that the high license system will do more for the public welfare and public prosperity of the state than the opinion of all your judges who think the prohibition law ought not to be repealed. [Applause.]

The presiding officer tells me that I have already talked nearly forty minutes, and like General Bradford who, when he was here, stated that he could go along in the same strain for three hours and suddenly fled—[laughter], I think, perhaps that I could go on for three hours; but I would like to have about half an hour to warm up that little state of Kansas whose interests he seems to have forsaken. [Cries of Go on.]

Take the state of Kansas. General Bradford told you that crime had diminished in the state of Kansas and that the number of convicts in their state penitentiary was being diminished. Let me tell you a few facts. On June 30, 1888, they had in the penitentiary in Kansas 929 people; in 1887 they had 978; in 1886 they had 929. Now look at the statement. Does that show any diminution? It shows an increase from 869 in 1886 to 929 in 1888. I read in a prohibition document entitled "Facts about the state of Kansas and not Opinions," and which I have here, that there are in the State of Kansas at the present time 873 state prisoners. I found by looking at the table from the state of Nebraska that we had 345, and I take both facts from their prohibition documents. Now look at the result. Eight hundred and seventy-three persons in the penitentiary in the state of Kansas was one to 1,830 of their entire population; in Nebraska 345 penitentiary convicts was as one to 3,330. The fact is that in the state of Kansas there are now in the penitentiary, two persons, compared to their population to where there is one up in the state of Nebraska. I found in another pamphlet which I have here entitled "Truth about Kansas" which I gathered down at the last prohibition convention, the statement, mark you, made by the president of a temperance organization in the state of Kansas. "Under the present construction of the laws there is hardly a railroad train moving in or out of the state that does not convey whole barrels and cases full of the seed of this contagion. Every wind that blows over the Kansas prairies is laden with the same infection." Why, people in Nebraska, has it come to this that when the winds blow over the prairies of the state of Kansas it is infected with whisky and with beer so that it becomes a contagion, and that under prohibition; and then let a Kansas representative man come here and ask you to infect the atmosphere of your state so that when the winds sweep over the great Platte Valley it shall become infected with the contagion of rum and of beer! I am one of those who were led to believe that in the atmosphere of the state of Nebraska there is something of health and of purity id stead of this dreadful contagion.

In the town of Fort Scott, Kan., in 1887, there were arrested for drunkenness 115 persons, total arrests 297. Look at the comparison. About one-third of the people arrested in the town of Fort Scott were arrested for being drunk; and so much for that prohibition which General Bradford seemed to think did away entirely with the evils of intemperance.

Down in Leevenworth in 1881 they sent 108 of their population to the penitentiary, and in 1887 out of the same city they sent 116 persons to the penitentiary; so that if we find by another comparison that during six years of prohibition that one town sent eight more persons to the penitentiary than were sent there under seven years of previous license system. So that the fact was what prohibition in six years produced more of criminals than free whisky did under a license system for seven years in the town of Leavenworth. In that same town of Leavenworth for 1889 there were arrested for drunkenness 352 persons. Now mark this statement. When they tell us that prohibition prohibits in the state of Kansas, when in that same city of Leavenworth there were 352 persons arrested for running saloons. Mark the comparison: In Omaha with 240 saloons the little town of Leavenworth with not one-fourth our population, had 312; mark you I do not know how many saloons you have got in Grand Island, but Leavenworth is not more than three times as large as Grand Island, and compute your saloons if you please and answer me tomorrow morning whether prohibition in Kansas has not more open running saloons according to the population than the beautiful city of Grand Island, where I am addressing these people.

To show utterly the character of some of these people who talk about prohibition I chanced to have the report of the police commissioners of the city of Atchison. I read in one sentence of that report a paragraph which told me that there was not a single rum shop in the town of Atchison. I thought that was a startling fact. I turned over another page to investigate, when I found the police court record, and I found touching the subject of arrest that for drunkenness and disturbance of the peace there were arrested 278 persons for drunkenness, notwithstanding the fact that the police officer made a report that there was not a grog shop in the town of Atchison. Having heard that statement I immediately wired the mayor of Atchison for his statement on the subject, and I beg the privilege of reading that letter to this audience, bearing date September 15, 1890.

"Hon John L. Webster, Omaha, Neb.—DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 13th, relative to the operation and effect of the prohibitory law of the state of Kansas. In answer to your inquiry, would state that my observation justifies me in saying that it is a failure and has been greatly detrimental to the best interests of the state of Kansas.

During the last two years I have been mayor of the city of Atchison, a city with a population of about eighteen thousand people, and my opportunities for observing the operation and effect of this law have been very good.

When the constitutional amendment was pending before the people of this state, although a lifelong democrat, I was in favor of it, and advocated its adoption to the extent of my ability. I then believed, and do now believe, that if we can have prohibition it would be a good thing for our people; but under the present law we have all the evils of intemperance without the power of regulating them.

In nearly every city of the state of Kansas there are many "joints" and places where intoxicating liquors are sold in violation of law; yet the people have become tired of the ceaseless agitation that prevailed throughout the state during the first five years of prohibition.

An examination of the recent census returns will show that the population of the cities of Kansas have not increased in proportion to the population of other cities not having a prohibitory law. On many of the principal streets stores are vacant, tenement houses for rent without number, and the only reasonable solution of this state of affairs is the fact that we have upon our statute book this prohibitory law. The people of Nebraska will regret the day that they ever adopt it; and as a practical temperance man in favor of prohibition when we can have prohibition, I would unhesitatingly say to the temperance people of Nebraska, let prohibition alone.

Prior to the adoption of the prohibitory law the liquor was in a measure under the control of municipal government, and it could be regulated and the evils of intemperance prevented to a very great extent, but now we have no power of regulation. The business is carried on in the cellars and in the attics, principally by a disreputable and lawless set of men who know they are violating a law, but who are willing to take the chances of prosecution in order to engage in the nefarious traffic.

The people of this state are today in revolt against the law and hundreds and thousands of those who voted for the amendment have openly declared themselves in favor of its repeal.

Within the last ten days a county fair was held in one of the prosperous counties of the state of Kansas and $700 was paid by one person for the privilege of selling beer on the ground, and I have been informed that the receipts at the bar for one day amounted to upwards of $900. No attempt was made to prosecute the parties engaged in the business and it was not only known but tolerated by those who had been active prohibitionists.

In the city of Atchison, almost daily, can be seen large beer wagons going to and fro over the streets delivering beer to the various joints that infest the city.

The law throughout the state has relaxed into a state of innocuous desuetude. Yours truly, B. P. WAGGONER, Mayor."

I want to say to this people that Hon. Bailey Waggoner is one of the brightest stars of the state of Kansas, familiar with its political history and with its progressive prosperity, equally well posted as to the effect of prohibition in the state of Kansas, and he sends that strong appeal to this people to let prohibition alone; and I believe that thousands of people in this state knowing Bailey Waggoner as I know him, will listen to that appeal and will take that as sufficient evidence that you should cast your ballot against the prohibition amendment. [Applause.]

My time has expired and therefore, I must close this discussion. I started into it with the earnest belief that to vote for prohibition would be a sin and to adopt the prohibition amendment, a state crime, and the more I have studied the proposition, the more I am confirmed of the proof of the assertion, and I appeal to the people of the state of Nebraska simply to preserve themselves from the nefarious results of adopting this prohibition amendment.

1309 | WHAT ARE MISFITS? | 1309

They are custom made clothing of merchant tailors, left on their hands for one reason or another. These we buy in large or small quantities, for ready cash. For example: A suit of clothes costing originally $40, we can, according to style and quality, sell for $18 or $20. Just think of it, a saving of 50 per cent, one-half of the original cost. Many of them are from the leading tailoring establishments throughout the country.

MERCHANT TAILORS' MISFITS and UNCALLED-FOR GARMENTS

OUR PRICE LIST AS A GUIDE.

SUITS.	FALL AND WINTER OVERCOATS.	PANTS.
$65 custom made suit for.....$30.00	$60 custom made overcoat for.....$30.00	$16 custom made pants for.....$8.00
$55 custom made suit for.....$25.00	$55 custom made overcoat for.....$27.00	$14 custom made pants for.....$6.50
$50 custom made suit for.....$22.00	$50 custom made overcoat for.....$25.00	$12 custom made pants for.....$6.00
$45 custom made suit for.....$20.00	$45 custom made overcoat for.....$22.00	$10 custom made pants for.....$5.50
$40 custom made suit for.....$18.00	$40 custom made overcoat for.....$20.00	$ 9 custom made pants for.....$5.00
$35 custom made suit for.....$16.50	$35 custom made overcoat for.....$17.00	$ 8 custom made pants for.....$4.50
$30 custom made suit for.....$14.00	$30 custom made overcoat for.....$13.00	$ 7 custom made pants for.....$3.75

Latest styles and elegant garments in silk and satin lined Suits and Fall Overcoats. Also Full Dress Suits for sale or rent, at the

ORIGINAL MISFIT CLOTHING PARLORS,

1309 Farnam Street, Omaha, Neb. 1309

Remember number and place, 1309 Farnam Street, Omaha, Neb. Open evenings until 9 o'clock. Saturday until 10 o'clock. All garments altered free of charge to insure a perfect fit.

MAGNIFICENT EXPOSITION

NOW OPEN!

EVERY AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

COLISEUM BUILDING

GRAND CONCERT!

BY THE MUSICAL UNION BAND.

MONS. MUNSULLA, Ariel Gymnast

Afternoon and Evening. Every one should see him. The greatest living high wire walker, and trick trapeze