HURTFUL TO A STATE

Views of Great Thinkers and Philanthropists on Prohibition Laws.

FRAUGHT WITH DANGER TO MORALS.

False in Theory, Harmful in Practice, Impossible of Execution.

THE EXPERIENCE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Local Option and High License Furnish the Only Practical System.

REASONS GIVEN FOR THEIR FAITH.

Sumptuary Laws Unjust, Do Not Diminish Drunkenness, Interfere with the Freedom of the People and Promote Crime.

When the prohibitory amendment was before the voters of Massachusetts last year the leading thinkers of that state declared themselves as opposed to its adoption. The following letters, from well known philanthropists and ministers of the gospel speak for

Ex-Governor Rice: In reply to your re quest, just received, for my opinion on the expediency of the constitutional amendment pronouncing prohibition and sale of intoxicat ing liquors the organic law of the state. I say that I do not favor such an amendment, for the reason that I am in layor of the most efficient means for suppressing drunkenness and I believe the adoption of such an amend ment would lead to an increase of drunker nest would lead to an increase of drungen-ness. Whatever may have been the effect elsewhere, statutory prohibition has not been a success in Massachusetts, according to the evidence which I have been able to find; and

evidence which I have been able to find; and I can see no reason why constitutional prohibition should be more effective.

I recognize the sincerity and zeal for good which inspires many of the advocates of prohibition, but my own opinion, reinforced by observation and experience, is that prohibition in Massachusetts has not been, and will not be, a means of preventing or diminishing drunkenness.

ALEXANDER H. RUE. ALEXANDER H. RICE.

Boston, March, 1889.
President Eliot of Harvard College—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 pro-moting temperance, I prefer the combination of local option and high license to prohibi-

tion. Your obedient servant, Charles W. Eliot. HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, Muss., March 18, 1889, Rev. Dr. Bartel: A prohibitory law would

be no wiser or stronger in a constitution than under it. Let us introduce only what we can Temperance must be maintained as a virtue if we would promote it as a cause. We can not prohibit or prevent what we must either use or abuse.

Rev. Brooke Herford: I certainly can not vote for the prohibitory amendment. I believe such sumptuary laws to be entirely vicious in principle, and never more that temporarily practicable. The present state of things—local option—enables prohibition to be carried out wherever there is a prevail is not such a prevailing local sentiment, it could not be enforced if enacted. As far as I can see, what is needed is not new legisla-tion, but the more effective use of what we have. It is not either prohibition or specially high license to which I look for the lessening of the saloon power and of the saloon tempta tion, but more effective supervision, both by the police and by the friends of temperance With such effective supervision, we have already laws enough to accomplish what law can rightly do; without it, more laws, unenforced, would, I fear, be a pure mischief.

BROOKE HEREFORD Ex-Governor Gardner-The result of the former prohibitory law-which, by the way, I signed while chief magistrate-was so un satisfactory in its results that it was repealed decisive majorities in a succeeding legis lature and does not encourage the re-enact ment of similar provisions in the organic constitution of the commonwealth.

Water will not run higher than its source laws cannot be successfully enforced unless a decisive majority of popular opinion sus-tains them; and a law upon the statute book constantly violated-much more a constitu-tional provision constantly violated-is a menace to popular government and a weaken-

Today every municipality in the state each of its towns and cities-possesses the power, and many of them exercise it, of voting total prohibiton within their own boundaries. In such cases, as the law has public opinion behind it, it is generally well exe-

In other municipalities, where public opinion does not sustain such a restriction, the sale of intexicants is permitted under rules that hedge around such sale by re-straint which the wisdom of the governing power imposes, and under high license, such permission produces large excise taxes, thus diminishing the burden upon polls and prop

erty.
Experience of the past seems to teach that tical system regarding this vexed question admirable as frail and imperfect humanity Yours respectfully, HENRY J. GARDNER. Boston, March 19, 1889.

Charles Eliot Norton: The adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and saie of intoxicating fiquors would, in my opinion, be a public misfortune. The amendment is, I be lieve, 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 com-munity that spirit of obedience to law on munity that spirit of obedience to law munity that spirit of obedience to law which the public welfare depends. I am, sir, C. E. Norron. yours truly, CAMBRIDGE, March 16, 1880.

Cambridge, March 16, 1880.

Roger Wolcott—If you deem my opinion of any value, I have no objection to stating it briefly. It is as follows: Even did prohibition. tion prohibit, its enactment should not, in my opinion, be by constitutional amendment. In our American system of government constitutions were never intended to be codes of laws which the experience of a few years might show needed amendment or repeal.

Very truly yours, ROGER WOLCOTT,
53 Tremont street, Eosrox, March 18, 1889.
Rev. J. H. Merison: In reply to your communication. I would say that I do not believe in the expediency of adopting the proposed constitutional amendment, because it cor-tainly will not be carried into effect in the places where it is most needed, i. e., in the large cities. A few things are more de-moralizing than laws of this kind which are not enforced. I believe that a prohibitory law adopted wherever a majority can be selaw adopted wherever a majority can be se-cured for it, and a high license law, rigidly executed elsewhere, will be far more effective than the proposed constitutiona

Boston, March 19, 1889. Rev. Arthur H. Wright-I am opposed to be proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, believing it wrong in principle and impossible of execution, and at this time especially inexpedient, because of the new and stringent license law, which ought to be given a fair trial and impartial execution.

ARTHUR H. WRIGHT.
BOSTON, March 18, 1889.
Rev. Frederic Palmer—I disapprove of the constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors,

and for the following reasons:

1. The constitution of the state is not the place for legislation on such a matter. A con-

stitution should contain principles of govern-ment, not rules, aims and causes of action.

2. Legal prohibition could only be enforced by the body of public opinion behind it.

When that opinion is in favor of prohibition. the present excellent local option law renders prohibition possible. That it is under these circumstances entirely practicable the condi-tion of this town plainly shows; for here each year an overwhelmning vote prohibits the sale liquor, and the prohibition is excellently afficacious. Where public opinion is against prohibition, it would be impossible to enforce amendment, as the cities of Maine, Iowa and Rhode Island show. All, therefore, that

could be accomplished by the amendment, if successful, is accomplished by the local option

3. 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 firmly established than before. If the country towns enforce prohibition before the cities, I fear the reform of intemperance will receive a severe check. 4. The present local option law, by bringing the question before every town, educates she public opinion which is to enforce it. A constitutional amendment would not necessitate this local agitation and consequent edu-

cation.

5. The present high license bill of Philadelphia, in 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 the saloons since. A constitutional amendment could not hope to approach this.

FREDERIC PALMER,

Rector Christ church, ANDOVER, Mass.

March 19, 1889.

March 19, 1889. Kate Gannett Wells—As a legal measure. robibition would be ineffective, for it does of prohibit. As a moral effort to free soci not prohibit. As a moral enort to free socia-tety from a terribic evil, it substitutes special legislation for personal energy. It inter-feres with the freedom of the individual. It becomes a precedent for further restrictive laws. It subverts the broad, legislative functions of the state into temporary, short-sighted coller, which under the prime of sighted policy, which, under the guise of paternalism, is fraught with danger to the moral energies of a nation. It is better to combat intemperance through voluntary associations and individual aid, than by a law which increases the tendency to dependence upon aid. When a state undertakes to pre-vent personal cyil, rather than to punish crime, it may soon be expected to also fur-nish work for the unemployed, as a means of prevention of unfortunate result.

KATE GARRETT WELLS.
Mrs. James T. Fields—I should like to b ieve that prohibition does prohibit. I would lieve that prohibition does prohibit. I would gladly do anything in my power to prevent the manufacture of intoxicating liquors in Massachusetts, but I firmly believe that a cordial enforcement by the people of the laws we now have would do more to prevent drunkenness than any further legislation at the present time. While the cases we already have before the courts are not prosecuted how are we to obtain prosecution of the still larger number of arrests under sterner laws: While our police officers are discouraged from arresting the well-known drinkers and abu sive man at present reported to them, what will strengthen their wills when twice the number of law-breakers are pointed out to

It does not appear to be legislation that is needed just now, but "a little plain religion"

among our people.

Mrs. James T. Figlips.

Dr. John Dixwell: After some nineteen years' work in charity, and fully realizing the fearful results of the abuse of alcoholic the fearful results of the abuse of alcoholic drinks, I am convinced that such evil can only be prevented, or lessened even, to any great degree, by the honest, careful instruction of the masses, old and young, as to the average consequences of using strong drinks habitually or to excess. I do not believe that any law can work much permanent benefit in the real interest of temperance.

Jour Dixwell, M. D.

the real interest of temperance,

JOHN DIXWELL, M. D.,

52 West Cedar street.

Boston, March 18, 1889.

Rev. Percy Browne: Your question as to
the expediency of making prohibition a part
of the organic law of the state is practically
a question as to the most effective method of
proventing intemperance. To my mind the
practical answer ought to be determined by
what experience has thus far taught of the
relative value of prohibition and high license
as methods of preventing intemperance. I as methods of preventing intemperance. I think experience in both methous has shown high license to be most effective for cities, and I am, therefore, compelled, in the interest of temperance, to vote "no" to the prohibitory proposition. Yours truly, Percy Browne.

Roxbury, March 18, 1889.
Charles P. Curtis—Fully alive to the evils of latemperance, I am nevertheless opposed to the adoption of any amendment to the constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.
The constitution establishes general principles of government, and leaves these principles to be carried into effect by the legislature, guided by public sentiment.
Should the constitution descend to the detail of prescribing what a citizen of Massachusetts must not drink, it might as reasonably prescribe what he must not eat or what he must not believe.
Public sentiment must be educated up to

Public sentiment must be educated up to the point where juries will convict, and this

must be done through the agencies of the day schools and the Sunday schools. Your truly, Charles P. Curtis.

Bosrox, March 18, 1889.
William E. Russell: I believe the proposed amendment to the constitution is inexpedient, unjust, wrong in principle, and, if adopted,

will be injurious in its consequence.

1. It is inexpedient because it supplants a better system of dealing with the admitted evil of intemperance. On principle and from experience, I believe the best, fairest and ost satisfactory way of controling the sale of liquor is to let each locality settle the ques-tion for itself, taking into account the differ ence in circumstances, needs and public opin ion of different localities, and their will ness and power to enforce the law. W public opinion demands prohibition, it has prohibition now, and behind it a power that can and ought to enforce it. The vast difference between a large city and a small town in this matter ought to be recognized in practical legislation and is under our local option law. Constitutional prohibition at-tempts to but cannot wipe out this difference. For Boston it would give prohibition nom-inally, but really freedom from all the restric-tions that now exist, there would be plenty

of law and free and untaxed rum 2. It is unjust. Such stringent interference with the liberty of the individual is only justi fied when unquestionably necessary for the public welfare and certain to accomplish the end desired. Judged by the results of con-stitutional prohibition in Maine and Rhode Island, I think it neither for the public wel-

fare nor likely to promote the cause of tem-perance, morality or respect for law.

3. The constitution was intended to express fundamental principles of government upon which all citizens are substantially agreed. It was not intended to define criminal offenses or police regulations, nor to ex-press a fleeting, changeable opinion, nor to enforce the will of a possible majority. Prohibition has been enacted in this state, thoroughly tried, and repealed by its spensors as a confessed failure. To make it

now part of the constitution is to start again on the same experience, but without a proper remedy for the evil that may follow. WILLIAM E. RUSSELL, George S. Hale: I am not inclined to vote

for the amendment—
1. Because I do not think it should be made the subject of a constitutional provision. I do not approve of burglary, larceny or embezziement, but I do not think that a com munity which can not prevent them statute can prevent them by law in the form of a constitution.

2. Because I am not satisfied that the

amendment will accomplish its object or may not tend to defeat it. That object can only not tend to defeat it. That object can only be accomplished under a state of feeling and ominion like that which tends to the prohibi-tion of recognized crimes. Until that state exists, constitutional provisions will weaken. and not strengthen, the authority of prohibi If a law which the constitution allows can

not now be enforced, how can a law which the constitution requires be enforced with any greater success! GEORGE S. HALE. Rev. Dr. Phillip S. Moxom: I am so heartily in sympathy with the social, economic and morals ends taught by prohibitinists that I am reductant to take any position of seeming opposition to those ends. But the more I observe and reflect on the subject of temperance reform, in all aspects, the more doubt-ful I grow as to the wisdom or practicability of the pending amendment. The expertation of rum to Africa, for example, is a disgrace to our state, but it is doubtful if the amendment in any effectual way meets, or would meet this specific case. I am inclined to think that local option, combined with high license in the cities, would meet the public needs in the most efficacious way. The satoons ought to go at once, and would go if all friends of temperance reform would unite in some practicable measure. I do not for a moment think that the defeat of the amendment will indicate any decline of the "temperance" spirit in the people, or give liquor dealers any ground for hope that the traffic in ardent spirits will not soon be effectually controlled. Sincerely yours, PPILLIP S. MOXOM.

incerely yours, Boston, March 21. Rev. Father Thomas J. Conaty: I have seen the prohibition principle in our local laws, and my experience of increased haunts of vice and increased difficulties of temperance work have led me to despise the farce of attempting morality by law. These are some of the reasons that urge me, as a total ab-stainer, to add my protest against placing in

our constitution a law which appears to me to be bad in morals and impracticable in poli-tics. Thomas J. Conart, President Catholic Total Abstinence Society

of America. Agrees with Abraham Lincoln: So much Agrees with Abraham Lincoln: So much has been gained for the cause of temperance during the last fifty years, and public opinion touching the slu of inebriety has so improved, that we may be confident of further progress in the right direction in the future, if the cause is not intemperately managed, for I share the opinion of Abraham Lincoln that "prohibition will sargle work great in uny to prohibition will surely work great injury to the cause of temperance.

FREDERICK O. PRINCE.
Rev. H. Bernhard Carpenter: Yes, let
your constitutional amendment be passed, and
I maintain that the only plorious result you
will have achieved will be—not to make fewer drunkards, but to make more law-breakers in

your commonwealth:

Rev. Alfred W. Martin: I am not in sympathy with any of the "conventional" methods of temperance reform. They are not radical enough in their nature to secure the real end in view—temperance in all things. Only moral education can fit a man so to live in this moral education can fit a man so to live in this world that he can face any and all temptations, and liquor will be made and used whether "prohibition" makes its manufacture and sale illegal or not. An amendment to the constitution prohibiting the maintenance of the saloon—the perpendicular drink—would be the most salutary aid toward moral reformation, efforts and ends. It is only against our disgraceful saloons that a rational temperance reformer can cry. rational temperance reformer can cry,
Alfred W. Martin,

CHELSEA, March 19. Rev. Francis Williams: Were the amendment expedient in its probable and immediate action, I hold its principle to be vicious, and hence its certain and final results to be mischievous. I respectfully refer you to the gospe according to St. Matthew, at chapter xii., 3 38 verses—and I see a prophecy of at least seven spirits more wicked than himself "en-tering in," and the "last state of the man

tering in," and the first.
Francis C. Williams. No. 28 HIGHLAND PARK AVENUE, RONBURY,

March 18, 1889.

Rev. George J. Prescott: I believe that such an enactment would be useiess. The existing evil, though in a measure hidden from sight, would not be cared; legislation never yet worked a moral reform. The cause can not afford to lose any influence of a personal character that will be given in its favor, between indiscrete. however indiscreetly

George J. Prescott. 218 TREMONT STREET, March 19, 1889. Rev. N. H. Ctamberlain-Only my sincere good will to the Transcript leads me to take even a little trouble to state why I hold that the prohibition amendment should not pass. the prohibition amendment should not pass. It should not pass because it is unnatural, wrong-headeded and impossible; unnatural, because it attempts to bind the passion of drunkenness with an outside law, instead of drying it up with an inner grace of good morals and self-respect; wrong-headed and ill-judged, because, as the event is likely to show, after all the expense, rancor and ill-blood engendered in the debate, not only will this amendment fall to pass, but proofs will not be wanting that, had it passed, it would have been an aggravation of drunkenness—ally of practically free rum; impossible, because to exterminate drunkenness or any cause to exterminate drunkenness or any other sin is what God never undertakes to do, and what man never did nor can ever do. Law represses: does not, cannot extermi-nate. Local option and high license repress, regulate, in my judgment, and do not attempt the folly of exterminating, as the prohibition

mendment does. These are my opinions. I am quite ready to leave every other man to enjoy his own, and I insist on the same right for myself What I claim is that the friends of prohibition by constitutional amendment shall nopose either as pre-eminent or the only friendt of Christianity, good morals or philanthropys to the exclusion of men who differ from them, to the exclusion of men who differ from them, They are in a minority in Massachusetts; in the civilized world they are a very small minority. To discuss in the name of the Christian religion any question throwing stones and mud at your opponents will only remind the Christian of what St. Paul says, that a man without charity is only as sounding brass or a tinkling exploit. or a tinkling cymbal.

N. H. CHAMBERLAIN, Rector of St. John's church, East Boston, William H. Brine: I do not think the con-stitutional amendment expedient and hope it will not pass. If it should it will not prevent the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, but it will make drunkards or hyporites. I shyll vote "No." WILLIAM H. BRINE.

Boston, March 20. Stephen M. Crosby: I object to such constant change of policy upon so important a question. I believe that the policy of high nd restricted license, with local option for all communities desiring prohibition, has no yet had a sufficiently extended trial to demon strate its efficiency. If it is found to fail I am ready to go farther. Stephen M. Crossy.

Rev. Solomon Schindler: Your circular note of March 15 comes to hand and in reply I would say that it would be a waste of space n your valuable paper should I reiterate at nome length what I have publicly said before toow in regard to the standpoint I have taker

ward the prohibitory amendment. i shall vote no, no, no Prohibition is an infringement upon per-onal rights (not privileges).

Prohibition does not prohibit. Prohibition drives traffic into the kitchens

cellars and garrets, where the law cannot reach an offender. Prohibition breeds by pocrites

Prohibition makes criminals of inoffensive

Prohibition is a curse and not a blessing it fosters intemperance instead of putting i

intemperate use only becomes harmless, be intrusted to none but responsible people; let it be regulated in the best possible manner, but do not make a crime of what is no crime; do not deprive ninety-nine persons of a legitimate right because one sot abuses it. SOLOMON SCHINDLER. Boston, March 16, 1880.

Dr. Henry J. Barnes: The majesty of our iaws depends for support on the law-abiding citizens. An enactment which will render most men disloyal places the government in the hands of too small a minority. I shall vote HENRY J. BARNES, M. D.

429 Beacon street. Rev. Francis G. Peabody: I shall, in the interest of the temperance movement, vote against the proposed amendment. I have been for some years actively engaged in supporting the no license policy in the city of Cambridge, and the same reasons which have commended this policy to me and which have made it, to all impartial observers, a benefit to this community, now put me in opposition to any constitutional change. The suc

Cambridge has depended or itions: First, the union of al conditions: the forces which make for sobriety over against the force of saloons; and, sec-ond, the constant demand on the voting community to face a question of principle. A constitutional amendment would remove both these conditions of success. It would be, first, decisive in its effect, separating once more the moderate and the extreme temper ance sentiment and weakening the forces of order in the face of the enemy of order. It would, secondly, change one's vote from a question of principle to a question of men, with all the risks involved in personal politics. In the interests, therefore, of such wholesome and steady reform as the last two years have witnessed in Cambridge, I—with many of those most actively engaged in our

no license work—oppose the amendment.

Cambridge. Francis G. Peardory.

Hon. Johnathan Stone: You ask my opinion as to the expediency of adopting the prohibitory amendment. I am decidedly opposed to it, and shall do everything I can to defeat it. The idea of incorporating into our funda-mental law an amendment that will attempt to strike out of existence one of the principal articles of commerce and manufacture—an article that is used in some way or other by every human being in all civilized commun every human being in all civilized communi-ties where it is to be obtained—and because some people are simple enough to make a bad use of spirituous liquors, it is no reason why others should be producted from the proper use and enjoyment of them. Prohibition is wrong in theory and practice; it never can be enforced; it will be a dead letter upon the statutes with spassingly attempts to enforce statutes, with spasmodic attempts to enforce it. I am in favor of a license law—high li-cense and a limited number. After a carefu consideration of the whole subject for nity years, I am convinced that any attempt to er force entire prohibition will be another fai ure, and only tend to retard the true cause of temperance and reform. Believing that yo only desire a general expression of sentiment without following the matter out in detail, leave it, hoping that every man will be able by common observation and intelligence to

form a correct conclusion upon the subject.

JOHNATHAN STONE. its present fiquor license system than any Revere, March 19, 1889. other state in the union, and 500 per cent

HIGH LICENSE HARD FACTS.

Condensations From Debates of Messrs. Rosewater and Webster.

STRONG ARGUMENTS BOILED DOWN.

Hundreds of Reasons Why Prohibition should Not be Engrafted on the Constitution of the State of Nebraska.

The following points have been condensed from the debates of Hon. E. Rosewater and Hon, John L. Webster:

Nebraska has less than 850 licensed fiquor

Kansas has two drinking places to No.

Prohibition was defeated in Michigan by a ajority of 4,000. Tennessee voted down prohibition by a

najority of 27,693. Prohibition was defeated in Pennsylvania y a majority of 188, 000.

Pennsylvania defeated constitutional p re hibition by 190,000 majority. The amount collected for liquor licenses in

Nebraska last year was \$820,000. Rents in the city of Des Moines, Ia., have tepreciated 23 per cent since 1885.

Prohibition would reduce the saiary of very school teacher in Omaha and Nebraska. After three years of prohibition in Rhode sland the obnoxious law was snowed under by 18,359 majority.

Ninety-one thousand three hundred and fifty-seven majority was the defeat prohibition met in Texas.

The liquor dealers of Iowa sell on an average 30,000 drinks of whisky a day in direct defiance of the statutes.

The speak-easy is the offspring of prohibition, and does its work without the supervis ion of any of those powers.

In prohibition Vermont there were 100 per cent more saloons according to population than in the state of Nebraska.

Salaries paid town and country school eachers in Nebraska average considerably above those paid in Iowa and Kunsas. In prohibition Maine the population in ten

years increased only 11,000, but in one year ner retail liquor dealers increased 125. Under the Slocumb law of Nebraska any town or county can vote absolute prohibition

as provided by the local option clause. In Massachusetts out of a total vote on the prohibition question of 216,000 there was a majority of 45,820 against prohibition.

Among the 165 incurable insane at Hast lugs 180 are temperate, 16 intemperate. The former habits of the other 19 were unknown Justices in Iowa make a special business of rresting a bottle of beer for \$5, and chargng \$10 to \$15 for convicting a bottle of beer.

Three years ago Michigan voted again on a onstitutional prohibitory amendment as against high license. Prohibition was knocked

Vermont only increased one-half of one per ent under prohibition rule while no high Ilcense state increased less than twenty per Prohibition as administered in the prohibi-

tion states of the union absolutely and actually produce more drunkards than the license The greater part of \$92,000 was spent in Polk county, Iowa, in 1889 in the farcical attempt to enforce prohibition which does not

There are in the prohibition state of Iowa over 4,000 places or resorts authorized to sell intoxicating liquors under the laws of the

decrease of licensed liquor dealers in Omaha from 277 to 248, or thirty-nine less than the preceding year. The capital of Connecticutt has a population of 53,000 and 250 smoons. Omaha has

Within the past year there was an actual

more than double her population with only five more saloons. High license weatinto effect in Nebraska in 1881, and closed up many dives. Trrespon-

sible men could not raise the license money and hence shut up shop. In June, 1888, the first month of high license in Philadelphia, the number of arrests

for drunkenness was 1,470, as against 2,357 arrests the month preceding. Nebraska had a population in 1870 of 122,-000, in 1880 we had 450,000 and in 1890 1,225,

000. During this rapid progress the prohibi tion states were at a standstill. Vermont, another prohibition state, has not increased her population one name within the

last twenty years. The census gives the cold figures in 1870 and 1890 at 332,000. In Maine in 1886 there were licenses issued by the government to retail dealers of liquors

1,135, as against 850 in Nebraska. That is pretty good for prohibition Maine. Not a single New England state that has tried prohibition has grown a bit in population, while every state surrounding them has increased wonderfully in population.

The number of saloons in Nebraska in 1880 was over seven hundred, and of that number Omaha, with a population of 30,645, has 180 Total increase in this state in ten years, 150. Since adopting a prohibitory law Kansas and Iowa have not increased in population at

one-half the percentage of Nebraska or Minnesota, both of the latter being high license states. In 1870 Kansas had four times the popula tion of Nebraska. A prohibitory law-was passed in 1882 by Kansas. Today Kan-

sas has only 450,000 more people than Nebraska. In states where there is a prohibitory law they have got more people in the alms houses, proportionate to the population, than there are in Nebraska, where a high license law is

enforced. In defense of the argument that saloons un der high license produce illiteracy, Maine has got as many people over sixteen years of age that cannot write as almost any state in

The city of Cleveland has over 1,600 saloons and a population of 250,000. Omaha has a little more than half that population, while Cleveland has seven times her number of saloons.

the union.

state of Maine of nearly 50 per cent during the nine years of prohibition, while the population of the state only increased 10 per cent during the same time. Omaha has grown 300 per cent faster in wealth, population, railways, sewers and

pavements than the older city of Topeka,

Kas., and has done it without the so-called

There was an increase of prisoners in the

beneficent aid of probibition. Court expenses of Lancaster county and city of Lincoln, Neb., for the year 1889, \$30,000, as compared with Polk county, city of Des Molnes, prohibition state of Iowa, about the same population, \$92,000.

Michigan had constitutional and statutory prohibition from 1855 to 1875, when it was repealed. At that time there were 8,500 saloons in the state, and under license regulation the number in 1889 had been reduced to 4.373. Nebraska has increased more rapidly under

greater than any prohibition state that had prohibition for a period of fifteen years,

In New Hampshire there were 1,442 vacant farms which their owners were compelled to abandon on account of prohibition and seek employment in the manufacturing villages or great cities of the west.

In 1880 Nebraska had one saloon for every 125 voters, or one to about seven hundred and fifty of the population. In 1890 we have one saloon to every 262 voters, which is equal to about one for every 1,570 of the population. In the language of Hon John L. Webster,

with the progress of civilization has compersonal liberty, and with the progress of civilization have we done away with laws that restrained man of his personal liberty. Wholesale liquor dealers claim that they sell much more liquor in Iowa and Kansas

now than before prohibition laws were passed in those states. They sell poorer grades at larger profits than in high license Nebraska. Seventy-eight towns in Nebraska have prohibition under the local option provision of our high license law. In these local com-

nutities public sentiment is adverse to the

saloons and prohibition is therefore absolute. In 1870 the state of Maine had a population of 648,000. In 1890, when the census was ounted, they still had the original 648,000, And yet the prohibitionists argue that prohibition will not stagnate the growth of a

In 1885 a block of six stores with offices

above in Des Moines, Ia., rented for \$5,200 a year and was valued at \$55,000. In 1888 the rental for the same property was only \$3,500 and the owner cannot get a purchaser for it. Prohibition would deprive the children of

poor people of free text books and school supplies. There could be but one resultthese children would be barred out and cheated of an education which would make good men and women of them. The product of the manufacturing indus-

ries of the state of Pennsylvania-which re pudiated prohibition—was during the years between 1870 and 1880, increased \$33,000,000, which was more than the agricultural pro duct of the prohibition state of Maine.

When the high heense law went into effect n Pennsylvania in 1888 there were 14,553 saoons in that state. The enforcement of the aw cut this number down at one blow to 7,724 a little more than one-half. And there has since been a steady reduction from year to year.

The state of Pennsylvania, by repudiating prohibition doctrines and voting down the mendment, increased her manufacturing industries in ten years to \$20,000,000 more than the entire amount of capital invested in manufacturing industries in the prohibition state According to the official report of the com-

nittee of the Massachusetts legislature, inder the five years of the license system in that state there were 14,673 less arrests for drunkenness than there were during an equal period of time under prohibition in the state Prohibition would raise the tax levy in

Omaha and Douglas county to nearly 8 per cent, and at the same time depreciate the value of property 39 per cent to 50 per cent in a few years. Thus would our property owners be caught in the vice, their fortunes waste away to ultimate ruin. In states where high license was enforced. states surrounding prohibition communities

New York, 6,533; Maryland, 975; Illinois, 1,952; Minnesota, 1,223; Nebraska, 733. All this within a period of ten years. The revenue derived from liquor dealers under the high license system for the year 1889 was \$750,818. Of this amount \$64,102 was collected in various towns and cities as occupation tax, and \$18,970 was collected by

increased in manufacturing enterprises as fol-

lows: Massachusetts, 1,140; Wisconsin, 661;

of their incorporated towns. The danger of prohibition being enacted in Nebraska has caused a delay to the investment of \$3,950,000. The investment of this vast sum would furnish employment to a vast number of people and enable them to purchase and pay for a large amount of gro-

ceries, dry goods and clothing. The prohibition book states that three-fifth of all the leiots in the Maine asylums were either drunkards or the direct descendants of drunkards. In 1880 Maine had 1,325 idiots. Did prohibition then prohibit drinking! In New Hampshire they had 703 idiots; in Vermont 803; in Iowa 2.314, and in high license

Minnesota only 729. A large number of people are ready and willing to invest their money in buildings and other improvements when they are satisfied that prohibition is defeated. There are also people in the eastern states whose business it is to loan money who have refused to put a cent into Nebraska until they are satisfied that such is the case.

The district and county court dockets in Nebraska show fifteen cases against saloonkeepers and their bondsmen for violation of legal regulations which hold forth redress to injured parents of minors and wives of drunkards. Without the powerful restraining influence of the saloonkeepers' bonds there would be hundreds of infractions of the law

and no possibility of redress. During the year 1889 there were, according to the state prison inspection of Maine, 16,808 persons arrested for drunkenness. Maine contained a population of less than seven hundred thousand people, with a small for eign element in large cities. This is an apalling number of arrests for one year in a prohibition state for street drunkenness

In Massachusetts, where the people had fair election, and where the intelligence and intellect of that state came forth to east their ballots, prohibition as a doctrine was snowed under. Is it plausible to tell the people of Nebraska that all the people in Massachusetss who voted against prohibition were saloonkeepers, thugs and drunkards!

Prohibition in the states of this union where it has been sought to be enforced either as a constitutional amendment or a statutory law-has done more to break down the commercial industry of those states than any other cause. The surrounding states where prohibition did not prevail during the ten years from 1870 to 1880 were increasing in population, prosperity and manufacturing industries.

During the years between 1880 and 1890 under the influence of high license, there has been such an increase in population, commerce, products and industries-both i mercantile and manufacturing-in the state of Nebraska that it stands without a rival and without a peer in any other state in the union With such a record as that the prohibitionists ask us to change to the disastrous policy in effect in Iowa and Kansas.

In 1888, when the high license law went nto effect, the number of licensed drinking places in Philadelphia was 5,773. It had been higher than that in previous years. In 1885 it was 5,999 and the number had been over six thousand. But the new license board denied licenses to all but 1,347 of these and in a single day over fourteen hundred saloons in Philadelphia were wiped out of existence Now there are only 1,103 saloons in that city.

The local option feature of the Slocumblaw s contained in section 25, the salient part of which reads: "The corporate authorities of all cities and

villages shall have power to license, regulate and prohibit the selling or giving away of any intoxicating, malt, spirituous and vinous liquors within the limits of such city or viilage." This section also fixes the amount of a little more than one-fourth as much.

the license fee, which shall not be less than ONLY A RELIC IN KANSAS 10,000 inhabitants nor iess than \$1,000 in cicles naving a population of more than 10,000.

After thirty years of prohibition in Maine there were 403 insane persons in her asylums This was in 1880. At that time in the Ne braska asylums there were but 175.

Prohibition would bring a worse condition of things to Omaha than is now found in Council Bluffs-saloons everywhere running wide open almost whorly without legal re-

Out of the 56 persons in the Lincoln penitentiary convicted of murder only 14 were inemperate and only a were under the influence of liquor at the time the crimes were

HOW TO VOTE

AGAINST PROHIBITION.

Those who are opposed to prohibition and desire our present local option and high license laws to remain in force should vote against both of the amendments.

Those who desire to engraft the license principle coupled with regulation upon the constitution and forever prevent statutory prohibition as it now exists in Iowa, should vote against the prohibition amendment and for the license amend-

Remember a vote for the license amendment is not a vote against prohibition. These propositions are entirely separate. If you want to defeat prohibition you must vote against prohibition.

The following is the form of the anti-prohibition ticket:

"Against the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage."

"For Proposed Amendment to the constitution, that the manufacture, sale, and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage in this state shall be licensed and regulated by law,"

Keep It Before the People.

Grand Island Independent.

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

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

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

prohibition state in the union that has so few people in jail in proportion to population as we have here in Nebraska. Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union where the public school facilities are so good, in propor-

tion to the population, as here in the license

state of Neoraska.

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

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

past ten years as right here in Nebraska. Keep it before the people that there is not a prohibition state in the union where the increase in population in the past ten years has been anything like as great as here in the li cense regulation state of Nebraska.

These are facts worthy of consideration is

the prohibition controversy and should be

carefully pondered over by every citizen who

mercial prospecity has been so great for the

is anxious to do the right thing, according to his best judgment. Poys and the Saloon.

Fremont Flait.

Larrabee favored the low resorts and holes in the wall as preferable to the respectable saloon on the busy street. His boy was safer as he would not be so apt to go into the dog geries. The Flail looks at it differently. The more secluded the den, the more apt the boy is to search it out and investigate it. When he would not think of going into a public saloon where his parents and friends might see him, he would hunt up the joints and heles in the wall as a mere matter of curiosity, more from the fact that they are supposed to be outlawed than that he cares t patronize them. Since Eve partook of the fruit, to place the ban on anything is to make it coveted above anything else under the sun.

A Warning From Kansas. Topcka Republi

There is not an original package house in he state of Nebruska today. But let us whisper a word in the ears of our friends over the line: If you adopt the prohibitory amendment on the fourth of next month, the very day that that amendment goes into effect three original package houses will open up for every saloon that closes. Don't for get it.

Your traffic is now restricted by the only liquor laws that ever were or ever will be a success. The traffic with you now bears its own burdens. The man who now sells liquo in your state pays for the privilege and is amenable to your laws. Strike down your license laws and the flood gates will be opened and free whisky will flow unrestrained.

Knocked Out Population.

Kansas in spite of prohibition has gained forty-two per cent in population during the last ten years. Nebraska without prohibl tion has gained in the same time over one hundred and fifty per cent. Kansas natur ally is the best state and should have gained twice as much as Nebraska instead of only

The Prohibition Craze Spends its Force and Passes into History.

HIGH LICENSE NOW THE ONLY WAY

No State Can Afford to Adopt or Continue Sumptuary Laws-The

Effect of the Latest

Court Decision.

Topeka (Kan.) Republican, October 26: As far as state prohibition is concerned, it will soon pass into history as one of those unaccountable crazes that at times have swept over entire states and countries.

The original package decision made by the

United States supreme court early last sum

mer rendered null and void all state prohibi-

in so far as they apply to the importation

tory laws, both constitutional and legislative,

and sale of intexicants in origpackages. This opened up opportunity (which was grasped by thousands) to import into prohibition states liquors put up in packages to suit all classes of buyers. At the behest of a faction that has never learned that personal liberties are too sacred to be tampered with by the law making power of this country, congress made an attempt to set aside the decision of the highest tribunal in the land by the passage of the famous Wilson bill. By the brainiest and most learned jurists of the land that law is pronounced unconstitutional, inasmuch as it attempted to delegate to the several states the power to regulate commerce between the states, a prerogative expressly reserved unto the federal gov. ernment. "Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states"-but this does not give congress the authority to delegate that power to any state or state If congress has the authority under the constitution to delegate the power to a state i prohibit, or regulate interstate commerce it he matter of liquors, it has the same authority to delegate to the states the power to prohibit or regulate the commerce between the states in cotton, corn, wheat, hogs or any other article. It is idle to say that this never would be done. The question is not what would be done, but what could be done. The principle involved is what should be taken into consideration. Once decide that any state has had the power conferred upon it to interfere with interstate commerce in any one article, and you have established a precedent that will be seized upon

It certainly does not take a great lawyer of a learned jurist to see that a law which attempts to give Kausus the power to regulate the commerce in any article between it and any other state, transcends the power vested in congress by the constitution. As already the congress of the consideration. As already said this is the opinion of the best jurists in the United States.

The federal supreme court will be called upon to decide this question in the near future, and there is not even a bare possibility.

when any state desires to apply the princip to the commerce in any other article.

that they will sustain the law known as the Let us see in what position this is sure to leave the states that are so unwise as to adopt or retain prohibitory measures. Every citi-zen of such state will be forbidden to sell in toxicating liquors, but citizens of other states can come in under the sanction of federal au can come in under the sanction of federal authority and open up drinking places on every block and at every cross roads all over the state, and sell in quantities large or small, to young or old, inebriate or idiot, night-time or day-time, Sunday or week day, without restraint, restriction or responsibility. Look at Kansas today. That is ner condition, and that will continue to be her condition until the people have learned sufficient wisdom to enact such regulations as they may constitutionally do. Free whisky from one end of the state to the other. Not a cent of revenue; not a deliar paid into the treasuries of the cities; no arm strong enough to close the

the cities; no arm strong enough to close the doors of the drinking places at any time of A state may tear down her broweries, let the fires die out in her distilleries and close up her licensed saloons, but across the line the neighboring states the breweries distilleries will be quickened into rene activity and their agents will troop into so-called prohibition state by hundreds, the same whisky, the same beer, the sam toxicants of all kinds will be sold as be

but the traffic will bear none of the bursh that it imposes on the people and the deal amenable to no laws. Is there any wisdom in such a policy?

Will any good results flow from such a condition of things? Is it a good and wise business transaction to close the traffic to the people of your own state and open it up for any citizen of all the other states! Is it prudent financiering to drive capital out of your state for investment in the same business in other states: And and beyond all, is it conducive to the and good government of your state and to be happiness and safety of your homes, to put the traffic beyond the police powers of your state to regulate and restrict it—the inext ble result of prohibitory enactments as le as the constitution of the United States mains as it now is? Will it save your boys and throw safeguards around your inebriates to close up the licensed saloon, where neither can lawfully enter, and open up the joint, the dive and the original package houses, where

boys, the inebriates and all others cannot prohibited from entering and buying at all Under the circumstances which now exist and which will, in all human probability continue to exist for generations to come, so state can or will long continue to attempt the maintenance of prohibition that bears down every parrier to the free and unre-

strained traffic in intoxicating liquors Maine Liquor Dealers. Bath has 25 rumsellers, one for every 313

ahabitants. Belfast has 14 rumsellers, on for every 386 nhabitants. Lincoln has 5 rumsellers, one for every (5)

nhabitants. Winn has 6 rumsellers, one for every 10 nhabitants. Orono has 8 rumsellers, one for every "SI habitants.

inhabitants

103 inhabitants,

41 inhabitants.

Bangor has 140 rumsellers, one for every 20 inhabitants. Portland has 129 rumsellers, one for every of inhabitants. Lewiston has 60 rumsellers, one for every

Bar Harbor has 18 rumsellers, one for eve

13 inhabitants. Rockland has 43 cumsellers, one for every 77 inhabitants. Oldtown has 33 rumsellers, one for ever

Augusta has 24 ramsellers, one for every 361 inhabitants. Biddeford has 24 rumsellers, one for ever 27 inhabitants. Gardiner has 13 rumsellers, one for every

Ellsworth has 17 rumsellers, one for every 89 inhabitants. Houlton has 12 rumsellers, one for every s7 inhabitants.

Waterville has Li rumsellers, one for every 125 inhabitants. Eastport has 10 rumsellers, one for ever 400 inhabitants.

36 inhabitants, Vinalhayen has 5 ramsellers, one for ever 571 Inhubitants. Presque Isle has a rumsellers, one for every

Brunswick has 9 rumsellers, one for ev 30

61 inhabitants. Skowhegan has 7 runsellers, one for every 552 inhabitants. Fairfield has 6 rumsellers, one for every

or inhabitants. Old Orchard has 9 rumsellers, one every 56 inhabitants. Five towns have 4 rumsellers each, one lot

for every 1.021 inhabitants.

Total in towns named, 540.

every 213 inhabitants, Twelve towns have 3 rumselters cach, out