## TELLING TESTIMONY.

Voices From the Pulpit Against Enacting a Prohibitory Law.

PROVED A FAILURE WHERE TRIED.

Kansas Ministers Show That it Has Resulted in Moral Corruption.

AND THEIR IOWA BRETHREN AGREE.

A Serious Impediment to the Material Development of the Country.

SIMILAR SENTIMENTS FROM DAKOTA

Nebraska Pastors Testify to the Efficiency of High License in Diminishing the Vice of Drunkenness and Attendant Evils.

In order to ascertain the practical operalions of prohibition in the states of Iowa, Kansas and South Dakota, letters were sent to pastors of churches in those states asking for their opinions on the effect of prohibition in their communities, both in a moral and material way. They were also requested to state for publication their own sentiments in regard to prohibition as compared with high license and local option. Letters were also sent to a number of Nebraska clergymen asking how they stood on the proposed prohibition amendment as opposed to the Slocumb law. The following reptles have been

Rev. B. J. Ansorge, Fort Dodge, Ia. writes: "The morals of this community have not been improved by prohibition, nor has the material development of the town or county been assisted by the laws, and the people generally would vote to repeal them think the liquor traffic is best controlled by

high license."
Rev. A. Ehler, Gray, Ia., writes: "How can a prohibition law elevate or improve if i does not prohibit! I do not know of any as sistance the law has given the town or county in the way of development. People make their home here not on account of prohibi-tion, but on account of the fine country. Ac-cording to my acquaintance, the people here would all vote for the repeal of the law; some who voted for it once would now, if possible, cast a dozen votes to repeal it. I would like to see prohibition substituted by a ligh li-

Rev. L. Tranb, Newall, Ia., writes: "You ask if the morals of this community have been elevated or improved by the prohibitory laws of the state. I can unhesitatingly say that they have not, and the material develor Many farms are for sale and very few buyers put in an appearance. If a proposition to re-peal the law was submitted to the people a impority of the people, whose views are known to me, would vote in favor of repeal. I am opposed to prohibition and favor high li-

Rev. P. Menicke, State Center, Ia., writes: "No sir, the morals of this community have not been improved, on the centrary morals have been lowered and secret drinking has been taught by the prohibitory laws of the state. The bottle in the pocket is more de-moralizing than the glass on the bar of the Every one knows and every one will admit that the laws have impeded the devel-opment of the county, and a great majority of the voters would vote to repeal them.

favor high license and local option; I am op-posed to prohibition." Rev. H. Wehking, Alta, Ia., writes; "The morals of the community have not been im-proved by prohibition. A majority of the people whom I am familiar with would vote to repeal the law. I am in favor of high license and local option." Rev. Ph. Harndschke, Sumner, Ia., writes:

"Not in any respect have the morals of this been improved by prohibition. The drinker now goes to his cellar or side-board; formerly he visited a saloen. As to the material development of the county I can only say that more taxes are collected now than before the prohibition laws were passed. Our county was, before the law rept is democratic. Such a change political sentiment answers quite fully if our people would favor a repeal of the law or not. I am in favor of high license, but not

R. P. Burdoch of Washington Heights, Ia., until quite recently a resident of Luvene, Ia., writes: "The morals of the community in and about Luvene were not im proved by prohibition laws. No, sir, they were not, and the people there would vote to repeal them. I am favorable to high decase and against prohibition."

Rev. J. Horn, Killinger, Ia., writes: "Pro hibition closed the open saloon, but for every saloon closed two or three mysterious whisk holes opened up, so anyone can see that pr hibition did not improve morals. Our neig boring county expended, last year, \$13,000 in prosecuting violaters of the prohibition law and collected from them between \$360 and \$400 in fines, so anyone can see that pro and \$400 in fines, so anyone can see that pro-hibition has not added to the material devel-opment of the county. This township, Max-field, is peopled with good, moral inhab-itants; if an opportunity was given them they would cast a solid yote for the repeal of the prohibitory laws—there would not be two votes against repeal. In my opinion high li cense—not local option—is a thousand times preferable to prohibition." Rev. H. E. Jacobs, Westgate, Iowa, says: "No, the morals of the community have not

been improved by the prohibitory laws of the state; on the contrary, the laws have de-graded the morals of the community; they compel men to make swine of themselves, in that they cannot buy less than too much at e time; any truthful man cannot purchase liquor without soiling his conscience, material development of this county been impeded; a majority of the people would yote for a repeal of the law with heart and They have learned that such a law is ruin to any state or nation. It is their down fail; no legislature can elevate morality by law; high license is what could and would improve the condition of our state and the

Rev. Theodore Wolfram, Waterloo, Iowa. writes: "I was not a resident of the state,be-fore the pronibition laws went into effect, so I cannot say if the morals of the communit have been improved or not, but I can say that I notice they are not better than in states where the manufacture and sale of intexicating liquors is not prohibited by law. For the same reason-non-residence previous to the passage of the law-I am not competent to pass judgment upon the development of the town since the law went into effect. The reduction of the prohibition vote from 793 in 1887 to 112 votes in 1889, would very naturally lead one to believe that if the people of this county had an opportunity vote for the repeal of the law the majority them would do so. My personal preferences are for high license and local option, and I would vote to repeal the prohibitory laws of

the state. Rev. Carl Schmidt of Elma, la., writes 'No, the morals of this community have not been improved by the prohibition laws: on the contrary, they have gone lower. Under a license law this town had two saloons, today it has five or six, where boys from twelve to fifteen years of age can procure drinks; and such boys are frequently seen drunk on the streets, as are men and women! The the streets, as are men and women! The laws have impeded the progress of the town. Many who were prohibitionists four or five years ago are now enthusiastically in favor or repealing the prohibition laws: I think th ajority of our people would favor repeal As to myself, I am in favor of repealing the present laws, and would like to have local option and high license; then the saloons would be controlled, and the shameful sales stopped, and the shameful sales

n the streets seen no more."

Rev. F. W. Heli ke of Bauer, Ia., writes "The morals of this community have not been elevated nor improved, but hypocrisy has been increased. According to the report of the late census the population of our county has decreased; so the material development of the county has been impeded and not assisted by the prohibition laws of the state. Many who voted for the laws in 1882 now admit that fact. To the best of my knowledge and information obtainable, a ma pority of our people would vote for the repeal of the laws, as they recognize it a failure— and so admit, even those who voted for it and supported it for years. I favor the enactment

of a license law, with such regulations as will not interfere with personal rights."

Hev. W. Faulstick of Whitmore, Ia.
writes: "As to the improvement of the writes: "As to the improvement of the community I cannot pass judgment, since I did not live here when intoxicating liquors were sold openly. I cannot give personal judgment as to the development of the county. Our people would vote against prohibition in each and every case. As to my pursonal disposition will say I am opposed to prohibition since it is based on entirely wrong principles. It should be repealed."

Rev. J. H. Brannoer of Lowden, Ia.

It should be repealed."

Rev. J. H. Brammer of Lowden, Ia., writes: "Not in the slightest degree have the morals of the city been improved or elevated by the prohibitory laws. I do not know if the material development of the city has been assisted or impeded by them. Our people would surely vote for repealing prohibition if the question was submitted to them. I would vote for repealing prohibition myself, because I am a temperate man and believe that no law can make a man temperate."

Rev. G. Lohr of Sherills Mount, In., writes Rev. G. Lohr of Sherills Mount, In., writes:
"No, the morals of this community have not been improved by prohibition laws, nor has the material development of the county been assisted. Our people would vote for the repeal of the inws if an opportunity was given them. I am in favor of a high license law. In Dubuque county, where I formerly lived, the law was never enforced."

Rev. V. P. Goesweller of Dexter, In., writes: "I have not paid any attention to the facts, hence I cannot say if the morals of the community have been improved or not; the same answer must be given to the develop-

same answer must be given to the develop-ment of the county under prohibition laws. I believe that a majority of the voters would be opposed to repealing the laws. I think prohibition wrong, hence to repeal the laws would be right; high license is the best pos-ible solution of the temperance question; scal option is tyranny on a small scale; local option is the less, prohibition the greater evil. If nothing is left, but a choice between

the two, then I would favor local option."

Rev. W. B., of What Cheer, Ia., writes:
"I have not noticed any improvement in
merals under prohibition laws; on the contrary, I often see some one reeling the streets unable to carry the load of liquor he has imbibed. To me prohibition seems to be an attempt to make men pious by law; it teaches lying and false swearing. In my opinion it has impeded rather than assisted the development of the country. The tax-payers in my neighborhood complain a good payers in my neighborhood complain a good deal of the nurdens that prohibition loads upon them, and I believe that a majority of them would vote for a repeal of the laws. Personally I think prohibition a religious fraud and a political failure. I have always advocated temperance and condemned drunkenness. The repeal of the prohibition law and the enactment of a high license law would be self: the state and the reach. would benefit the state and the people." Rev. W. F. Strobel of Wilton Junction, Ia.

Rev. W. F. Strobel of Wilton Junction, Ia., writes: "During my seven years' residence in Crawford county, if my observations can be taken for grounds for an opinion, I must say that the morals of the community have not been improved, for all that time beer and dancing parties increased in number from Sunday to Sunday, and as a consequence th People do not, nor will not, look upon the transgression of the prohibition laws as a transgression of the prohibition laws as a crime, and in that way learn to transgress other laws—moral as well distate. From the working of the law I think the development of that county (Crawforti) has been materially impeded, and, without a deadt, an overwhelming majority of the people of that county would vote for its repeal. Personally, I am for recogning the law and favor the I am for repealing the law, and favor the ensetment of a high license, local option

Rev. A. C. Doerffler of Amelia, Ia., writes "I do not believe that prohibitory laws will improve or elevate the morals of any comcunity. Prohibition laws have a tendency o make drunkards. Under them temperat trinks are hard to get, while whisky by the pint or quart is not. If a drinking man e get what he wanted when he wanted it. surchase of stimulants by the quantity and he drinking of intoxicants by the quantity would not be so frequent. No, the law has not aided in developing the county; rather it has impeded development. I am against pro-hibition and in favor of a high license law." Rev. A. C. Steege of Council Bluffs, In. vrites: "I cannot see that prohibition ha

writes: "I cannot see that prohibition has brought about any great improvement in the the direction of true temperance. As prohibition does not prevent what it would prohibit it has unnecessarily, to say the least, has made an army of law-breakers. As we have no prohibition in fact I cannot say that it has inhibition in fact I cannot say that it has im peded or aided the development of the city or county. The majority of the people whose

county. The majority of the people whose predilections politically are known to me are opposed to prohibition, and would vote to repeat the law. I consider high license, provided it be conscientiously and justly exercised and enforced, to be the most justifiable, and at the same time the most efficient damper on the evil of drunkenness."

Rev. C. W. Baumhoefener of Hamestead, Ia. writes: "No, the morals of this community have not been improved by the prohibitory laws, and the development of Iowa county has been impeded by them. Our people would vote for repealing the laws, as cople would vote for repealing the laws, as would myself. I am in favor of the enact-

nent of a high license law."

Rev. Charles W.Ott of Atlantic, Ia., writes:
'I was not a resident of this state before the Twas not a resident of this state octor the passage of the prohibitory law, but if hypocrisy, perjury, open secret violation of the law, vile, adulterated liquors should be considered a moral improvement, the morals of this state must have improved wonderfully. From what I hear I should judge that our city property is worth scarcely two-thirds its former value. To what extent prohibition is responsible for this I am not prepared to say. I am in favor of the proposition to repeal the present prohibitory law and would endorse a igh license system."
Rev. L. A. Muller of Odebolt, Ia., writes

The morals of the community have not been elevated by prohibitory laws. Prohibition has given cause to secret dram shops in our town at least. Odebolt would without doubt be more of a town if we had one or two re spectable saloons. I believe a great major ity of the people I know would vote for re bealing the law. I am against prohibition because it leads to perjury and other crimes Rev. C. Hafner, Leavenworth, Kas, writes "The iderals of this community have no been elevated by prohibitory laws. The town's growth has been impeded to the extent of reducing the population fully 10,000 I am in favor of repeal, provided high license

Rev. F. Brust, Dubuque, Ia., writes: "Th law was never for a moment enforced in Du buque. This very non-enforcement of a law in my opinion is unwise and has had a bac influence upon the morals of both old and and young men. I am certainly for repealing and in favor of high license and every posble and practical control of the saloons, bu against local option, because the tyrany of small majority of a county or township is th ame and unjust as the tyrany of a big ma

ority of a whole state."

Rev. E. Riedel, Fort. Dodgo, Ia., writes "If false swearing, and in consequence of this contempt of the laws is elevation of morals in our country, then we have a great deal of it. The prohibitory laws have never assisted us and in a great many cases have injured. I am in favor of repealing the pro-hibitory law and adopting a high license system, but not too high, as the orderly people

have to bear the burden."

Rev. F. V. Strope, Montecello, Ia., writes To the best of my knowledge the morals of Monticello people have not been in the least improved by prohibition, as it does not prohibit. I think such prohibitory laws can never and will never be enforced in any state. The law has given us no assistance but I can not say how much it has impeded the growth of our county and town. The majority of u ere are in favor of repealing—the sooner th

Rev. I. P. Guerther, Boone, Ia., writes The morals of our community have not been elevated by prohibitary laws. The develop ment of our town and county has been impeded to a small extent. I am in favor of repealing the laws and am in favor of high li

cense and local option."
Rev. G. Hoar, Hubbard, Ia., writes: "Sinc we have had prohibitory laws the morals of the community have not improved. Down with prohibition and introduce the high li-

Rev. P. Studt, Luzerne, Ia., writes: "The Rev. P. Studt, Luzerne, ia., writes: "The prohibitory law has had the opposite effect to moralize this community. It has caused no development and I am decidedly against the law. I am in favor of a high license sys-

A. D. Grelf, Davenport, Ia., writes Rev. A. D. Greif, Davenport, Ia., writes: Prohibitory laws have not improved the morals of this community. Development of our county has been impeded, but to what extent is unknown to me. I am in favor of repealing the prohibitory law and substitut-ing high license. Don't know about local op-

Rev. J. Aron, Athens, Benton county, own, writes: "Hypocrisy has been flourish Iowa, writes: "Hypocrisy has been flourish-ing; lying, crimes raised as if in a hotbed; more arrests for drunkenness than in corre-sponding years before. Prohibition has dam, aged our town more than a civil war would

have done. I would rather see prohibitio baried today than tomorrow. I would deliver the funeral sermon free. I have lived here for eleven years and know whereof I SDEDK.

Rev. J. Deckman, Cedar Rapids, Ia. crites: "The morals of the community writes: "The morals of the communi-have, according to my opinion, not improved, but are rather diminishing. The material development of our county and town has not been assisted by prohibition. If a proposi-tion to repeal the present prohibitory law in our state should be submitted, the majority of the people that I know would vote for re-pealing prohibition. I shall vote for high license and local option every time."

Rev. J. G. Schliepsiek, Pomeroy, la., writes: Thave not lived in Iowa long enough to compare the morals of now with former times. know, however, they are no better than the morals of communities where prohibition is a stranger. Our county has made wonderfu progress in the last few years, but not as a consequence of the prohibition laws, but from the natural resources of the county. Liquor has been consumed as before, but the money was all sent out of the state. I consider pro hibition as it now is here, in direct opposition to the word of God. I am in opposition to prohibitory laws with heart and soul and in favor of repeal and high license."

Rev. A. Dommanu, Ireton, Sioux county, Ia.

writes: "There is plonty of beer and whisky in Iowa and I tell you it is drank, too. But every one who sells it and drinks it is, in the eyes of the moral element a law-breaker and an immoral citizen. I am for repealing the law because intoxicants are now sold free, that is without moral or legal control High license would at least bring the abuse of selling and drinking intoxicants under

public control."

Rev. W. Mallon, Herndon, Ia., writes "There has been no improvement of morals, but on the contrary people are forced to lie. They have intoxicants shipped under false denotation. They buy brandy by the gallon and more, and drink it in much larger quantities than though they could buy it by the drink. The law has impeded the growth of our county greatly. We have five families less in every school district. We get 5 cents less on every bushel of corn. Houses in town are empty and taxes are very high. There are no new comers. Every good prohibition-ist in this community confesses that there is something wrong with our prohibitory law and will vote against it a second time. We are in favor of a reasonably high license and local option. Not because I am in favor of drunkenness, but because I am in favor of so-briety, honesty and prosperity of my beloved Iowa. Now, my dear sirs, if you would like o see your state damaged as much as poss-ole, have our prohibition imported. But you would like to see your state prosper, de all you can to have it prevented. This is no experience after living lifteen years in Iowa.

## HIGH LICENSE GOOD ENOUGH. Nebraska Ministers Who Stand by the Slocumb Law.

Rev. G. Jurg, Waco, Neb., writes: "I would not vote for a constitutional amendent prohibiting the manufacture and sale of iquor. I consider the enforcement of prohi-pition an abridgement of the inalienable rights of man. It is my opinion that there would be just as much drinking, it would make more hypocrites, and things would be altogether worse than they are now should a prohibition amendment be adopted. I would advise my friends to vote against prohibi

Rev. H. W. Hohn, Deshler, Neb., writes A constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet with my approval. I do not believe that my state has the right to dictate what we shall cut or drink. I think the adoption of the prohibitory amendment will hypocrisy and diminish the trade of I would not advise my friends to vote for prohibition.

Rev. L. Poepertern, Beatrice, Neb., writes: I would advise the people of Nebraska to vote against prohibition."
Rev. P. Moellening, Bazile Mills, Neb.,
writes: "I am of the opinion that the Sio-cumb law tends to diminish drunkenness. I would not vote for a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor. The enforcement of prohibition is an abridgement of man's rights. A prohibitory law would increase drunkenness, lawlessness, hypocrisy and other evils. I hope my friends will vote against prohibition."

N. Bremer, Pierce, Neb., writes "The Slocumb law is a good one and would diminish drunkenness if enforced. I am against a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor, prohibitory amendment, if adopted, prove the greatest disaster our state has ever met. The personal rights league will vote against prohibition at the coming election. The most of the inhabitants of the county are

against such a measure. 11
Rev. M. H. Pankow, Norfolk, Neb., writes "I believe that sobriety and temperance "a best be promoted by the high license and is cal option laws, wherever they are enforced I will not vote for the proposed constitutiona amendment. I believe that an attempted re form enforced on an unwilling people wil not reform, but will operate to the contrary

in many ways. I would advise people to vote against prohibition."

Rev. W. Barder, Schuyler, Neb., writes: I consider the Slocumb a good law. I would not vote for a constitutional amendment pro hibiting the sale of liquor. The adoption o the prohibitory amendment will not being any changes for the better, but for the worse as it creates disobedience to the laws, his poorisy and other wrongs. I advise m friends to vote against prohibition for social, moral, and above all, a religiou

standpoint."

Rev. C. A. Scharfer, Glenville, Neb "I do not believe that the high I cense law tends to diminish drunkenness, be cause it is not enforced. The adoption of prohibition would relieve us of many evil connected with the saloon, but woul foster lying, deception, perjury and fanatic

Rev. A. Long, Fremont, Neb., writes:
"We can better control the liquor business in an open saloon than the sale of liquor in the dens of prohibition bition states. In my opinion prohibition would result in ruining the bright prespect of our state, would make the people defraud ers and hypocrites, as the prohibition state of Iowa and Kansas clearly show. I shall continue to advise my people to have the Slocumb law enforced.

W. Brakhage, Malcolm, Neb., writes "I would not approve of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale of liquor, and would advise my friends to vote against pro hibition."
Rev. E. Kawitter, Molden, Neb., writes

Rev. E. Kawitter, Molcen, Neb., writes:
"In a general way I believe that the Slocumb
law tends to diminish drunkenness. I think
that a prohibitory law would be for the
worse, and I advise my friends to vote against Rev. A. Hefins, Fontanelle, Neb., writes "I believe that a high license law tends to diminish drunkenness. I would not vote for the amendment, as I feel that any change

from the present system would be for th

I advise my friends to vote against Rev. L. Mueller, Elk Creek, Neb., writes "Neither myself nor the people with whom am associated will approve of a constitu tional amendment prohibiting the sale of liquor. In my opinion the change would be for the worse, and I shall vote and advise

against prohibition."
H. Wind, Millard, Neb., writes: "I do no approve of a constitutional amendment pro-hibiting the sale of liquor. The enforcement of prohibition would act in direct opposition to the words of St. Paul, 'Let no man judge you in meat or in drink,' etc. When-ever God binds by his word we say amen, but not so when mar would bind where God has given liberty Prohibition promotes hypocrisy; it promotes perfidiousness. I would advise my people to rote against prohibition because such a movement as this cannot promote the cause of temperance. It does not stand the test of God's word."

Rev. J. Desch, Imperial, Neb., writes "High license tends to diminish the vice of drunkenness, for it brings the use of such peverage at the most under the control of all sober, honorable men. I am opposed to a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of iiquor, for a misu-never abolishes the right use. I consider the enforcement of prohibition an abridgment of the inclienable rights of man. The bible teaches Christians a Chris-tian liberty in eating and druxing. Christ himself teaches that the right use of drinking is not making the man profane. He himself made wine for drinking. The resul of prohibition would be for the worse. It as sists hypocrisy; makes every neighbor a spy, and interrupts the social, peaceable neighbor-hood. I shall advise and vote against prohi-

Rev. G. Bullinger, Clearwater, Neb. writes: "I am opposed to the amendment, for experience shows me that prohibition does not prohibit. I regard the enforcement of prohibition an abridgement of the rights of man. Should prohibition be enforced it gression of and contempt for our laws, sneak-

would fill our country with hypocrits. I

would most certainly advise my people to vote against prohibition."

Rev. M. Adams, West Point, Neb., writes: "High license, if strictly enforced, will diminish drunkenness. I am opposed to the proposed amendment, as I de not believe its enforcement would be for the better. Drunkenness in the secret deprives the state of its due taxes, makes hypocrites who pretend to be such in order to get a drink of liquor in drug store, and encourages fraud in ny ways. I would advise the people to

vote against prohibition."

Rev. G. G. Gundeil, Berlin, Neb., writes: "In my opinion, a high license liquor law tends to diminish drunkeuness. I consider he enforcement of prohibition an abridgment of the mallenable rights of man. Its co-forcement would prove for the worse, and I herefore advise my people to vote against

Rev. J. C. r. Burmeister, Sterling Neb. writes: "I am of the opinion that the Slocumb law tends to dimensh drunkenness. The constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor does not the manufacture and safe of liquer does not meet my approval, not a single vote will be east in favor of it by my people. Prohibition is an abridgment of man's rights. It means golden times for bootlesgers and will make many perjurers and hypocrites. I would advise everybody to vote for high license

and against prohibition.

Rev. J. H. Hoffman, Battle Creek, Neb. writes: "The slocum law, if enfor , is a good one, and tends to deminish druntenness. A constitutional amendment prohibit ng the manufacture and sale of liquor would ing the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet the approval of the people with whom I am associated, nor myself. To eat and drink that which is wholesome for my body is an inabinable right, a right founded in nature. Prohibition promotes mypocrisy, perjury, etc. I would advise the people of the stills to vote against it.

perjury, etc. I would advise the people of this state to vote against it." Rev. E. Denninger, Madison, Neb., writes: "The Slocumb law tends to diminish drunk-enness as far as enforced. The country people buy beer by the keg and whisky by pie buy beer by the keg and whisky by the gallon and drink as much as they please. A constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet with the approval of the people with whom I am associated. I consider the enforcement of prohibition an abridgement of the inalienable rights of man, and its en forcement would be for the worse. It would make both the sellers and consumers hypo-crites, and annoy those who need stimulating beverages as medicine or wine for sacra-mental purposes. I would advise the people of this state to vote against prohibition."

Rev. J. F. S. Her, Omaha, Neb., writes I am satisfied that the Slocumb law tends to diminish drunkenness. A constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet with the approval of the people with whom I am asso-clated. I consider the enforcement of probi-bition an infringement on a man's personal liberty and rights. Its enforcement would result in hypocrisy, theft, secret drunken ness, violation of the law by those selling and purchasing liquors, and may other evils are introduced by prohibition, as experi-ence shows. My appeal to the citizens of Nebraska is to vote against prohibition. Re-serve the rights which God has given them. Let us remedy evils, but not increase them.

Rev. L. F. Huber, Kramer, Neb., writes I think that high license tends to diminish the vice of drunkenness. I am opposed to constitutional amendment prohibiting th manufacture and sale of liquor. The en-forcement of prohibition would in my opinion be for the worse. The members of my

church as well as myself will vote against prohibition,"
Rev. G. Mueller, Lincoln, Neb., writes "Am of the opinion that the Slocomb law tends to diminish drunkenness. I would not approve of a constitutional amendment rohibiting the manufacture and sale of quor, as I believe prohibition to be an in iquor, as fringement on a man's imilienable rights. The enforcement of prohibition would result for the worse and I advise my people to you ngainst it

Rev. A. Baumhoefener, Grand Island Neb. wrote: "High license is the proper law, and it should be enforced vigorously. I can hardly believe that a person who will yote for a constitutional amendment prohibvote for a constitutional amendment prohib-ling the manufacture and sale of liquor to be of sound mind. The next thing the prohibitionist will ask will be an amend-ment to abelish the use of coffee. Should the proposed amendment be adopted we would have more drunkenness and more violation of the law than now. This I have experienced in the prohibition state of lows. My advice would be for everybody to vote against pro-hibition, because I do not want man to forbic what God has not forbidden

Rev. H. Frinche, Lincoln, Neb., writes: "My observation is that, the Slocumb law tends to diminish the vice of drunkenness. A prohibitory amendment would not me with my approval, as I consider that proh bition means anything but personal safety, and would result for the worse. I therefore would advise the people of Nebraska to vote

Rev. C. Volz. Eustis, Neb., writes: "I am opposed to an amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor, as I regard such a measure an abridgment of the inalienable rights of man. Should prohibition be enforced worse results would follow, would advise the people to vote against pro-

Rev. J. Casenbusen, Monley, Neb., writes:
'I think the slocumb law would be sufficient if enforced. The people with whom I am associated are opposed to the amendment, as they consider it an abridgment to their rights, and believe that worse results would come from an effort to enforce prohibition I shall therefore, by all means, vote against prohibition."
Rev. C. Schubkeyel, Blue Springs, Neb.

writes: "I favor the Siecumb law and an opposed to the amendment, as it interferes with a man's personal rights. In my opinion the adoption of the prohibitory amendment would be a curse, both socially and finan cially, to the people of our state. I shall therefore most emphatically advise the peo-ple of this state to vote against prohibition at

ple of this state to vote against prohibition at the coming election."

Rev. A. Larson, Blair, Neb., writes: "I do not approve of a constitutional amend-ment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor, as I consider it an abridgment of the inalienable rights of man. Should the amendment be adopted the result would be for worse and I would advise the people of this state to your against prohibition." this state to vote against prohibition

Rev. C. H. Siltz, Arapahoe, Neb., writes To some extent the slocumb law tends to diminish drunkenness. I do not approve of the proposed amendment as I consider it ar infringement upon—the rights—given—me—by God. Its adoptirn would only change hone men to hypocrites, and cause the people to transgress laws and thereby sin, which would not be if there were no prohibition Prohibition does not close, but create saloons, which every person can learn by passing through Iowa. I would advise the people of this state to vote against prohibi-tion."

Rev. P. A. Hendrichson, Omaha, Neb. writes: "I am of the opinion that the Slodrunkenness. I am opposed to an amendmen prohibiting the manufacture and sale of li quor, as I consider it an absidgment of man's personal rights. Should prohibition he adop ted it would increase the vice of drunkenness creatse hypocrites, and tempts even law-abi ding citizens to become tresspassers. would advise the people to vote against pro

Rev. P. Schultz, Martinsburg, Neb., writes "I am convinced that the Slocomb law tends to decrease drunkenness. Yet in country towns it should be more rigidly enforced." towns it should be more rigidly enforced. I
believe as a community we are the most sober
people in the union. The people with whom
I am associated are opposed to the constitutional amendment and will continue to oppose it as long as we are able to contend
against it, with heart, mouth, pen and hands.
Christians are admonished, 'Let no man
judge you in meat 'or in drink.' I
most certainly regard the enforcement of prohibition an abriagment
of the inalienable rights of man. Prohibition incaeases drinking, drunkenness, by potion incaeases drinking, drunkenness, hype crisy and all vices. What is worse, it con demns Christ, our Lord's, conduct and sets human opinion on a par with the brole. Yea, above it, and thus undermines the authority of holy writ. To Christians 1 would say: Vote by all means against it if you love your Lord and do not want to have His word set aside. To others I would say: If you love the union and its glorious liberty-frought constitution; if you love your own state and its welfare: if you love personal rights, vote against prohibition." Hev. J. C. Mueller, Norfolk, Neb., writes:

"I know it to be a fact from personal observa-tion that the Slocumb law tends to diminish the evils of drinking. I would not approve of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale of liquor, as I certainly think a man has a right to cut and drink moderately what he pleases and his circumstances permit The result of the adoption of prohibitio would be bad. The moderate or harmless use will be restrained. The drunkard will drink by the pint instead of the glass. Trans-

ing spylsm and hypocrisy will prevail, and the prosperity of our state will be impaired. I would advise the people of Nebraska to vote against prohibition, as I consider our present laws far better."

Present laws far better."

Rev. G. Weller, Marysville, Neb., writes:
"I would not vote for the prohibitory amendment, as I believe it to be an infringment on the rights of a man. Should the amendment carry the saloon would go and the drug store would take its piace, just as has been done in Iowa and Kaesas. I would advise the people of Nebraska to vote against prohibition every

me," Rev. F. H. Donnenfeldt, Lawrence, Neb. writes: 'I believe that the Slocumb law tends to diminish drunkenness just as much as any law can do it. I do not approve of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture of liquor and I know that my whole congregation will vote against it. I do not intend or pretend to be any better than Jesus Christ, the son of God, was, and therefore regard the enforcement of prohibition as an abridgment of the inalienable rights of man. I think that if prohibition becomes a law there will be just as much drunkeaness as now and that we then would have more perjury, oath-breaking and hypoerisy than anybody could look at without shudder or norror. God save us! I would advise every body to yote against prohibition at the com ng election and at every election if it should e necessary."
Rev. C. E. Wiedevanders, Gothenburg,

Neb., writes: "I think high license works all right. The people with whom I am associated are opposed to a constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale of liquer, and so am L. Such a measure, in my opinion, infringes upon a man's personal liberty. I never had a chance to observe prohibition, therefore I do not know in what it would result. I would never say that anybody should vote for prohibition." Neb., writes: "I think high license work

Rev. C. Bock, Deshler, Neb., writes: "My opinion of the Slocumb law is that it tends to diminish the vice of drankenness. I do not approve of a constitutional amendment denanding prohibition, as it infringes upon the the God-given rights of man. Should it earry, it would create lying, false swearing, hypocrisy, disobedience of the law and drunkenness worse than before. I would advise the people of the state to vote against

Rev. C. Helmreich, Lodge Pole, writes "I am satisfied that the Slocumblaw is a good one and tends to diminish drinking. All of us here are against prohibition, as we feel that it is a measure which infringes upon the rights of man. Should the amendment be adopted the result would be worse that at present. I would advise the people to vota

gainst prohibition."

Rev. C. Bunnler, Grand Island, writes "If the Slocumb law is enforced it is a good enough one for any one. Neither myself nor the people with whom I am associated approve of a constitutional amendment prohib-ting the manufacture or sale of liquor, as we consider such a proposition an abridgement of man's rights. Should prohibition be en-forced it would not prevent the slaves of alcohol to get drunk; but many others might im-agine sickness and become liars and perjurers as well as hypocrites. I would advise the people of Nebraska to vote against the

Rev. J. Kippell, Osceola, Neb., writes: "I am in favor of high license and against a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor. I consider the enforcement of prohibition an infringe-ment of man's rights, and believe the result would be far worse than it now is. My ad-vice to the people of the state is to vote

Rev. K. John, Wayne, Neb., writes: "By Rev. K. John, Wayne, Neb., writes: "By no means would I vote for an amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquer, as I feel that such a measure would be an infringement on my God-given rights. I firmly believe that the adoption of the prohibitory ameadment would make the evils worse. I advise everybody to vote against perchibition." prohibition

prohibition."
Rev. O. L. Luscher, Ohiowa, Neb., writes:
"I am of the opinion that high license dimin-ishes drunkeuness or the evils associated therewith more than a prohibition law would As I have lived in Kansas I can say that a prohibition law is a great evil too. I would never vote for a prohibitory amendment, as consider the enforcement of prohibition an abridgment of the rights of man. Should the amendment carry I can see no chance for the better, but for worse. A great many men would drink more on account of being com-pelled to purchase liquor in large quantities.

My ndylecris to vote affainst prohibition."
Rev. W. Chalcher, Deshler, Neb., writes:
"Yes, sir, in my opinion the Slocumb law
does tend to diminish drunkenness and the evils associated therewith. I do not think a prohibitory amendment forbidding the manufacture and sale of liquor would meet the approval of my people. I regard the enforce ment of prohibition an abridgement of the personal rights of man. In case the prohibitory amendment is adopted by our people the results would be lying, false swearing hypoc risy, disobedience of laws, more drunken ness, and I would therefore advise the people

ness, and I would therefore advise the people of the state to vote against it." Rev. S. Rademacher, Bennett, Neb., writes "My personal observations lead me to con-clude that the Slocumb law diminish... drunk-enness and other vices; that a prohibitory amendment would not meet the approval people with whom 1 am associated. I abridgemene of the inalienable rights of man, and I would advise the people to vote against

t, as I shall do."

Rev. F. H. Dahl, Lincoln, Neb., writes: "I am of the opinion that the Slocumb law tends to dimmish drunkenness and the attendant evils. A constitutional amendment prohinit ing the manufacture and sale of liquor would ot meet the approval of the people I am associated with. I do, indeed, regard the en forcement of prohibition an abridgement o the rights of man, and a change to prohibi tion from the Siocumb law would result in many places for the worse. I would advise a

vote against the amendment."

Rev. H. Meissler, Columbus, Neb., writes "I am of the opinion, and I believe that the so-called Slocumb law, if it be enforced to the very letter, sufficient regulation of the saloon system. The proposed prohibitory amendment would not, by any means, meet the approval of the people I am associated with. I regard the enforcement of prohibi-tion as much an abridgement of the inalienable rights of man as it would be to force person to drink intoxicants who, by persons option, would abstain from drinking them. know of an change for the better that could result from the adoption of a prohibitory amendment. Wherever it has been adopted and tred it has increased the vices it aimed to destroy. From a political, social, and above all a religious standpoint, I could only, and do only, advise the people of this state to vote against prohibition at the coming

W. Zabel, Orleans, Neb., writes The Slocumb law does tend to diminish the vice of drunkenness and other evils, and a constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale of liquor would not meet the approval of my people. I regard the enforcement of pro-hiption an abridgement of the inalienable rights of man, and I shall advise my people

to vote against the proposed amendment. Rev. A. Bergh, Hooper, Neb., writes: constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet the approval of the people I am associated with, nor my own approval. adoption. I will vote against it and I advise Rev. H. J. Hubert, McCook, Neb., writes

"I am against prohibition; I shall vote against it, and I advise all voters to do the Rev. C. H. Becker, Falls City, Neb. writes: "The people with whom I am asso-ciated do not approve of a prohibitory

ciated do not approve of a prohibitory amendment; they and I regard enforced prohibition an abridgement of the matienable rights of man; the adoption of the proposed amendment would promote hypocrisy. I advise people to vote against it."

Rev. T. Meeske, Tobias, Nob., writes: As possible for any law, the Slocamb law does diminish drunkenness and the evils associated with it. The proposed amendment does not meet the approval of my people for many reasons, one of which is the abridgement of personal right; it would work; another, the personal right, it would work; another, the hypocrisy it would instigate. I am against it and shall use all influence to defeat it

Rev. F. H. John, Grand Island, Neb. writes: 'So far as my personal observation extends as to the Slocumb law, it leads me to believe that it does diminish drunkcaness, and for that reason the proposed prohibition amendment does not meet my approval, nor the approval of my people. Its adoption would injure our giorious state in many repeets. I shall vote against it, and advise

others to do likewise."
Rev. F. Durver, Kearney, Neb., writes:
"It is my candid opinion that the Slocumb law as enforced in this state does diminish drunkenness and other evils. A constitu-tional amendment prohibiting the sale of in toxicants or their manufacture does not meet the approval of the people with whom I am associated. It would abridge the inalienable rights of man, it would make worse the moral status of the people, and it should (the pro-

posed amendment) be defeated. I shall ad-

New E. Mocekle, Cedar Rapids, Neb., writes: "I am of the opinion that the Siocumb law tends to diminish drungerness and amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor would not meet the approval of the people with whom I am associated, should regard the enforcement of prohibition an abridgement of the inalicable rights of man. I shall advise against the proposed

amondment.

Rev. J. P. Kulhurst, West Point, Neb., writes: "I do think our present license law has a tendency to diminish drunkenness, but it should be enforced with more energy. A constitutional prohibitory amendment would of meet my approval, for the approval of he people with whom I am associated. Its adoption would work a change for the worse eleading to hypocrisy and the entire loss of personal and religious liberty. By all means I advise people to vote against it." Rev A Leuthaenset, Cedar Bluffs, Neb., writes: "A constitutional prohibitory

writes: "A constitutional prohibitory amendment would not meet my approval, nor the approval of my people. I should and de regard the enforcement of prohibition an regard the enforcement of prohibition an abridgement of personal rights, its adoption would work a change for the worse and I shall advise against it with all curnestness.' Rev. E. W. J. Rudolph, Lindsay, Neb., writes: 'I think the present high Reense law the best weapon possible to battle with against the vice of drunkenness. A constitutional prohibitory amendment would not, by any means, meet my approval, nor that of my parishoners. The adoption of the proposed arishoners. The adoption of the proposed menament would make a great set of hypecrites, inaugurate the worst kind of a spy sys-tem and increase taxation. Believing so I shall yote against it and advice others to do

H. Brandt, Stanton, Neb., writes "Yes; wherever and whenever enforced the Slocumb law tends to diminish drankenness and consequently associated evils. A con-stitutional amendment prohibiting the sale and manufacture of liquor if adopted would re sult in changes for the worse. Being an un just law it would not be respected nor obeyed; it could not be enforced. It would therefore acrease crime and lawlessness. The proposed amendment does not meet my approval nor that of the people with whom I am asso-I shall advise against it.

Rev. J. Wittig, South Auburn, Neb., vrites: "Yes; I do think our Slocamb law tends to diminish drunkenness. I am op-posed to prohibition for I think it would work changes for the worse. It would be an abriggment of personal rights and the law would not be respected. I carnestly advise ngainst it."
Rev. J. M. Johannes, Carleton, Neb.,

writes: "A constitutional amendment pro-hibiting the sule of liquors, or their manufac a majority of my people, who would regard its enforcement an abridgment of the personal rights of man. I advise all people to vote

Rev. E. Flack, Scribner, Neb., writes My observations lead me to believe that righ license as a weapon against intemper sale of liquor would not meet the approval of a majority of the people of this county. I am opposed to it: I believe it to be, when enorced, an abridgement of personal rights. In owa and Kansas they have pleaty of free whisky, plenty of hypocrisy, plenty of per pry, so I cannot see now any good could result from the adoption of the proposes amendment, but I can see how harm and de based morals could ensue

## CORRUPTED KANSAS MORALS. The Enactment of Prohibition a

Drawback to the Church. Rev. E. Muller, Linconville, Kas., writes: The morals of the community in which I reside have neither been elevated nor improved y the prohibitory laws. They have im-sled the development of the county to a onsiderable extent, and our people would vote for repealing them. As to myself, I am in favor of repealing the laws and submitting ich license, but not la favor of local on

Rev. C. Vetter, Atchison, Kas., writer: n this community morals have not been ele-vated nor improved by the prohibitory laws instead, they have materially impeded the de-velopment of this city and county. A large majority of my friends and acquaintances would vote for the repeal of the laws. I am for substituting high license laws."

Rev. G. Polack, Bremen, Kan., writes:

"The morals of my community have not been elevated, on the contrary, the liquors that are now kept in homes has rather lowered the morals of our people. The material develop ment of this (Marshall) county is considerably less than the adjoining county (Gage) in Nebraska, and it has improved but little since 885, the year when an attempt was first made o enforce the prohibition law. A propositio o repeal it would be voted for by almost very one with whom I am acquainted. would favor high Heense and a strict super ision of saloons, interdicting the sale of adul erated liquors.

Rev. August Hering, Elmwood, Kan. writes: "By no means have the prohibitory laws of Kansas improved the morals of this community. Drankards of old are drankards still in spite of prohibition, while countless immoral, unlawful things are the fruits of prohibition. Prohibition is and has been an impediment to the naterial development of town and county and the majority of the people would, with out a doubt, vote to repeal it. I have alway been and always will be opposed to prohibi-tory laws, because they are unjust, absurd and tyrannical. Wherever established, prohibition should be repealed. High license, with strict but just penaities, will do more to check drunkenness than prohibition ever Prohibition is a failure in every

Rev. R. Ludwig, Bern, Kan., writes "The morals of this community have no been elevated nor improved by the prohibi tory laws of this state, and they have im peded the development of the town and county. Our people, a majority of them would be in favor of repealing them."

Rev. E. Meyer, Oakley, Kan., writes:
"During my stay in this town, and from my

"During my stay in this town, and from my frequent visits to all the surrounding counties, I am forced to say that the morals of the people have not been improved nor elevated by the prohibition laws. On the contrary, I am convinced by stubborn facts that prohibition has caused bad morals, viz: perjury, hypocrisy, etc., and by no means has it abolished drankenness. The material development of this county has certainly been impeded by prohibition, oc cause other states reap the harvest which is due to us. If the money which is used to import liquor into these western towns and counties from other states remained here, i counties from other states remained here, it would be a great aid to the people, who are in debt and are burdened with high taxation Numbers of people have left the state and more are going. I am inclined to the onlinion that a majority of my people would vote for resubmission and repeal. I am for repealing prohibition, because I think its repeal would

benefit my county and my people."
Rev. E. Ehrhardt, Strong City, Kan.,
writes: "No, not by the prohibitory laws
have the morals of this community been elevated or improved. There are as many crimes committed here as in towns of other states where license laws exist, and the prohibitary laws have been provocative of hypocrisy and falsehood. Prohibition has impeded rather than assisted the material development of the town and county, consequently our people would vote for a repeal of the laws, so far as my acquaintance goes. I favor a high license law and am opposed to prohibition." Rev. J. M. Hohn of Lincoln, Kan., writes: From prohibition the morals of this commu-nity have not been improved to any great exnity have not been improved to any great ex-tent! The prohibitory laws have impeded the material development of the county, which has been assisted somewhat by good crops. I know that a majority of the people whose views I am acquainted with would yout to repeal prohibition. I am for high li-cense and its enforcement." Rev. J. Klugman, Argentine, Kan, writes: "In my onlying prohibition has hyperelevated."

In my opinion prohibition has never elevated my one's morals. I cannot say that the devel opment of this town has been greatly impede prohibition, since prohibition does not probbit; the whisky joints are numerous. A majority of the people whose views I am fa-miliar with would vote for a repeal of the law. I am in favor of high license and think that the only way the liquor trade can be con-

Rev. H. Bode, Wameyo, Kas., writes: "I am a new-comer here, therefore I cannot say as to the effect of prohibition on the morals of the community. The people I have become acquainted with would all vote against pro-hibition, as I would myself. I favor high li-

cense, but not local option."

Rev. C. H. Graebuer, Topeka, Kas., writes
"You ask if the morals of this community have been improved or elevated by prohibition, and I answer, decidedly not. As to it effect in other directions. I can unhesitating ly say that it has not only impeded the ma-terial development of county and town, but the state generally. It has certainly caused the tide of immigration, also the tide of

manufacturing industries, to turn away from this state. That the prohibitory laws do not assist in the development of the country is self-evident, and my people would cast their votes for the repeal of prohibition. I favor high incense, and an opposed to prohibition. Rev. C. R. Kalser, Junction City, Kan, writes: "Not according to my observations have the prohibitory laws improved or elevated the morals of this community. The pals and lumntle asylums are as full as before, and other vices—optum eating and positius

jalis and lumitle asyluma are as full as before and other vices—optim eating and prostitution—have taken, in many instances, the place of excessive drinking. I am fully convinced that our material development would be 100 per cent larger if it had not been checked by prohibition. Most of the people whose views on the question have been expressed to me would vote to repeal the laws. The resubmissionists are gaining ground every day. My personal opinion is, substitute high license—with or witnout local option—for prohibition. It is the only course that will save our state from ruin, financially and morally. Prohibition nourishes hypocrisy and inculcates a discreasil for laws."

Rev. H. Voss, Harnen, Kus., writes: "The prohibitory laws of this state have not improved or elevated the morals of the community; on the contrary, since the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are forbidden, the people in my community seem

bidden, the people in my community seem the more determined to have them and to be more greedy. The material development of of this town and county have been impeded by the laws. Many respected farmers and wealthy business men have expressed to me wealthy business men have expressed to me their determination to leave the state if the laws are not soon repealed. All the members of three churches in Reno, Sedgwick and Kingman counties would vote for repealing probiotiton without an exception. I am against drinkenness; it is a terrible sin; we tolerate no drinkers in our churches, but I am absolutely arminst prohibition because I is against the word of God—Col. II-16."

Rev. H. C. Senne, Block, Kas., writes: "The morals of this community have by no means been elevated by the prohibitory laws.

cans been elevated by the prohibitory laws. In fact the material development of the county has been impoded to the extent of many thousands. Should a proposition to repeal the present law be submitted to the people they would nearly all vote against prohibition. My personal disposition in the natter is to repeal prohibition and take up

high license."
Rev. E. A. Frese, Palmer, Kan, writever.
"The morals of this community have not been improved or elevated by the prohibitory laws of the state, nor do I think the material development of the county has been assisted. by them. A great majority of my people would vote to repeal the law if they could so. am against a prohibitory law and for high

Rev. J. F. Moffer, Magratoa, In., writes: Prohibitory have have not advanced the morals of our community. In fact, it is not teachings of God. The majority of the pos-

ple whom I know will vote for repealing the law and in favor of high license."

Roy, J. H. Fischer, Henler, Kass, writes, "You ask if the moralf of this community have been elevated or improved under prohibition; not that I know of, unless evasion of the law and hypocrisy multiplied can be called improvement or elevation. The major-ity of the people whom I know would vote to epeal the law. It is an invoise and unjust aw and abould be repealed. It cannot be ou-Rev. J. H. Hoyer, Hanover, Kun., writes:

I have resided in Hanover but two years, though I have resided in Kansas nine years, and I have not experienced that the morats of the people have been improved by the pro-hibitory laws. A majority of the people whose political view I am acquainted with, would vote to repeal the law. Personally I am in favor of high license and local opth a, and in cases of scandalous drunkennes ponish-ment of the drunkard and the saloon keeper." Roy J. C. Keller, Palmer, Kan., writes: No, sir, the morals of this community have not been elevated or improved by prohibition, and the development of the county has be a impeded by the laws. I am in favor of repealing prohibition and substituting high license, as are a great majority of the people who i am acquainted with.

Rev. O. Mencke, Herington, Kan., writes, and his views are endorsed by Rev. F. Doeg-maller, of the same city: "No, morals have ot been improved; on the contrary they have seen lowered instead of elevated by the prohibitory laws, and the same laws have im-peded the material development of the town and county in which I live. If a proposition to repeal the laws was submitted to the peo ple a majority of those who I know wanted vote to repeal. I am in favor of a high Reense

Rev. F. Droegemuller, Herington, Kan., vrites: "The morals of the community in which I reside have not been improved. On the contrary, they have been improved. On by the prohibitory laws forbidding the rangu-facture and sale of intextenting liquors. The material development of my county has been inneded by material. impeded by prohibition. All people with repeal of the law. I am against prohibition and local option. I believe in high license, Laws will never cure drunkards."

## SOUTH DAROTA SENTIMENT. Moral and Material Warfare Impeded

by Prohibition.

Rev. C. C. Metz of Gratan, S. D., writes:
"No, the mocals of this community have not been improved since the prohibitory laws have been enforced; on the contrary, they have become worse. As to the material development of the county, it is going down grade under prohibition. Most of the people I am acquainted with are in favor of repealing the law, as I am myself."

Rev. R. Arustein of Ferney, S. D., writes: by Probabition. Rev. R. Arnstein of Ferney, S. D., writes:

"The morals of this community have not im-proved under prohibition, and it is questionable if the action of the laws have impeded or assisted in the development of the county. As the people would vote for its repeal, they probably think it has hapeded progress and development. I am in favor of a high license development. I am in favor of a high license law. Prohibition is a great humbug and makes hypocrites."

Rev. H. Hamerman of Pukwana, S. D.,

writes: "The morals of this community have not been improved in consequence of the prohibitory laws. They have impeded the development of the county and people are leaving the country. If given an opportunity they would vote for the repeal of the law. I am for a license law with a pecuniary penalty for drunkards." Rev. A. Braner of Freeman, S. D. writes i "No, not at all, have the morals of the com-munity in which I live been improved or ele-vated by the prohibitory laws, neither have they assisted in the development of the coun-ty. The majority of the people whose per-

ional views I am acquainted with would vote for the repeal of prohibition. I am in favor of a high license and local option law."

Roy. George Fisher, of Millard, S. D., Roy. George Fisher, of Milla writes: "The prohibitory laws of have not improved the morals of this com-munity. While I cannot say they have im-peded development, they certainly have not

pears development, they certainly have not assisted in that direction. Most of the peo-ple I know would vote for repealing the law. Personally I favor high license." Rev. A. F. Mundt, Ellendule, Dak., writes: "No, there is no difference noticeable as to noral improvement since prohibition, but it is noticeable that the law has impeded the material development of the country, and the majority of our people would vote to repeal the law. An oath should be a sacred and selemn affirmation, but prohibition makes

perjurers and hypocrices," Rev. A. H. Kurtz, Dakota, writes: "Drunkards are still numerous, hypocrites have mul-tiplied and disrespect of law has increased, so it is easy to note that the morals of the community have not been elevated nor im-proved under prohibition, while it has unloubtedly been the cause of checking the immigration of good farmers into the state. In that respect it has impeded the material development of the country. Most of my people would vote to repeol the law. I do not believe in abridging the rights of all the people because some of them are drunkards, 1 am opposed to prohibition." Rev. G. Protratz, Hillsboro, Dak., writes;

"Morals have neither been elevated nor im-proved; on the contrary, prohibition has done proved; on the contrary, prohibition has done much harm to the people. Drankenness has been increased; hypocricy and contempt of law have been added to the sins and shorteomings of the people. It is not noticeable that the material development of the country has been affected in any way by the prohibitory laws, as prohibited drinks can be procured just as readily as ever, however the voice of the people is 'emigration' if the law is everenforced. They would all vote for its reneal. I am disposed favorably toward high license and strongly opposed to prohibition and shall advise against it."

Rev. E. G. Stark, Shous Palls, S. D. writes: "Have the morals of this community been un-

Hey, E. G. Stark, Sioux Failis, S. D., writes in "Have the morals of this community been improved! No, they have been degraded since the people could not get drinks openly they get them secretly. Not to say anything of increased taxation, the closing of many business houses attest that prohibition has impeded the material development of the county, My people would vote against prohibition if an correctenity was given them. I advise all an opportunity was given them. I advise all people who prize liberty and good morals to vote against prohibition in any form."