

State-Wide Prohibition Defeated

Perfectly Proper to Drink Liquor, Provided it is Not Purchased in the State of Nebraska, is the Decision of the Anti-Saloon League

It is reasonable to suppose that if the advocates for the Anti-Saloon League had a real argument they would use it.

So far their interpretation of the proposed prohibitory amendment is utterly foolish. They have jumped from one phase of the amendment like a drowning man grasping for a straw.

Their facts are imaginary, their figures a delusion, and their interpretation of the law is a pitiful apology for a dismal failure wherever tried.

They realize that the voters of the state are not going to adopt an amendment that is so full of loop-holes as the one that is proposed. They realize that their amendment is not practical and that it will be defeated, so they are endeavoring to bemuddle the voters of this city and state by prejudiced opinions which come from individuals when looked up cannot be located.

They say this amendment will not prohibit the shipping in of liquor, AND WE DEFY THEM TO PROVE THAT IT WILL.

Now, if this proposed prohibitory amendment will not prohibit the shipping in or the use of liquor, it brands the prohibitionists as Near Politicians, and by that they admit they are advocating something that is not practical.

They argue that liquor is the cause of poverty, and then in order to overcome the citizen's plea for "personal liberty" admit that it is perfectly legal and proper to drink, provided the liquor is not purchased in Omaha or the State of Nebraska. They ask the citizens of this city and state to believe them when they say that liquor is at the bottom of eighty per cent of crime, but from their interpretation of the law they have no objection to any man drinking in the exercise of his "personal liberty," provided he buys his wet goods from St. Joe, Kansas City, Chicago, Milwaukee or St. Paul. Go hear any dry speaker and see him weep tears over the condition of the poor intemperate man, then ask him if this amendment will prohibit this intemperate man from drinking liquor. They would make it unlawful to secure intoxicating beverages in Omaha and this state, and then by the interpretation of this amendment they tell him he can have all he wants, provided he secures it from outside dealers. Liquor purchased by the mail-order route from St. Joe, Kansas City and Chicago, and other wet cities, and abused in Omaha and this state, will make a man just as drunk as that purchased of a local licensed dealer.

Now, in order to procure your supply under the proposed prohibitory amendment, you must patronize the foreign

brewer or mail-order liquor house. The liquor that you would receive and that would be consumed in Omaha and this State, would pay no revenue for the support of our school system. The money that the prohibitionists are advocating us to send out of this city and state into wet cities and states is forever lost as far as our city and state is concerned.

The admission that the amendment will not prohibit the shipping in or the use, should not only brand the amendment a dismal failure, but a screaming, staggering farce. It would make no difference in Omaha or any other community in this state, for no man can do more than exercise his fullest personal liberty, the same as he would do if the amendment was in effect, in drinking as he pleases. The only difference is, he would not be compelled to send his money to St. Joe, Kansas City, Chicago and other wet cities.

Again we state that if this amendment is not a prohibitory amendment, as far as the shipping in and the use of liquor is concerned; if it does not mean downright prohibition, it means nothing, and it is the greatest farce that could be attempted to be voted into the Constitution of our Sovereign State.

The voters must choose between the revenue-paying saloon and the "blind tiger" and "bootlegger." The question which they must decide is this:

Shall the people who drink have their liquor with or without local revenue?

If your proposed prohibitory amendment does not prohibit the shipping in nor the use of liquor, then why vote the city out of \$353,000 annual revenue, throw 2,000 men out of employment with their 10,000 dependents, place a 25 per cent increased tax rate on the taxpayers and disorganize business interests in this city and throughout the state.

Mr. Prohibitionist, you may fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Liquor purchased from foreign mail-order liquor houses, as you would have the residents of our city and state do, pays a revenue into the city in which these dealers are located. Why should Omaha and Nebraska be deprived of revenue upon liquor consumed within their borders?

If the prohibitionists do not want to rob men of their personal rights, what is all this noise about? They should either stand by their prohibition guns or give up the ship.

It looks very much to us as though the prohibitionist was intending to prohibit the laboring man and not the rich.

To vote down class legislation, vote NO.

Douglas County Taxpayers' League