

The National Prohibitionist

A Journal of Good Citizenship

CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

Volume XIII.

December 19, 1907.

Number Thirty-Two

RESPONSES COMING

One Hundred Fifty-six Dollars Received Monday in Answer to Appeal of Extension Committee

Quick and generous responses have come to the appeal in *The National Prohibitionist* of last week looking to putting the paper in position for the great work which it must do in the coming campaign.

Notwithstanding the fact that, owing to the great storm, thousands would not get their paper until Saturday and some not until Monday, the mail Monday brought back replies aggregating one hundred fifty-six dollars. With these contributions and pledges came words of cheer and hope. It is evident that the Prohibitionists of the country intend to see that we have a national paper with funds behind it which will enable it to serve the party and the cause with greatest efficiency.

The problem before the Prohibition party now, is to establish *The National Prohibitionist*. It should be done at once.

Have you answered the appeal of last week? Do you intend to answer it—or is it your decision to have no part in this great move?

It is not possible to make a report for later than Monday. Any contributions or pledges received after that time will be reported later.

All pledges or contributions should be addressed to OLIVER W. STEWART, 5464 Jefferson Ave., Chicago.

Up until last Monday twenty-two persons had given one hundred fifty-six dollars, as follows:

Sixty Dollars, OLIVER W. STEWART.
 Twelve Dollars, F. R. MARKS, W. F. MULVHILL, ANNA SNEED CAIRNS.
 Six Dollars, OLIVER F. BRAND, the Rev. W. GIMMELL.
 Five Dollars, the Rev. A. A. KNAPPEN, CHAS. W. CRAIN, J. M. UNDERWOOD, W. H. TROUT, JOHN STUDEBAKER, J. E. WALTON, GEOFFREY DAZET,
 Three Dollars, F. R. HERRICK.
 Two Dollars, ABRAHAM BROWN, J. W. ROSS.
 One Dollar, BRICE SUFFIELD, MRS. EMMA BRAY, E. E. HARRIS, A. M. BECKER, O. P. SCOVILL, A. B. DINGMAN.

BILLS IN CONGRESS

National Legislature Has the Liquor Business Squarely Before It—Prohibition for the Capital

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 10—(Special correspondence).—Representative CHANDLER of the first district of Mississippi, has introduced in Congress a bill providing for the prohibition of the liquor business in the District of Columbia. The bill is drastic and, should it become a law, would prevent the operation of breweries and distilleries, as well as the retail sale of liquor. The bill provides for punishment, in event of violation of the law, fines ranging from \$100 to \$500, with or without imprisonment of from thirty days to six months. The bill has been referred to the House committee of the alcoholic liquor traffic.

Congressman ROBERT M. WALLACE of Arkansas, has introduced a measure prohibiting the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors wherever state or local laws forbid the traffic in the same.

THAT "BLOW TO PROHIBITION"

Another Liquor Fake Investigated and Refuted—Light Upon a Dark Claim Made on Basis of "Government Figures"—What is Shown to be the Result of Even a Poor Sort of Prohibition

In some of the recent campaigns in the South much space was purchased in the daily papers by the liquor interests for the publication of what purported to be an official statement given out by the United States Census Bureau, showing that drunkenness and crime in general are more common in Prohibition cities than in license cities. The matter has been reprinted in north-

any desired showing. It will also readily occur to the intelligent reader that to take Kansas City under its old nullification regime, and Portland under the kind of government that it has enjoyed since the death of Sheriff Pearson, as cities that show the result of the Prohibition policy, is manifestly unfair. Of course, everybody knows that upon occasion these same people would have

TABLE 1: LICENSE AND PROHIBITION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

CITY.	POPULATION.	SALOONS.	ARRESTED FOR DRUNKENNESS.	"DRINK CRIMES."	TOTAL ARRESTS.
Boston	594,618	783	27,792	30,888	43,033
Worcester	128,552	91	4,034	4,458	5,761
Fall River	114,004	100	2,476	3,223	4,708
LOWELL	100,150	None	2,664	2,844	4,034
CAMBRIDGE	98,444	None	1,344	1,788	2,802
Lynn	72,350	66	2,661	3,068	4,096
New Bedford	68,955	57	1,567	1,869	2,302
SOMERVILLE	68,090	None	917	1,078	1,846
Lawrence	67,932	56	1,770	2,089	3,064
Springfield	67,423	55	1,656	1,818	2,658
Holyoke	48,736	45	840	983	1,343
BROCKTON	43,843	None	788	943	1,528
Haverhill	38,987	37	1,087	1,298	1,695
Salem	37,504	32	1,276	1,450	1,838
MALDEN	36,853	None	215	286	1,062
NEWTON	36,350	None	498	606	873
CHELSEA	35,920	None	1,218	1,391	2,174
FITCHBURG	34,378	None	636	690	1,038
Taunton	32,713	31	1,439	1,538	1,726
EVERETT	28,317	None	298	329	498
Gloucester	26,562	26	878	1,024	1,308
North Adams	26,519	22	597	709	1,070
QUINCY	26,053	None	471	635	835
WALTHAM	25,161	None	214	265	475
Pittsfield	23,707	19	933	1,073	1,353
Chicopee	19,781	19	355	412	550
Northampton	19,431	18	359	390	434
MEDFORD	19,108	None	93	107	218
BEVERLY	14,687	None	227	253	367
NEWBURYPORT	14,595	None	513	600	797
Woburn	14,342	14	754	797	913
Marlboro	13,887	13	204	263	324
MELROSE	13,716	None	77	102	176

ern papers and widely commented upon editorially. The "stuff" is almost entertaining in its character from the fact that it is so manifestly not a fair study of statistics, but a bungling compilation prepared for the purpose of deceiving the reader. Its effect, however, has probably been considerable, since it was given out as official, and gravely quoted unnamed officers of the government as commenting on and explaining the serious results of Prohibition.

In various papers the "expose" was published under head lines announcing a "Blow to Prohibition."

The National Prohibitionist has already showed that the representation that this matter came from the government as an official output, was erroneous, if not fraudulent, and has already explained—what everybody knows—that it is easy enough by picking particular cities to make almost

taken these cities to show that Prohibition does not stop the sale of liquor at all and would have asserted the wide-open character of the cities in question with just as much earnestness as they now assert the bad results of enforced Prohibition.

Prohibitionists have never placed much stress upon the showing made by the statistics of license or no-license cities, or of nominal Prohibition cities under anti-Prohibition government, since, as it has repeatedly been explained, the Prohibition area is so limited, it is so difficult, and, in fact, so impossible to protect a single city or even state from any of the results of the liquor traffic, the governments by which the cities are administered are so uniformly hostile to the Prohibition policy and so anxious to discredit it, that while not wholly valueless, the figures can seldom be taken at their *prima facie* showing.