

Dry Amendment Dangerous Law for Oregon

PROMINENT BUSINESS MEN OF COOS BAY MAKE APPEAL FOR WET TICKET

They Believe State-wide Prohibition Measure as Presented on Ballot is an Experiment Which the People of Oregon Cannot Afford to Try at This Time When General Business Depression is Felt.

We, the undersigned business interests of Coos Bay, recognizing the great financial injury that state-wide Prohibition will cause, take this opportunity of asking the voters of this community that they do not permit Oregon at the present time—with our already depressed business conditions—to experiment with state-wide Prohibition, which after a trial of from two to forty years by sixteen of the most substantial states of the Union, has been found less satisfactory in remedying the evils of the liquor traffic than our present local option system. We do not believe that business interests are sufficiently prosperous to justify the state-wide prohibition experiment at the present time.

VOTE 333 X NO.

SIGNED:

- J. H. FLANAGAN
- C. S. WINSOR
- J. W. BENNETT
- H. G. KERN
- DORSEY KREITZER
- A. H. POWERS
- E. M. SIMPSON
- L. F. FALKENSTEIN
- HUGH McLAIN
- J. A. MATSON
- HERBERT LOCKHART
- A. J. MENDEL
- W. H. PAINTER
- O. F. McCOLLUM
- H. G. HUNTLEY
- EVENING RECORD
by A. R. O'Brien, Owner
- F. M. PARSONS
- GEORGE H. ROTNOR
- C. C. GOING
- A. H. DERBYSHIRE
- C. M. BYLER
- P. N. REBERG
- W. N. EKBLAD
- VY CONDRON
- EUGENE O'CONNELL
- F. E. HAGUE
- ED. MOELLER
- J. G. HORN
- R. M. ROUNDS
- PETER LOGGIE
- JOHN G. MULLEN
- EDGAR McDANIEL
- WILLIAM G. CHANDLER
- DR. GEO. E. DIX
- DR. W. A. TOYE
- FRANK D. COHAN
- DR. E. O. MORROW
- IRA L. WEITZEL
- J. R. ROBERTSON
- MRS. J. R. ROBERTSON
- A. S. ATKINS
- J. E. LEETS
- JOHN KRONHOLM
- T. S. HARVEY
- R. P. LANDRITH
- R. M. JENNINGS
- OTTO SCHEITZER
- E. A. ANDERSON
- J. A. GOLDEN
- WILLIAM S. TURPEN
- B. R. KELLER

- A. O. ROGERS
- R. F. WILLIAMS
- DAVID Y. STAFFORD
- G. J. LEMANSKI
- E. CROSTHWAITE
- GEORGE GOODRUM
- JAMES H. MILLS
- P. M. TULLY
- H. A. McCLEES
- W. E. HOAGLAND
- C. W. TOWER
- JAY B. TOWER
- C. A. METLIN
- L. M. TOZIER
- W. T. MERCHANT
- H. S. HARRIS
- F. D. FLETCHER
- G. F. McGEORGE
- H. J. VAUGHAN
- A. E. NEFF
- J. T. HARRIGAN
- W. R. HAINES
- ALLAN TODD
- H. A. WELLS
- FRANK PUGSLEY
- R. M. SARTER
- HUGH LONG
- WILLIAM SCHROEDER
- J. W. HILDENBRAND
- DAVID A. ALEXANDER
- GEORGE J. FOURIER
- MEL J. DUNCAN
- J. L. TERRELL
- AUGUST FARLEY
- E. D. BUSBY
- D. A. CURRY
- BLANCO CIGAR STORE
- W. O. WIMMER
- UNION CIGAR STORE
- GEORGE S. YOUNG
- BLANCO BARBER SHOP
- A. JOHNSON
- R. M. WOOD
- LEE VANDERMARK
- J. W. DAVIS
- H. H. BRADFIELD
- R. STAR
- J. KELLOND
- O. S. TORREY
- L. H. BALM
- R. C. DILLARD

for S. Lando.

STATEMENT OF DRY FORCES

Read what Mr. Wheeler, chairman of the "Prohibition" Committee of One Hundred says in his own words in the "official dry organ," The Evening Telegram, of Portland, September 29, 1914:

"The 'wet' forces are seeking to make capital of the fact that the proposed Oregon dry amendment DOES NOT FORBID THE 'DISTRIBUTION' OF LIQUOR, but merely its 'MANUFACTURE' and 'SALE.'"

"THEY ARE CORRECT. This was done DESIGNEDLY and DELIBERATELY BY THOSE WHO DREW THIS AMENDMENT. Oregon has many citizens, especially many of foreign birth, who desire to have liquor in their homes. They feel that it would be a **HARDSHIP** and an **INFRINGEMENT OF THEIR PERSONAL LIBERTY** absolutely to forbid them the use of liquor."

"The present proposed law DOES NOT FORBID THE USE OF LIQUOR by any citizen, be he poor or rich, provided he wishes to have this **SHIPPED DIRECT FROM SOME OTHER STATE TO HIS OWN HOME.**"

PROMINENT BUSINESS MEN ASK VOTERS TO CONSIDER

A careful consideration of the above statement is of much interest and will convince the thoughtful person of the lack of logic and reason in the argument of the dry organization.

This statement says that the present proposed law "does not forbid the use of liquor by any citizen, be he rich or poor, provided he wishes to have this shipped direct from some other state to his own home."

The dry party has no objection to everyone drinking, "rich or poor alike," they say. Surely they cannot talk of wanting to save the poor man from the "crime of drink." They will allow him to drink all he wants provided that he sends his money out of Oregon to Washington and California or the liquor manufacturers of the east, instead of spending it in his own state.

They would do away with the revenue the state and cities may derive from a legitimate license sale of liquor, not for the salvation of mankind from drinking, for mind you, they say rich and poor alike can send out and get all they want.

Encourage Bootlegging. They encourage by this method the practice of bootlegging. A man can send away and get all he wants and in spite of everything, he can manage to sell it out to his neighbor. Some bootleggers would be found and prosecuted, but hundreds of cases would never be discovered. Without saloons where drinking men can buy what they want, and the dries mark it, do not say the people are to be deprived of drink, a man will, with a supply on hand, furnish his acquaintances or neighbors. He will not do it with a desire to break the law but in a friendly way. But he will be bootlegging just the same and will be encouraged to take this step in law breaking.

Admitting that the prohibitions do not object to the free use of liquor provided the people get it out of the state, it may safely be assumed that drunkenness will be worse where liquor can only be procured in quantities than where drinkers can buy what they want at any time.

Must Send Money Away. The dries do not object to drinking but they would do away with the revenues for Oregon and have the Oregon man send his money to another state. They would help the liquor makers and seller of other states and thus deprive Oregon of what financial benefits it might derive from the business. For the sake of drinking humanity? By no means for the dries especially say that the law "does not forbid the use of liquor by any citizen to be rich or poor."

He can drink all that he wants from other states simply by having it shipped direct to him and his friends can have all they want just so they accept it on the quiet.

The dries according to their own statement would have Oregon men "rich and poor" drink all that they may desire but they must spend their money in other states.

The policy is not to prohibit the use of liquor, and does not regulate the amount that shall be consumed by an individual. Licensed saloons are required not to sell liquor to a man intoxicated but under the dry plan a man can buy a barrel of beer and drink it all at once if he is fool enough to try it just so, understand, that he spends the money for the beer in some other state.

Harms Without Help. From a business standpoint the dry policy is simply one which butchers the revenue of Oregon without preventing in the least the drinking habit which requires that money should be sent out of the state instead of being spent in Oregon, and which encourages unlawful means of securing liquor replacing the licensed and legitimate ways of buying and selling liquor. The proposed law is one which would harm the state without in anyway helping the individual.

Would Not Stop Drinking. The dries are not attempting to stop liquor drinking, for they say so, but their policy as advertised is one which will crush out the smaller industries of this state and help to build up the liquor industries which exist in other states.

The whole policy is a subterfuge. It is designed to catch the vote of the drinking man who will say that even that if the state does go dry he can still have what he wants to drink. It is to make the man who favors saloons believe that by voting dry he will not be deprived of a personal privilege. But some person may fall to notice that what he chooses to expend for liquor must go out of the state.

The dries do not say that people shall not drink so they can save their money and buy town lots, but it says to drink if you want just so you send your money to a neighboring state to help the liquor business in that locality.

Would Favor One Class. Then too the policy caters to the foreign element. The statement says "Oregon has many citizens, especially many of foreign birth, who desire to have liquor in their homes. They feel that it would be a hardship and an infringement of their personal liberty." The dries are trying to secure the foreign vote by showing that they would favor the foreign element against other elements.

The business men who have signed their names to the statements which appear herewith have looked into the legal phase of the matter and find that the dries are not prohibiting the use of liquor but are simply requiring that all money spent for liquor shall go out of the state.

If they were stopping the use of liquor the question would be a different one, but the dries would permit of the free use of liquor by rich and poor just so they buy it outside.

Why It Is Done. The question has arisen in the minds of some as to why the policy is designed to crush out the smaller Oregon breweries in order to fatten the purse of the liquor trusts in other states.

It is asked that the voter exercise his or her fairness of mind and consider whether it is right to vote for a policy which allows the unrestricted use of liquor and the unrestricted expenditure for the same but requires that the revenues of Oregon be cut off and all the money thus expended sent to other states.

The women voters who object to their men friends and relatives drinking and who think that by voting dry they will accomplish this end, should not be misled. If they vote the dry ticket they are voting to do away with the properly regulated and licensed drinking places, to allow the men to consume unrestricted amounts of liquor, and to force them to send what money is spent in that way out of the state.

From a business standpoint the dry policy is simply one which butchers the revenue of Oregon without preventing in the least the drinking habit which requires that money should be sent out of the state instead of being spent in Oregon, and which encourages unlawful means of securing liquor replacing the licensed and legitimate ways of buying and selling liquor. The proposed law is one which would harm the state without in anyway helping the individual.

DRUNKS TROUBLE GARDINER PEOPLE

WARREN REED SAYS ALTHOUGH DISTRICT IS DRY CITIZENS ARE FORCED TO INCORPORATE TO PROTECT PLACE.

Results of a dry community are clearly seen in a locality close to home, when an observation is made of the conditions now existing at Gardiner and the Umpqua River country. Warren Reed, founder of the town of Reedsport near Gardiner, says that with Gardiner dry the people of that place are demanding incorporation. They find that it will be necessary to incorporate as a city in order to protect themselves.

The territory is dry, but the railroad construction men managed to get liquor from the outside, and bad liquor, as is usually the case where bootlegging is practiced, and as a result drunken men are on the streets.

Gardiner finds it necessary to become an incorporated city so there can be lights and police protection. As it is now it is not safe for women to be on the street at night as they must be subjected to the embarrassment of meeting drunken men, all in a dry country, while with licensed saloons, the drinking would be regulated and it would be possible for the city to control the use of liquor.

The Gardiner newspaper, the Courier, recently printed an article telling of the necessity of incorporating and stated that because of the drunkenness women walking on the street were compelled to hear foul language and be subjected to indignities of intoxicated men.

Because it is a dry community, Gardiner will be compelled to incorporate in order to protect its people against the drunkenness due to bootlegging which almost always is practiced to more or less extent in a dry community.

The conditions at Gardiner simply show that a dry community is not able to stop the use of liquor and drunkenness, and is in worse moral standing than a city holding the control of licensed saloons.

URGES CONGRESS TO TAX "DRYS"

The following is a recent press telegram to a coast paper sent from Washington, D. C.:

"Tax all Prohibitionists \$5 a head and raise \$150,000,000 in revenue," was the advice given the Ways and Means Committee today in a letter signed by John Boyle, leader of one of the Democratic factions in the voteless District of Columbia. Mr. Boyle, in his memorial to the committee, suggests that instead of increasing the internal revenue tax on beer, liquor and tobacco, the Democrats replenish the treasury by a tax on the occupants of the "water wagon." He estimates the drinkers of the country are already paying a per capita tax of \$7.50 per annum because of the present duties on beverages, whereas the Prohibitionist contributes nothing.

"It is a cardinal principle of the Democratic party that so far as possible taxes should be levied on all alike," said Mr. Boyle's letter. "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none should be the motto now."

"If you tax the Prohibitionists \$5 a head you will raise about \$150,000,000 in additional revenue, as the Prohibitionists claim to represent one-third of the population, or about 33,000,000 persons."

Notwithstanding Mr. Boyle's protest, members of the Ways and Means Committee are understood to be at work on a "war tax" scheme, which will impose an additional tax on beer, and probably whiskey, tobacco, checks and legal documents.

THOS. VIGARS SAYS DRY SYSTEM IS BAD

AFTER SEEING UNLAWFUL USE OF LIQUOR ALONG RAILROAD ROUTE HE WILL VOTE WITH THE WETS.

Drunkenness exists to a great extent in the dry territory through which the Willamette Pacific railroad is being built. That the men employed in the construction work are drinking heavily and show a shocking degree of drunkenness is testified to by a former North Bend man. Thomas Vigars, who has large property interests in North Bend, and who went from Coos Bay to Portland to reside, recently made a trip over the railroad line to see the progress of the work.

Mr. Vigars, as his friends know, has always been on the dry side, and favored prohibition. He says that he never saw so much drunkenness as he witnessed among the men on the railroad work in the dry territory through which he passed. He was so disgusted with the immoral results of a dry territory that he determined to leave for Portland so he could get back there in time to cast his vote for a wet state, a thing which he had never before done when called upon to vote on this question.

Mr. Vigars, through his own observation in the dry territory north of Coos Bay, was convinced that the evils of liquor are lessened in territories where the saloons is licensed and where the use of liquor can be controlled.

DRY DISTRICTS HARD ON BOYS

Bootleggers Find Their Prey Among the Youths, According to Records of Arrest.

The Portland Telegram, the organ of the dry party, contained a few days ago a big front page display stating that the saloon must have boys in order to exist and asked the question: "Have you a boy to spare?"

It is well to look into the question of the welfare of the young men of our community and the state, for it seems that they are the particular game of the bootlegger in dry territories in this part of the state.

At Roseburg there have been several arrests of men who sold or gave liquor to boys and in most cases these men received the severe punishment that their illicit and wrongful practice warranted. In a city with licensed saloons the laws provide that a saloon keeper shall not sell liquor to minors. If this rule is broken without punishment it is because of the lack of prosecution on the part of officers.

The laws under which saloons are licensed provide protection against the youths until they have reached the age of twenty-one. In a dry territory they are unprotected and are the prey upon which the vulture bootleggers especially feed. Secretly and silently the peddlers of liquor in a dry territory can poison the boys with their cheap and dangerous substitutes for liquor, but in a licensed community young men under age cannot enter a saloon and drink with any safety to himself or to the saloon man.

No one wants to spare a boy for any cause if it can be helped, but ask the question put by the prohibition organ, "Have you a boy to spare?" Unless you have, don't take him to a dry territory where he will be the victim of the bootlegger.

You cannot protect your boy against learning illegal habits and acquiring the drinking habit in a dry territory. But in a community where there are licensed saloons, the law protects your boy for you until he reaches the age of twenty-one years, when in all legal and moral matters, it is recognized that he must have sense enough to look out for himself.

The records of dry counties in southern Oregon will show that more boys under age have been led astray by being allowed to secure liquor than in the licensed districts where the selling of liquor to minors is not allowed and is prosecuted.

COQUILLE FEELS BUSINESS SLACK

Loggers Do Not Come to the City Since the Council Voted the Place Dry.

While the people of Coquille do not particularly care to make the matter public, it is a fact admitted by business men that the county has greatly suffered since it was voted dry by the Council. Loggers who had spent their money in all channels of business but now they pass through Coquille. The fact that the town is dry does not prevent their drinking, but it does prevent their staying in the place for any length of time.

The city has simply discriminated against itself in comparison to other places in the county, and has not prevented drinking on the part of the people of the county.

The people in Coquille who can't drink go elsewhere. It would be the same with the proposed dry law. The Oregon people would send in other states to secure their liquor.

The case of the city and state are similar in that neither prevent consumption of liquor or remove any of the evils.

MYRTLE POINT BOOTLEGGING

Physicians of That Place Were Fined Because They Wrote Prescriptions for Liquor.

The utter failure of a dry community to prevent the use of liquor was well illustrated in the case of Myrtle Point, a Coos county city which has been dry for a long time. Frequently there have been prosecutions for selling liquor there and recently a number of the leading physicians of the city were fined for writing prescriptions for whiskey.

During the county fair this year there was a lot of drinking at Myrtle Point, even though the place was "dry."

DRY ROSEBURG BUSINESS POOR

Because City Went Dry New Hotel Laid Idle and Vacant for Fourteen Months.

Roseburg suffered a business shock some time ago when the Umpqua Hotel was erected in that city. The hotel was located on conditions that the city went wet. Douglas county and Roseburg went dry and the man who had taken the lease cancelled it. He did not want to try to run a hotel in a city of that size which was dry. As a result the hotel building stood idle for a period of fourteen months. Finally some of the business men got together and decided that the loss of the vacant hotel was too great, and made up enough money to furnish the place cheaply and secured someone to conduct it.

The incident simply shows from a business standpoint that those who are willing to invest in a city will not undertake any enterprise of any size when there is an uncertainty about the liquor question or when the place is to be dry. It also shows the losses which are suffered in a purely business way when the people see fit to vote against the licensed control of liquor business.

There are other cities and communities which have suffered likewise in a business way because of being voted dry.

(This page Paid Advertisement by H. C. Diers for above petitioners.)

"The Holy Scripture and the history of the Church are alike without warrant for prohibition. And looking to the history of civilization from the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to the present hour, where can a Nation be found of strength and progress whose people could not be trusted to regulate daily habits for themselves?" —DANIEL VORHEES