

JOINT DEBATE AT HAWTHORNE TABERNACLE

PROHIBITION AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION DISCUSSED BEFORE IMMENSE AUDIENCE

Over 5,000 People Hear Rev. Clarence True Wilson and Col. E. Hofer Under the Auspices of the Oregon Civic Federation—Both Sides Strike Hard Blows—Shall Local Option be Superseded by State Wide Prohibition?—Vital Issue Before the People of Oregon on Which the Politicians Are Taking to the Woods.

Mr. I. H. Amos: I am requested to announce that members of the W. C. T. U. are desired on the platform. The president of the W. C. T. U. is on the platform and she hasn't quite as many people as she would like to have there, and there are a number scattered through the audience, but the ladies come forward, the ladies of the W. C. T. U., and take seats on the platform.

and I wish to resent that imputation. (Laughter and applause.) I am all a private citizen and hope to remain so. A voice: No doubt of it. Mr. Hofer: With your kind indulgence (Laughter and applause.) And there is a prohibition newspaper published in the city of Salem that assures me every week, to the extent of about a page, that I am the one man in Oregon who never, never shall sit in the Governor's chair. (Laughter.) So if you believe that newspaper, there is nothing further necessary for me to say.

Mr. Hofer: I remember a very honorable man, as Cassius told Brutus, we are all honorable men in politics—I remember a very honorable Senator at Salem who talked prohibition in the morning to the ministerial association and in the afternoon signed up a contract to kill certain temperance bills in the Oregon State Senate. I am not in that class, ladies and gentlemen. (Applause.) And he was an honorable man; as politics goes, and I want to say to you right here and now that I would not suppress my convictions, nor following any suggestion from any source whatever, I would like that plainly understood.

Mr. Hofer: That is good. Mr. Hofer: I remember a very honorable man, as Cassius told Brutus, we are all honorable men in politics—I remember a very honorable Senator at Salem who talked prohibition in the morning to the ministerial association and in the afternoon signed up a contract to kill certain temperance bills in the Oregon State Senate. I am not in that class, ladies and gentlemen. (Applause.) And he was an honorable man; as politics goes, and I want to say to you right here and now that I would not suppress my convictions, nor following any suggestion from any source whatever, I would like that plainly understood.

the discipline of that church to preach prohibition and to practice total abstinence. (Applause and laughter.) In a way I feel sorry for Dr. Wilson. (Laughter.) Strictly speaking, he is not a free moral agent. (Laughter.) He hasn't got any choice in this matter. He has got to preach prohibition and he has got to practice total abstinence or his salary would stop in a minute. (Laughter and applause.) Now, I say that with all respect and deference to the honorable doctor, because I am not here to throw mud or to throw bricks, and I hope to convince you that I am a bouquet thrower from away back. (Laughter.)

amendment would be trampled under foot, and the Seventh Day Adventists would multiply and thrive under that kind of persecution. I only use these illustrations to show that there are many things that it is unfit and improper in a free country to put into the constitution of a State, and I take the same position toward the prohibition question, and I think I can convince you later in my argument that the few states that already have prohibition amendments in their constitution, that they are trampled upon and that they are not obeyed and that they are not respected. And the point to take into your hearts is this: That merely putting a thing into the constitution does not change conditions one particle. If we would put, if we could do so sacrilegious an act as is sometimes proposed, as to put God himself into the constitution of Oregon, we would not be putting God one iota nearer to any human heart in Oregon, not one particle; and yet there are people who want to put God into the constitution. There are all kinds of cranks in this world who want to amend the constitution.

some of these churches and get you to thinking on the other side of this subject. I want you to think on both sides of a subject for once in your lives. (Great applause.) Chairman Reed: Ladies and gentlemen, I was much impressed with the remark that Colonel Hofer made concerning the continuation of these debates with Dr. Wilson, and what the outcome might possibly be, and I could not help but think that if Colonel Hofer has as much influence with the Almighty concerning liquor as he has with praying for rain that he would pour the thing all over Dr. Wilson. Now then, we have as our next speaker a gentleman whom you all know, Portland's pride, the Reverend Dr. Clarence True Wilson, who will address you now. (Dr. Wilson was greeted with prolonged applause, after which he spoke as follows.)

Mr. I. H. Amos: I am requested to announce that members of the W. C. T. U. are desired on the platform. The president of the W. C. T. U. is on the platform and she hasn't quite as many people as she would like to have there, and there are a number scattered through the audience, but the ladies come forward, the ladies of the W. C. T. U., and take seats on the platform.

the wholesalers or of the retailers, or of any political party or of any faction; nobody but God and I are responsible for what I say here tonight. (Applause.) And I make my statements in the sight of God and before you as one of your fellow-citizens, not under any instructions, nor following any suggestion from any source whatever, I would like that plainly understood.

Dr. Wilson: That is good. Mr. Hofer: I remember a very honorable man, as Cassius told Brutus, we are all honorable men in politics—I remember a very honorable Senator at Salem who talked prohibition in the morning to the ministerial association and in the afternoon signed up a contract to kill certain temperance bills in the Oregon State Senate. I am not in that class, ladies and gentlemen. (Applause.) And he was an honorable man; as politics goes, and I want to say to you right here and now that I would not suppress my convictions, nor following any suggestion from any source whatever, I would like that plainly understood.

the discipline of that church to preach prohibition and to practice total abstinence. (Applause and laughter.) In a way I feel sorry for Dr. Wilson. (Laughter.) Strictly speaking, he is not a free moral agent. (Laughter.) He hasn't got any choice in this matter. He has got to preach prohibition and he has got to practice total abstinence or his salary would stop in a minute. (Laughter and applause.) Now, I say that with all respect and deference to the honorable doctor, because I am not here to throw mud or to throw bricks, and I hope to convince you that I am a bouquet thrower from away back. (Laughter.)

amendment would be trampled under foot, and the Seventh Day Adventists would multiply and thrive under that kind of persecution. I only use these illustrations to show that there are many things that it is unfit and improper in a free country to put into the constitution of a State, and I take the same position toward the prohibition question, and I think I can convince you later in my argument that the few states that already have prohibition amendments in their constitution, that they are trampled upon and that they are not obeyed and that they are not respected. And the point to take into your hearts is this: That merely putting a thing into the constitution does not change conditions one particle. If we would put, if we could do so sacrilegious an act as is sometimes proposed, as to put God himself into the constitution of Oregon, we would not be putting God one iota nearer to any human heart in Oregon, not one particle; and yet there are people who want to put God into the constitution. There are all kinds of cranks in this world who want to amend the constitution.

some of these churches and get you to thinking on the other side of this subject. I want you to think on both sides of a subject for once in your lives. (Great applause.) Chairman Reed: Ladies and gentlemen, I was much impressed with the remark that Colonel Hofer made concerning the continuation of these debates with Dr. Wilson, and what the outcome might possibly be, and I could not help but think that if Colonel Hofer has as much influence with the Almighty concerning liquor as he has with praying for rain that he would pour the thing all over Dr. Wilson. Now then, we have as our next speaker a gentleman whom you all know, Portland's pride, the Reverend Dr. Clarence True Wilson, who will address you now. (Dr. Wilson was greeted with prolonged applause, after which he spoke as follows.)

There is not a state in this union, or under God's stars, that is not debauched and befouled by saloon influences that will tolerate the prize fight today. (Applause.) California has fifteen thousand liquor licenses, places where liquor is sold, and most of them are concentrated in the northern part, and San Francisco is one of the most debauched places on earth. There is not a form of corruption hinted at in the Ten Commandments, or ever conceived by the depraved mind of men that does not thrive there, and the self-respecting earthquake absolutely refused to swallow them. (Applause.) There are only five states in this union that tolerate the liquor business; I mean that tolerate the liquor business and give no chance to the people to speak on it, that restrict their regulations to a license law and have no local option, no option on the part of the people, and two of those states are California and Nevada. California, in spite of the prevailing sentiment in Prisco that put back the grafters and drove out Heney, has got a decent Governor (Applause); and when California's Governor refused to tolerate a prize-fight with its betting, gambling, lewd women, demoralizing effect upon civilization, then Nevada beckoned to it and its governor said, "We want you here."

benefit the State." That was the first proposition submitted to me. Or the alternative: "Resolved, that the defeat of the prohibition amendment to be submitted to the people of Oregon in 1910 would benefit Oregon."

Mr. Chairman, I accepted this latter proposition. Resolved, that the defeat of the prohibition amendment to the constitution would benefit Oregon." Hence, I am here to oppose the adoption of the prohibition amendment to the constitution of Oregon, and I want you to bear that in mind, because it is entirely a different question from some of the questions that have been stated in the newspapers, and I think I can make it plain to you why it is a different question.

Mr. Hofer: That is correct. Mr. Hofer: The local option law which we have now, ladies and gentlemen, was submitted to the people of this State, was prepared by and recommended to the people of this State by the same organization that now comes before you and asks you to amend the constitution of this State with a prohibition amendment. Now, if there is no controversy about that let that statement stand. Is that satisfactory? Dr. Wilson: That is right. Mr. Hofer: Now, I have been a little bit further misrepresented in the newspapers and I think I am entitled to a word upon that subject. I have been advertised, perhaps to help draw the crowd, although that wasn't necessary (laughter).—I have been advertised, in fact, I have been almost, I was going to say, culminated with the charge that I am a candidate for the office of Governor,

answered for my own satisfaction; and one of them is dictated to me by my ancestry. My parents were poor people who came over across the water to make their home in a free country, and they came from a country called Germany, and I would like Dr. Wilson to tell me why, if the prohibition doctrine is true, if it is sound in principle, why it is that the people of Germany, who are not very much given to prohibition as yet (laughter) why it is that the German nation has become the greatest and the most powerful nation, industrially and educationally and morally, in the entire continent of Europe. (Applause.)

Now, my next objection to the adoption of this so-called prohibition amendment to the constitution is along the line that I first indicated, that everything is not fit to go into the constitution. For instance, there are such things as a dead letter in the constitution. We have them in the constitution now. We have a clause in there that prohibits free negroes and mulattoes from coming into the State or owning property here. Of course, that amendment or that feat of the constitution is as dead as a door nail. You will all agree with me that it would be improper to propose an amendment to the constitution that no Mormon should ever come into the State of Oregon, and that no Mormon, that no person should practice or believe in the Mormon religion, and yet that kind of an amendment would be proposed by some people, and yet it is perfectly plain that if such a thing was put into the constitution it would be openly violated. It could not be enforced, the Mormons would feel that they were persecuted and they would multiply and spread and thrive in Oregon as under no other circumstances. So it would be if you tried to amend the constitution to compel everybody to go to church on Sunday. If you put a Sunday amendment into the constitution to compel everybody to cease from labor, which is already the law and is violated every day, to compel everybody to observe the Sabbath and to go to church, and that everybody would have to observe the Sabbath day on Sunday. Of course, that would be a persecution of the Seventh Day Adventists, and that kind of an

Now, my next objection to the adoption of this so-called prohibition amendment to the constitution is along the line that I first indicated, that everything is not fit to go into the constitution. For instance, there are such things as a dead letter in the constitution. We have them in the constitution now. We have a clause in there that prohibits free negroes and mulattoes from coming into the State or owning property here. Of course, that amendment or that feat of the constitution is as dead as a door nail. You will all agree with me that it would be improper to propose an amendment to the constitution that no Mormon should ever come into the State of Oregon, and that no Mormon, that no person should practice or believe in the Mormon religion, and yet that kind of an amendment would be proposed by some people, and yet it is perfectly plain that if such a thing was put into the constitution it would be openly violated. It could not be enforced, the Mormons would feel that they were persecuted and they would multiply and spread and thrive in Oregon as under no other circumstances. So it would be if you tried to amend the constitution to compel everybody to go to church on Sunday. If you put a Sunday amendment into the constitution to compel everybody to cease from labor, which is already the law and is violated every day, to compel everybody to observe the Sabbath and to go to church, and that everybody would have to observe the Sabbath day on Sunday. Of course, that would be a persecution of the Seventh Day Adventists, and that kind of an

Now, my friends, when you hear a man say if you close up the saloons you will have blind pigs, you remind him that wherever the liquor business gets the upper hand, that lawlessness and vice hold high carnival and that the encouragement of it by one license system has filled all the license states and communities with blind pigs tea to one that we would

benefit the State." That was the first proposition submitted to me. Or the alternative: "Resolved, that the defeat of the prohibition amendment to be submitted to the people of Oregon in 1910 would benefit Oregon."

Mr. Chairman, I accepted this latter proposition. Resolved, that the defeat of the prohibition amendment to the constitution would benefit Oregon." Hence, I am here to oppose the adoption of the prohibition amendment to the constitution of Oregon, and I want you to bear that in mind, because it is entirely a different question from some of the questions that have been stated in the newspapers, and I think I can make it plain to you why it is a different question.

Mr. Hofer: That is correct. Mr. Hofer: The local option law which we have now, ladies and gentlemen, was submitted to the people of this State, was prepared by and recommended to the people of this State by the same organization that now comes before you and asks you to amend the constitution of this State with a prohibition amendment. Now, if there is no controversy about that let that statement stand. Is that satisfactory? Dr. Wilson: That is right. Mr. Hofer: Now, I have been a little bit further misrepresented in the newspapers and I think I am entitled to a word upon that subject. I have been advertised, perhaps to help draw the crowd, although that wasn't necessary (laughter).—I have been advertised, in fact, I have been almost, I was going to say, culminated with the charge that I am a candidate for the office of Governor,

answered for my own satisfaction; and one of them is dictated to me by my ancestry. My parents were poor people who came over across the water to make their home in a free country, and they came from a country called Germany, and I would like Dr. Wilson to tell me why, if the prohibition doctrine is true, if it is sound in principle, why it is that the people of Germany, who are not very much given to prohibition as yet (laughter) why it is that the German nation has become the greatest and the most powerful nation, industrially and educationally and morally, in the entire continent of Europe. (Applause.)

Now, my next objection to the adoption of this so-called prohibition amendment to the constitution is along the line that I first indicated, that everything is not fit to go into the constitution. For instance, there are such things as a dead letter in the constitution. We have them in the constitution now. We have a clause in there that prohibits free negroes and mulattoes from coming into the State or owning property here. Of course, that amendment or that feat of the constitution is as dead as a door nail. You will all agree with me that it would be improper to propose an amendment to the constitution that no Mormon should ever come into the State of Oregon, and that no Mormon, that no person should practice or believe in the Mormon religion, and yet that kind of an amendment would be proposed by some people, and yet it is perfectly plain that if such a thing was put into the constitution it would be openly violated. It could not be enforced, the Mormons would feel that they were persecuted and they would multiply and spread and thrive in Oregon as under no other circumstances. So it would be if you tried to amend the constitution to compel everybody to go to church on Sunday. If you put a Sunday amendment into the constitution to compel everybody to cease from labor, which is already the law and is violated every day, to compel everybody to observe the Sabbath and to go to church, and that everybody would have to observe the Sabbath day on Sunday. Of course, that would be a persecution of the Seventh Day Adventists, and that kind of an

Now, my friends, when you hear a man say if you close up the saloons you will have blind pigs, you remind him that wherever the liquor business gets the upper hand, that lawlessness and vice hold high carnival and that the encouragement of it by one license system has filled all the license states and communities with blind pigs tea to one that we would

Now, my friends, when you hear a man say if you close up the saloons you will have blind pigs, you remind him that wherever the liquor business gets the upper hand, that lawlessness and vice hold high carnival and that the encouragement of it by one license system has filled all the license states and communities with blind pigs tea to one that we would



M. C. REED, President Civic Federation of Oregon



COL. E. HOFER, Editor Daily Capital Journal.



REV. CLARENCE TRUE WILSON, President Anti-Saloon League.