

1914

PROHIBITION

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props

Recommended Citation

PROHIBITION California Proposition 34 (1914).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/67

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

Seventh—Inducement to investment in real estate, which high taxes now prevent.

Eighth—Prevention of immigrants, following the opening of the Panama canal, mortgaging California for their debts.

Ninth—Allowing the man who pays the debt to contract the debt. FRANCIS CUTTING.

ARGUMENT AGAINST QUALIFICATION OF VOTERS AT BOND ELECTIONS.

First—This amendment proposes a step backward. The world is not moving toward disfranchisement, but toward enfranchisement of those now disfranchised. Even the citizen who has no property has a right to a direct voice in all matters of government.

Second—If voters who have no taxable property should not be allowed to vote on bond issues, which involve taxation, for the same reason they should be prohibited from voting for members of congress, legislators, city councilmen, school trustees and other taxing bodies.

Third—If the proposed amendment is based on correct principles, then it falls short of the logical conclusion that the ballot belongs to property rather than to men and women; and, therefore, the amendment should not only give all resident property owners the ballot, regardless of citizenship, when bond issues are proposed, but should also give non-resident property owners the right to vote on bond issues.

Fourth—The amendment is based on the false idea that no one pays taxes unless he is actually assessed for taxable property. But, as is well known, the owner of property liable to be taxed for bond indebtedness, or for any other purpose, is often able to snift the whole tax to persons

who are not on the assessment roll. The consumer pays the tax, whether it be a tariff tax, a tax for bonded indebtedness, or taxes for ordinary expenses of government.

Many of the so-called "large taxpayers" are merely tax collectors. The merchant gets the tax receipt for taxes paid on his goods, but the tax is added to the price of the goods, and the consumer pays it. The owner of an office building gets the tax receipt, but the tax is added to the rents, and the tenants pay it. The tenants, in turn, shift the tax when they are able to do so. The man who lives in a rented room, eats at a restaurant, and has no other property than a change of clothing, pays taxes when he pays for his room and food and clothing.

Fifth—This amendment would give a vote on bond issues to a property owner who has already sold all of his taxable property, but to whom the property is assessed at the time of the bond election, and would withhold the vote on that bond issue from the purchaser of the property, in case that purchaser is not on the tax roll. Yet, in this case, the seller votes on the bond issue and is not taxed for the bonds; while the purchaser will be taxed for the bonds under this amendment, though he has no vote on the bond issue.

Sixth—The real purpose of this amendment seems to be to put a stop to public ownership of public utilities. The amendment would endanger the issuing of bonds for public ownership. Public ownership is already handicapped by the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote in favor of bond issues for that purpose; and it would be made practically impossible if none but property owners were allowed to vote on bond issues. JAMES H. BARRY.

PROHIBITION.

Initiative amendment adding sections 26 and 27 to article I of constitution.

Prohibits the manufacture, sale, gift, or transportation wholly within the state, of intoxicating liquors; permits any citizen to enjoin violations; makes the showing that the manufacture, use, sale, gift or transportation was for medicinal, scientific, mechanical or sacramental purposes, a defense to civil and criminal actions, and requires regulation by law of such acts for said purposes; prohibits transportation into this state of intoxicating liquors, unless shown to be for such purposes, subject, however, to United States laws; prescribes and authorizes penalties.

The electors of the State of California present to the secretary of state this petition, and request that a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the State of California, by adding to article I thereof, sections 26 and 27, prohibiting the manufacture, the sale, the giving away, and the transportation of intoxicating liquors, as hereinafter set forth, be submitted to the people of the State of California for their approval or rejection, at the next ensuing general election, or as provided by law.

The proposed amendment is as follows:
The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Article I of the Constitution of the State of California is hereby amended by adding thereto, two new sections, to be numbered respectively section 26 and section 27, in the following words:

PROPOSED LAW.

Section 26. The manufacture, the sale, the giving away, or the transportation from one point within the state to another point within the state, of intoxicating liquor is prohibited. Any citizen of the state may, in his or her own name, maintain an action of injunction in the county where the violation occurs, to restrain such violation, provided, however, that to any criminal or civil prosecution for violation of this prohibition, it shall be a defense if it be shown

that the liquor in question was being manufactured, used, sold, given away, or transported for medicinal, scientific, mechanical or sacramental purposes. The manufacture, sale, giving, or transportation of such liquors for medicinal, scientific, mechanical, or sacramental purposes shall be regulated by law. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be fined for a first offense not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand dollars, and for a second offense shall be fined not less than two hundred dollars nor more than twenty-five hundred dollars and imprisoned in the county jail not less than thirty days nor more than one year, provided, however, that additional penalties may be imposed by law.

Section 27. The transportation into the state of intoxicating liquor, unless it be shown to be for medicinal, scientific, mechanical, or sacramental purposes, is prohibited, subject, however, to the laws of the United States relating thereto. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be fined for a first offense not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand dollars, and for a second offense shall be fined not less than two hundred dollars nor more than twenty-five hundred dollars and imprisoned in the county jail not less than thirty days nor more than one year, provided, however, that additional penalties may be imposed by law.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION.

This amendment is proposed by initiative petition procured by the California "Dry" Federation, a non-partisan organization.

Voters should enact it for every reason. License or other laws regulating the liquor traffic do not lessen drunkenness or the quantity of liquor consumed, but do make those who vote for them *responsible for evil results*.

The enormous consumption of liquors, resulting in sickness, idleness, insanity, crime, profligacy and death, puts the issue squarely before our race to go "dry" or die. Science proves that habitual, moderate drinking is as bad as periodical drunkenness. Of ninety-seven children observed who were conceived while parents were partially intoxicated only fourteen were normal. Life insurance tables show the life expectancy of a person of twenty years, if a total abstainer, is 44 years, if a moderate drinker, 31 years, if a hard drinker, 15 years. Three drinks of liquor daily decrease efficiency five to eight per cent. Accidents due to alcohol and employer's liability laws compel employers to hire total abstainers. Healers, physical, spiritual and mental, are hindered by alcoholic conditions.

Seven hundred and seventy lunatics in our state hospitals in 1912 were registered as alcoholic insane. Half the remainder were so indirectly. (See Eighth Report State Lunacy Commission.) It cost California taxpayers \$1,469,367 to maintain these hospitals in 1912, and \$29,600,000 to deal with alcoholic crime. Liquor costs the taxpayer seven dollars for every dollar received in taxes or license fees. The Fifteenth Report, Bureau of Labor, shows our courts in two years dealt with 113,526 misdemeanors, of which 54,930 were "drunks" and 20,000 more were kindred crimes caused indirectly by alcohol.

In "wet" towns huge police forces and many courts grind daily grists of crime; in "dry" towns few are needed. Other states show like conditions. Kansas under prohibitory laws has many counties without a criminal in jail or an insane person in hospital.

Brothels and red-light districts are part of the liquor traffic.

This amendment will help business and relieve poverty. Let breweries and distilleries be turned into flour mills. Let barley and corn be turned into beef, poultry or bread instead of liquor. The increased supply will lessen the cost of living. Let wine grapes worth six dollars per ton be substituted by table grapes worth thirty, or dried or turned into grape juice or syrup. Professor Bioletti says there is a market in the United States for ten times the whole product.

Our grapegrowers admit that wine grapes have been unprofitable, that their hope for future profit lies in the immigration of cheap laborers from Europe through the Panama canal. With pauper labor they hope to profit. (See Vol. II, Bulletin State Commission of Horticulture for 1912.) The liquor traffic is the confessed enemy of American labor. Laboring men do not desire to earn bread from evil business.

Immigrants from Europe are generally liquor drinkers. "Dry" the state and turn them elsewhere.

This amendment does not interfere with personal liberty. Like laws against opium, cocaine, lotteries, and horseracing, it interferes only with personal license. Remove temptation from people of weak or abnormal appetites. One who only drinks occasionally should vote "dry" to save them. The liquor traffic has never benefited any one; it has ruined millions. Voter, it may ruin your son or daughter as it has ruined others. Carefully investigate. Vote "Yes."

SAMUEL W. ODELL.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROHIBITION.

There are three objections to this amendment:

First—Prohibition is contrary to sound political principles. The best government, as all authorities agree, is that which most liberally lets its citizens alone, constraining them in nowise inconsistent with common sense ideas of perfect freedom. Political science teaches that reform to be effective must be temperate. Nothing ever remains of any artificial reform except what was ripe in the conscience of the masses. The unripeness of total abstinence is evident from the failure of prohibition in Maine, Kansas, Georgia and other states where it is at once a scandal and a farce.

Second—Prohibition is immoral and contrary to the teachings of religion and physiological science. A form of intolerance, it substitutes enmities and hatreds for peace and goodwill, the foundations of the soundest morality. It breeds general demoralization, since wherever it is enacted moonshine distilleries, little kitchen breweries and hidden wine presses flourish; the spy system, the most mischievous of all governmental agencies, is established, and officials are corrupted by lawbreakers, as always where laws are not sanctioned by a heartfelt and vigilant public sentiment. Further, prohibition is immoral in that it breeds intellectual dishonesty among its advocates. Consider their sweeping assertion that even moderate drinking causes disease and leads to vice. Scientists gathered from all countries at the physiological congress in Cambridge affirmed officially that alcohol "supplies energy like all common articles of food, and that it is physiologically incorrect to designate it as a poison," also, that "there is nothing to show that a moderate daily use of alcohol in any kind of beverage may not be beneficial to health."

Third—Prohibition in California, especially on the eve of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, would be an economic blunder of colossal proportions. Why should California destroy her great wine industry? In the cultivation of it she has spent enormous sums of public money, and has made the fostering of it one of the duties of the State University.

California has 320,000 acres devoted to viticulture. The wine industry represents an investment of \$150,000,000, yields annually \$30,000,000, supports 75,000 persons. California breweries represent an investment of \$50,000,000, distribute annually \$6,000,000 to 4,000 employees, consume annually \$1,000,000 worth of California barley, \$175,000 worth of California hops, and \$2,500,000 worth of other essentials. They pay the general government an annual revenue of \$1,350,000 and about the same amount to towns and counties.

In the manufacture and distribution of liquors 282,000 persons are employed and dependent. In the distribution of liquors \$10,000,000 is invested, and the annual license tax paid is \$3,000,000.

So prohibition would not only destroy great properties and industries, impoverish thousands of families and increase the army of unemployed, but it would substitute the vilest of poisonous concoctions for our pure wines, beers and brandies, and make every taxpayer pay the cost of the industrial cataclysm. And to what end? Prohibition has been a failure wherever the hobby has been given the dignity of legal sanction.

Do prohibitionists believe, as they say, that the race is dying? Mankind has been drinking thousands of years, never so moderately as now; and Professor Muensterberg, greatest living psychologist, holds that alcoholic stimulants are essential to great achievement. Drunkenness is deplorable, but it has been steadily declining for one hundred years without the aid of prohibition.

Vote "No."

WILLIAM SCHULDT,
Sec'y California State Brewers' Ass'n.