

tion of the law was an old citizen who was reputed to be worth 200,000 dollars. The proprietors of two of the leading hotels in Topeka are now in prison for a similar offence. Few "joint-keepers" (as illegal sellers are now called) venture to dispute the law: on one occasion twenty-one out of forty-seven that had been indicted, pleaded guilty, and threw themselves on the mercy of the court. And conviction means not only imprisonment, but often *work upon the rockpile*. The rockpile is a heap of large stones in the yard which prisoners have to break with hammers into road metal.

The testimonies of the highest authorities to the beneficial effects of the prohibition law in this state seem to be beyond challenge. Conspicuous among them are the ex-Governor and the present Governor. The ex-Governor, Mr. John Martin, was at first a determined opponent of the measure. He did not believe in making men sober by Act of Parliament. He had little faith in the morality of a man that did not steal only because the law said he must not (yet he upheld laws against theft). He thought prohibition a piece of grandmotherly legislation. But after seeing its results he became its strenuous defender. In a pamphlet entitled "Prohibition in Kansas: Facts, not Opinions" (a statement prepared by friends of temperance, and "indorsed by Governor Lyman M. Humphrey, the officers of state, and the judges of the Supreme Court of Kansas"), we find the following remarkable extract from Governor Martin's biennial message to the Legislature in January 1887:—

"Three general elections have been held in Kansas since the adoption of the prohibition amendment to the constitution. At each of these elections the people have reaffirmed their decision against the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, by electing Legislatures pledged to the support of the amendment. At the election in November last this question was a paramount issue, and again, by an