

wine thereof and was drunken; his sons, in mortification, took a garment and, walking backwards that they might not see their father's nakedness, spread the garment over him as he lay drunk in his tent. Back in the twilight days when Homer sang of the fall of Troy—even then the word "Winebibber" was used as a term of reproach. Alexander the Great, in a drunken quarrel, slew a favorite general who had once saved his life. Wine has not ceased to be a mocker; Ibanyez, the greatest living novelist of Spain, tells us that in his native land it is wine—not whisky, but wine—that destroys the young men of promise before they are old enough to be of service to their country. This is the verdict of history, confirmed by our own experience; and it condemns beer as well as wine.

Come with us and meet the question squarely; let it be settled that we may take up other questions that demand the attention of the American people. Why should we be drawn away from the tremendous problems that confront us today in order to quarrel over the amount of alcohol to be allowed in a non-intoxicating drink. (Applause). If you cannot get alcohol enough to make you drunk, why do you want alcohol at all? Why not cut it out altogether and go on about your business. (Great applause).

It is argued that, if you adopt the platform plank that I suggest, some will leave the party. That is true; you cannot do anything good without giving some an excuse for leaving the party. But, in politics, you weigh those who come against those who go. While we may lose some, we will draw to our support a much greater number; and when these new recruits come they will come because of love for the principles for which we stand. (Applause). They will not come because afflicted with a disease of the throat; they will not come as invalids to abide for a time in a hospital. They will come because they stand for the home against the Home's greatest enemy.

If I were to select a text—I have already selected it. On the night of the sixteenth day of last January when, at the nation's capital, we celebrated the Passover from the old era to the new, I was honored by the leaders of this great cause with the privilege of being the last speaker at the meeting. I watched the clock and when it was within one minute of the time when this nation would become saloonless for ever more, I quoted a passage from the Bible—the language in which the Angel assured Joseph and Mary that it was safe to take the young child Jesus back to the Holy Land—you recall the words: "They are dead that sought the young child's life." (Applause). When you remember that King Alcohol has slain a million more children than Herod ever did, what language can more appropriately express the joy in the hearts of the parents today than those words: "They are dead that sought the young child's life."

Are you afraid that we shall lose some votes? O, my countrymen, have more faith in the virtue of the people. If there be any here who would seek the support of those who desire to carry us back into bondage to alcohol, let them remember that it is better to have the gratitude of one soul saved from drink than the applause of a drunken world. (Great applause). It is better to have the mothers of the land think of our party as they press their babes to their breasts and thank God that they are now safe from the temptations of the saloon—aye, far better than to hear all the hurrahs that can come from those who would make money by selling poison to their fellow men—who would for money raise the death rate among the little children in their neighborhood. (Applause).

And now, because the limitations placed upon my time by parliamentary law, I must turn very briefly to four other propositions, only stopping to add that I wish it were possible to discuss and settle one question at a time. (Cries of "Go on, go on").

I shall speak of prohibition again when I use the 20 minutes that I have in closing. (Applause). Now let me in a moment's time ask you to consider four other amendments, which, in my judgment, would help our party to win.

The first is a national bulletin. We have no newspapers in this country except those under private control, and these are divided into two classes; namely, those that are owned by honest and patriotic men and used for a patriotic

purpose, and those owned by predatory corporations and used to deceive those who read their editorials and news columns. (Applause). It is not fair that the voters should be left to the mercy either of a biased press or to be exploited by the subsidized papers that sell their readers at so much per head. The very best of our papers are owned and edited by men who are human, and, because human, are biased. They cannot give both sides fairly even when they try. The organs of the plunderbund do not try to give either side honestly. The Democratic party should declare that it is in favor of light rather than darkness, because its deeds are not evil. Democratic principles and policies do not fear the light of day. A government publication, furnished to all who desire it, offers the only means by which the people can receive, thru unpolluted channels, the information that they need. Such a bulletin would inform them as to the issues before the country, and the editorials, written by chosen representatives of both parties, would furnish the arguments on all sides. There should be advertising space for the proper presentation of the claims of candidates for national offices. These three things are necessary for the following reasons: First, because government by the consent of the governed is a mockery unless the people know to what they are consenting; (Applause) second, the voters cannot vote intelligently unless they hear both sides. Out of the conflict of ideas comes truth. We believe with Jefferson that "error is harmless when reason is left free to combat it." But reason cannot combat error unless it is presented to those who must decide. (Applause). The third reason is that we do not want any more candidates for president excusing large campaign contributions, as Republican candidates tried to do, on the ground that it is necessary to spend enormous sums of money in order to get the facts before the people. We do not want them to spend either large sums of their own money, or large sums contributed by others. Any man of merit should be able to aspire to the highest office with the gift of the people, regardless of whether he has a fortune himself or rich friends or is poor. (Applause).

My third plank deals with the profiteers. You have read the plank, I cannot go into detail. The records now show that some of these profiteers have been making a thousand per cent, some two thousand, some three thousand, and some even five thousand. This profiteering began when our country was at war; when young men were leaving college to offer upon their country's altar their preparation for life; when mothers were giving up their sons, wives their husbands, and children their fathers; and when the country was straining every nerve. It has continued and even increased since hostilities ceased.

I went to the Republican convention and urged delegates to write into their platform a strong plank on profiteering. I told them that I would gladly bring such a plank here and ask this convention to insert the same plank in our platform, so that we could act jointly for the protection of society against these plunderers. (Applause). But they did not do it. Why? Because nearly all the profiteers were there in the convention, or in the gallery, or nearby. (Applause). I suppose we have here all the profiteers who were not at Chicago, and possibly some who were. (Laughter). We may still have some in our party. The profiteering plank in our platform is not harsh enough; my plank is written for the express purpose of driving out of the Democratic party and into the Republican party every profiteer who is not already a member of the Republican party, so that, when we put the profiteers in the penitentiary, they will enter as Republicans and not as Democrats. (Applause and laughter).

My fourth plank is against universal compulsory military training. (Applause). A Republican senate committee reported a bill providing for universal compulsory military training which contemplated an annual appropriation of about 700 millions of dollars a year—a larger sum than we ever spent on the army and navy before the war waged to make the "world safe for democracy." Is it possible that after we have spent 25 billions of dollars in this war and sacrificed an hundred thousand precious lives, we must load our people down with this grievous burden of taxation, and train every young man in the gentle art of taking human life, on the theory that war is a necessary part

of civilization? No, the Democratic party should do as our Democratic congressmen did in the House of Representatives; this convention should assure the nation that there is one party that will never support universal compulsory military training in time of peace. (Applause).

And now, my friends, I have only a moment left for a subject to which I shall devote more time in my closing 20 minutes. I propose as my fifth amendment a plan that, at least, gives hope of an early entrance into the League of Nations. It will enable us to remove the issue from the campaign and do our duty to our own people and the world. You may think it comprehensive; but it needs a large and comprehensive plan to meet the extraordinary conditions of today.

Our nation has shamed itself before the world for a year! Why is it that while our government could speedily go into the war, and under the leadership of our President, mobilize the resources of the nation as no other nation ever mobilized its resources in the same length of time—why is it that we could do this but cannot get out of the war? Why is it that Germany and Great Britain and France and Italy, and even poor devastated Belgium, can make peace while we confess ourselves impotent to ratify a treaty? Why? Because we have a provision in our constitution that requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty. The constitution should be so changed that the American people can end a war as quickly as they can begin it. (Applause). We fought for the most fundamental of Democratic principles, namely, the right of the majority to rule. If that is worth fighting for in Europe it is worth recognizing in the United States—and worth recognizing in representative bodies as well as when the people vote directly.

If we endorse this doctrine—and how can we refuse to endorse it?—we are then in a position to demand that the Republican senators shall meet us in Washington and there join with Democratic senators in an effort to secure immediate ratification on any terms that a majority may agree upon, leaving for the future such changes as may be deemed necessary. If they refuse to accept our challenge we will go out and take the larger and the better part of the Republican party away from the leaders. The people of all parties favor a league of nations and they want our nation to do its part in world affairs. If they do join us in securing ratification, they will turn over to our party the moral leadership of the world.

The Lord has delivered them into our hands. We have a Democratic president who can reconvene the Senate; we have enough Democratic senators to convert a majority into the necessary two-thirds majority by voting or not voting, whichever they prefer. The issue lies with us, and we cannot shift the blame, however inexcusable the opposition of Republican senators has been.

Is it not worth while for the Democratic party to present these alternatives to the Republican party? Is it not worth while to place in the hands of Woodrow Wilson the standard of civilization and allow America to lead in the conquest of the world for universal peace? Some day the song the shepherds heard at Bethlehem will be sung in every land—why not make it the international anthem now? (Great applause).

Mr. Bryan's Closing Speech

(After others had spoken, Mr. Bryan concluded the discussion as follows:)

My friends, I only have twenty minutes and I need every second of the time. In the first place I desire to say just a word about the National Bulletin. I want some way of getting information to every voter; I want them to know the facts when they come to vote; I want them to hear the arguments pro and con; let them know the truth, and the truth will make them free. I have faith in the virtue, integrity, and patriotism of the American people, but how can these things find expression in government unless the voters have the arguments on each side from the highest sources. We need a paper thru which every candidate can lay his claim before the voters. We want it so that they will not sell a congressman's position on the bargain counter. We want it so that they cannot open the door of the United States Senate