

athletic fields, and prove their superiority in every line of business.

UNCLE SAM'S CARE OF YOUTH

If you visit the naval school at Annapolis, Md., you will find there more than 800 young men, the pick of the country, selected from every congressional district in the United States. They are being trained at government expense for government service, and Uncle Sam is anxious that they shall show the maximum of efficiency and capacity. These young men are not allowed to use alcohol during their stay in college. Why? Because the government believes that alcohol is harmful. If the opponents of prohibition think that the use of alcohol is a benefit, why do they not attack the government's policy and compel the college authorities to give alcohol to the students? And if alcohol is injurious, why is not every father and every mother as anxious about the welfare of a son as Uncle Sam is about the welfare of the boys entrusted to his care?

Is there any parent in Nebraska who is less interested in a son than Uncle Sam is in his wards? On the contrary, every parent must be more interested. If any of Uncle Sam's boys go astray, he can get other boys to take their place, but if your boys go astray no other boys can take THEIR place.

Last month I went to Austin, Texas, to speak to the students of the state university, and as I approached the city I inquired about the people whom I had met there. I asked whether it was true, as I had heard that Mr. —, one of the most distinguished citizens of Austin, was dead. "Yes," said my companion. And then he told me of a speech which the man had made just before his death. He had been opposed to prohibition and this was his pathetic confession: "You will remember that I have spoken against prohibition—I am NOW for prohibition. Drink has ruined my sons, and in my old age I am left alone." What a punishment for God to visit on a father who has favored the saloon! Can it be that any father in Nebraska will wait until the demon alcohol invades his own family circle before he will understand the evils of the saloon.

Last week a porter stopped me in a sleeper in this state and said: "Mr. Bryan, I am just a humble Pullman porter, but I read your speech at Lincoln and I want to tell you that the emancipation of our young people from drink will mean more than emancipation from slavery." And then, as if he had not made it strong enough, he added: "The man who frees us from drink will do more for us than Abraham Lincoln did." If this man, whose ancestors were in bondage seventy years ago, and three hundred years ago were roaming in the forests of Africa—if he can understand that the saloon is worse than slavery, what white man or white woman in this state can be ignorant on this subject?

BUSINESS WORLD AGAINST INTOXICANTS

It is so well known that the use of liquor is indefensible that the business world is throwing its influence against even the moderate use of alcoholic drinks. The man who drinks is the last one to find a job when employees are wanted and the first one to lose his job when employees are being dismissed. This economic pressure is being brought to bear against alcoholic liquors throughout the industrial world. If any of you think that drinking is a business advantage to any man anywhere, let me suggest a test which you can apply between now and election day, and if your vote is governed by the test you will vote for prohibition. Here is the test: Go to the best friend you have and ask him for a recommendation; tell him to make it as strong as possible. After he has said all the good that he can of you let him write at the end of the recommendation three words—write them in red ink, so that they will be sure to be seen—"And he drinks." Then take the recommendation to any man who has money enough to employ another and watch his face when he reads the recommendation—and then wait for a job. No brewer, distiller, or saloon keeper ever added those words to a recommendation given to a friend—find such a recommendation if you can. If the men who make liquor and sell it know its effect well enough never to put it in a recommendation that the man recommended drinks, why should anybody else think it an advantage in business?

If you think that a saloon helps a town answer this question: Did you ever know a "wet" town to put the number of saloons on any sign board or in any advertising literature? The num-

ber of banks, business houses, factories, colleges, schools—all these are mentioned as attractions, but not the number of saloons or the amount spent in them. Why?

If the use of alcoholic liquor is an injury and if this fact is universally known, why is its sale as a beverage licensed? The arguments against the saloon are as conclusive as the arguments against alcohol itself.

IF A BENEFIT WHY THE TAXES?

Let me pass on to you an argument which was given to me by a retired farmer in southern Nebraska. He moved into a village to spend the latter days of his life and soon after he had reached the village was solicited to sign a petition for a man who wanted to open a saloon there. He refused to sign the petition, and, when asked for his reason, replied that the town did not treat the saloon keeper fairly. The applicant for a license had heard many other reasons, but never having heard that one given before, he asked the man to explain. The explanation was like this: "You want to start the saloon for the benefit of the town, don't you?" "Yes," replied the would-be saloon keeper. "You think it will bring trade to the town and improve business, don't you?" "Yes," said the man who wanted the license. "Well," said the farmer, "if your saloon will help the town, draw trade, and improve business they ought to give you a bounty instead of making you pay a high price for the privilege of starting a saloon."

Can you escape this logic? You know that the saloon is not a legitimate business in the sense in which you apply that term to other business enterprises. If a grocer wants to open a store in your city, you welcome him as you do the man who wants to start a hardware store, a bank, a restaurant, a butcher shop, or any other place of business, except the saloon. But if a man wants to start a saloon you meet him at the city limits and say to him, "You can not open a saloon in this city unless you pay the city \$1,105 a year, and even then you must submit to certain restrictions. The butcher shop can open at any hour in the morning, but your saloon can not open before a certain hour. The restaurant can stay open as long as it wants to at night, but your saloon must close at a certain hour. Everybody else can sell anything else to anybody at any time, but if you open a saloon in this town you must not only comply with the restrictions named but you must agree not to sell to anybody under age or overdrunk." Why do you make this distinction between the men engaged in other businesses and the man running a saloon? Because you recognize that the saloon is an injury, and, therefore, you subject it to different treatment from that accorded people in other business.

THE ABSURDITY OF LICENSE

How absurd it is to license a man to make men drunk and then fine men for getting drunk. I heard this illustrated many years ago, and I know of no better illustration of the inconsistency of the policy. A man said that it was like licensing a person to spread the itch through a town and then fining people for scratching.

Suppose a man applied for a license to spread hog cholera throughout this country, would you give him a license? No. He could not bring enough money into the country to purchase a license to spread disease among the hogs. Why, then, will you license a man to spread disease among human beings—disease that destroys the body, robs the mind of its energy, and undermines the morals of men?

What excuse do the representatives of the brewery, distillery, and saloon give for opposing prohibition? They formerly insisted that any interference with the sale of alcoholic liquor was an attack upon individual rights, but that argument has been so completely answered that we do not hear much of the personal-liberty plea now. No man can assert as a right that which interferes with the equal rights of others, neither can any man insist that respect for his rights requires the toleration of a system that invades the more sacred rights of others. No man can claim that his right to drink intoxicating liquor requires the licensing of a saloon which pollutes the locality in which it is situated and brings want and misery and violence into the homes around it.

And I call you to witness that the brewer and the distiller understand the saloon; they are not willing to have a saloon located near them. As a rule, they live in the fashionable part of the city and would not sign a petition for the location of a saloon near where their families reside. They know it would reduce the value of

their property and subject their children to an objectionable environment. No; they will not have a saloon near them, but they will locate their saloons among the poor, knowing full well when they do so that their saloons will absorb the money that their patrons ought to spend on wife and children. They not only impoverish the poor and multiply their sufferings, but they increase the death rate among the children. Who will defend them before the bar of God when they are confronted with the violation of the commandment "Thou shall not kill"?

But have you considered this: that no saloon can be located in any town unless a majority of the people of the town are willing to share moral responsibility for what the saloon does? If the voters of a town had to enter into a written agreement to be jointly liable with the saloon's owner for any damages done by it, how many saloons do you think we would have? Are we less concerned about our MORAL responsibility than we are about our legal liability?

At next November's election we are to decide whether saloons shall be licensed in the state; after that election no saloons can be licensed unless at the November election a majority of the voters assume responsibility for them. I do not know what position you will take, but my course is decided upon. I shall not share responsibility for the saloon by voting for it. If, after next November, any saloon is ever licensed in Nebraska, it will be in spite of all that I can do to prevent it. If any of these young men, who should be the glory of the state, are ever again led into temptation by the open saloon, it will not be my fault.

"BLIND TIGERS"

The opponents of prohibition having been driven from every other position have fallen back upon their final stand, namely, that prohibition does not prohibit. They tell us that the law can not be enforced; that liquor will be sold anyhow. They are the only element of society that announces in advance that it will not obey the law; it is the only element that boasts of lawlessness, but even here the facts are a complete answer. Statistics show that in the state of Ohio there is more illicit selling in wet counties than in dry counties. Only a few months ago the saloon keepers of Cleveland sent a delegation to the governor to complain of the selling of liquor without license. Those who paid the license protested against those who were selling without sharing the burden of the tax.

But the very language which the advocates of the saloon use in describing illicit sales shows that they understand the nature of their business. When they speak of the place where liquor is sold without license, what name do they use? Do they call the place a blind sheep or a blind goat? No! They call it a "blind tiger." They name it after an animal which is ferocious by nature—they know the nature of the saloon. Well, if a tiger was after my boy, I would rather have it a blind tiger than one which could see. Wouldn't you? If a tiger is blind, you must look it up; if it can see, it can look you up. The man who sells without a license must dodge around and keep himself concealed, but the licensed saloon plants itself in the most conspicuous place and sends out its invitation to all.

LIKENED TO A RATTLESNAKE

One of the men imported into Ohio to defend the saloon went even further than those who talk of blind tigers. He asks, "Would you not rather keep a rattlesnake in a glass case than allow it to run loose in the alley?" But why keep a rattlesnake at all? Why not kill it? How many families would be willing to keep a rattlesnake in the house, even in a glass case? It must have something to eat, and those who feed it are always in danger of being bitten. But to liken the saloon to a rattlesnake—what a confession! And what an apt illustration it is. It must have been by inadvertence that the speaker selected man's earliest enemy on earth, for was it not the serpent that deceived the first pair in the garden? And has it not lived ever since under the curse then pronounced upon it? Is there not additional reason today why the seed of the woman should bruise this serpent's head? Is not woman today the greatest enemy of the saloon? All praise to the good women of this country whose love for their children and interest in their country make them an increasing influence on the side of temperance and in support of all legislation which has for its object the protection of society from the effects of alcoholic liquor.

Statistics show that prohibition can be and is enforced in other states. But, if we do our