

on all other things, but we were agreed that the time had come for the extension of suffrage to woman on equal terms with man. It is true that the republican party said that it ought to be LEFT to the states, and that the democratic party RECOMMENDED to the states the adoption of it.

I am not willing, however, to put the form before the substance. The real question is whether woman ought to vote; if the democratic party believes, as it said in its platform, that the time has come for suffrage to be extended to woman on equal terms with man, and recommends all the states to adopt this, you will find it very difficult to find any logic that will support you in opposing its adoption by a national amendment to the constitution.

WOMEN HELPED DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Objections to a national amendment come only from the states that have not yet adopted the amendment; just as rapidly as the states adopt woman's suffrage, the states' rights idea disappears and they are ready to join in making woman suffrage national. If any party ought to be friendly to woman suffrage, it is the democratic party. In the first place, the democratic party builds upon an ethical foundation; the foundation of democracy is human brotherhood and that is an ethical. Second, in the last campaign, the women saved us when the men would have rejected our party.

I have told you of a record made, a record that has no parallel in all our political history, and yet that record, submitted to men only, would have been rejected. It was the women who held the balance of power and converted a defeat into a victory. We made our fight on what our President had done in securing economic reforms and then we found that the visit that he made on one occasion to the state of New Jersey, when he voted for woman's suffrage, had an influence sufficient to give him a second term in the White house.

What was it that influenced these women my friends? My good friend from Montana, who has contributed so largely to this victory in the west by his splendid management, has spoken of the protest against a return of the government to the hands of the predatory interests; and that is true. It is true that we could not have won, if we had not drawn to our party a large percentage of the progressives of the west, but even with all the progressives whom we attracted to our party, we would still have failed had it not been for the appeal that the President's course made to the women.

And why did the women respond? It was because he stood as the champion of peace and peaceful methods as against the more warlike methods advocated by the republican candidate. Did these women lack patriotism? No! I know the mothers of this country; if any country ever attacked us these mothers would give their sons; they would button on their uniforms and send them out with their blessing. But these mothers are not going to give their sons in unnecessary wars. They did not believe it was necessary to wage war against Mexico, and they did not believe it necessary to send their sons across an ocean, three thousand miles wide, to march under the banner of a European monarch and die on European soil in the settlement of kings' disputes. It was the mother instinct that led these women to cast their vote as they did.

We need these women in the fights we have ahead of us; we need the mother's influence and the mother's solicitude. To my mind the mother argument is the strongest argument in favor of woman's suffrage. The mother's investment in the child is different from the father's investment. I love my children as well, I think, as a father can, but I do not put myself in the same class with my wife when it comes to the love of a child; and I do not put any father in the same class with the mother. If you want to know why a mother's love for a child is the sweetest, tenderest, strongest thing in the world, you will find the explanation in the Bible. It says: "Where your treasures are, there will your heart be also." The child is the treasure of the mother; she invests her life in the child. Two thousand years ago, when the mother of the Gracchi was asked: "Where are your jewels?" she pointed to her sons and said, "These are my jewels."

The mother's life trembles in the balance at the babe's birth, and for years it is the object

of her constant care. She expends upon it her nervous force and energy, and she endows it with the wealth of her love. She dreams of what that child is to be, and do; and, oh, if a mother's dreams only came true, what a different world this world would be! And the most pathetic struggle that this world knows is not the struggle between armed men upon the battlefield; it is the struggle of a mother to save her child when wicked men set traps for it and lay snares for it. While you give the ballot to a man who conspires to rob a home of a child, it is not fair, and you know it is not fair, to tie the hands of a mother as she struggles to protect her home and save her child. If there is such a thing as justice in this world, the mother has a just claim to a voice in shaping of the environment that shall determine whether her child will realize her hopes or bring her gray hairs in sorrow to the grave.

The mother should also have a voice in establishing the nation's standard of honor, which is, after all, the important thing. Who says that the husband is the only one who should have a voice in determining whether the ties that were formed at the marriage altar shall be severed by the husband's departure for the battlefield.

Who says that our standards of honor are not safe in the hands of women? Woman has a sense of honor that man will never surpass. We need the votes of women more than women need the ballot. We need the votes of women to help us in the great fight against the saloon, the monster evil of our day, and we need the votes of women to help us create a public opinion that will make us potential in the world's affairs.

The only substitute for war is friendship built upon the spirit of brotherhood, and woman, who, as has been said, was the last to leave the cross and the first to find the sepulchre, is needed in this country to help us crystallize a moral sentiment that will enable us to lead the world up to higher ground and to build a peace that shall endure.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION

There is one other reform, and I think you have probably been looking for it. I shall take a double portion of water before I proceed. We have to meet the liquor question, gentlemen. I have sometimes been accused of traveling too far ahead of the army. I think I can present a very complete defense to that charge on most questions. I have not been ambitious to be a pioneer. The best definition of leadership that I have ever heard was given by Governor Oglesby, of Illinois. He said, "A leader is one who is going in the same direction as the people, but a LITTLE BIT ahead—not too far!" I have simply taken up questions when I thought they were ripe for action, and for twenty years I have divided my time about equally between defending the things I advocated and explaining why I was not advocating something that I did not advocate! I think the time has come to take up the prohibition question. It is the question of the hour.

Upon what ground does the demand for prohibition rest? Upon the only ground upon which any legislation on the liquor question has ever been built. There is just one proposition which furnishes the foundation for every law that has ever been passed in any country at any time on the liquor question, namely, that alcohol is a harmful thing; that, when taken into the body, it weakens the physical strength, saps the vigor of the mind, and menaces the morals of the man. Now, if anybody can overthrow that proposition, he will not only defeat prohibition, but he will secure the repeal of every law ever passed on the liquor question. That is the foundation, and it is not an open question. Nobody will praise the saloon today. The saloon has no eulogist. Why? Because, although the drinking of liquor may be practised, it is not defended. Everybody knows that alcohol is injurious, and recommends everybody but himself not to have anything to do with it. I have heard a number of fathers, who themselves drink, boast that their boys were teetotalers. Why? Because they recognized that it is not wise to drink.

I went down to Annapolis some two years ago, one of the splendid institutions of our country, presided over by one of the best of my friends (Secretary Daniels). I spoke to eight hundred and more midshipmen there, collected from all

the districts of the country, selected by examination and competition—and you can not find eight hundred finer specimens of manhood on this earth than those men. They are being trained at government expense for a government service, and Uncle Sam is so anxious that every one of them shall measure up to the highest point of efficiency that he will not allow one of them to use alcohol while he is in school there.

If anybody thinks that alcohol is a good thing for young men let him convince the government that its policy is wrong. If he can compel Uncle Sam to feed alcohol to those boys, the saloon will win the greatest victory it has ever won since it came to curse mankind. But he can not do it and he will not try, because the history of the human race stands back of the government's position. Now, my friends, if Uncle Sam is so anxious about his wards that he will not allow those midshipmen to use alcohol, should not a parent be even more anxious about his sons? If any of Uncle Sam's boys goes astray, he can get other boys to take their place, but if one of your boys is destroyed by this evil, you can not replace him in your home.

I went down to Austin, Texas, last March, to speak to the students of the state university, and as I approached the city I asked my companion about a man whom I had known there—a man of advanced years and great prominence. I thought I had seen in the newspapers that he had died a few years before, but was not sure. My companion answered that he was dead, but that before he died he had made a speech in Austin in favor of prohibition. Then he told me how this man stood before his townsmen and reminded them of the fact that he had spoken and voted against prohibition, but he said, "I am now for prohibition." And why? This was his pathetic explanation. "I have not a son who is worth anything. Drink has ruined them all, and in my old age I am left alone." What an awful punishment for God to visit on a father who had thrown his influence on the side of the saloon until it has robbed him of his own flesh and blood!

The liquor habit can not be defended, and if the liquor habit can not be defended, the saloon can not be defended. If anybody tells you that the saloon is a good thing for the town, let me give you two arguments, each of which furnishes a conclusive answer.

First: Travel over this country as I do and you will often see at stations a signboard advertising the town. The first thing at the top is the name of the town and the state, and under that the population. I have noticed that the population is generally given as thirteen thousand three hundred and seventy-nine, or some other exact number, and when I read that I know that there are no MORE people there. They are advertising the town, and they mention everything that will attract, the number of factories, the number of business houses, the number of churches, colleges, and schools—but one thing they never mention. I challenge you to find a bill-board between the two oceans that tells the number of saloons in a town. You can not find a board of trade, or a chamber of commerce, or a commercial club, that ever sent out advertising matter telling the number of saloons when it was trying to draw people to a town.

The other answer was given me by a farmer in Nebraska, who refused to sign a petition for a saloon. The applicant asked him, why? He replied, "Because they do not treat the saloon keeper fairly." The would-be saloon keeper had heard other objections, but never that one. The farmer explained: "You think your saloon will bring trade, improve business and help the town?" and he said, "Yes, sir." "Well," said the farmer, "if your saloon will do what you say it will do, bring trade, improve business and help the town, they ought to give you a bonus to start that saloon to help the town, and not tax you for it!"

NO DEFENSE FOR THE SALOON

You can not escape the logic of it. You can find no defense of the saloon because you know that the saloon is a bad thing; and, if the saloon is a bad thing, then how can we defend the licensing of a saloon? Scientific experiment has demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the use of alcohol, even in moderate quantities, impairs the physical welfare and decreases man's expectancy, according to the life