

was a pathetic plea, for I found that those who did not want the prohibition question brought up at this time were the same people who did not want it brought up at any former times and would not be in favor of having it brought up after the war. My answer was, that those who are opposed to prohibition at any time are not the best ones to tell us at what particular time we shall bring it up. A man whose patriotism is measured by the quart does not have enough patriotism to make him worth considering at a time like this. The support of men who condition their support upon a cessation of the activity of those favoring prohibition is not valuable enough to offset the injury they would do if we let them continue their saloons. If I thought that prohibition would delay by one day the triumph of our arms I would be the last one to mention the word until our boys come marching home victorious, but I expect to show to you tonight that there is no one thing that we can do that will do more to hasten victory than the abolition of the saloon.

Lloyd George declared that Great Britain is fighting three enemies: Germany, Austria and Drink and then he adds that as far as he can see Drink is the worst of the three. While our soldier boys are whipping Germany and Austria across the ocean we will thrash Drink on this side of the Atlantic.

#### ARGUMENTS SUFFICIENT TO CONVERT THE FORMER OPPONENTS OF PROHIBITION

I am here for a purpose and that purpose I frankly avow. I am here to render the Missouri Dry Alliance any assistance I can in its effort to secure the adoption of the state prohibition amendment and in the ratification of the national prohibition amendment. I am here tonight to present arguments which I regard as sufficient to convert any man who has in the past opposed prohibition. I have had enough experience in politics to employ the easiest method instead of looking for the hardest way of bringing a man to our side. Every time a new question comes up there are realignments, and so when this question came up there were necessarily realignments. I have lost more democratic friends by my fight for prohibition than I have ever lost in the discussion of all other questions put together, but one has to do his duty and a man who is not willing to lose friends when he believes he is right does not deserve to have friends.

I do not question the right of any other man to vote as he thinks best for his country, but never before have I discussed a question where I was so sure that the triumph of the cause which I advocate will be good even for those who differ from me on the subject.

I feel about this cause as our soldiers feel about the people in Germany. Just as our soldiers believe that in the days to come the people whom they now fight will rejoice at the triumph of our arms; so I feel that in the days to come the very people who fight us most bitterly now will be most grateful that they have been defeated and that our cause has triumphed. Thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of men who will vote against prohibition and who will think that we are violating their personal rights will, when they are released from the habit and relieved from temptation, go down on their knees and thank us for having helped them against their will, and their wives and children will not have to wait a year; they will thank us now for saving their husbands and fathers. And the men who today have their money invested in breweries, distilleries and saloons will, when set free from this business and permitted to go into a better business, find that their wives and children will not be ashamed to answer when people ask them what they are doing. I say, my friends, we are fighting a battle where even our opponents will be benefited and I am glad that as I draw near the end of my life I am able to take part in a fight that brings together the best representatives of both the parties that have been contestants in the arena of politics for fifty years over nearly every great question.

I want to make it easy. I want to give those who have been against us some new reasons that will enable them to come over without necessarily having to admit that they were wrong in rejecting our old reasons. That is better than to compel a man to acknowledge that he was wrong in the past.

In the first place, it used to be possible for a man to maintain his respectability and favor the license system, but the time has passed when he can do this and expect to be considered

respectable. Let me state the situation. Years ago I heard a very nice distinction drawn between two kinds of truthfulness. It was that some men would tell the truth if they knew the truth; that was the highest standard of truthfulness, but that there was a lower standard, the standard of the man who would tell you the truth if he knew the truth and knew that you knew that he knew it. Do you see the distinction? It is a very nice one. Now, there are two kinds of respectability also. There is the respectability of the man who will not associate with a bad man if he knows that the man is bad. That is the highest standard, and then there is the lower standard, the respectability of the man who will not associate with a bad man if he knows that you know that he is a bad man.

Now, the time has come when the world knows that the saloon is bad. It has been indicted; it has been tried; it has been convicted; it has been sentenced; it has the black cap on, it is on the way to the scaffold, the band is playing the funeral march. No one but the friends of the family can stay with it now. You must shun it. You cannot afford to have your own reputations blasted by keeping company with an outlaw.

Then there is another reason. Whether you will appreciate this rule or not will depend somewhat upon your activity in politics, but every man who has had any considerable experience in politics knows that a large percentage of the voters of every party will decide questions according to what the party says. I have known many cases where a man has changed his opinion in a night when a convention of his party, held on the same evening, has changed the party's position.

To illustrate the rapidity with which a man can change let me tell you a story. Senator Jones of Nevada was a great story teller and he used to amuse his associates in the lobby of the senate between busy sessions. I heard him tell this story which I think illustrates the point. He said that, in California, the year the republican party first declared against Chinese immigration, a prominent republican came into the convention hall and was called upon to speak before he had had time to learn of the party's platform. He began his speech by saying, "the gates of our country are open and our invitation is extended to the people of all lands to come and live among us." By that time the chairman was badly frightened for he could see that the speaker had not read the platform and was talking on the other side, so he pulled his coat tail and stopped him for a moment and whispered, "we have just declared against Chinese immigration." The speaker took a drink of water, cleared his throat and then proceeded: "I have stated the arguments of our opponents, now, I shall answer them."

#### MAJORITY RULE INVOKED FOR FIRST TIME ON DEMOCRATIC SIDE

Now, my friends, for the first time we can invoke the majority rule on our side. I suppose the republicans think that they are getting a great deal of pleasure out of the progress of the nation toward prohibition, but I will not offend any of them when I tell them that no republican in the United States is getting as much real joy out of this as I am.

I have lived among republicans most of my life. I know them. Except on election day they are not different from democrats. But some of them have mighty queer ideas about democrats. I have known good honest republicans who seemed to think that when God made man he took the best clay he could find and made republicans, and then used the scraps to make democrats out of. One thing that they have thrown up to my party ever since I can remember was, that my party was a whiskey party. They have not only said that about it ever since I can remember but they said it even before I can remember. There is a story told on Douglas and Lincoln. It is said they were walking along a street of Springfield one day and saw in front of them a man who was drunk. Lincoln said to Douglas, "Judge, there is one of your democrats," but Douglas who knew the man said, "No, Abe, he is a republican." So they decided to ask the man to find out who was right. Lincoln presenting the subject in dispute, asked him to settle it by telling to which party he belonged. I will not attempt to imitate the manner of the man but the substance of what he said was this: "Judge Douglas is right. I am a republican but I have democratic symptoms."

I have had republicans tell me to my face that

my party was a whiskey party, and it made me mad; made me mad twice; first, that any republican would be mean enough to say a thing like that of my party, and madder still when I could not deny it. I did not know there were as many republicans here. If there is a republican who has ever uttered that charge against my party he had better hold his tongue hereafter. I want to tell you what you may not know, namely, that the democratic south is leading the fight today for the greatest moral reform of this generation. Only three wet states in all the south. Florida, Louisiana and Kentucky. They are the only southern states today in which there are saloons. You can take a train on any of the leading railroads of the south and start at Baltimore, and when you leave Maryland you do not pass through a city that has a saloon in it until you reach Louisiana; when you leave Louisiana and start west you do not pass through a city that has a saloon in it until you reach southern California. There are only three wet counties in all Florida today and Florida will go dry next November by an overwhelming majority. Prohibition in Florida is sure, there is no fight being made in Florida today against state prohibition. That is one of the states that is wet, and what about Louisiana and Kentucky? They have both ratified the national amendment. Kentucky was state number three; Louisiana was state number fourteen. That is the south. You cannot find an equal area in any republican section of this country where there are as few saloons as there are in the south. And remember that when Kentucky ratified the amendment by five to one in her legislature, she had more than half the whiskey of the United States within her borders and had given names to more brands of whiskey than all the other states of the union put together. That is the south.

#### DEMOCRACY QUESTIONED BECAUSE OF FIGHT AGAINST LIQUOR INTERESTS

But do you say it is local? No. That is the position of my party in the nation. They used to question my democracy because I was in favor of prohibition. When I began eight years ago last spring to fight for county option in Nebraska—that was before state prohibition was submitted—I went to Omaha to open the campaign. I could not find a democrat of prominence in that city to introduce me or even sit on the platform with me although I had carried my state for the presidency twice. I had to hire the hall myself, and it was not a big hall; and it was not crowded. I put my coat and hat on a chair and addressed the chair and made my speech in Omaha against the saloons. Yes, they questioned my democracy then but they cannot do it now.

The District of Columbia is dry now. The white flag of prohibition floats over our national capital, just beneath the stars and stripes, and no hand will ever haul it down. When the district went dry it was a democratic House that passed the bill; it was a democratic Senate that passed the bill, and it was a democratic President who affixed his signature to the first prohibition law ever signed by a President in this country.

Do you have any wet democrats in St. Joseph who want to question my democracy? They need not bother about me. Let them go down to Washington and call at the White House and ask the President to turn aside a little while from war business while a wet democrat from St. Joseph reads him out of the democratic party because he signed a prohibition measure. My party in the nation is on record on this subject. When the national prohibition amendment was submitted, 48 democrats voted on the subject in the Senate. How did they vote? Thirty-six democrats voted for submission and twelve voted no. Three-fourth of the democrats voted for national prohibition and only one-fourth voted against it. I am on the side of the three-fourths and not on the side of the one-fourth. In the House, over two-thirds of the democrats voted yes; less than a third voted no. I am on the side of more than two-thirds, not on the side of less than one-third. They used to say that I was disturbing the harmony of my party. It was not true then. I never disturbed the harmony of my party. I was always on the side of the majority of my party. I could not have been nominated for the President three times without money and without any great corporation back of me if I had not had a majority of the democrats for me. But now they cannot even accuse me of disturbing the harmony of my party.

A mother once said to her boy, "Johnnie stop pulling that cat's tail;" the boy replied, "I am