

not pulling the cat's tail, I am just holding the tail, the cat is doing the pulling." I am not disturbing the harmony of my party. It is the wet democrat who is disturbing the harmony of the democratic party.

When ratification began eight democratic states voted for ratification before a single republican state ratified and of the fourteen that have now voted for ratification ten of them cast their electoral votes for Woodrow Wilson two years ago. Don't call the democratic party a whiskey party any more. If our parties are to share equally in furnishing the thirty-six states necessary for ratification then our share is eighteen and the republicans' share eighteen. We have furnished ten of our eighteen and the republicans have furnished only four of theirs and we have thirteen more that are sure to ratify. If only thirty-six states ratify we will have five more than our half. Isn't that a pretty good record for the democratic party, my friends? The situation is even better than that. It is not only possible for the democrats to invoke the rule of the majority in behalf of prohibition, but the republicans can also. When this question was submitted the republicans of the Senate gave even a larger percentage than we did in favor of prohibition. We were three to one and they were five more than three to one. In the House we had two-thirds and they had two-thirds, but we had just a little larger percentage than they had. Now, that is the record.

#### ARGUMENTS OF ADVOCATES OF SALOON HAVE BEEN TAKEN AWAY

We have also taken away the arguments behind which the advocates of the saloon used to hide. I will give you the only argument you have heard in ten years from any man who wanted to be considered respectable. You have all heard it. The man would begin by saying: "If by my vote I could drive out the saloon I would be the first one to vote for prohibition, but you cannot enforce prohibition, and as prohibition cannot be enforced I would rather have a well regulated saloon than a prohibition law unenforced." Isn't that the argument that you have heard? That is the only argument within recent years. It cannot be made any more. First, we have the thing now that they said they would like to have. They said if they could wipe it out of the United States that they gladly do it. Here is the chance to wipe it out of the United States. When prohibition was to be voted on in a town they said, "If we have prohibition in our town they will have another wet town near and we will have to take care of our drunks when they come back, and we will not have any license fees." Is not that what they said? And then when county option was to be voted on they said, "If we make our county dry there will be a county near where it will be wet." If you said, "how about state prohibition," they said, "if we have state prohibition there will be a wet state near." Now, my friends, we are going to have a nation dry and no wet nation near.

So we have the very condition now that they have been hoping for if what they said was true. More than that, we now have laws that enable us to enforce prohibition, as we could not do it a few years ago. For instance, we have the Webb-Kenyon law that enlarged the power of the state; and, strange to say, the very men which used to say that prohibition could not be enforced — that they would be for it if it could, were opposed to the Webb-Kenyon law that enlarged the power of the state to enforce prohibition, and what was their objection? They said it would "interfere with interstate commerce," that it would "violate the federal constitution," and men which had never risen to the dignity of a justice of the peace at home blossomed out into constitutional lawyers in Washington when they defended the liquor interests. I have found that the most dignified and respectable argument a man can make when he is ashamed to give his real reason is the unconstitutionality argument, but in spite of all the pathetic pleas of saloon representatives for the constitution Congress passed the law, and then the liquor interests rushed to the White House and demanded that the President should save the constitution. The President called in a New York attorney general and that attorney general wrote an opinion saying that the law was unconstitutional and the President, poor Mr. Taft, relied upon Attorney General Wickersham's opinion and vetoed that law as unconstitutional, but it passed in spite of his veto. Then the liquor interests appealed to the Supreme Court and said, "For Heaven's sake

don't let Congress trample on a sacred document like the constitution of the United States." The Court gave it very serious consideration, and then, by a majority of seven to two, held that this law was constitutional, and, in order to save themselves any further annoyance, they added that the saloons have no constitutional rights in the United States.

And so we have the Webb-Kenyon law, and we have the amendment to the post-office appropriation bill that puts the federal government into partnership with the state when the state goes dry. It provides that, when the state prohibits the manufacture and sale of liquor, the instrumentalities of interstate commerce cannot be used to carry the liquor in from the outside.

That provision has brought up some very interesting questions. I was in Nebraska a short time ago and talked with a United States district attorney there. He told me about a case recently decided there. They found ten gallons of alcohol that had been brought from Missouri and arrested the man and woman in whose house the alcohol was found. They set up as their defense that they had read in a newspaper that if you would give alcohol to a sow with little pigs it would make the sow good to her pigs. Our judge is a very conscientious man and he did not want to do injustice to a man and woman who were trying to take care of poor little pigs. So he examined the authorities very carefully and could not find a case in point, not a single case, where a sow was even remotely connected with alcohol and he had to fall back on common sense and analogy. He decided that until further informed he would hold that as investigation had demonstrated the fact that alcohol does not make a father good to his children, — it would not make a sow good to her pigs.

We have also the law against advertising. The law says that whenever a state prohibits the advertising of intoxicating liquor in the state the mails shall not carry any advertisements of liquor into the state from the outside.

Now, that is a more important law than you would imagine. One of the reasons why we have never been able to find out the truth about states where they had prohibition is that the liquor interests have hired the press to lie about the conditions in their own states. Not that they would pay any editor so much a lie. Oh, no. They pay him so much a line for advertising space. That is, they would hire space in which to advertise the claims of an intoxicating liquor and then the advertisements would be put on the back of the editorial page and left standing long enough to soak through to the other side and color the editorial opinion of the paper.

We have these three laws now, the Webb-Kenyon law, the post-office appropriation bill amendment and the law against advertising, and we are enforcing these laws.

#### SUCCESS OF PROHIBITION IN LARGE CITIES OF THE COUNTRY

Would you suppose that a great mountain city could have prohibition? It can. Denver did not think so when the state went dry. Denver voted no when the state voted yes. But ten months after prohibition went into effect Denver had a chance to vote on a proposition to bring beer — not whiskey, but just beer — back into the state, and Denver voted fourteen thousand majority against allowing beer to come back into Colorado. That was Denver's experience.

And Seattle. Can a sea port town enforce prohibition? Seattle is a great sea port. Seattle did not think it would be good to have prohibition and so voted wet when the state voted dry, but after Seattle had had time to see what prohibition meant Seattle by a large majority voted against allowing liquor to come back into Washington. That was Seattle's experience.

Can a manufacturing town have prohibition? Birmingham, Alabama, is a great manufacturing town. Before the state went dry, Birmingham built a city jail, a big one on plans suited to a saloon city, but soon after they finished their jail the state went dry and they found crime so decreased that they did not need their big jail and so when we entered the war Birmingham offered her empty jail to the United States for sick soldiers there. That was Birmingham's experience.

Prohibition can prohibit. They have told you that Kansas does not enforce the law. Do you suppose there is a city that knows better what they do in Kansas than Kansas City. Yet Kansas City voted for state prohibition two years ago, and when she did so she was the biggest city

in the world that had ever voted to drive saloons out. That is what Kansas City did. If Kansas City can take the side of prohibition you had better take it also or else take the word Saint off of your name and just call it Joseph.

Prohibition can be enforced and prohibition is being enforced. You cannot say now that you would vote for it "only prohibition cannot be enforced." Yes, we have now destroyed all the old arguments behind which people used to hide.

They used to say that you were violating personal liberty, that a man's personal liberty required the saloon. Well, you don't hear any more of that now. A man does not have to be run over more than twice by a drunken chauffeur to get an entirely new idea of personal liberty. Another stock argument was: "How can you run the government without the money collected on beer and whiskey?" That, too, is answered. A nation that can borrow nine billion dollars of its citizens in a single year is not compelled to dicker with a criminal business for money to run the government. And the war has taught us the value of a human life. Our boys are too precious to be auctioned off to the saloon in return for license fees or liquor tax.

#### OLD EXCUSES OF LIQUOR FORCES HAVE LOST THEIR FASCINATION

We have, I repeat, overthrown the old excuses that they used north and south. Up north here they would say you must not interfere with interstate commerce and down south they would say you must not interfere with state rights. When I was a boy I used to be greatly interested in the Punch and Judy show. I would look on with open-eyed wonder as Punch and Judy would quarrel and fight, but when I was old enough to know that the same voice spoke through both the fascination disappeared and I was never interested in a Punch and Judy show again until a few years ago when the brewers put on the real Punch and Judy show. They had two groups of men, one up north and one down south. Whenever an attempt was made to enlarge the power of the state to enforce prohibition the group up north would shout "you must not interfere with interstate commerce," and whenever an attempt was made to secure national prohibition the group down south would shout "you must not interfere with state's rights."

Well, my friends, it makes me think of a story I once heard. A ventriloquist went into a saloon leading a dog by a string. He called for a glass of beer, the dog said: "Give me a sandwich." When the saloon keeper heard the voice coming from the dog he said: "Can that dog talk?" "Didn't you hear him?" replied the owner. "Will you sell him? I think I can use him in my business," asked the man behind the bar. "If you will give me my price," answered the owner. "How much do you want?" "One hundred dollars." "I will take him," and he counted out the hundred dollars and handed the money over to the owner of the dog and the owner turned over the string to the saloon keeper and started out. When he reached the door he turned and made the dog say: "What, are you going to sell me?" "Yes," he replied, and the dog said: "I will never speak again."

My friends, in eighteen months from today the voice will be gone and the saloon politician north and south will never speak again.

They have no more excuses. If any man wants to vote against prohibition now he might just as well take off the mask, stand out in the open and admit that he is voting for the saloon because he wants the saloon.

#### PATRIOTIC REASONS FORCED CONSIDERATION OF EVILS OF LIQUOR

But, my friends, I now come to the patriotic reasons that have come to us with this year. Prohibition would have won anyhow. Prohibition was rapidly gaining even before war came across the sea. The war began over there on the first of August, 1914, but we had already submitted prohibition in four states that went dry in November, 1914, and then four more went dry in 1916. Before our nation entered this war we had gone far enough to know that the triumph of prohibition was not far away, but when we entered this conflict, the war threw a ghastly light on the evils of intemperance. We found that the saloon which was bad in peace was worse in war and we have seen prohibition hastened by the fact that we understand alcohol better now; we see what it means to a nation under stress and strain. A year ago Congress declared by law that no more bread stuff should be converted into whiskey, and