

be empty, and, lastly, that the rooms occupied by saloons would remain empty (till the crack of doom and 40 days more).

"Our law closing the saloons went into effect just one year ago, and we can come to a pretty fair conclusion as to what actually did happen. In the first place, thousands of workers were not thrown out of jobs. In fact, there wasn't even a ripple of that kind. The brewery workers have lost one branch (the brewers). There are no brewers employed in Colorado, and those either found other employment else went to other states to work at their trades. But the drivers, the stablemen, the bottlers, and the engineers, all connected with the Brewers and Maltsters' international, find just as much work in their own line as before. The bottlers work on soft drinks and the drivers deliver the goods as before. The engineers are all employed. So we find no unusual conditions here. The plumbers and pipe men have more members and more men at work than ever before, and the cooks and waiters are so astonished at what has happened that they are all prohibitionists now. When the saloons were closed, patrons immediately began to eat in a natural way, and the culinary trades have benefited probably more than any others. The musicians were wont to play engagements in saloons, now nearly twice as many of them are engaged in the moving picture houses. (You can readily see that there has been a shift of employment in the amusement fields. We now have a strong moving-picture operators' union, which was not possible before because not so many persons patronized the movies.) And the barbers—they are all tickled at the increased trade. Really, you have no idea, till you experience the results, how much money was released to go into the legitimate channels of trade as soon as the saloon keeper got off the working-man's back. Milk dealers and grocery stores are the most benefited by this result.

"We had about 600 saloons in Denver a year ago, and when they closed many of the rooms were empty. Some were kept open as soft-drink parlors, but most of them were rented at once by other and entirely different classes of business, in many cases at a somewhat smaller monthly rental, but the absence of the saloon made it possible to rent other rooms in the same block for more money. This is so palpable that it is a wonder the owners never saw it before. Many of the rooms occupied by saloons are yet empty, and will likely remain empty for a long time, as they are mere hovels and not fit for anything but saloon bums, of which we have no more.

"Some workers have left Colorado on account of prohibition—they personally detest the idea of prohibition and would not stay in 'gay Paree' under that rule. But Denver has grown during the year both in population and materially. So I should say without hesitation that a dry Denver has been of vast benefit to the city; that a dry Colorado has been of vast benefit to the state.

"Yours, fraternally,

"OTTO F. THUM.

Chester J. Common, President Denver Building Trades' Council

"Local Union No.—, Denver, Colo., December 27, 1916. — Mr. John G. Cooper, Congressman, House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C. Dear Sir: Your letter of recent date asking my opinion on

prohibition in Colorado received, and I am glad to give you any information I can on this subject, and you are at liberty to use it any way that will help prohibition.

"Having been a drinking man myself for many years, I, like a great amount of people, was against prohibition, thinking it would be harmful in a general way. However, after the first three months I began to see the benefits it was bringing to the men of labor, their wives, children, and dependents. More efficiency in the men and far more happiness and contentment for everyone. And now, after 12 months, I am absolutely of the opinion that prohibition is the proper thing, and has come to Colorado to stay.

"Hoping this is a satisfactory reply to your question, and wishing you and your colleagues on the labor committee every success, I am,

"Fraternally, yours,

"CHESTER J. COMMON.

"1340 S. Downing St., Denver, Colo."

W. C. Thornton, President Trades and Labor Assembly, Denver

"Denver, Colo., December 27, 1916.—Mr. John G. Cooper, M. C., House of Representatives, United States of America. My Dear Mr. Cooper: Yours of recent date, in re my opinion on prohibition in Colorado, to hand.

"I might say primarily that I voted against prohibition. In my humble opinion the workers of Denver and Colorado are a lot better off mentally, morally, financially, and physically than they were when the state was 'wet.' True, it hurt the trades which depended on the liquor traffic to keep them going, but it can be safely said that business this year is 50 per cent better than it was last year, and as a consequence those who were employed in the liquor traffic here gradually became engaged in other more legitimate lines of endeavor. You can not gather together in this city a good-sized 'company' who would proclaim openly for the return of the saloon. It is gone forever in Colorado, and for my part I say 'Good riddance.' We are all better off without it, as I stated before, for it never did anybody any good.

"Please give my regards to Mr. Ben Hilliard, if possible. Also to your colleague on the labor committee, Mr. John I. Nolan, of San Francisco, Cal. Tell him I went to school with his wife.

"In conclusion, as the fellow said, 'I don't know which gang yer wid,' but you asked for my opinion and I have given it to you, and anything further I can do for you, Mr. Cooper, I am yours to command.

"WILLIAM C. THORNTON,
"1766 Lafayette Street."

Mr. Speaker, these letters come from prominent members, leaders, and organizers of labor unions in one of the great states and large cities of the nation which have experienced the benefits of prohibition. They do not express theories or sentiment, but come as testimony of the actual results of abolishing the liquor traffic in a big center of population, especially upon the welfare of the working men and women.

Sympathizes With Workers

Ever since I was a small lad it has fallen my lot to associate with the working people of this country, and I have a warm feeling of brotherly love for all of those that toil. I have no authority to speak for organized labor, but as a member of one of the great labor organizations and as a citizen who has the interests of the

working people at heart, I feel that I can render no greater service to my fellow men than to work and vote for an amendment to the federal constitution providing for national prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand on the floor of this house and advocate the adoption of national prohibition because I live in a district that is without saloons. There are saloons in every one of the three counties which comprise the nineteenth Ohio congressional district which I have the honor to represent. There are over 200 saloons in the city in which I live, and many more scattered throughout the three counties. But, Mr. Speaker, I am for prohibition because I believe it will be the greatest step toward the conservation of our people that we have ever taken. I am for it from the standpoint of the preservation of the American home, and, after all, the home is the foundation of all government. I am for it because all over this land of ours today there are tens of thousands of mothers down on their knees pleading with the members of congress for prohibition legislation in order that our country may be made a better, cleaner, and purer place in which to rear their sons and daughters. I say it is to the everlasting shame of the manhood of our country that God-fearing Christian wives and mothers must go down on their knees and beg of big, strong men to stand for decency, morality, and good government. Mr. Speaker, I have always regarded the liquor question as a moral issue, but at this time I have a firm conviction that the hour is here when the great political parties can not afford to ignore this question any longer. It is sweeping the country by leaps and bounds. As I have stated previously, over half the states of our union have adopted prohibition, 85 per cent of our country is dry area and 65 per cent of our people live in dry territory. Yes; the time has come when the republican and democratic parties must stand on one side or the other of this great question.

I am glad that my name is recorded as a member of the republican party. During the last 60 years, under the leadership of Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, and McKinley, our country has made wonderful progress, and I want to see my party keep up the good work along the lines that it has done in the past. The republican party has always stood for the higher, better, and nobler elements in national life; and at this time I want to express my honest conviction to the republicans of this house and say that I know of no greater service you could render to your God, your country, and its people than to support the resolution to submit to the states an amendment to the federal constitution to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Speaker, at present there are two measures pending before this congress with regard to this question. One of them is for prohibition in the District of Columbia and the other is to submit a constitutional amendment for national prohibition. What action congress may take at this session upon these measures it is impossible to say at this time. Regardless of such action, the fight will go on, and when we are asked how much longer will this fight continue, our answer is we will fight on and on and on and on until we see the dawning of a brighter day when the black shadow of alcohol shall have passed away from over this fair land

of ours, and in its place will appear the shining light of sobriety, purity, and righteousness.

A STARTLING UTTERANCE

According to a dispatch from Petrograd, the Grand Duke Michael, in accepting the throne from his brother, declared that his acceptance was subject to the consent of the Russian people who should, by a plebiscite, establish a new form of government and new fundamental laws. The utterance is so startling as to throw doubt upon the authenticity of the dispatch. For the Romanoffs, of all reigning families, have hitherto been the staunchest champions of "divine right." The Hohenzollerns have occasionally conciliated public opinion and so have the Hapsburgs. But for the Romanoffs no such thing as public opinion existed in the old days, and even since the war created a peculiar necessity for popular support, the Duma, the press and the Zemstvos, the people's most direct representatives, have been held in leash and consequently antagonized. Indeed, the course of the war might have been very different, if the czar and the autocracy had trusted the people; but the bitter lesson of the Japanese catastrophe went for naught and every branch of the fighting services reeked with mismanagement and graft. It was an almost universal discontent with this state of affairs that enabled the Duma to effect so sudden and complete a sweep.

What echoes will the Russian revolution find in the Central empires? The question can not be answered with the slightest approach to exactitude, at this distance and with the vague data available. But there is no lack of omens to indicate that, in Germany as in Austria-Hungary, the war is intensifying old discontents. For example, the German chancellor has just said that the Prussian franchise must be liberalized and a liberalization of the Prussian franchise would shake, if it did not shatter, the foundations of the Junker caste, upon which the absolutist pretensions of the Hohenzollern dynasty rest. The new emperor of Austria is thought to hold liberal views, but a Hapsburg's liberalism is apt to be little more than a pose. Yet neither the Hohenzollerns, nor the Hapsburgs will count for much, if their subjects take their cue from the Russian proletariat which, after centuries of serfdom, has risen in its might and sponged the slate.

Among the most desirable results of a radical change in the three empires would be the abolition of secret diplomacy. It is far too soon to allocate the blame for the present war, but it is by no means too soon to say that the war would have been impossible if the Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian masses had known what their sovereigns and their diplomats were doing. As a matter of fact, a few men had authority to make treaties and keep them in pigeonholes till the fateful hour struck. That can never happen again, if the Grand Duke Michael's utterance is borne out by events; for the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs will vainly prate of "divine right," when once Russia shall have fully and finally repudiated the principle, by repudiating the Romanoffs.—New Orleans Times-Picayune.

A fool and his potatoes are soon parted.—Deseret News.