

interstate commerce from the liquor interests whenever a state prohibits the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors. And the federal government now denies the mails to liquor advertisements where such advertisements are prohibited by state statute. Prohibition is a success, and nowhere is the proof more conclusive than in our own state of Nebraska. Can you ignore this change in opinion which has so greatly increased the majority in favor of prohibition?

Fifth—We have entered the world war since you received your commission from the people, and the nation realizes as it never did before the need of food and of one hundred per cent men. Congress has already prohibited during the war the conversion of foodstuffs into whisky, and the President, though limited in power in this matter, has reduced by 30 per cent the food grains available for the making of beer. But the breweries still use at least fifty million dollars worth of breadstuffs and probably more than sixty millions worth. They also use something like eight million tons of coal, and they use the railroads to carry the coal to the brewery and to distribute the beer. There is a growing protest in the United States against permitting a single bushel of foodstuffs to be converted into alcoholic beverages and against allowing any fuel to be used in the manufacture of intoxicants. This sentiment is so strong that it is increasingly difficult for a patriot to justify a vote that denies food to the soldier in order to give it to the beer-maker—that robs the table in order to feed the brewery. We must win this war. We can not afford to be defeated or to allow our allies to be defeated. Can you at such a time as this afford to throw your influence on the side of a business that jeopardizes the life of the nation in order to make a profit out of a business discredited in peace and indefensible in war? Can you afford to aid the enemy by protecting a traffic that is as disloyal as it is lawless?

Sixth—But even more serious than the waste of breadstuffs and fuel is the menace to our soldiers. We need upon the battle line men whose heads are clear and whose nerves are steady, and congress has put the brand of a criminal upon any man who sells intoxicating liquors to a soldier in uniform. Alcohol is an enemy at home scarcely less deadly than the foe upon the field. Lloyd George did not put it too strongly when he said that of Great Britain's three enemies—Germany, Austria and drink—drink seemed to him to be the worst of the three.

And it is mockery to make our soldiers face the fire of battle unless we are prepared to feed them while they fight and furnish them with the ammunition that they need. We can, therefore, no more afford to allow the brewer, the distiller and the saloon to sap the strength of the men at home than we can allow them to reduce the efficiency of the men in arms. Can you as legislators of Nebraska, entrusted with the responsibility of speaking for this great state, put your influence on the side of a business which would, for pay, make drunkards of all the soldiers in our army and leave a nation defenseless before the most militant power known to history?

In conclusion allow me to address a word to you who, as democrats, constitute a majority of the legislature. The democratic party is now committed to prohibition, and those who oppose it register their dissent from a judgment already rendered. In all the south, the solidly democratic section of the nation, there are only four wet states—Florida, Kentucky, Texas and Louisiana. Florida has already submitted a constitutional amendment and will vote dry in November. Kentucky has already ratified the national amendment by a vote of more than five to one in both branches of her legislature, and has, since then, submitted a prohibition amendment to the state constitution. Kentucky will go dry by a large majority as soon as the vote can be taken. Texas, the biggest state among those always democratic, has ratified the amendment by a vote of more than two to one in both branches of her legislature, and the legislature has just made the state dry by statute. That leaves only one wet state in the South—Louisiana—and it is probable that their legislature, which meets in May, will ratify the amendment. When the national amendment was submitted, three-fourths of the democrats of the senate voted for it and only one-fourth

against it. When the house voted on the amendment, more than two-thirds of the democrats of the house voted for it and less than one-third against it. (The vote in the republican party was substantially in the same proportion.) Will a democratic legislature in Nebraska repudiate the leadership of the party in the senate and house and refuse to ratify an amendment so overwhelmingly endorsed at Washington?

The District of Columbia is dry, and the measure that made it dry passed a democratic house and a democratic senate and received the signature of a democratic president. Will the democratic legislature of Nebraska stand with the party in the nation or will it, by becoming the champion of an outlawed business, defy the leaders of the party in the country?

In the ratification of the amendment democratic leadership has been even more pronounced. The first eight states to ratify—Mississippi, Virginia, Kentucky, South Carolina, North Dakota, Maryland, Montana and Texas—every one supported the democratic ticket at the last presidential election. Will Nebraska prove an exception among the democratic states? Delaware, the ninth state to ratify, supported the republican party in the last presidential campaign, and the tenth state, South Dakota, did also, and when the list of thirty-six states is complete, it is probable that the two parties will not be far apart in the number of states ratifying. I appeal to the Democratic legislature not to allow Nebraska's name to be omitted from the roll of honor. Our state has, for twenty years, occupied a foremost place in the fights for great reforms. She must not fail to respond now that the lines are forming for the greatest moral conflict in which the nation has enlisted during this generation.

If this legislature fails to ratify, there is no doubt that a legislature will be elected whose members will be committed in advance to ratification, but why compel this conflict when the sentiment of the state is known in advance? Why, by delay, save to the liquor trade more than an hundred millions a month that will be available for food, clothing and shelter as soon as the saloon is abolished? Why invite the National Liquor Dealers' Association and its ally, the German-American Alliance, to insolently thrust themselves again into our politics? An affirmative vote by this legislature ends the contest for this year and for all time, and makes it possible for the voters of the state to devote themselves to the upbuilding of our great state and the welfare of its people.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

Lincoln, Nebraska, March 19, 1918.

ASK LEGISLATURE TO VOTE ON PROHIBITION

[From the Nebraska State Journal, March 20.]

Temperance leaders in the city to attend yesterday's conference are a unit in the belief that the state legislature is not restricted or prevented by the failure to include a vote on ratification of the national prohibitory amendment in the governor's call, from acting thereon if it so pleases. The legislature will be asked to do so. The only trouble anticipated is in the senate, where eighteen opponents of prohibition are located out of a total membership of thirty-three. It is believed, however, that the success which prohibition has achieved in the state, the disinclination of ambitious men in politics to go down with a dead system and the fact that the patriotic argument is unanswerable will swing enough of the eighteen to secure the necessary majority in that body.

A legislative committee to present the proposition of ratification to the legislature next week has been named. It will meet at the Lindell hotel at 11 o'clock next Tuesday, March 26, for organization and to plan for the campaign. Elmer E. Thomas thinks that while the state senate might be inclined to balk, it will eventually pass it. The committee is:

A. C. Epperson, Harry Sackett, W. T. Thompson, representing the Nebraska dry federation; H. F. Carson, representing Anti-Saloon league; Mamie Claffin, representing W. C. T. U.; A. G. Wolfenbarger, representing Speakers' club; J. Dean Ringer, Omaha, Douglas county dry committee; J. A. Murray, Uni. Place, prohibition party; L. J. Dunn, Omaha; Charles W. Bryan, Lincoln; Frank A. Harrison, Lincoln; W. R.

Patrick, Sarpy county; M. M. Brugger, Columbus; Mrs. Patrick McGerr, Falls City; Elmer J. Burkett, Lincoln; Arthur J. Wray, York.

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

[From the Nebraska State Journal, March 26.]

The thirty-fifth legislature of Nebraska will convene in special session at high noon today, old fashioned standard time, and within a few moments, if nothing happens to mar the pleasure of the occasion, both the senate and house will be organized and assembled in joint convention listening to Governor Keith Neville deliver his message.

If there is any delay in the organization it is possible the governor may not be invited to appear before the joint convention until Wednesday, but if the busy legislators who have expressed themselves have their way, there will be no delay anywhere along the legislative line.

The governor's message will deal briefly with the following ten subjects on which he has asked the legislature to take action:

1. An act to extend the franchise to electors in the military and naval establishments of the United States and the state of Nebraska; an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof and such amendments to existing election and primary laws as may be necessary to harmonize same.
2. An act to extend protection to civil rights of Nebraskans in the military and naval establishments of the United States engaged in the present war.
3. An act defining the crime of sedition and prescribing penalties therefor.
4. An act defining the crime of sabotage and prescribing penalties therefor.
5. An act to legalize the Home Guards.
6. An act to repeal the Mockett law.
7. An act to submit to the voters at the next regular election an amendment to the state constitution affecting declarant voters.
8. An act conferring upon the state board of education lands and funds authority to execute mineral leases upon school lands and to validate leases previously executed.
9. An act to correct error in section 4387, being a part of the session laws of 1917.
10. An act to appropriate salaries for the state insurance examiners and for the state bacteriologist.

Those who are looking for trouble glance at the senate and then think of the repeal of the Mockett law, and the efforts of that body to define sedition and sabotage, also to attempt which the "drys" will make to have both houses ratify the prohibitory amendment to the United States constitution, also the governor's recommendation that an amendment be passed to change the suffrage rights of unnaturalized citizens of the state who are now voting by virtue of their declaration of intention to become citizens, but who have apparently no intention of carrying out their declared intention.

PUSH PROHIBITION TO FRONT IN HOUSE

[From the Nebraska State Journal, March 27.]

Preliminary steps to bring the question of consideration of the national prohibitory amendment before the house were taken by that body Tuesday afternoon when it adopted a resolution by Norton of Polk to send to it all communications relative thereto that he (the governor) has in his possession.

Eight bills were introduced in the house, but none fell into the senate hopper. Three of the eight provided for a mail vote by soldiers and the counting thereof. Two covered appropriations the regular session had overlooked. One repealed the Mockett law relating to the teaching of German in grade schools. One legalized the Home Guards, and the other defined the crime of sedition and provided penalties therefor.

GAG PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

[From the Nebraska State Journal, March 28.]

Will the state senate ratify the prohibitory amendment? It will not, if Senator Henry of Colfax, democratic caucus leader of the senate, has his way about it. If his way prevails the senate will not even permit the question of ratification to come up for consideration.

Senator Henry introduced a resolution Thursday forenoon having for its object to confine the