

already have Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Missouri, Massachusetts and Michigan, and will have New York and Pennsylvania.

When the agricultural states swung into line for prohibition, we were told that the movement would be checked when it reached the city, but Chicago, the second city in the union, could not keep Illinois from ratifying; New Orleans could not keep Louisiana from ratifying; Louisville could not keep Kentucky from ratifying; San Francisco could not keep California from ratifying; St. Louis could not keep Missouri from ratifying; Detroit could not keep Michigan from ratifying; Baltimore could not keep Maryland from ratifying; Boston could not keep Massachusetts from ratifying; and New York City and Philadelphia cannot keep the Empire State and Pennsylvania from ratifying.

If all of these cities could have been located in one state, with no agricultural district to counteract the influence of the saloon, they might have been able to keep one commonwealth under the control of the liquor traffic.

VICTORY POLITICALLY UNIVERSAL

The victory for prohibition is not only geographically complete but it is also politically universal. The democratic and republican parties have fought each other upon almost every other political issue for fifty years, but they are united in this fight and share about equally in the glory.

It is true that we democrats are able to "point with pride" to the fact that the bill making the District of Columbia dry and the bill closing the saloons during the war, were both passed when the democratic party was in control of both houses, and that it was a democratic congress also that submitted the prohibition amendment. We can congratulate ourselves, too, that it was a democratic President who signed the only prohibition bills that ever reached the White House, and, as the amendment has been adopted, no similar prohibition measure will have to be passed in the future; but it is only fair to admit that the republicans in congress gave as large a percentage of their vote to the support of these measures as did the democrats, and that a republican President would doubtless have signed the bills had the White House been occupied by a republican.

While we can be happy over the part that the democratic party is playing in the concluding months of the fight it is not safe for us to brag much, because a boast might tempt the republicans to reply that it required a great deal of latter day activity to deodorize our party's earlier record.

My party's record up to a few years ago, and its more recent record in the cities in the East, suggests the only explanation I can give for being so highly honored by those who entered the fight earlier than I did. In a debate once held over the relative merits of the sun and the moon the champion of the latter contended that the moon deserved the more credit because it gave its light at night where it was needed. Certainly, it used to be dark enough in my party, on this subject, to make even a moon look bright.

Now that the wave is running our way, we have reason to believe that it will not be long before every state in the union will be recorded in favor of ratification of the prohibition amendment, and thus give to the policy of prohibition the strength that comes from unanimous endorsement.

Even legislators who were pledged to the saloon find it possible to justify the support of prohibition, in spite of the promises that they made. If any of you question the right of a wet politician to break his promise under the circumstance that now exists, a word of explanation will set you right:

The marriage contract is the most sacred obligation that we know of, but it terminates on the death of either party. The contract between a wet politician and John Barleycorn surely can not be more sacred than a marriage contract, therefore, as John Barleycorn is now dead, the wet politician is at liberty to contract a new alliance.

Of course there will be a certain amount of protest from representatives of the liquor traffic. Even now wet lawyers are threatening all sorts of obstruction, but that is to be expected. The raising of a billion dollar fund to fight prohibition was widely advertised, and as long as any of it remains there will be lawyers ready to sug-

gest all sorts of ingenious ways of overthrowing prohibition.

These lawyers are expecting to make more now than at any previous time on a theory that I can best explain by telling you an Irish story that a Irishman told me: Two sons of Erin were traveling on a highway and came to a bridge over a stream; on the bridge they saw a sign "Five dollars reward for the rescue of a drowning person." Being sorely in need of money, they hit upon a plan to secure the reward. They decided that one would fall in and the other would rescue him, and then they would divide the five dollars. Carrying out the scheme, one of them fell in. As he was going down for the third time, he noticed that his companion showed no signs of rescuing him and demanded an explanation. The man on the bank replied, "Since you fell in, I have seen another sign,—ten dollars reward for recovering a dead body." It is evident that these wet lawyers are expecting to make more recovering the dead body of John Barleycorn than they could make trying to rescue him. But it is too late.

It is real amusing the way the newspapers have kept the big cities in the dark about this movement until after the fight was won, because this fund was raised after the election of last November, at which the friends of prohibition secured six more states than they needed for ratification. To the credit of our form of government, let it be said that the billion dollar fund has not changed a vote. They could not buy a single legislature.

It is not necessary that, in the presence of these pioneers, I should elaborate on the forces that have combined to put an end to the saloon. The moral reason has grown stronger year by year; the scientific objection to alcohol has been reinforced by investigation; the business arguments have accumulated and just as these made a final victory certain a patriotic impulse carried the nation over the top. The country found that drink, dangerous in peace, was disastrous in war when the maximum of our man-power was needed.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW

The problem immediately before us is enforcement of the law, and it is necessary that the opponents of the saloon shall be vigilant and see to it that officers are chosen who are in sympathy with the law rather than the law-breakers. No one could intrust the prosecution of murderers to one who believed in murder, or the prosecution of thieves to one who believed in stealing. It would be as absurd to entrust the enforcement of prohibition laws to men who believe in the liquor traffic and want to protect it.

We have taken a long step in advance and made prosecution easier, because the national amendment will stop the manufacture of intoxicants as well as their sale.

Enforcement has been difficult heretofore, mainly because enormous combinations of capital have been engaged in the liquor business, and these organizations have furnished money to elect officials pledged in advance to the violation of their oaths. But we have transformed it from a business into a crime. Our fight hereafter is not with organizations, with big corporations, or with national associations, but with individuals, and these individuals cannot co-operate. A national association of bootleggers is as impossible as a national association of pickpockets. Every year will find it easier to enforce the law, because every year will find a stronger public sentiment behind it.

Next to the enforcement of the law comes the work of building up a sentiment in favor of total abstinence, and in this work our churches will take the lead. Every pulpit will become the centre of an influence against the use of alcoholic drinks. We stand upon solid ground when we condemn even the moderate use of intoxicating liquors. God never made alcohol necessary to body, mind, or soul. He never made a man strong enough to be sure he could resist the appetite for drink when once formed, and there is no day in life after which it is safe to begin the use of intoxicants.

In addition to these propositions that apply to all, the Christian has special reasons for not drinking. He has no moral right to impair the value of the service he has pledged to God and Christ; he has no money to use for alcoholic drinks when so many noble causes need all the money that he has to spare; and he cannot afford to put a Christian's example on the side of a habit that has brought millions to the grave.

The third problem with which we have to deal

is world prohibition. We cannot hide the nation's lamp under a bushel. We suspect the Christianity of a man who does not want to spread the gospel which he professes, and so we would suspect our nations' devotion to prohibition if it did not desire to impart to others a knowledge of the benefits received.

In the first place, some of our breweries and distilleries are preparing to move into Mexico and to the Orient. When a good man goes abroad, he carries a letter of introduction; when a bad man leaves his country he is followed by a certificate of his criminal record. We owe it to Mexico to warn her against welcoming a traffic which we are driving out of this country. We owe it also to China and Japan to let them know the character of the business which has aroused the wrath of our country.

And shall we not give to the republics which are rising in Europe the benefit of our experience?

We rejoice that popular government is spreading; that Germany has driven her Kaiser into exile. Germany ought to know that she will not advance very far if she puts a brewer on the throne in the place of the Kaiser. The representatives of the liquor traffic have been as much opposed to popular government here as the Kaiser was in Germany, and as despotic in their methods.

Our flag of democracy has been lifted so high that it can now be seen around the world. Today the white flag of prohibition has been flung to the breeze,—it floats just beneath the stars and stripes. They are emblems that stand for things that bless us; their triumph will, we believe, bless people everywhere.

Doctor Scanlon and friends I thank you again for the joy you have added to this day.

MR. BRYAN AND PROHIBITION

It fell to the lot of Nebraska to put the capstone on the monument. Thirty-six votes were necessary to ratify the prohibition amendment, and she supplied the thirty-sixth.

The Blackwater state is the home of Mr. Bryan. No public man in America has contributed more of his time to the cause of prohibition than the orator of the Platte. Probably none has addressed so many people on the subject. For years, in his ceaseless journeyings up and down the country, appearing before audiences on this subject and that, he has never forgotten the subject of prohibition.

Since retiring from the cabinet, Mr. Bryan has confined his canvassings largely to prohibition. He promptly made his purpose known, and has held to it. His audiences have never been larger. His challenges to the drink traffic have never been more direct. More applause has never at any time greeted his utterances.

In his home state Mr. Bryan has done his part in creating and fostering prohibition sentiment. Politically, he has lost ground there. Democratic leadership has been transferred to others. But on this moral issue, put and kept on moral grounds, he has maintained his influence; and the vote of yesterday is due probably in generous measure to his activities.—Washington Star.

GREATEST VICTORY EVER WON

Oakland, California, January 19, 1919.—W. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Nebraska. My Dear Mr. Bryan: Wish it were so that I could literally present to you my armful of poppies, golden smiles from the warm hillsides of California, as a token of my appreciation of the supreme part you played in making national prohibition a fact, the greatest victory ever won by a people engaged in moral and economic effort. While many noble souls contributed to the victory I am persuaded that it would not yet be achieved had not your leadership ever been there to carry on. You have fought, my dear sir, many a great fight and won but none so great as this one. May your days be long upon earth and filled with other great and glorious victories. Sincerely your wellwisher, W. D. Young.

The scientists have it all figured out that with the war taking its toll of lives there will be left about six women to every five men, and that this fact will give the men a wider choice than before. All we have to say is that the scientists have a funny idea about who does the choosing in the matrimonial business.

About the easiest way to make a member of the legislature angry is to list him as a wet. There's a reason.