

case. One man says that he had a little work to do and could not spare the time; another went to visit his wife's relatives and a family dinner made it inconvenient for him to return. I met a man on the train a few years ago who said that he had not voted for ten years and gave as his reason that a neighbor for whom he voted gave a dinner to celebrate the victory and did not invite him. He said, "I concluded that, if I could make a mistake like that about one whom I knew personally, I did not have sense enough to vote and I have not voted since." Think of a man refusing to vote because he made a mistake at the polls! The Republicans are not that sensitive about the mistakes they make; I know Republicans who have made three mistakes to my personal knowledge and they go on voting just as if nothing had ever happened. No one should be discouraged because of a mistake; he should vote earlier next time and correct the mistake. I look back with some amusement to an opinion which I held when I was a young man. I thought that my party, if it could just get into power—it had not been in power for a long time—would do everything that it ought to do and nothing that it ought not to do—I even thought that it would do so much that, when it got through, there would be nothing left for any other party to do, but that was a long time ago. I soon learned that there were some bad men in the Democratic party and some good men in the Republican party. When I found that the wheat and the tares grow together in both parties, I entered upon my life work, viz., to get all the good Republicans out of the Republican party into the Democratic party and all the bad Democrats out of the Democratic party into the Republican party. After thirty years of earnest effort I am compelled to admit that I have not succeeded as well as I had hoped to, but I am still at work. When I attended the Republican convention at Chicago I was convinced that there are still some good Republicans, and, when I went to San Francisco I was convinced that there still are some bad Democrats left in our party. If I am permitted to select the Democrats to be exchanged and the Republicans to be admitted into full fellowship I am willing that the trade shall be made on the basis of sixteen bad Democrats for one good Republican.

We must not expect the government to be perfect, no matter what party is in power. When the Democrats are in power I can prove by all the Republicans that the government is not perfect; when the Republicans are in power—no proof is necessary. If the government were made perfect today it would be imperfect tomorrow. New laws are necessary to meet new conditions; even the constitution requires change occasionally. We boast of the wisdom of those who wrote the constitution but the wisest provision they framed was that in which they reserved to their descendants the right to change what they had done. A constitution belongs not to the dead but to the living; each generation has the right to protect itself and advance its welfare by any constitutional changes that may be deemed necessary.

We have already amended our constitution nineteen times, four times within the last ten years. The Nineteenth amendment is still in the courts but its adoption, if not completed now, is only a question of a short time. Before speaking of the other three recent amendments permit me to say a word about the Nineteenth. No one in the country is happier than I at the coming of Woman's Suffrage. I believe in woman's right to vote and am willing to endorse, without reading it, any argument that anyone will frame in favor of Woman's Suffrage, but stronger than any argument based upon right is the argument based on duty. Duty is a larger word than right; we can waive our rights but we cannot evade our duty. The world needs woman's conscience at the polls even more than woman needs the ballot. I am counting on Woman's Suffrage to effect a final settlement of two great problems—alcohol and war—twin enemies of the home—alcohol drags men down to premature graves and war offers them as sacrifices on the altar of Mars. Woman, the guardian of the home, can be relied upon to stand guard at the grave of John Barleycorn and see to it that he has no resurrection morn, and she can be relied upon to find a substitute for war as a settlement of international disputes. If we can secure a referendum on war except in case of actual invasion, reason will soon be substituted for force.

I return to the other amendments recently adopted in order that I may use them to illustrate how the apathy and indifference of citizens prolongs the struggle for reform. It required twenty-one years to secure the popular election of senators—the change would have been made in twenty-one months if the people had been as alert as they should have been. The resolution submitting the amendment passed the House six times before it could pass the Senate once. Now the people appreciate the importance of the change, nine-tenths of the voters of all the parties would oppose a return to the old methods of electing senators by legislatures.

It required seventeen years to secure the amendment authorizing an income tax—it would not have required seventeen months if the people had been as vigilant as they should have been. During the period covered by this struggle the government could draft a citizen but could not draft a pocket-book—it was omnipotent when it dealt with man but impotent when it dealt with property. Now that we have an income tax no party would dare to propose its abandonment.

And so with the fight for National Prohibition; it has required many years to win the victory. If you read the New York papers you might suppose this a new issue thrust upon the people without notice and decided without opportunity for deliberation. But do not allow the New York papers to mislead you. Reforms always surprise them; they have no political weather signals down there to give notice of the economic and moral movements that sweep northeast from the west and south.

I have been getting acquainted with the New York editors, off and on, for some twenty-five years, and the better I know them the more sure I am that the passage in the Bible that has most profoundly impressed them is the passage that tells of the wise men coming from the east nineteen hundred years ago—the New York editors seem to think that the wise men have come from that direction ever since. Therefore, unless reform starts in New York they cannot have any faith in it and, as no great reform ever starts in New York they do not have any faith in any reform.

It is nearly fifty years since the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was organized. A few women, at Hillsboro, Ohio, prayed in front of a saloon and then rose up and organized the greatest association among women, I think, that the world has yet known. For almost half a century these noble women, increasing in number, have attended the meetings of the organization in bad weather as well as in good; they have saved their money, paid their dues and contributed to the cause. Without their patient and persistent efforts we never could have won this victory, and yet they have never had as many as one in twenty-five of the women of the country as members of the organization. The burden has fallen on a few; the sacrifices have been made by a few, while all enjoy the benefits.

The same may be said of the Anti-Saloon League. It is twenty-seven years old, and yet never have as many as one in twenty-five of the adults of the country contributed to the fund that supported its work. For many years the Presbyterian church has had a temperance committee as have the Methodist church and many other churches; the work has grown until all the moral forces of society finally united in the overthrow of the saloon. And, now that the amendment is in the constitution and an enforcement law on the statute books, will the friends of prohibition be vigilant enough to hold by the ballot that which has been secured after so prolonged a struggle?

Within the last year I have suffered the most bitter disappointment of my life. Twelve months ago when I spoke to audiences like this I told them that this year the two great parties that had shared together, and in about equal proportion, the glory of this the greatest moral triumph in our nation's history, would stand together and, by the adoption of dry platforms and the nomination of dry candidates, remove the liquor question forever from the arena of American politics. I hoped and I believed that the two parties would stand together in victory as they had stood together in the conflict so that prohibition would be safeguarded no matter which party won.

I was amazed when, last January, Governor Edwards announced himself a candidate for president on a wet platform. I at once warned our party of this sinister announcement and de-

clared that it was an insult to the party for anyone to think of being its candidate on a wet platform. I pointed out that it was a Democratic Senate and House that made the District of Columbia dry and raised the white flag of prohibition over the nation's capital never to be hauled down; that it was a Democratic Senate and House that passed the resolution (three-fourths of the Democratic senators voting for it and more than two-thirds of the Democrats in the House of Representatives) submitting national prohibition, and that every Democratic state ratified—excepting New Jersey which refused to ratify while under Republican control before it refused a second time under Democratic control. It seemed absurd that such a party could be influenced by an outlawed business.

When I was accused by some of the wet papers of disturbing the harmony of the party I explained that I was standing by the splendid record of my party, and that the wets were making the disturbance. When I was told that I would have trouble at San Francisco I called attention to the fact that the Republicans would act first and I felt sure that they would nominate a dry candidate on a dry platform, and I intended to use their endorsement of prohibition as an inspiration and an example—I have never been able to use the Republican party as an inspiration or an example before but I looked forward with pleasure to doing so this time.

I was surprised to hear the temporary chairman of the Republican convention omit prohibition when he recited the achievements of the party; I was still more surprised when I listened to a platform that pointed with pride to all the other great deeds of the Republican party but omitted prohibition; I was amazed when the delegates from thirty-seven dry states made no protest against a platform silent on prohibition, and I was disgusted when the convention nominated a wet candidate on a silent platform.

Then I went to San Francisco, happy in the hope of using the Republican mistake as a warning when I could not use its action to stimulate our convention. I prepared a dry plank, not a harsh one but a plank heartily congratulating the party upon its splendid leadership in submitting and ratifying prohibition and pledging it to enforcement, honestly and in good faith, without any increase in the alcoholic content of permitted beverages and without any weakening of other provisions of the Volstead law. The committee rejected my dry plank and I carried the fight into the convention where it was voted down—it received only one hundred and fifty-five and a half votes out of nearly eleven hundred.

If the wets had been wise they would have allowed the matter to rest there; they might have misled some into believing that the Democratic party was wet by counting as against prohibition all who refused to vote for the dry plank. But greed is never intelligent; if it was it would own the world. The wets demanded a roll call on the plank that they prepared—the weakest wet plank ever offered in a convention and their plank was defeated by a vote of more than two to one. Yes, the dries went down to defeat at San Francisco but when they fell they carried down with them a bigger temple than Samson did when he slew the Philistines in his own fall. The vote against the wet plank made it certain that no Democratic congress hereafter will be wet.

But my joy over the defeat of the wets did not last long. The convention proceeded to follow the example of the Republicans and nominate a wet candidate on a silent platform. Let no Republican boast that his candidate is wetter than ours; I will guarantee that, by any standard of moisture ever invented, they will both register one hundred per cent wet, if not more. Both have stepped off of their platform to assure the wets that congress has the right to change the enforcement law. What purpose could they have had in doing so except to pledge executive approval to any wet bill passed by congress.

The failure of the two conventions to take a position on the prohibition question, coupled with the invitation extended to the wets by the two candidates, makes the liquor question an issue in every congressional district and in every state in which a senator is to be elected. The dries must see to it that their full strength is polled for a dry candidate for the House and Senate, even if they have to go outside of their party to secure one. Party lines do not divide the enemies of the home; until organized op-