

low pirates to prey on our commerce. I think this council might well adopt a resolution, and I suggest it:

RESOLVED: That no Christian nation should allow its flag to protect violations of the prohibition law of any other land.

All you have to do is to tell your people, and they will find some way of taking the British flag off the houses and from over the people who there plan to invade our lands and homes with this enemy of the human race.

Our nation should go as far as it can, and therefore, I am proposing that our congress withdraw American citizenship from any man who goes on any other soil, and uses the flag of another nation to protect him while he conspires against the laws of the United States.

We say that no man shall come into this country, under our immigration law, who has violated the laws of the land from which he comes; if we ship out criminals who have violated the laws of other lands, why should we show partiality to an American who goes out abroad in order to violate the laws of his own country?

We are not going to turn back. If anybody tells you that this nation is turning back, he does not know what is going on. Let me give you a few facts. New York is our largest state. New York last year elected a governor by popular vote, pledged to the enforcement of the law. It elected a legislature pledged to the enforcement of the law, and since last November New York has passed a law that puts the Empire State back of the Volstead Law. And Pennsylvania? It is the second in size. Pennsylvania nominated and elected its present governor on a platform demanding the ratification of prohibition—elected him by popular vote; and its legislature has recently increased the stringency of the laws enforcing prohibition. What about the third state, Illinois? Illinois, with the second city in the United States, has a law today as strict as the Volstead law, for the enforcing of prohibition. What about the fourth state Ohio? Well, my friends, Ohio gives us the best illustration we have of the growth in prohibition sentiment.

They have had six popular elections in Ohio on this subject, beginning in 1914. I ask you visitors to bear this in mind. In 1914, the dries submitted state prohibition in Ohio, and the wets carried the state by 84,000. The next year the dries submitted it again, and the wets carried the state by 54,000. Then the dries waited two years, and in 1917, they submitted prohibition the third time, and the wets carried it by 2,000. There were three elections asked by the dries and won by the wets, but by decreasing majorities—84,000, 54,000, 2,000. And then in 1918, the dries submitted it the fourth time, and dries won by 25,000 majority. But just about this time the war ended, and the wets demanded another election, so that the soldiers could vote. Anyone who went into the state would have supposed that all the soldiers came home for was to vote to bring the saloon back. All over the state the wets were talking about the soldiers' eagerness for a chance to vote on this subject. And so they had another election in 1919; and after "the boys" got home and had a chance to vote, prohibition carried by 40,000 instead of 25,000. Having retained prohibition by 40,000, the dries secured an enforcement law, and the wets insisted that there should be still another vote, and under the referendum they had a right to it. So last fall, the last election we have had, they voted dry by 200,000 majority in Ohio.

Now, this is the record: Three elections when the wets won by decreasing majorities; three elections when the dries won by increasing majorities. But for fear somebody may tell you after I am gone why they had 200,000 the last time, I will tell you now. The women voted the last time. But what consolation is that to a wet? They are going to vote hereafter.

In Michigan, the state went dry by 67,000 majority; it went dry in 1916 and then the wets, after a couple of years, demanded an election to bring wine and beer back. Some of you may imagine that wine and beer are stronger than whisky. I want to say to you that, so far as I have been able to discover, the old-fashioned saloon, with a gambling house above and a disorderly house near, is more popular in this country than wine and beer alone. Wherever we have had a chance to test it, the wine and beer proposition has not been as strong as the old saloon itself. This was the case in Michigan. The dries had carried it by 67,000 for complete prohibition, and then wine and beer were defeated by over 200,000; only one county in Michigan voted to let wine and beer come back. Any man who thinks the liquor traffic can be brought back with the women voting, when we drove it out

with only the men voting, does not know much about politics in this country.

But to show you, my friends, that the woman vote is not the only reason for the rejection of wine and beer, let me call your attention to Colorado. When Colorado went dry in 1914, Denver voted 10,000 against state prohibition; after they had it a year, the wets submitted an amendment for beer alone, and Denver, after one year's experience under total prohibition, voted 14,000 against beer coming back into the state of Colorado. The women voted both times.

No, there is going to be no invitation to wine and beer to come back; for twenty-five years the brewery has been a more corrupting influence in this country even than the distillery. There was never any thought of separating beer from whisky until prohibition was adopted and then, as an afterthought, they said, "If you will just separate beer from whisky; beer can come back." No, my friends, the brewery and distillery have been partners in crime all these years. They have been co-conspirators against everything high and holy, and now, as they approach the end of their criminal careers, it would be cruel to separate these boon companions; they must die together and be buried in the same grave.

I call attention to another fact. New Jersey had a governor, Edwards, a Democrat, who was wet, soaking wet, and he was so proud of what he did in keeping New Jersey from endorsing national prohibition, that he became a candidate before the Democratic National Convention a year ago. When I shut my eyes I can now see his banner on the gallery, "Governor Edwards, of New Jersey, Emancipator." But he did not emancipate. And last fall his state went 300,000 against his party and the party pledged to enforcement. The new legislature passed an enforcement law over his veto, and New Jersey now stands back of the federal government in the enforcement of prohibition. The last I heard of Edwards, he was putting a bottle of whisky in the cornerstone of a bank. Visitors, it means something when a man like Edwards has to hide his whisky in a cornerstone.

Now, my friends, I have tried briefly to give you something of the history of this fight. I had no expectation, as I said, of seeing these things come in my lifetime. But now I am so sanguine that although I am sixty-one, I expect to live to see the day when there will not be an open saloon under the flag of any civilized nation in the world. Look at what is going on about us. Am I correctly informed when I say that in Scotland they were never able to vote directly on this subject until last fall? Is that true? (A voice: "Yes.") Last fall, at the first election, nearly a third of the votes cast in Scotland were for prohibition. Think of it, my friends! Where in this country did we do so well when we began? Think of Scotland with one-third voting for prohibition on the first trial that they had there? I read only a few days ago a publication by the committee that has prohibition in charge in Great Britain, and what was it? They gave the facts to show that Great Britain is spending two billions and a half a year on intoxicating liquor, and suggested that Great Britain could soon pay all she owes if she spent her money in paying her debts, instead of intoxicating her people. Our nation was spending two and half billions for intoxicants ten years ago. A few weeks ago a committee in Germany gave out figures to show that the amount spent in Germany on intoxicating liquor is one-third as much as she spends on the indemnities that grew out of the war. The world will soon understand that the people cannot afford to squander their money on intoxicating liquor. More than that, we will give such testimony before the world as will shake the strongholds of John Barleycorn. The example of this nation will be an unanswerable argument in favor of the abolition of the saloon.

The wiping out of liquor in a community increases the number of those who can go to school. When this is understood, what nation that prizes education can oppose the elimination of alcohol? When your teachers come over here and see what is going on in this country, they will go back and make their appeal to the intellectuals of all lands. When your masters of industry come and see our men going to and from their work without the evidences of intoxication, and using their incomes for the benefit of their families and for the uplifting of their class, they will go back home and say: "A drunken Europe cannot compete with a sober America; we must sober up in order to compete." When your ministers come over here and see what our churches have done they will go back to become leaders in the cause of world prohibition.

The physicians have recently discovered a remedy for typhoid fever. Twenty-three years ago, in our little war with Spain hundreds died of typhoid fever, although our army only amounted

to about 200,000. Twenty-seven members of my regiment died of typhoid fever in that brief war. But now we have a remedy, and it is so complete that, in the late war, of nearly a million men who reached the battle line in France not one American soldier died of typhoid fever, and only 125 out of four million called to the colors. Is it not a wonderful remedy? Total abstinence is like that remedy. That remedy gives immunity from disease; total abstinence gives immunity from the evils of alcohol—no total abstainer ever becomes a drunkard.

But we have found another remedy in the last few years—the remedy for yellow fever. They found that the mosquito carried the germ of the disease, and then they destroyed the breeding place of the mosquito and made the tropics habitable. This enabled our country to add the Panama Canal to its great achievements. We could never have done it without that remedy. We now have a remedy for alcohol that is like the remedy for yellow fever. We found that it was the saloon that carried the germ of alcoholism, and prohibition destroys the breeding place of the germ. The world will be saved by total abstinence and prohibition.

There is only one thing that, to my mind, compares with prohibition as a world benefit, and that is the abolition of war. Here are twin enemies of the home; alcohol brings the husband, the father and the son down to a drunkard's grave, and war sacrifices the husband, father and son on the altar of Mars. In proportion as the governments become representative, in proportion as the people speak through them, it becomes important that sober people shall control the governments. I would combine these two great reforms and back of both I would put the Christian church. It will save mankind from the curse of alcohol and from the ruinous waste of war. Back of both reforms we have the authority of the Book of Books.

I thank you for your attention.

MAN SHOULD HAVE ALL HE EARNS

Mr. Bryan is of the opinion that a man should have all he earns, but no more, since an excess necessarily deprives some other person of his just earnings. He fully believes that men often earn as much as five hundred million dollars in a life time, and he cites as proof the efforts of Lincoln and our great men of science and invention. But Mr. Bryan further states that these men who have honestly and honorably earned five hundred million dollars each have been so busily engaged in earning that they have not had time to collect it. On the other hand, he states that those who have collected five hundred million dollars each have been so busily engaged in collecting that they have not had time to earn what they have collected! This little statement from Mr. Bryan will bear many readings.—Altamont, Ill., News.

THANK GOD FOR PRESIDENT HARDING'S SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

Rev. Dr. Charles S. Stevens of the First Presbyterian church, Chicago, in his sermon Sunday, June, 12th, 1921, praised President Harding for his Sunday observance platform. The preacher said: "President Harding by his refusal to join his golf cabinet on the links on Sundays has set an example for the American people to follow. He has shown that he remembers the Sabbath day to keep it holy."—Ex.

THE STATE OF MIND

If you think you are beaten, you are.
If you think that you dare not, you don't.
If you like to win, but think that you can't
It's almost a "cinch" you won't.
If you think you'll lose, you've lost.
For out in the world, you find,
Success begins with a fellow's will—
It's all in the state of mind.

Full many a race is lost
Ere even a step is run,
And many a coward fails
Ere even his work's begun.
Think big, and your deeds will grow.
Think small, and you'll fall behind.
Think that you can and you will—
It's all in the state of mind.

If you think you are outclassed, you are;
You've got to think high to rise;
You've got to be sure of yourself, before
You can ever win a prize.
Life's battles don't always go
To the stronger or faster man,
But soon or late the man who wins
Is the fellow who thinks he can.

Author Unknown.