

LOWER HOUSE OF CONGRESS VOTES TO SHIFT DRY DEPT

Not a Vote Against Changing Prohibition Unit to Department of Justice

MANY BILLS PENDING

Wet Leaders are Long on Noise and Proposals But are Short When it Comes to Votes in Congress

The lower House of Congress passed, without a record vote and without opposition, the administration measure to take the Federal Prohibition Department from the control of the Secretary of Treasury and place it under the Attorney General. The public and the enforcement officers have felt for some time the change should be made, and Attorney General Mitchell, a firm friend of prohibition, will now reorganize the department and make it more effective.

The measure will now go to the Senate where action will be delayed until that body has threshed out the tariff question.

The House Judiciary Committee is now holding hearings on some of the numerous measures introduced by the wets. It seems to be the general impression in Washington that aside from the bill changing the Prohibition Department to the Department of Justice, about the only action which will be taken on any of the wet measures will be on one of the numerous proposals of the wets to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. Dries, it is said, will bring the proposal to repeal to a vote—something wets did not foresee, as the introduction was just to show the wets of the country that wet leaders in Congress are doing something. These leaders thought the proposal would be smothered in committee.

WETS CANNOT WIN

The repeal proposal must have a two-thirds vote in both Senate and House and then it must be concurred in by three-fourths of the states. No dry or wet believes such a majority possible, but dries in Congress are ready to vote on the resolution and administer a smashing defeat.

The following Joint House resolutions are before the Judiciary Committee of that body and will be considered, and there will be enough oratory at the hearings to relieve the lungs and feelings of wet leaders.

By La Guardia, of New York—A constitutional amendment giving Congress control of the liquor traffic, the states the right to fix the alcoholic content of beverages.

By Cochran, of Missouri—"The Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

By Sabath, of Illinois—Giving Congress power to govern the manufacture, transportation, and sale of liquors under government permits and in packages.

By Clancy, of Michigan—"The Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

By Igoe, of Illinois—"That on and after the date of the passage of this resolution the national prohibition act, as amended, is hereby repealed."

By Mrs. Mary T. Norton, New Jersey—Providing for a national referendum on the question of repealing the Eighteenth Amendment.

Another proposal which will bring out a lot of wet oratory is that of Congressman Dyer, of Missouri, who has introduced a measure to legalize 2.75 per cent beer. Dyer will have an array of wets back of this proposal who will try to make the members and the country believe that 2.75 per cent beer is not intoxicating. Of course, this measure will be defeated if it ever comes to a vote in Congress.

DOYLE WANTS BEER

Congressman T. A. Doyle, of Chicago, has introduced a bill to allow beer with alcoholic content up to 5 per cent in those states which, by referendum, so defined intoxicating liquor. Doyle's bill is entitled: "An act to prevent open conflict between state and Federal officers and to allay the present unrest of labor in every state of the Union."

GERMANY MOVES AGAINST DRINKING

The first definite attempt to wards the control of liquor drinking in Germany was taken by the economic committee of the Reichstag, that country's legislative body. The committee voted to proportion the saloons of Germany on the basis of one saloon to each four hundred inhabitants. Should this movement become a law, several thousand saloons of Germany will close. Economic reasons are at the bottom of the movement.

BEFORE PROHIBITION

Proof That Bootleggers are the Product of Booze, Not of Prohibition

How often is the claim made that prohibition causes speakeasies and bootleggers and that bootleggers are friends of the dry law? The uninformed is given the impression that bootleggers and blind tigers were unknown before prohibition. Right here in Ohio, there are persons who recall that a few years ago when the late Frank B. Willis was governor, he was waited on by a delegation of Cleveland saloonkeepers asking protection from the illicit seller of liquor.

At that time, Cleveland had 1,800 to 2,000 saloons and the committee of saloonkeepers declared that city had as many speakeasies as saloons paying the one thousand dollar yearly tax. They wanted protection from these speakeasies as well as from a horde of bootleggers.

So there were illicit sellers then as now and there were buyers of illicit booze then as now. What was true of Cleveland was true of every other city and town in Ohio and other states as well. Note the follow-

ing from a Pennsylvania paper, quoted from a newspaper in that state 30 years ago:

"According to a statement made November 15, 1900, by the Retail Liquor Dealers Association of Pittsburgh, there were 2,300 speakeasies in that city at that time. There were also 1,047 licensed dealers, making 3,300 in all."

PROHIBITION CHANGES

Some of Them Are Noticeable Even in New York City

O. O. McIntyre, the well-known New York newspaper columnist and who formerly lived in Gallipolis, tells in the following humorous paragraph the great changes in New York caused by prohibition:

Where the Knickerbocker Hotel bar stood fifteen years ago is a drug store. In the old bar one thirsty noontime I recall receiving a bartender's scowl for asking for a lemonade. The other day in about the same spot I asked for a lemonade and received a soda jerker's smile. And yet there are those who say prohibition has made no changes.

FEDERAL COURTS BUSY

Federal enforcement officers and Federal courts in the West and Southwest are busy these days in bringing to justice dry law violators. In Oklahoma City, the Federal Court is faced by 102 persons while 300 more are under indictment in sections of Idaho, Texas and Wyoming. These defendants include a number of local officials and ex-officials. In Idaho, one Federal court assessed fines totaling \$18,500 and prison sentences aggregating 29 years.

You know the sale and consumption of liquor in your neighborhood is less now than ever before, and this is true in nearly every other community.

THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE

Recent Meeting in Detroit Calls Out Some Complimentary Comment From the Country's Leading Religious Daily Newspapers

(The Christian Science Monitor)

The members and supporters of the Anti-Saloon League, which has just concluded its convention at Detroit, have every reason for satisfaction with the work accomplished by that body and for confidence in its future activities. In the savage assault of the forces of liquor upon the prohibition law, this League has had to bear the brunt of the conflict. During the struggle to assure the adoption of the prohibition amendment it was the political arm of the temperance movement in the United States, and as such was exposed to the slings and arrows of all the forces that rallied to the support of the saloon. There have been bitter things said about the Anti-Saloon League, and they are still being said. There have been on occasions errors committed by individuals associated with that organization which have seemed to justify criticism and which have been only too eagerly seized upon by its foes. But as matters now stand, the Anti-Saloon League holds the proud position of having been the organization which led the campaign for prohibition in the United States, and which has been its unflinching and militant defender since that policy was enacted.

Perhaps the best phrase relative to the purposes of the League was that used by its attorney, Edward B. Dunford, at Detroit, last Saturday:

"The Anti-Saloon League is neither dictator nor detective, but is the organized determination of millions of Americans to solve social problems growing out of beverage intoxicants. It does not attempt to usurp governmental functions, but operates by the formation of public opinion to achieve the enforcement of law through constituted authorities."

No political issue can receive form and effect, and status as law, without its systematic advocacy by some organization. This duty has fallen to the Anti-Saloon League. Many of its best and most loyal members believed that its end was fully attained when prohibition was written into

the Constitution of the United States, and its method of administration fixed by law. They underestimated the tremendous power of the foes arrayed against them. They failed to make allowance for the persistence of a depraved appetite, and for the determination of individuals seeking profit to find it in catering to that appetite. They did not recognize the fact that just precisely as American prohibition through methods of local option failed, because distillers and brewers in wet states of the Union corruptly and criminally invaded neighboring states, the citizens of which desired to keep them dry, so national prohibition in the United States now suffers from the attacks of the distillers and brewers and wine makers of foreign lands.

It is an evidence both of the devotion and of the intelligence of the managers of the Anti-Saloon League that at their Detroit meeting much stress was laid upon the necessity for taking up again the work of education in the evils of the liquor traffic and of intemperance. It was a long, vigorous and devoted campaign along educational lines that brought the people of the United States to the point of demanding prohibition. Since the Eighteenth Amendment was enacted a new generation has come upon the field, and youth is pressing forward, recognizing existing evils, but wholly uninformed as to the greater measure of poverty, dissipation, and vice that attended the license system to which prohibition put an end. It was rightly said at Detroit that this work of education must be begun de novo; that these young minds must be educated as were the minds of their parents, and their grandparents. It is no slight task, but those who understand how it is to be discharged are ready for the undertaking. They have put their shoulders to the wheel, their hands to the plow, and there will be no turning back. They deserve the support of an American people determined to maintain the sobriety of their nation against the assault of the friends of liquor, whether domestic or alien.

WIND STORM IN WASHINGTON OVER PROHIBITION QUESTION

Hearings on Before the Judiciary Committee of the Lower House of Congress

WETS HAVE INNING

Usual Clamor, But Arguing on Nothing Except That They Want Booze and are as Certain as Dries They Will Fail to Get it

Congressional hearings on proposed wet measures pending in Congress are now on before the House Judiciary Committee, presided over by Congressman Graham, a Pennsylvania wet. For the first time in ten years, the bars are down and both wets and dries will be heard. Wets have the first inning and they are crowding the committee room with their usual clamor and noise, demanding either straight-out repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment or the modification of the Volstead act—anything which will destroy prohibition and bring back booze.

And most of the wets say they do not want saloons back, but at the same time they argue for the sale of liquor in some form. They declare the dry law a failure and that it cannot be enforced. They complain about what they call "intolerable conditions," and point to the number of arrests and the cost of enforcement. They want state option, government control or anything under which liquor may be secured. There is much talk about personal liberty and the rights of the people to secure and consume liquor.

CLAIM OF ONE WITNESS

One witness, a writer for a magazine as wet as the *Brewers' Journal*, told what he claimed he found in his trip over the country. Liquor for sale everywhere—in the driest sections and easily procured. He told the "exact" number of bootleggers and speakeasies in Washington, Detroit and other cities, the "exact" amount of liquor-consumed and the "exact" cost. He discovered liquor parties attended by mayors, commissioners and judges and the corruption among officials.

The story told the committee was on a par with wet tales published in wet newspapers, but without any proofs of their truthfulness. It was the usual wet ranting, nothing more.

He was followed by former Senator Bruce, of Maryland, Congresswoman Norton, of New Jersey, Mrs. Sabin, of New York, head of the Woman's Committee for Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and others. All of them want modification or repeal and the legalizing of liquor in some form. They are not agreed on the form, but are running about in circles as wets have been doing for the past ten years.

DRYS WILL BE HEARD

Drys will be heard later by the committee and then the committee, which is dry, will reject all the wet measures except perhaps a measure for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. That may be reported out and voted on AND KILLED. The committee hearing was merely an opportunity for wets to blow off steam. It will not get them anything.

Methods of wets in seeking a change in the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead act are, for the most part, "disloyal and un-American," so says the executive committee of the national conference of organizations supporting the Eighteenth Amendment.

The charge was part of a "statement of facts and principles" issued by the executive committee of 29 dry organizations, including the Anti-Saloon League, after a conference in Washington. They said they had "just begun to fight."

Pointing to recent modification proposals, the statement said:

"We cheerfully concur in the sentiment expressed by the President that every citizen has a perfect right to agitate and move for repeal of any part of the Constitution in a frank and open manner.

"But to seek the repeal of laws enacted to make the Constitution operative, or to seek so to modify such laws that they would allow what the Constitution itself forbids, is nullification by indirection which no loyal American will tolerate."