

THE "WETS" AND "DRYS"

Have a Lively Discussion in the Old Town.

Last Sunday afternoon there was a lively debate in the Opera House in this city between the "drys" and the "wets," which drew a full house. Numerically, the "drys" outnumbered the "wets," also in enthusiasm, still showing that there are a large number of citizens who will vote in November to keep the county in the "dry" column, as well as vote for state wide prohibition. The speakers were Hon. Sydney Clarke for the "wets" and Dr. Wilson for the "drys," and from what we can gather, quite a number of the "wets" admit that they came out the little end of the horn, and for that reason this is liable to be the last time in this election when the "wets" and the "drys" will divide time in a public debate. There are some, however, amongst the "wets" who think their side put up the best argument. One thing is sure, though, most persons who attended the meeting on Sunday had their minds made up one way or the other. We give below a full report, which gives both sides of the controversy:

Sidney Storey's Address.

SIDNEY STOREY, representing the Greater Oregon Home Rule Association, introduced by Mayor Coates, spoke as follows: Fellow Citizens: It affords me great pleasure to see such an intelligent audience composed of so many ladies. I am here to discuss the question on which the voters of this State will cast an intelligent ballot on November 8th. My friends I come not here to appeal to your emotions; I come not here to appeal to your religious passions or prejudices; I come here as an American citizen to submit to your intelligent consideration vital facts and figures which will enable you on November 8th in this great state of Oregon to decide by your ballot as to whether or not you want here state wide prohibition, which prohibits the sale and manufacture of spirituous liquors within the state of Oregon, or whether you prefer to remain as you are under the local option law of your State, or whether you prefer as I shall point out to you, to have home rule and self government, which will give to each town and municipality the right to prescribe its own conduct.

Now my friends, I do not belong to that class of Americans that says: Because you differ from me; you are not entitled to a free expression of your views or of your opinions. Now, there is a school that says that the Prohibitionist—the rank and file of the whole business are a lot of fanatics. I do not stand in that category. I say that the prohibition element of this country, of this great United States, is composed, the majority of them, of the best element of our citizenship, both men and women. (Applause) They are striving, and have been for years past, to solve a problem in our economies. They have tried for the past 50 years, and the remedy, as I shall proceed to prove to you, does not cure, and that is the reason that I am arrayed against the subject of Prohibition. There is nothing so disgusting to the sight of man as a drunkard, a moral weakling who debases and debauches his being and disgraces himself, and has not the moral courage to know a thing is made for use and not for abuse, who brings disgrace upon himself and his family. He is lower than a coward—he is a villain. But while I agree with you on that, I say that Prohibition is not the cure for that man, and Prohibition is lawlessness that follows in the wake of prohibition.

Now, I shall rapidly review with you the history of prohibition in America, because time does not permit me to dwell lengthily upon it. I had intended to appear upon this platform for the purpose of making an argument upon this question that would have taken fully two hours to encompass, but at the suggestion of the learned and distinguished gentleman with whom I have the honor to appear on this platform (Clarence True Wilson) we have agreed that the two meetings shall be combined into one, and I was only too glad of the opportunity afforded me of appearing before those who possibly might be of a contrary opinion.

Now my fellow citizens, I want to tell you that prohibition in America has been a total failure. Take the State of Maine. Here is a state that has had prohibition since 1860. In that state lawlessness and drunkenness and crime have been rampant for all these years, and the good people have been trying to strike off and ward off prohibition during all these years, but they have been unable to do so because the bad party of that state was weakly to the prohibition idea, and together with other good measures they combined, and the result was that the good, intelligent people of that state were unable to throw off prohibition. No man will deny but that liquor has been sold in the state of Maine ad libitum, for all these years. As you got off the train at the railway station, you would meet the little boy or little girl who would lead you to a kitchen bar-room. The clerk at the hotel, as you registered, would wink his eye, and tell you if you needed anything, all you would have to do would be to go to room 22. Or, take the man on the street with the walking cane. That cane was hollow, and inside was spirituous liquor; and if you went to a man's drawing room even, there was an album on the table, and all he had to do was to touch the spring, and there sprang forth the bottle of whiskey. Was that prohibition? Did prohibition prohibit? Not at all, but the census of our country, the reports of the Government, show that Maine has more drunkenness per capita than any other state in the Union. That has been the history of Maine, and that is the reason why the republican majority of that state (since 1890 she has been republican) has been lowered every year. Two years ago the republicans carried by only 7000

majority, and yet even then they would not heed the warning, until recently the democratic nominee of that state stood upon a platform that pledged itself to repeal the prohibition law, and re-submit the question to the people. The democratic ticket was elected; and that has been the "prohibition" history of Maine for the last 50 years.

Let us pass to Alabama. Prohibition does not prohibit. If it did, my God, the prohibitionists would have a foundation to stand on, perhaps, altho it might be wrong in principle; but there is no man or woman in this country who can prove to you that in any community of our country or in the world, prohibition has ever prohibited. Take, I say, the State of Alabama. She has tried it. Yet prohibition has brought in its train in that state increased lawlessness, more drunkenness, more fights, and more corruption than your imagination can scarce up,—so much so that recently Governor O'Neil has been nominated by a democratic primary, which means an election, and that the Governor is pledged to repeal all the prohibition laws that have been enacted, if elected in Alabama. Birmingham has been a cess pool of crime; the public schools have been closed; the treasury has been bankrupt; she has had to pay police and fire department in city scrips, and even their local banks would not cash them. Mobile has had to close a great portion of her schools. Alabama confronts a deficit in her state treasury, and is unable to float bonds in the financial markets, and the people are so tired and disgusted with prohibition that they have elected O'Neil, and are going to repeal the prohibition law, because they do not prohibit, and they are going to adopt the Model License Law, which is the only cure for the saloon and drunkenness.

They say Atlanta is a prohibition city. Last year they had 200 arrests for drunkenness. Take a city like Denver in the state of Colorado, which is a license city, and with 225,000 population as against Atlanta with 125,000, they had only 2000 arrested for drunkenness in all Denver. Talk about your whiskey and beer and "near beer." (Laughter) The only distinction between "near beer" and the real beer is simply in the label yet these are the conditions that prevail in Atlanta, and the whiskey bill of Atlanta per week averages a quarter million dollars, and that is substantially the improvements and extensions made by the express companies in order to provide facilities for the receiving of whiskey that comes from other states. In Savannah, Georgia the saloons are run wide open in defiance of law. Go to Memphis, Tennessee, and you will find there at any day, in this prohibition state, the saloons are wide open and run in defiance of law and decency. Why? Because you cannot enforce a prohibition law in this country because it is against healthy public sentiment, and you cannot enforce a law in this nation against the sentiment of the people, because the people are sovereign, any more than you can enforce in New Jersey what would be blasphemy in Chicago or in Turkey or in some other place. You cannot enforce laws which are against public sentiment, I say, and I want to tell you, to show you the sentiment that exists against prohibitive legislation in this country. In North Carolina at a recent election, the people voted and elected a ticket; the nominees were all anti-prohibitionists. The same can be said of the state of Michigan, the same can be said of many other states, all of which shows that the people of this country are absolutely opposed to prohibitive legislation because it does not prohibit. I want to tell you about my own state. In 1908 in Louisiana we had possibly the most disgusting condition that ever prevailed in this country. The saloons were run wide open, not only in New Orleans, but every town and village in the state; gambling was going on galore, and every one carried a six-shooter, so to speak, and the prohibitionists took the cue, and said that the state ought to come under prohibition system, but our people realized this, and benefitting and guiding themselves by other states, came to the conclusion that prohibition was not the remedy, and after a hard fight, went to work and adopted the Model License legislation, and ever since they adopted the right kind of Model License legislation we have eliminated vice and drunkenness and lawlessness, and every body was pleased, until last spring when our legislature was in session, the rabid element of the Anti-Saloon League went to the legislature and tried to get a bill passed to bring about state wide prohibition and the broad element of that party went to the capital and said: "We will have none of it because there is a bill passed that eliminated the evils we are crying against, and we do not want prohibi-

tory laws, and want to have the license system legislation remain in effect. I was in Denver last year in May, and there we had a fight on hand for state wide prohibition; and to make a long story short (as I have only 30 minutes in which to speak) I desire to say to you that the women of Denver (for the women vote in Colorado), together with the men of Denver, voted against that proposition, and on the 17th day of May of this year the city of Denver went against prohibition by 17,000 majority. Why? Because the women, whom it is said are often arrayed with prohibition, and it is claimed by these people that they naturally did not vote with the prohibition party, did not so vote in this instance, because the women of Denver went to the meetings just as you have come here today, and listened to both sides of the question, and the result was that they voted against this iniquitous law, as I am sure the women of Tillamook will advise their husbands to do.

To show you how much prohibition is gaining in this country, last April 7 cities in Illinois went wet; twelve of them had been dry for two or three years and they went back, why? because they found that prohibition was a failure and a farce, and did not prohibit, and was not a cure. In the city of Chicago the bill was re-submitted to a vote because the petition drawn up by the preachers with 75,000 signatures was thrown out because these sanctified gentlemen, it had been shown, had 25,000 that were absolutely fraudulent. I am passing rapidly, and come to the state of Nebraska, and there they have local option, and our man Billie Bryan is in favor of local option, and not prohibition, and Nebraska has absolutely repudiated prohibition, as you will know if you have kept informed by reading the papers.

In Texas they had a recent election, and the nominee of the successful party in that state, which is the democratic party, was elected by over 20,000 majority—or rather he was nominated at the Primary, which is equivalent to an election in that state. All of which shows that the wave of prohibition, instead of gaining strength, on the contrary is receding. Why? Because the intelligent business men of America are beginning to understand, to see, that prohibition is against liberty and conscience, and that it is a disastrous failure from every standpoint, and has wrought economic disaster all over this country. In the beginning it was laughed at as a huge joke and no one paid any attention to it, and then it gained an impetus and it marched on, and when the people of America began to realize the ruinous and disastrous effects which prohibition wrought, they got together, and the business men of America are getting together for the purpose of solving this problem because they know the saloon men cannot solve it, the prohibitionists cannot solve it, and the common sense people of America are getting together for the purpose of solving this problem as in the states of Maine, Alabama, Georgia, etc., and as they are going to do in the state of Oregon on Nov. 8. Why should the people of this state want to destroy all these helpful industries—why should they want to destroy the industries created and represented by the people of free America? Well now, gentlemen, I want to tell you, my friends, that in all this agitation (I have got to just gallop over this for want of time) there is surely a nigger in the woodpile and I will show him to you. He is behind all this political question, the most gigantic political question that has ever presented itself to the minds of the American people. Now, the rank and file of the prohibition party and the good men and women of this country (some even in the pulpits of churches) that are preaching prohibition are preaching it—why? Not because they want to obtain the best for the human race, but they are simply little tools in the hands of the most powerful temperance organization ever instituted in this country, and behind all this movement is the National Anti-Saloon League of America. Let me tell you of this organization and what, under the laws of our country they seek. What is their business? Simply to preach this doctrine for the purpose of acquiring political power. Now, let me tell you, when Judge Landis of Chicago about a year or two ago fined the Standard Oil Co. people twenty-nine million dollars, the Standard Oil people laughed at the idea, but let me tell you, shortly thereafter the newspapers and magazines of this country began to write about the Standard Oil octopus and all others that have been feeding upon the blood of the American people for the last quarter of a century, and these people were very much disturbed, and it didn't take them long to find out that the American people are a people that have got to ride a hobby,—got to have some iam to feed upon,—some iam to feed upon! and some one said, "I have got it! a prohibition law, and the result is that Mr. John D. Rockefeller (and it has never been denied and can be proven) contributed five hundred thousand dollars for the purpose of diverting their mind from the real issues; and if they, our prohibition friends, achieve political power, you will find them where? In the cellar. What are they driving at? To acquire political power in the state of Oregon? No. They are after National power, that is what they are after, and instead of going by the byways and going to the great industrial centers of America if they are so much concerned and engaged in the holy cause of saving people from crime and de-wa-cheries, why don't they go to those great industrial centers of our country where men and women and good boys and good girls are employed at starvation wages, which leads them to crime and sin and shame? Why don't they go there and reach out and lift them up? Oh, no, that is to hard; the other is easy, that is the reason; and I tell you they are engaged in getting political power. They have launched this crusade, and say: "We want state wide prohibition" and if they get that (which they never will) they will say: "We want National prohibition." Why? Because they want to destroy all the industries in our country that represent three billion dollars of property,—these industries that put three billion dollars into the hands of the American people, to be used for the necessities of life. They would wipe out the enormous sum that these industries put into the hands of labor, not only to feed the people but to support ten million women and children depending on the labor of these

men,—that is what they want to destroy. Now don't you think these people have a right to defend their property? Say! Let me show you—don't you know that property rights is the basic foundation of society and government? Not that the dollar should be above brains, the energy and the ambition of men, and it is the basic foundation of society, and altho some of them say: that is the "root of all evil," still I never saw any of them yet that would give up any of the "evil". (Cheers)

Dr. Wilson's Address.

Rev. Clarence True Wilson, representing the National Anti Saloon League, introduced by Chairman Goyno, spoke as follows: I want to congratulate my friend Mr. Storey on having made the ablest and kindest speech that can be made on the wrong side of this subject. (Laughter and applause.) If this contest were just between the ability of speakers, I would give it up now, but this is a question of right and wrong, and feeling that there is but one right side of this cause, I know that you will be with me. (Applause.)

The one contention of this address has been that prohibition does not prohibit, but I am not going now to Maine or to Alabama, or to Georgia or Tennessee or anywhere else so far away from home. I will take Oregon, Portland, Tillamook and the rest of our towns, and will ask—since the saloons have been closed on Sunday, is there any man who thinks that any more liquor is sold and drunk on Sunday than the other six days of the week? Nobody thinks so. We close our saloons on election day; more liquor than we did the day before or the day after? There is not a man in Oregon that thinks so, but those are the days—election and Sundays—when we try prohibition in Oregon, and it works out in every town and county in the state. Moreover, since our splendid local option law went into effect (and I am going to confine myself to Oregon)—since this law went into effect, we have closed the saloons in twenty-one whole counties and 83 different precincts in the remaining wet counties. In some of the counties and precincts the law is absolutely in force, but in some, notably in Tillamook, it is not so well enforced; but even where it is not enforced, there is a bottle and a keg occasionally sold where you would have had five or six or seven saloons running wide open all the time under the other system, and one place selling liquor socially, and I don't know where to find it and you don't, but they point to that as if were worse than having a half dozen saloons turning your boys and girls into drunkards and worse, and dragging them down, down to God only knows where. There is not the hundredth part of the liquor now sold in your county that there would be under the "Model License Law" system which you hear about.

My friends, the State of Oregon was founded by missionaries of the Cross when there were only about 300 people in all the Oregon country, including what is now Oregon, Washington, Montana and Idaho; they got together and adopted prohibition, and we have copied their old amendment word for word, for the new amendment on which we vote this year. In Oregon we have more colleges in proportion to our population than any other state in the American Union—this land of schools and churches and homes. We could build up here consequently a high moral civilization if it were not for a frowning fortress of perdition bring into our lines all the time, undoing the work of our homes, schools and churches, and dragging down the four corners of our civilization—business impurity, Sabbath observance, temperance in the habits of the people. There is the saloon element in Portland standing at its center; we have the gambling mania being bred, Sabbath desecration, impurity in the social life and hosts of saloons, all upheld by the saloon element, and have drunkards and drunkenness everywhere; but we are coming to a contest on November 8th with this great evil.

I want to make one thing clear here this afternoon. The former speaker referred to the liquor traffic business. I want to say to you what Roosevelt said to the people of New York when he was Police Commissioner. He said: "Your trade is not like any other business, and it cannot be treated like any other business. Your traffic tends to breed lawlessness in the population at large and anarchy among the saloon-keepers themselves; you have got to obey the law." But the liquor traffic, from the running of the bootlegging establishment and "blind pigs" to the saloon and distillery, is not a business at all, and it has no right to claim any immunity as a business. Let me call your attention to three things: All human activities are divided into three classes, namely, business, charity, crime, these three and no more.

What is business? Selling so much commodity for so much profit. We will say certain material costs 2 cents and the manufacturing price is 3 cents and I sell it for 8 cents; 5 cents goes for stock and 3 cents for profit. I have the profit, the manufacturer has his pay and you have the goods to show for it; that is business. Suppose that you are poor and you need it, and I am charitable and give it to you,—is that business? No, it is charity; it is the same commodity without any profit, but business is so much commodity with a reasonable profit. But crime is the contrivance to get the profit without giving the commodity. Take gambling. A man goes into a place and expects to get something for nothing, or else he gets nothing for something. If he gets something for nothing he is a thief, and if he gets nothing for something he is a

fool! But is that charity? No! Is it a business transaction? No! Is it a crime? Yes! The Supreme Court of every state in the Union has so declared it, and the Supreme Court of our United States has so declared it, and under that decision even the Louisiana lottery, from which state our friend Storey comes, had to go down before the rising tide of Christian civilization, because this nation says: We will not be in partnership with crime. (Prolonged applause.) And just as gambling went down before its advance, and as slavery went down before the red tide of war, and prize fighting went down,—because they were not business but crime,—so I believe, my friends, that sooner or later, in your time and mine, the whole legalized liquor traffic, by which we turn men into drunkards and blight the whole face and fabric of human society, is going down because Christian civilization is going up. (Applause.)

When a man goes into a saloon and puts down the price of a drink he gets no adequate value for the money expended. If he spends it in the grocery store he has food on his table; if at the dry goods store he walks out with a good suit of clothes; if at the carriage painter's, his buggy shines in the street; if at the milliner's, his wife is well dressed; and if spent at the butcher's, he has something to show for it; but he can spend his money over the saloon bar for fifty years and has nothing to show for it but a red nose. (Applause.) Taking a profit and giving no adequate return is a crime! Here, for instance, is a saloon and a butcher-shop and a shoe-shop. The saloon proposes to get 8 cents profit on every 10 cts. worth it sells, but the merchant is contented if he gets 2 cts. profit on every 10-cent sale. I believe in a square deal, but this principle is an outrage,—dealing in meat and shoes and groceries and the other necessities of life at one-tenth the profit of the rum-seller, and giving credit for much of that. (Not that the liquor seller gives any credit, oh no.) License that man to give a saloon city council of our cities to pass, and if that would not be a combination of Sodom and Gomorrah—and, yes, hell, in the State of Oregon, I would like to know what would. All the laws on the statute books restricting the liquor traffic would not apply to the cities. It would annul the Local Option Law as far as the cities are concerned. Take Yamhill County. Four-fifths of the taxpayers and four-fifths of the assessment is outside of the corporate limits of cities. If this bill passed, four-fifths of the voters would be disfranchised so far as the rum traffic is concerned; like Milwaukee used to be on the gambling question—set up a hole of horror and breed four-fifths of the crime and shame and misery, and make the honest men and women outside the city pay for the devilry that goes on in the cities. Towns are a part of their counties—counties are part of their states; you cannot separate them; they go up or down together. Portland is the metropolis of our state; the farmers helped make Portland what it is; they send their produce and money there; and every county has its metropolis, and they get together and make the criminal laws of the state, which are to be executed in town and country places alike. You see the point, and you will help us, gentlemen, to show under that bill which is brought to give rum rule in all of our cities.

Another thing, when in Santa Monica, we had up the question of saloons or none. A man running the biggest store in the town said he was against us because the grass would grow in the streets if they closed the saloons. I said: "Mr. Brown, you know I am to speak on temperance, and I know you will help." He said: "I am on the other side." I told him I intended to make the speech anyway and there were three things I wanted to know, how much business was lost in the past three years by bad debts; how many people on the list, and how many were drinkers? The next morning I found that he had lost in three years through unpaid bills and bad debts \$1180, by 55 different people. "And," he said, "one of them didn't drink a drop." (Laughter and applause.) I wanted to know who it was, and he told me it was a poor widow on the outside of the town who took in washings; she was living and she got sick and owed him \$10, and at that time she was doing washings because her husband five years before was killed in a drunken brawl. I said to this merchant: "You have lost in three years \$1170 by 54 different people, everyone of whom were spending their money over the bar for that which satisfeth not, and would be dear at any price, and robbing you of the necessities of life, how do you think those fellows are helping your business do you?" And he woke up at last to the fact that the liquor traffic is a leech upon every business industry in our country. If you should close every saloon in Portland Monday morning, there wouldn't be a beef steak left in the city by next Saturday night. If you were to pour out all the money which Portland spends over its saloon counters every year, and turn such money into the channels of honest trade such a wave business prosperity would come to that city as the business men have never dreamed of. The greatest waste is money squandered for that which satisfeth not, and does no one any good, over the bar rooms of the country. Our friend Storey says that prohibition does not prohibit. There is no one who dares stand up in this country, where the people rule and the laws are the expression of the people's thoughts, and where we elect our rulers, and say: Your laws cannot regulate our business. There is no one but saloon keepers and anarchists that do that. Here the voice of the people is the voice of God. We are forcing prohibition upon no one. We are putting it to the majority, and if the majority says that the liquor traffic is evil and only evil, that voice is going to be obeyed, and when the liquor traffic sends out a man to say that prohibition does not prohibit, what do they mean? They mean to say: "We will not obey the law"; and when any group of men say "We will not obey the American law," it is time the American people arose in the majesty of their manhood and said: "You will obey our laws or get out of this country." (Prolonged applause.) They will leave behind them the words of the poet:

"True patriots are we, have firmly stood; We leave this country for this country's good."

My friend said this is a wave that is going to recede. I wish it were true what he said about Rockefeller giving half a million dollars to the Anti Saloon League; the statement is absolutely incorrect, but I wish it were true for I think we could take the "taint" off and do a lot of good with it. The simple case is when we go to these towns we go by voluntary contribution that we pay to our traveling expense—because this is a reward for any town. Mr. Storey represents the more wealthy and powerful organization in Oregon today, the Greater Oregon Home Rule Association, and every man is supported by salaries paid by the Oregon Brewers and Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association, millionaires who have gotten their money on ill-gotten gains filched from the pockets of the poor. This is not a theory, you can illustrate all you please about "model license laws," without using logs, nor a gristmill without grain, nor a rock-crusher without rocks; and you cannot run saloons in Tillamook County or any other county without using up boys. To turn sawlogs into lumber and grain into flour may be a business, but to turn our school and church and home boys into drunkards is a festering crime that has got to stop! (Applause.)

Mr. Storey comes here to represent the Greater Oregon Home Rule Association, which has brought us a bill under the name of the Home Rule Bill for Cities. That bill says that all cities and corporate towns shall have the exclusive power to regulate, control, restrict, suppress or prohibit the liquor traffic within their corporate limits, and that means that all of our present restrictive laws, such as the law against selling liquor to minors, to girls, selling liquor on Sundays and election days, can all be annulled at one fell stroke if this amendment should pass, and every town and city in the State of Oregon would have no restrictive laws against the liquor traffic except what they could get the average city council of our cities to pass, and if that would not be a combination of Sodom and Gomorrah—and, yes, hell, in the State of Oregon, I would like to know what would. All the laws on the statute books restricting the liquor traffic would not apply to the cities. It would annul the Local Option Law as far as the cities are concerned. Take Yamhill County. Four-fifths of the taxpayers and four-fifths of the assessment is outside of the corporate limits of cities. If this bill passed, four-fifths of the voters would be disfranchised so far as the rum traffic is concerned; like Milwaukee used to be on the gambling question—set up a hole of horror and breed four-fifths of the crime and shame and misery, and make the honest men and women outside the city pay for the devilry that goes on in the cities. Towns are a part of their counties—counties are part of their states; you cannot separate them; they go up or down together. Portland is the metropolis of our state; the farmers helped make Portland what it is; they send their produce and money there; and every county has its metropolis, and they get together and make the criminal laws of the state, which are to be executed in town and country places alike. You see the point, and you will help us, gentlemen, to show under that bill which is brought to give rum rule in all of our cities.

Another thing, when in Santa Monica, we had up the question of saloons or none. A man running the biggest store in the town said he was against us because the grass would grow in the streets if they closed the saloons. I said: "Mr. Brown, you know I am to speak on temperance, and I know you will help." He said: "I am on the other side." I told him I intended to make the speech anyway and there were three things I wanted to know, how much business was lost in the past three years by bad debts; how many people on the list, and how many were drinkers? The next morning I found that he had lost in three years through unpaid bills and bad debts \$1180, by 55 different people. "And," he said, "one of them didn't drink a drop." (Laughter and applause.) I wanted to know who it was, and he told me it was a poor widow on the outside of the town who took in washings; she was living and she got sick and owed him \$10, and at that time she was doing washings because her husband five years before was killed in a drunken brawl. I said to this merchant: "You have lost in three years \$1170 by 54 different people, everyone of whom were spending their money over the bar for that which satisfeth not, and would be dear at any price, and robbing you of the necessities of life, how do you think those fellows are helping your business do you?" And he woke up at last to the fact that the liquor traffic is a leech upon every business industry in our country. If you should close every saloon in Portland Monday morning, there wouldn't be a beef steak left in the city by next Saturday night. If you were to pour out all the money which Portland spends over its saloon counters every year, and turn such money into the channels of honest trade such a wave business prosperity would come to that city as the business men have never dreamed of. The greatest waste is money squandered for that which satisfeth not, and does no one any good, over the bar rooms of the country. Our friend Storey says that prohibition does not prohibit. There is no one who dares stand up in this country, where the people rule and the laws are the expression of the people's thoughts, and where we elect our rulers, and say: Your laws cannot regulate our business. There is no one but saloon keepers and anarchists that do that. Here the voice of the people is the voice of God. We are forcing prohibition upon no one. We are putting it to the majority, and if the majority says that the liquor traffic is evil and only evil, that voice is going to be obeyed, and when the liquor traffic sends out a man to say that prohibition does not prohibit, what do they mean? They mean to say: "We will not obey the law"; and when any group of men say "We will not obey the American law," it is time the American people arose in the majesty of their manhood and said: "You will obey our laws or get out of this country." (Prolonged applause.) They will leave behind them the words of the poet: