

WHO SAYS SO!

Many and varied have been the opinions expressed as to the success or otherwise of Prohibition in the U.S.A. But the people who live in the country and under the much-discussed law are surely the best judges of its value. Nobody contends that the Prohibition Law is 100 per cent. enforced. But then neither is any other law? We have laws to regulate the sale of alcoholic beverages. Are they 100 per cent. enforced? Every country has tried to regulate the Liquor Traffic, and found it a failure. The U.S.A. has prohibited the manufacture, importation, or sale of alcohol. At the recent elections, after six years of Prohibition, the verdict of the people is, "Prohibition is better than Regulation."

Will doubters carefully study the following statement by the President of the World Prohibition Federation. Remember, as you read it, that this is the verdict of the only people who are qualified to give an opinion. They lived years under regulation, they have given prohibition a fair trial, and their verdict is for Prohibition.

Who would dare to place against such a verdict as this the wild statements of a Trade "which is fighting a law enacted by the people, a Trade which knows its only hope of saving itself from total extinction is to so discredit prohibition in the U.S.A. that other countries will be loath to adopt it. Surely, it's not hard to see the "nigger in their woodpile."

THE AMERICAN ELECTIONS AND PROHIBITION.

(By Guy Hayler, Hon. President, World Prohibition Federation).

The question of Prohibition, although not a main issue in the recent Congressional Elections in the United States, nevertheless loomed large in a few of the States owing to Prohibition Referenda which were taken.

In four States it was proposed to repeal the State Enforcement Act, and in four others to petition Congress to permit an increase in the alcoholic content of liquor sold. In the first case, the DRYs won splendid victories in California, Colorado and Missouri, but they lost in Montana. In the second case, the DRYs generally refused to give any countenance to the poll, contending that such a change in the law could not take place without repealing the Eigh-

teenth Amendment. The WET votes, therefore, in Illinois, Nevada, New York and Wisconsin, are of no avail.

The crushing defeat of Senator Wadsworth (Republican) in New York is, perhaps, the greatest DRY victory since National Prohibition was adopted. Owing to the fact that President Coolidge and the Republican Administration are building up a most effective enforcement policy—to which Senator Wadsworth (Chairman of the powerful Steering and Military Affairs Committees) was determinedly opposed—the DRY Republicans of New York adopted as their Candidate, Mr Franklin Christman (Independent Republican), who polled some 225,000 votes. This candidature secured, by 100,000 majority, the defeat of Senator Wadsworth, much to the astonishment of the WETS who had put forth enormous efforts to secure his return. This division in the ranks of the Republicans resulted in the election of Judge Wagner who, though a WET Democrat, cannot be of anything like the service to the Liquor Interests that Senator Wadsworth undoubtedly would have been. Mr Arthur J. Davis, State Superintendent of the New York Anti-Saloon League, declares that the defeat of Senator Wadsworth is "a great and far-reaching victory" for the Anti-Saloon League, and there is general rejoicing throughout the States.

While the WET Republicans suffered defeat in New York, the WET Democrats met an equal fate in Illinois. Here, in spite of the heavy WET vote in Chicago, Mr George E. Brennan "a dripping wet Democrat Senatorial nominee" was defeated by Mr Frank L. Smith, a DRY Republican Candidate. The British Press should not assume, as it would seem to, that the Republican Party is the DRY Party and the Democrat Party the WET one. This is not so, as may be proved by the vote on the Prohibition Amendments as follows:

Senate:

FOR 36 Democrats, 29 Republicans.

AGAINST 12 Democrats, 8 Republicans.

House of Representatives:

FOR 141 Democrats, 137 Republicans.

AGAINST 64 Democrats, 62 Republicans.

The results of the recent contests go to show that the DRY majority in both Houses of Congress will be fully maintained. Of 35 Senators elected, 26 are DRY, and of 415 Representatives elected, over 300 are known, either by their votes in former Congresses or by pledges given to DRY voters during the present elections, to be DRY.

Surveying the whole situation, the general result is most decidedly satisfactory to the Prohibitionists and Temperance Reformers of the United States. They are to be congratulated upon their non-partizan stand for Prohibition.

World Prohibition Federation,
99, Buckingham Palace Rd.,
S.W.I.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOP GIRLS' TROUBLES.

(To the Editor.)

Madam,—Having just returned from Melbourne and Sydney, I was pleased to see that sales girls in drapery stores are allowed seats behind the counters. It is simply a board, which slides in and out of the fixtures. Messrs Buckley and Nunn, Collins Street, Melbourne, would no doubt furnish plans or details of seats used by their girls.

When in San Francisco I also noticed that sales girls in the stores were sitting when not serving.

I beg to urge every W.C.T.U. to interview their local member of Parliament, to urge that the thousands of young girls in our New Zealand shops be allowed seats **behind** the counter, as our **present Act does not insist** that the seat **shall be behind** the counters. Owing to physical make-up of women, it seems cruel to allow (as on late shopping) a girl to stand ten hours on a hard floor. If a horse is kept standing four hours in the street unattended, the owner is liable to be sued for cruelty to animals, whereas a frail girl can stand all day, getting footsore, nervy, etc., and nothing is said. I find a girl more kindly and polite with customers if she has a rest. I am, etc.,

A DRAPER.

What you have you must some day leave behind; what you are is all you can take with you to the better land.—Ex.