ADDRESS of WILLIAM L. MARBURY

Attorney for a Committee of Prominent Citizens of Baltimore

BEFORE THE

Federal Relations Committee

IN REGARD TO THE

Ratification of the Proposed Prohibition Amendment

TO THE

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

In The Senate Chamber

Annapolis, Maryland, January 24, 1918

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen o the Committee: I appreciate the honor and the favor you have done me in giving me an opportunity to be heard on this question. I come representing a Committee of Gentlemen in Baltimore city who desire to have presented to this committee in some orderly fashion the reasons why, in their judgment, as citizens of Maryland it would be unwise for the legislature of this State to ratify the proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution establishing or seeking to establish prohibition on a national scale.

I am not here for the purpose of discussing the question of prohibition or making any argument as to the wisdom or unwisdom of prohibition as a policy, and least of all, am I here to argue against the absolute right of the people of Maryland, whenever a majority of them desire so to do, to adopt prohibition within their own State boundaries and keep it as long as they like.

But, as I understand it, the question before this committee is an entirely different question from that.

The question involved in the passage of this resolution and the ratifying of this proposed amendment is not a question as to whether we ought to have prohibition in Maryland, but, in the first place, IT IS A QUESTION AS TO WHETHER WE SHALL FORCE PROHIBITION UPON OTHER STATES CONTRARY, IT MAY BE, TO THE WISHES OF NINE-TENTHS OF THE VOTERS OF THOSE STATES, AND FASTEN IT UPON THEM BY A LAW WHICH CAN NEVER BE REPEALED FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES, YOU MAY SAY. IT MAY BE EVADED; IT MAY BE NULLIFIED AND DESTROYED BY ALL KINDS OF MEANS, BUT IT CAN NOT BE REPEALED PRACTICALLY.

That is a grave question, it seems to me, gentlemen, one which ought not to be answered lightly by any responsible man, any man trusted with the power of legislation. Therefore, we make no excuse for asking the privilege of being heard before you shall act upon it.

THERE IS ANOTHER ASPECT OF THE QUESTION INVOLVED IN THE ENACTMENT OF THIS AMENDMENT. SHALL THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, WITHOUT ANY AUTHORITY SO TO DO, DERIVED FROM ANY INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE, WITHOUT ANY MANDATE FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE, PRACTICALLY WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE, BECAUSE THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THIS THING IS, THEY HAVE NOT HAD TIME TO LEARN ABOUT IT—SHALL THE LEGISLATURE SURRENDER TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, A BRANCH OF THE FIELD OF LEGISLATION, A PART OF THE POLICE POWER, SO-CALLED, OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND,WHICH WAS RESERVED TO IT WHEN THE UNION WAS ESTABLISHED OVER ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO,AND WHICH HAS EXISTED IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND SINCE LONG BEFORE THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR, AND MAKE THAT SURRENDER, AS IT WERE, BETWEEN TWO SUNS WITHOUT,AS I SAY, PRACTICALLY WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PEOPLE WHOSE RIGHTS ARE BEING SURRENDERED?

What on earth can the great majority of people know or understand within such a short time regarding the merits of this proposed amendment or the consequences which may follow from its enactment?

Now, Gentlemen, I say, the effect of this amendment, that is to say, of its being made operative by receiving the endorsement and ratifications of the legislatures of three-fourth of the States, IF IT IS TO HAVE ANY EFFECT AT ALL, WILL BE TO DEPRIVE THE STATE OF MARYLAND, THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND,PRACTICALLY FOREVER, OF THE RIGHT TO CONTROL THIS QUESTION, AND TRANSFER IT TO THE FIELD OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION—THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Gentlemen, you cannot determine this matter without a good deal of study and reflection. Even then it is very difficult to realize what it might be to deprive the people of Maryland, through their Legislatures, of any right practically to say how the liquor laws should be enforced. You can readily understand that the kind of legislation that might be necessary and proper for the enforcement of laws of this kind in one State might be very different from what was necessary in another State.

The conditions existing in Kansas, for example, which is practically an agricultural State, and those existing [illegible] or in Maryland, with a [illegible] New York or Baltimore, [illegible]nt.

NOW, GENTLEMEN, THIS INVOLVES SOMETHING FAR BEYOND ANY QUESTION OF THE WISDOM OR UNWISDOM OF PROHIBITION. IT INVOLVES THE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND SHALL SURRENDER ANY PART OF THAT RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT, THE RIGHT TO REGULATE THEIR OWN INTERNAL AFFAIRS WHICH THEY ALWAYS HAD HERETOFORE.

I have an idea that we do not realize what the right of self-government is, how important it is.

WHY, GENTLEMEN, THE RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IS THE MOST PRECIOUS RIGHT THAT ANY FREE PEOPLE CAN HAVE. PROBABLY MORE BLOOD HAS BEEN SHED IN ORDER TO SECURE AND TO PRESERVE THE RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT THAN FOR ANY CAUSE IN HISTORY. IN fact, there can be no civil liberty, according to the standard of the Anglo-Saxon race, at any rate, if people at a great distance, who know nothing about our conditions and the requirements of our lives and our ordinary surroundings, if they have the right to say how our lives shall be ordered, what we shall eat and what we shall drink and wherewithal we shall be clothed.

If people living three thousand miles away who know nothing about our requirements can control those questions and deprive us of the right to determine them for ourselves, we have not liberty.

When the representatives of the people of Maryland first assembled in convention in 1776 in this city of Annapolis for the purpose of framing a Constitution for the new State of Maryland, ONE OF THE FIRST PRONOUNCEMENTS THEY MADE IS EMBODIED NOW IN THE 4th ARTICLE OF THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS OF THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION. It expresses that idea in these simple and expressive terms: "WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, GRATEFUL TO ALMIGHTY GOD FOR OUR CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, AND TAKEN INTO OUR SERIOUS CONSIDERATION THE BEST MEANS OF ESTABLISHING A GOOD CONSTITUTION IN THIS STATE FOR THE SURE FOUNDATION AND MORE PERMANENT SECURITY THEREOF, DECLARE * * * (ART. IV.) THAT THE PEOPLE OF THIS STATE HAVE THE SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF REGULATING THE INTERNAL GOVERNMENT AND POLICE THEREOF AS A FREE SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATE."

The people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof. They claim no right to regulate the affairs of other States or the affairs of the United States, but they reserve to the people the exclusive right to regulate their own internal affairs. That is what they fought Great Britain for, because she tried to deprive them of that right and undertook to regulate their affairs in Maryland by acts passed three thousand miles away—no further than Oregon or California is from us today.

If we don't know what that means, gentlemen, it is time we learned. Our Ancestors knew what it meant; some of my own people in these very halls helped to frame the Constitution, and I do not want to see the people of Maryland throw it away.

I do not want to see them throw away the right to control the question, I DO NOT CARE HOW MUCH YOU BELIEVE IN PROHIBITION, THE RIGHT TO SAY WHETHER WE SHALL HAVE IT OR SHALL NOT HAVE IT SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AWAY FROM THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND.

I TELL YOU, WHEN IT IS PUT IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES IT IS TAKEN AWAY AND PRACTICALLY TAKEN AWAY FOREVER.

It is a far more serious question with us than it is with any other country under the sun. The Parliament of Great Britain may adopt prohibition and no harm be done because it can change it when it sees fit. The Republic of France may do likewise, or Italy, or any other country. It was not until the United States of America entered the family of nations that history furnished a record of any country, except that of the Medes and Persians, whose laws were unalterable, and that is what happens practically here.

A friend of mine said to me, "if it don't work right we can repeal the amendment." Well, can you? Let us look at it as practical men. Did you ever hear of any one of the various amendments that have been adopted to the Constitution of the United States ever having been repealed? Does that mean because they were all satisfactory to the people who were affected by them?

Gentlemen, may I not speak with perfect candor, hoping that I may not offend any man's party prejudice. I want to give you an illustration of that thing. Under the influence of the passions of the Civil War and the natural fury following upon the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, than which no greater calamity ever afflicted a great people, the madmen at Washington enacted into law and dragged through the State legislatures contrary to their judgment, the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution by which two million of men just out of slavery were given the political power in the Southern States.

There is not one intelligent man out of one hundred in the world today who does not recognize that that was a dreadful wrong and dreadful mistake, and would not like to see it remedied, but have you seen any sign of its being remedied?

AND YET THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THOSE SAME STATES ARE GOING TO FORCE UPON THE PEOPLE OF OTHER PARTS OF THIS UNION AN AMENDMENT AND LAW JUST AS HATEFUL TO MANY OF THEM AS THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT WAS TO THE PEOPLE OF ALABAMA. AND IF THEY THINK THEY CAN DO THAT AND SUFFER NO PUNISHMENT IN THE FUTURE FOR IT, THEY MAKE A DREADFUL MISTAKE, IN MY JUDGMENT.

The people of those States will never forgive them. Why should they? You may have made up your mind on the subject of prohibition and you may think that your constituents will justify you for having voted for it. They will until they understand what you have done.

Until they understand that you have caused them to do this wrong to other people in other States and aroused enmities for the people of this State and especially for the people of the Southern States. It might die out in a century, but it can do our people nothing but harm.

Those are some of the reasons why we oppose the enactment of this amendment and that is why I say when you put it in the Constitution of the United States it is there forever, because a Constitutional Amendment, unless it happens to deal with something with reference to which there is a unanimity of opinion throughout the Union, can not be repealed, practically can not be repealed, because it lies in the power of a comparatively small number of people living in those small States to veto any repeal. It can only be repealed by the addition of another Constitutional Amendment and that requires ratification of three-fourths of the States and one-fourth of those States having a population of only five or six millions can veto the wish of those States having a population of ninety millions, and that makes it practically an irrepealable provision.

WHY, GENTLEMEN, TO SURRENDER, AS SAID BEFORE, THE CONTROL OF THE STATE OVER ANY BRANCH OF INTERNAL LEGISLATION IS THE GREATEST RESPONSIBILITY THAT ANY MEMBER OF ANY LEGISLATURE COULD POSSIBLY ASSUME.

When this Legislature was elected this question was not before the people of Mrayland. When the gentlemen who now constitute the House and Senate of Maryland were candidates for election this Amendment had not been submitted by Congress.

It was, therefore, not in the view of the people. The people did not have any opportunity to make known to these candidates how they desired them to vote on it, and therefore the present General Assembly has no kind of mandate or commission from the people of the State on that subject. I SAY, WHATEVER YOUR LEGAL POWER MAY BE, AND I DO NOT THINK THAT IS BEYOND THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION, WHATEVER YOUR LEGAL POWER MAY BE, IT WOULD BE A DREADFUL ABUSE AND MISUSE AND BETRAYAL OF THE TRUST INVOLVED IN THAT POWER FOR THE MEMBERS OF THIS ASSEMBLY TO GIVE AWAY, SURRENDER, ANY PART OF THE SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND BECAUSE, MARK YOU, THIS HAS NEVER BEEN DONE BEFORE. THE RIGHT TO REGULATE INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND LEGISLATE REGARDING QUESTIONS OF CONDUCT, CONTRACTS, EATING OR DRINKING, OR ANYTHING OF THAT KIND, AND THAT INFINITE VARIETY OF SUBJECTS CONSTITUTES WHAT IS KNOWN AMONG CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYERS AS THE POLICE POWER OF A STATE. WITHOUT THAT POWER THERE CAN BE NO STATE.

IF A STATE LEGISLATURE EVER SURRENDERED ALL THAT POWER IT WOULD DESTROY THE STATE.

NOW I QUESTION, AND I QUESTION MOST EARNESTLY, BOTH THE LEGAL AND ABSOLUTELY THE MORAL RIGHT OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS ASSEMBLY TO SURRENDER ANY PART OF THAT POWER WITHOUT A MANDATE AND INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE SO TO DO.

IF THEY HAVE POWER TO SURRENDER A PART OF THAT RIGHT, SUCH AS THE RIGHT TO LEGISLATE REGARDING LIQUOR OR THE ENFORCEMENT OF LIQUOR LAWS, WHY MAY THEY NOT SURRENDER THE RIGHT TO LEGISLATE WITH REFERENCE TO ANY OTHER SUBJECT, ANY ONE OF THE ORDINARY SUBJECTS OF LEGISLATION IN A STATE? IF THEY CAN SURRENDER THAT MUCH OF THE POLICE POWER,WHY MAY THEY NOT SURRENDER MORE? WHERE CAN YOU DRAW THE LINE? WHY MAY THEY NOT SURRENDER ALL WITHOUT AUTHORITY FROM THE PEOPLE? WHY MAY THEY NOT, IN THAT WAY, DESTROY THE VERY STATE WHOSE CONSTITUTION THEY ARE SWORN TO SUPPORT?

It seems to me, Gentlemen, that these questions are questions of too grave import to be passed on hurriedly, without debate, without opportunity for the people to know what is being done with regard to them. Why, Gentlemen, we are living in a momentous period of the world's history.

Democracy is on trial for its life before the bar of the world, and the trial is by battle.

The great Autocrat of the German Empire, the greatest enemy that Democracy has ever had, possibly in all history, and the most powerful and ablest, has told his people that Democracy is a sham and a fraud and he makes them believe it, too. He tells them that the pretense made on behalf of the Democracy of America that it is a government where the people rule, where the people through majority vote govern themselves, that that is a false pretense, that it is a lie. He says that is not so. All you have to do is to look at the facts. INSTEAD OF RULING THEMSELVES THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA ARE RULED AND DOMINATED ABSOLUTELY BY MINORITIES, BOLD, AGGRESSIVE MINORITIES,DOMINANT MINORITIES WHO DOMINATE AND CONTROL AND BULLY THEIR LEGISLATIVE BODIES TO PASS LAWS WHICH THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT, AND NEVER WOULD HAVE DREAMED OF ENACTING FOR THEMSELVES.

That is the charge he makes against Democracy in America.

Now, I am speaking in utmost seriousness and I say if you Gentlemen, members of this Assembly, without giving the people a chance to be heard, without giving them time to find out what the thing means and understand it, without any mandate or direction from them—YOU CAN NOT KNOW WHAT THEY WANT EXCEPT BY A VOTE—A REGULARLY COUNTED VOTE—and notwithstanding the fact that on the face of the Amendment itself seven years are expressly allowed for the purpose of getting time to understand it, IF, IN DISREGARD OF ALL THAT, THIS LEGISLATURE ADOPTS THIS AMENDMENT, GENTLEMEN, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT YOU WILL GO FARTHER THAN IT WAS EVER DREAMED TO BE POSSIBLE AND JUSTIFY THE GERMAN KAISER'S SNEER. Talking about fighting for Democracy! What becomes of the slogan—of the doctrine—The Rule of the People? WHAT BECOMES OF THE CRY OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE, LET THE PEOPLE RULE? That, as I understand it, has been the war cry of the gentlemen who are insisting upon the enactment of this Amendment NOW. What becomes of that when you won't let the people have a chance to vote on the question? I say, the people of the State don't know what you are doing.

THERE IS ANOTHER PROVISION OF THIS CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND to which I would like to call your attention in this connection. IT SAYS IN THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS THAT "ALL PERSONS INVESTED WITH THE LEGISLATIVE OR EXECUTIVE POWER OF GOVERNMENT ARE TRUSTEES OF THE PUBLIC AND AS SUCH ARE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR CONDUCT." Those words meant a great deal, Gentlemen, when they were written in there one hundred years ago. They mean no less today. They mean that you are trustees, that the members of this General Assembly are the trustees of legislative power to be used for the benefit of the people, and you are to be held accountable to whom? To the people who gave you the powers, accountable for the misuse of that power, and they come to you after you have voted in favor of the adoption of this Amendment and say: Why did you do it? You say you had the power to do it. What right have you to use the power we gave you in any such fashion and strip the State of the power to regulate this thing forever? What was the necessity for it? Who made you do it? We did not make you do it. We did not tell you to do it. You know it is not necessary to do that in order to have prohibition in this State. We have got prohibition everywhere in the State where it is wanted and we have full authority to make that prohibition effective in every county by keeping every drop of liquor out of it by law if necessary.

In addition to that, we have the Webb-Kenyon and the Reed Laws, which have been enacted by Congress and held valid by the Supreme Court of the United States, to keep liquor out of any State which does not desire to have it there. With all this on the statute books, why could you not have waited before committing us to this dreadful step by which you have stripped us of the right to regulate our social life?

Personally, I certainly can speak without any great feeling or prejudice on the question of prohibition. I do not think that warps my judgment because I recognize the fact that the Gentlemen who are urging this thing so vehemently are, as far as I know them, acting with the purest motives, acting under a sense of religious duty and according to deeply fixed convictions. I don't question their sincerity for a moment. I know that some of them could not be otherwise than sincere, but, Gentlemen, that does not decide the question. The men who burned heretics at the stake in the Middle Ages, the agents of the Spanish Inquisition, were as sincere men as ever lived under the sun, and they believed they were doing God's service when they took a man who refused to subscribe to the doctrine of transsubstantiation and burned him at the stake, as much as any man who is advocating this amendment. THERE IS NO QUESTION ABOUT THAT, AND YOU CAN NOT TRUST THE GOVERNMENT OF ANY COUNTRY TO ECCLESIASTICS OF ANY KIND WITHOUT PERIL. LET ME DEMONSTRATE THAT TO YOU RIGHT HERE. TAKE ANY ONE OF THESE GENTLEMEN TO WHOM I REFER. Some of them are my personal friends for whom I have the highest regard, some of the most intense Prohibitionists as I know of, and you take one of them and ask him this question: WHICH DO YOU REGARD AS MORE IMPORTANT, THE PRESERVATION OF THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY, OR THE ENACTMENT OF THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT? And he will vote for the Prohibition Amendment every time. Do you think it safe to leave the shaping of the constitutional law, the organic law of this land, in the hands of gentlemen like that?

Gentlemen, it is the most dangerous thing imaginable and that is what you are coming to just as certainly as the sun that shines. You pass this law; you have this Amendment ratified and made a part of the Constitution of the United States; force it upon a State like New York, for example, and what happens? You take a community like Manhattan, the Borough of Manhattan, where there would be probably majorities of hundreds of thousands opposed to it absolutely, and look upon it as tyrannous infliction, and you pass a law making it a crime in that district, as it would be under this Amendment, for a man to make a glass of cider or a glass of beer, or give it to his friends, or take it across the street, and what would happen? You undertake to prosecute any man for the violation of that law and how are you going to convict him? By a jury made up, as juries would be, of probably ninety per cent. of men who feel just the same way about it as the fellow did who was being accused? You know you could not convict any man as long as you had the right of trial by jury in that district. What would happen then?

Then they would want the abolition of the right of trial by jury, and I put it to my friend, Mr. Baker, or any of these gentlemen, and ask them whether they would not rather see the right of trial by jury abolished than see the cause of prohibition fail, and they would say, "Good-bye, jury trial."

And if he does not say so, he won't be comfortable when he goes back to his congregation.

IT IS A MATTER OF RELIGION, GENTLEMEN, AND YOU CANNOT SURRENDER, AS MUCH AS YOU MAY LOVE OR ADMIRE THESE PEOPLE, YOU CANNOT SURRENDER YOUR JUDGMENT AS TRUSTEES OF POLITICAL POWER INTO THEIR KEEPING IN A MATTER OF THIS KIND.

There is a matter to which I want to refer you, and that is that some people seem to have a vague impression by voting to refer this Amendment, to give it a referendum, give the people a chance to vote on it, they will in some way jeopardize the laws in force in various counties in this State. If any one will take the least trouble and consider for a moment you will see there cannot be anything in that. What is proposed? THE COMMITTEE I REPRESENT URGE UPON YOU THAT YOU REJECT THIS RESOLUTION AND ADOPT SOME RESOLUTION TO THE EFFECT THAT THIS LEGISLATURE OUGHT NOT TO VOTE ON THIS QUESTION ONE WAY OR ANOTHER; THAT THE PRESENT GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HAVING BEEN ELECTED BEFORE THIS THING HAD BEEN SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION,BEFORE IT WAS EVEN DREAMED OF,OUGHT NOT TO VOTE EITHER FOR OR AGAINST THE RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL PROHIBITION AMENDMENT,BUT SHOULD REFER IT TO THE NEXT COMING LEGISLATURE. You have seven years in which to do that, and that is only two years hence, and in the meantime should provide some kind of law, just as was done here last year in the case of Prohibition on the unit system; some kind of law to enable the people of Maryland at the next election by some mark or something written on the ballot to inform the next General Assembly as to their wishes; to tell them whether they were in favor of the Amendment or opposed to it. IF THEY DID THAT, HOW COULD THAT IN ANY WAY, IN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE AFFECT OR JEOPARIZE THE PRESENT PROHIBITION LAWS IN FORCE IN MARYLAND? Surely, I do not want to do anything to jeopardize them.

I am certain that a man does not know what he will do until he tries it, but I am very certain if I lived in Charles county I would be just as red hot for the local law as anybody. All my friends down there are, certainly, and I have no prejudice on the subject one way or the other, as far as that is concerned; but I certainly would not want any action taken here which would deprive my friends down there of the right to have any laws they want. I have a great many kindred down there and I know what that means. I SAY IF THIS REFERENDUM WHICH I HAVE SPOKEN OF IS ADOPTED IT WILL NOT IN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE AFFECT THOSE LAWS. HOW CAN IT?

The people will do it, I suppose, naturally the way they did it two years ago when they refered the matter of prohibition to Baltimore city and the wet counties have a box on the ballot. First copy the Amendment on the ballot and have a box opposite or after the Amendment, so that one of them would have the words, "For the Federal Prohibition Amendment," and the other box, "Against the Federal Prohibition Amendment," so that a man might put his cross-mark opposite one or the other, and thereby indicate whether he favored it or opposed it.

Then, when the election was over, have those ballots counted and the result announced and the members of the next Legislature would know how the people felt on this question of the Federal Amendment. If the majority was in favor of it, it would be equivalent to a mandate to the Legislature to vote for its ratification.

Well, if they did that, that certainly would be exactly what our friends, the Prohibitionists, want, and, on the other hand, IF THE MAJORITY VOTED AGAINST IT, THAT WOULD BE A MANDATE TO THE LEGISLATURE NOT TO RATIFY THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT, AND THE EFFECT OF THAT WOULD BE TO LEAVE THINGS EXACTLY AS THEY ARE. I SAY IT WILL NOT AFFECT THE SITUATION IN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE, THAT IS TO SAY, IN ANY WAY JEOPARDIZE THE EXISTING LOCAL OPTION OR PROHIBITION LAWS OF THE DIFFERENT COUNTIES OF THE STATE.

The question which the people would have before them would be, not whether we shall have prohibition for Maryland—take the people of Charles county,for example, or Prince George's county, and the question before them would be not whether we shall have or continue to have prohibition in Charles county as far as this Amendment is concerned, because we have got it now, and the Amendment won't take it away from us and won't give us any more than we have, but the question is whether we shall force that on other states.

Of course, incidentally, you force it on the City of Baltimore, where fifty thousand majority voted against it, and you talk about democracy making the world safe for democracy, and making a war for democracy, and the German Kaiser says, "You lie; you are not democrats; you are not a democracy; you have not got a shred of democracy. You force these things down the throats of men living in other States, three thousand miles away, whose conditions you know you have the power to do it because you have the political power to do it, and for the same reason that I trampled over Belgium, because I had the power to do it, where might makes right, and you call that "Democracy."

GENTLEMEN, LET US HAVE SOME COMMON SENSE IN THIS THING. YOU HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY. THE MEN WHO PUT THIS THING UPON YOUR SHOULDERS TELL YOU, NOW, YOU CAN VOTE FOR THESE BILLS AND YOU CANNOT COME HOME. THE CONGREGATIONS UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY MEAN RIGHT,BUT NOT THE TRUSTEES OF POLITICAL POWER. THEY ARE GOING TO BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS ABUSE. THEY WON'T BE ON RECORD AS HAVING EVER AFTER AS HAVING BEEN THE MEN WHO GAVE AWAY THE LEGISLATIVE POWER OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND. THE PEOPLE THAT WILL BEAR THAT REPROACH WILL BE A REPROACH IN IT IN THIS HASTY FASHION.

DID ANYBODY EVER THINK THAT IN MARYLAND MEN WOULD BE EXPECTED TO DO IT IN THIS WAY? WHY, WHAT IS THE NECESSITY FOR THIS, GENTLEMEN? WHO IS MAKING YOU DO IT? I AM A MARYLAND MAN FROM THE GROUND UP. ALL MY PEOPLE HAVE BEEN HERE FOR TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS. I KNOW HOW MARYLAND PEOPLE OUGHT TO FEEL ABOUT IT. WHEN I THINK OF WHAT OUR PEOPLE DID IN THE OLD REVOLUTIONARY TIMES AND THE WAY THEY SHED THEIR BLOOD TO SECURE THE RIGHT OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT, EMBEDDED IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE, NOW TO SEE OUR PEOPLE OF TODAY THINKING ABOUT THROWING IT AWAY LIKE A DRUNKEN SAILOR(I CONFESS IT GIVES ME A FEELING OF HUMILIATION AND SHAME.

If the people of Maryland come to the point where they are so unappreciative of this blessing of self-government, of local self-government, the local control of their own affairs, as to give it away in this fashion, I don't know of any disaster which could befall them, I think it is likely ultimately to befall them worse than that of the Moors. You remember when you read history that the Moorish civilization in its time was the finest in the world. This people, Mohammedans, as they were, unbelievers in the divinity of Christ, and yet in harmony with the civilization of the Christians, they settled themselves in Spain, established and flourished for several centuries. They built the beautiful Alhambra and the splendid palaces of the Moors and they were not surpassed in the arts and sciences of Europe, but they were driven out of Spain by the superior force of the Christian hosts. They did not go far; they only crossed the narrow strait of Gibraltar and located in Morocco.

After they got there they forgot that their old historic traditions. They did not appreciate what they were or who they were. They mingled their blood with the native races of that country, and what has become of the Moorish civilization now? Whoever hears of Moorish literature or art or culture? Where has it gone? It has perished from the earth. And as a modern American writer today has said, "The Moor of today will not even repair the splendid structures his forefathers built. Why? Because he does not appreciate what his forefathers did for him and he threw it away."

NOW YOU HAVE IN THIS CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND A BILL OF RIGHTS, WHICH GIVES THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO REGULATE THESE AFFAIRS TO THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES, AND YOU TALK ABOUT THROWING IT AWAY IN A HURRY, WITHOUT LEAVING IT TO THE PEOPLE TO TALK ABOUT IT, I SAY TO DO THAT WOULD BE UNWORTHY OF ALL THE TRADITIONS OF MARYLAND STATESMANSHIP.

It is all well enough for these people out West who just started to run a government a few years ago to get in a panic and pass it, but it is not worthy of Maryland men, especially the men from those counties, those old districts which today have more of the same old breed in them that fought the Revolution than in any part of the Union. It is not worthy of them or their traditions that this matter should be dealt with in that fashion. And why should it be so dealt with, gentlemen? I know I am asking some of the members of this assembly—I am asking them to run the risk of political proscription and maybe in some localities of social ostracism.

IF THE KING OF GREAT BRITAIN CAME INTO THE LOBBY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SAW EVEN THE HUMBLEST MEMBER OF THE HOUSE AND ASKED HIM HOW HE VOTED AND SAID, AFTER THAT VOTE YOU DARE NOT GO HOME—IF HE DARED DO THAT WITH THE HUMBLEST MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS HE WOULD LOSE HIS THRONE BEFORE THE NEXT SUNSET. YET I HAVE HEARD OF THAT THING BEING DONE TO A SENATOR OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND WITHIN THESE HALLS.

Gentlemen, if that is the kind of government you are going to have, if that is the kind of influence that is going to govern this State, we may just as well be under the Kaiser! I KNOW WHEN I ASK MEN TO VOTE AGAINST THIS MEASURE I ASK THEM TO TAKE THE RISK OF BEING SUBJECTED TO THAT KIND OF TREATMENT, BUT THAT ONLY MEANS THAT I ASK THEM TO HAVE A MAN'S COURAGE. THAT IS ALL, AND IF THEY HAVE NOT THAT COURAGE, I HAVE SPOKEN IN VAIN.

Gentlemen, I thank you. (Loud applause.)

(Advertisement.)

©Maryland State Archives msa_sc3326_scm8220-0049