So It is Really Up to the States

Next Tuesday the Prosecution Department of Washington will be formally transferred from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, in conformity with liberal ism by Congress on recommendation of the President. At the same time the states are being told that the change results in a better enforcement of the law. Our guess is that it will not work. We feel that the difficulties attending enforcement are inherent in the law itself. It is not the state that is the real affirad by the agency selected to administer the law. It may seem to the states to have end the enforcement of this criminal statute in the hands of the Department of Justice, but the problem remains exactly the same, for one department or another attempts its solutions.

Under the plan of reorganization, a number of enforcement districts have been reduced from twenty-six in twenty, to correspond with the Federal Judicial Districts. All the states and territories will be in charge of each district. The New England States comprise a district, being assigned to the administrator. Mr. P. S. Lewis, who has his of fice in Boston. Of the 2700 agents of the department, about half will be trans ferred to the Department of Justice. The rest will remain under the Treasury Department, which will still have charge of excise and internal revenue districts. Of the current app osition of 413,500, about 90,000 have been assigned to enforceallon and 145,000 to super vision of permits.

Attorney General Mitchell frankly recognizes the fact that the Federal Government is not equipped to make prohib tion less than 300 agents and investigators can hardly be expected to dry up the illicit distillation of liquor. This country has a 18,756 miles of boundary "at every point of which inspection is made," as Mr. Wickersham of the Law Enforcement Commission states. The Coast Guard and customs agents materially help out the administrative body, but even as the task of enforcement is so gigantic that the Attorney General declares the de sign of making much headway with it unless the States render every possible assistance.

Mr. Mitchell admits that there is no legal way of compelling unwilling States to aid in the enforcement of this criminal law, but he thinks that because of the concurrent responsibility of the enforcement of a moral obligation rests on the States to help out. He says that some States enforce their own liquor laws to a greater extent than others. It is also possible that there are State States! The Attorney General does not wish to carry the point; he does not want to make it appear that the States are rendering their State liquor laws if they really set themselves to the task. "That being so," he may have Federal permission to prevent shipments of liquor from wet to dry territory, for the Webb-Kenyon law, enforcement of which is administered, is to that. The fact is that the States render every possible assistance to the Federal Government, and the enforcement is essentially an affair of the States and not of the Federal Government.

People in Colorado, Montana, and Idaho, from Washington, whether from the President himself, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the Law Enforcement Commission, or the growing number of the enforcement of the Amendment will be considered, and the fast way to prevent such attacks. Mr. Mitchell has said that he does not want to be interpreted as suggesting that the States should be forced to do anything, but that has the evil effects of overreach its assumed benefits would be grossly overestimated, and the prohibition of the policy of the prohibition law.

The States that are exercising the power of the States to enforce the Federal Prohibition law would be better satisfied. Those that want prohibition, believing that there should be the way to prevent such attacks. It is the possibility of the prohibition law.
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