

hood, crushes childhood, curses motherhood, and has never done good to anyone. You laboring men spend your nickels and dimes for booze in hopes of getting cool if too hot, and warm if too cold, getting joy if depressed and fellowship if lonely. But with your money spent each year for booze you could buy the yearly output of

All the fresh beef of packing plants, \$327,583,456.

All the canned tomatoes, \$18,747,941.

All the canned corn, \$10,332,136.

All the dried prunes, \$5,130,412.

All canned berries, \$1,754,927.

All the wheat flour, \$557,814,979.

All the beet sugar, \$48,122,383.

All the boots and shoes for men, women and children, \$442,630,726.

All the women's and children's leather gloves and mittens, \$5,462,064.

All the stoves and furnaces, \$78,853,323.

All the women's clothing—complete suits, dresses, skirts, petticoats, cloaks, underwear, shirtwaists, infants' clothing, etc., etc., \$384,751,649.

All the men's and boys' clothing—suits, overalls, overcoats, raincoats, shirts, etc., \$568,076,635.

All the butter (real butter) \$194,999,198.

All the eggs sold, \$180,768,249.

Total, \$8,825,028,078.

And have enough left to buy 68,758 homes costing \$2,000 each. Almost enough to give a home to every laboring man in the business of producing booze. This money spent for the above articles would set the workmen to work. There would be increased demand for tools, clothes, and food, and everybody would prosper, the farmer most of all because his customers, the city laborers, would have more money, with which to buy what the farmer produced. This would be repeated every year and prosperity would be a permanent thing.

ONLY HALF TOLD

But the half has not yet been told. There is still another side—the tax side of the booze question—and that is what I started out to show.

According to the last census report there were 5,400,556 persons received into benevolent institutions during 1910. It cost \$1.21 a year for every man, woman and child in the United States to take care of the insane, unfortunate, aged, blind, etc., etc. This does not include prisoners. There are 91.8 paupers in almshouses; 204.2 insane; 123.5 prisoners in state institutions per 100,000 population.

Archbishop Ireland says 80 per cent of the poverty and 75 per cent of the social crimes are caused by drink. Billy Sunday says, "75 per cent of our idiots came from intemperate parents; 80 per cent of the paupers; 82 per cent of the crime is committed by men under the influence of liquor; 90 per cent of the adult criminals are whiskey made."

The Chicago Tribune kept a record for ten years and found that 53,556 murders were committed by men under the influence of liquor.

This means that the per cent of your tax money that goes to maintain the institution and courts which take care of the harvest of booze is a dead waste which would stop were there no booze to keep up the awful toll of crime, poverty, misery and broken homes. About 54 per cent of all industrial accidents are due to booze, to say nothing of the destruction of property by drunken carelessness.

IT HITS EDUCATION

Everybody pays taxes to maintain schools. It costs no more to teach a

large class than a small one. What effect does booze have on our schools?

Down in Texas they investigated twenty-six wet and twenty-five dry towns and found that nearly one-sixth of the school children in wet towns were kept out of school by booze. In the state as a whole about 50,000 children were annually robbed of a public school education by the saloons.

In Indiana in 1910 there were seventy dry towns and twenty-two wet counties. There was enrolled in the common schools 69.5 per cent of the children of school age in the dry counties, and 55.2 per cent in the wet counties. In other words, 43,509 children were kept out of school in the wet counties because the people preferred saloons to education. The dry counties graduated from the grade schools 3.36 per cent of all attending school, while the wet counties graduated 2.58 per cent. Had the wet counties been dry, there should have been 10,223 boys and girls finishing eighth grade instead of 7,877, based on the results in dry counties. The saloons kept 9,502 out of the high schools and kept 1,382 from graduating from high schools who had a right, under "dry" conditions, to get that schooling.

In Massachusetts the report of the state board of education for 1910 shows that in the dry towns and cities there were twenty-three high school pupils per 1,000 population and only sixteen per 1,000 in wet towns and cities.

In Illinois 82 per cent of the entire school population attended schools in dry counties, and 56 per cent in wet counties. In California in dry cities thirty-seven per 1,000 population attend high school and in wet cities only twenty-eight per 1,000. What is the ultimate loss to our country because of these children going without the advantage of an education? How many of them must we again spend money on because of crime or inability on their part to support themselves?

But why prolong the discussion? It is endless when one goes to the extreme ramifications of this traffic. There is no getting away from the logic of these figures. If you want to stop the awful economic loss, the payment of taxes that are swallowed up by booze; if you want to close the almshouses, insane asylums, and prisons, and relieve the courts of the clogged condition brought on by booze, see that your state legislature puts the saloons out of business, and that the national congress stops the evil at its source by putting the breweries and distilleries out of business. In other words, if the nation ceases to legalize the liquor traffic we can break the shackles that have bound us ever since the civil war.

Don't be bamboozled by booze any longer.—E. T. Meredith, in *Successful Farming*.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION IN FRANCE

How right we were when, in the brief remarks yesterday with which we introduced the letter of Mr. Joseph Reinach, we said: "He greatly deceives himself who thinks sufficient the measures we have taken to conquer that redoubtable enemy—alcohol. Every day we are in receipt of letters insisting upon the danger which it offers and the necessity for new measures."

Now, as he readers of that letter noted to their great surprise, Mr. Joseph Reinach, fighting alcohol, has not escaped the severity of the censure. Could he then have betrayed some diplomatic secret, revealed military movements, run the risk of compromising the national defense?



Eddie Collins
Drinks

Coca-Cola

—considers it the premier, all-round wholesome thirst-quencher for athletes. This comes well from one of whom Comiskey said, after paying \$50,000 for him—"I secured him for the White Sox fans because I believe he will prove that he is the greatest exponent of quick thinking and the brainiest player in the game."

Demand the genuine and
avoid disappointment

THE COCA-COLA CO.
ATLANTA, GA.



The patriotism of the former deputy of the Besses-Alpes is too well-known, it seems to us, for such a suspicion to occur to the thought. Our correspondent, lending the weight of his opinion to our campaign against alcoholism, limits himself to citing some natural facts that will impress public opinion. Was it too much moved? But could it ever be appealed to too strongly to arrive at results which are envisaged by the thought for France's future? The race itself is at stake. Henceforth, all French intelligence should rival itself in zeal to conquer the public opinion for the national cause which the "Temps" is endeavoring to serve. From this little incident, we simply get this conclusion: The more the fight against alcoholism encounters difficulties, the more those who have undertaken it in the interest of the country should consider themselves bound to redouble their vigilance and efforts. — "Le Temps," Paris, March 30, 1915.

LET FACTS TALK

The New York financier who said that prosperity is so sure to come that the only thing we need to fear is that the democratic party will be continued in power after 1916 is not alone among standpat republicans in wishing to attribute the results of war to the tariff. Republican politicians still try to ascribe the industrial depression of the past few months to

the Underwood law. Of course the only answer necessary is the facts.

The decline in foreign trade is their favorite topic. Compare this decline for the first six months of 1914, before the war began, with the same period of the preceding year, and we find that foreign trade fell off less than 1 per cent in that period. For the last half of the year, when Europe was submerged by war, it declined 16 1/2 per cent. Yet the tariff was in force through the whole year.

Take the other fact of which we are so often reminded, that in the ten months after the new tariff went into effect and before the war began, our imports increased \$101,000,000. More than this amount was represented by the increase in raw materials. There was in short a decrease in manufactured articles. The American manufacturer and the American labor were not suffering.

Even so, the increase in imports, as the Journal has pointed out, was not phenomenal. In 1912, while the Payne-Aldrich tariff held full sway, imports increased \$126,000,000. Why didn't such an increase cause depression, if the smaller increase under the Underwood tariff was such a bad thing?

Charging the effects of war to the tariff is poor economics when it isn't downright dishonesty. But the worst thing about such reasoning is the way it collides with the facts.—Milwaukee Journal.