

ancy of the user as measured by the insurance tables.

But, even if it could be shown that the immediate effect of the alcohol contained in beer and wine was not perceptible, it would be unsafe to permit their sale and use because alcohol produces disease in both the brain and the blood. It creates an appetite which calls for more and more and more.

The beer hall and the wine room are the vestibules, so to speak, of the whiskey shop. The brewer and the wine maker are schoolmasters—they take the beginner through the kindergarten and the lower grades, instructing him in the art of intoxication until he is ready to enter upon the career of the drunkard and the lot.

But few of those who develop into whiskey drinkers begin with that beverage; they commence with light wines and beer and then go on from stronger drinks to drinks still stronger as the taste becomes fixed and the craving increases. For this reason some argue that, instead of giving a preference to beer and wine, it would even be safer to give the preference to the stronger drinks on the theory that, while they might more quickly kill off those already addicted to the liquor habit, they would not bring in so many new recruits. But it is not wise to prefer either; both should be put under the ban for both are enemies to man's welfare and progress.

If any one doubts the evil effects of beer and wine upon the individual let him visit the saloons and inquire into the habits of those who have not yet gone beyond these beverages. He will find that even beer and wine benumb the better nature and deaden the sensibilities. They wean the father, the husband and the son away from the family and its interests as effectually as the stronger drinks. Even before the drinker begins to stagger and reel he becomes brutish, selfish and inconsiderate. His thirst for beer and wine will have more influence over him than the hunger of wife or child, and the coarse companionship of the bar room will have more charms for him than the holier environment of the home.

If the champions of the beer saloon and the wine room desire real information as to the character of the beverages which they are trying to protect let them submit the question to the women voters of the country and get their opinion as to the effect of these kinds of liquor upon men. They will find that the female members of the family have accurate knowledge and very positive convictions as to the effect of beer and wine drinking, as well as to the effect of whiskey drinking.

But there is also a political objection to the proposition that beer and wine be excepted from the prohibited drinks. The brewers of the United States have, in recent years, been the most corrupting influence in our nation, as shown by investigations conducted in several states. No one interested in the purifying of politics can, for a moment, think of showing favor to so mercenary and consciousnessless a group.

The objections to the sale and use of beer and wine are so weighty and so manifest that any truce entered into would be short lived. To prohibit the sale and use of whiskeys and stronger alcoholic drinks, while permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and wine, would simply postpone the real struggle and strengthen the adversary for the final fight. The brewers would be encouraged by any consideration shown them and would use the government's partiality as an argument in favor of the legitimacy of their business, just as the licensed saloon seeks to cover its criminality with the cloak of legality.

The brewers' corruption fund has grown from year to year as the temperance sentiment has more and more menaced the industry. The investigation in Texas disclosed the systematic efforts of the brewers to pollute the electorate. Huge sums have been spent throughout the country in the support of lobbies and in the subsidizing of newspapers. In Pennsylvania the brewers, by taking refuge behind the objection that their testimony would incriminate them, confessed that they would be proven criminals if they revealed the business methods shown by their books.

The fight that the brewers have made against woman suffrage is another evidence of their determination to oppose anything and everything calculated to lessen their profits. They libel womanhood while they use the bar room vote to defeat laws proposed for the protection of the home.

The country understands that the issue is in-

divisible. When, a short time ago, congress enacted a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to any man in uniform, it did not attempt to draw any distinction between whiskey and beer; such an attempt would have been met with derision.

The states that have prohibited saloons can not be inveigled into a return to beer and wine. When, in 1914, the state of Colorado adopted constitutional prohibition the city of Denver registered its protest against the change, but after a year's experience under a prohibitory law the city of Denver, by a substantial majority, rejected an amendment which proposed to reinstate beer. Any action by the national congress which would seem to sanction the use of beer and wine would make more difficult the enforcement of the laws in the states, now numbering more than half of the union, which operate alike against all kinds of alcoholic drinks.

The fight must go on; there can be no compromise. Whiskey and beer will stand or fall together; it is the alcohol in both that makes them a menace to health, to home and to all that is highest and best in the nation. A division of the temperance forces would be disastrous. Any attempt to make a distinction between beer and whiskey would drive away more voters than it would draw to the cause.

Those who have entered upon the work of making the United States saloonless will, therefore, give no heed to the plea of the brewer and the wine maker. The manufacturers of these so-called milder beverages have, during all the years past, cast in their lot with the distillers. They have been partners in a long career of lawlessness; they have made the bar room the bureau of information on crime; they have clustered about the saloon every form of vice and sin. It is too late now for them to seek an extension of life by promises to reform, or of separation from their associates. The entire firm of "Barleycorn, Gambrinus, and Bacchus" must retire from business—a dissolution of partnership is not sufficient.

W. J. BRYAN.

ITS GREATEST UTTERANCE

The following item appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on July 4th:

"NOTICE

"Owing to the regulations of the federal government in connection with the publication of liquor advertisements the Courier-Journal hereafter will not accept any advertisements of this character."

This is the Courier-Journal's greatest utterance. It is not as deep as a conviction or as wide as a moral principle, "but it is enough." It would have read better if it had said that the advertisements would be excluded because alcohol does injury, or out of deference to public sentiment, now in a majority and increasing, but even small concessions are gratefully received. No one can doubt the tremendous sweep of prohibition when this prince of bourbons among newspapers bows to the anti-advertising law and leaves its readers without information as to the relative merits of Kentucky's famous brands, or where they can be secured.

COL. CALLAHAN'S NEW WORK

On another page will be found a clipping setting forth a new work to which Col. P. M. Callahan has been called, namely, the superintending of the army work of the Knights of Columbus. This great organization, which is doing among Catholics much the same work done by the Y. M. C. A. among Protestants and the general public, is collecting a million dollars for religious work among the soldiers in camp. It is a worthy undertaking and no better man could be found to supervise the work than Colonel Callahan.

ANOTHER KING DETHRONED

On another page will be found a cartoon in which the great artist McCutcheon presents the fate that has overtaken whiskey. It is a bright conception. Here's to McCutcheon, may he soon have an opportunity to cartoon King Beer on the Bier.

A NOBLE APPEAL

The appeal of the Russian peasantry, found on another page, is noble and inspiring. Who will say that men who can thus set forth their aspirations are not fit for self government?

What Partnership Means

The liquor lobby is insisting that the government can not afford to give up the revenue derived from the sale of liquor. It would look like a government that can call for bids for a two billion dollar loan and receive subscriptions of three billions might be able to dispense with the taxes collected on liquor. As it only amounts to a few dollars for each individual, the voter can decide for himself whether he can afford to go into partnership with the saloon in order to avoid paying a few dollars more tax. The man who helps to keep the saloon in existence must share moral responsibility for what the saloon does—he is a partner without receiving any of the financial profits.

What does the saloon do? It takes the husband away from the wife, leads him to violate every vow he made at the marriage altar, and causes her to die of a broken heart; it takes the boy away from his mother, and makes him forget the one who brought him into the world; it takes the father away from his family, converts him into a brute and makes his children flee when they hear his returning footfall. And it takes the wife and mother, and the daughter too, when it can. There is not a woman whose virtue it would not sell—not a man whose valor it would not undermine. The saloon is the ally of the white slave trade, and the first place the police go when they are looking for a criminal. It is society's putrid sore, pouring out sorrow and sin and crime—who desires to become a partner of those who, knowing what the saloon is and does, engage in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor? And yet we can not escape the responsibility of a partner if by our votes we continue the existence of this menace of the home, this most corrupting influence in society and politics.

Now is the time to vote the saloon out of every state and out of the nation.

W. J. BRYAN.

MR. BRYAN SUPPORTS FOOD BILL

William Jennings Bryan, passing through Washington June 21, gave out the following emphatic statement in support of the administration's food control bill:

"War is not a normal condition; it is abnormal and requires extraordinary remedies. The farmers are urged to increase the food products and should be guaranteed against an inadequate price; without such guarantee they might be penalized for their patriotism. The consumers, too, deserve protection from food speculators. A government that can commandeer the lives of its young men and call for the money of its older men should have power to protect the whole people from the greed of an unpatriotic few. I am not afraid to trust the President with the powers which the food administration bill proposes to confer. He acts in the daylight and without a selfish interest. No president would abuse such a power."

Mr. Bryan is on his way to Kentucky and other Mississippi valley states, where he will lecture at a number of chautauquas. Mr. Bryan's chautauqua lectures are delivered in the afternoon. In the evening of each day he will speak at meetings arranged by the Democratic Forward League.

He is prefacing every address with an appeal for the Red Cross and the Army and Navy Y. M. C. A., and is urging increased food production as well as calling upon the people to furnish the money needed to carry on the war. He recently completed a lecture trip through the southwest from the Mississippi river to the Pacific coast.

One of the officers of the Rotary club proposes a resolution honoring the member who during the year has performed the most valuable public service. Why not? If each fraternity would do this we would soon have a national roll of honor that would inspire good deeds.

Mr. Bryan called on the President at noon, June 21st, by appointment. In the afternoon he called on the Belgian commission and the Russian commission.