

keeper's company to that of his wife will not be in the democratic party long."

"If we are going to favor woman suffrage," continued Mr. Bryan, "we might as well go the whole hog and drive the saloon out of politics."

**Iceland Votes "Dry."**

A Copenhagen cablegram, January 25, says: The parliament of Iceland, 34 of whose 40 members are elected by popular suffrage, has passed a measure forbidding the sale of alcoholic liquors. All the remaining stock in the Danish dependency has been exported.

**Alabama's Liquor Law.**

A Montgomery, Ala., dispatch, February 9, says: The bill preventing any person receiving more than one quart of liquor a month from outside the state became a law automatically today. It becomes effective June 30 when the state goes dry.

**"Drys" Win in Iowa.**

A Des Moines, Ia., dispatch, February 12, says: Statewide prohibition in Iowa January 1, 1916, was practically assured this afternoon when the senate, by a vote of 27 to 22, passed the Clarkson bill for the repeal of the mullet law.

The house is regarded overwhelmingly dry and it is expected the question will be up there within the next week.

The prohibitory amendment to the constitution, providing for statewide prohibition, passed the Iowa senate today by a vote of 39 to 10. The measure now goes to the house.

As the house is dry by a big margin, it is claimed that the amendment will go through that branch of the legislature almost without discussion.

The temperance forces say the prohibition question will go before the people in a special election in 1917. It must be passed by the next legislature before it can be submitted to the people.

**Utah to Get Into the Dry Column.**

A Salt Lake City, dispatch, February 12, says: After a prolonged and spirited debate the state senate passed the Wooten statewide prohibition bill by a vote of 14 to 3, with one member absent. It is regarded as equally certain that the measure will pass the house by a large majority.

The bill is stringent in its provisions, with the search and seizure clause, immunity for informers, fine and imprisonment for second offenses and revocation of doctors' and druggists' licenses for writing or filling illegal prescriptions. The bill does not permit advertising or soliciting for sales of liquor in the state. All preparations which contain more than one-half of 1 per cent alcohol are defined as liquors. The proposed law is to be effective June 1, 1916.

**Alabama Becomes Prohibition State.**

Montgomery, Ala., January 14: A bill to make Alabama a prohibition state after June 30, 1915, was passed by both houses of the legislature. The vote today was 74 to 27 in the house and 26 to 9 in the senate.

A Montgomery, Ala., dispatch, January 22, says: Alabama will become a prohibition state July 1, under two related measures which became law tonight without executive approval. Within a few hours after Governor Henderson had vetoed the bills and asked that the prohibition question be submitted to voters at a special election both houses voted down his proposal and passed the bills by overwhelming majorities.

The vote in the house on re passage was 73 to 29; in the senate it was 24 to 10. The prohibition measure re-enacts the prohibition law repealed

in 1911, after it had been in force two years. Under the 1911 local option law all but eight of the sixty-seven counties voted dry.

**UNJUST CRITICISM OF MR. BRYAN**

Secretary Bryan is coming in for criticism, both good-natured and sarcastic, on account of his letter to Walker W. Vick expressing a desire to place good democrats in office in Santo Domingo. Some of the high-brow political reformers and hypocrites profess to stand aghast at this letter, and several newspapers denounce Mr. Bryan as if he had been guilty of something almost criminal. We have no patience with such cant and hypocrisy.

Mr. Bryan was guilty of remembering his friends. He was guilty of seeking to place in office suitable democrats instead of men of other parties. He was guilty of preferring to have in the government service men of his own political belief, whose sympathies were with the party in power, and who might be depended upon to make the party's administration a success.

May all party leaders be as great criminals, if these things are crimes!

Mr. Bryan is criticised for an act that reflects credit upon his political and personal character. He did nothing that was not honorable as a man or judicious as a party leader. He would have been deserving of criticism if he had proved an ingrate to his followers and associates, if he had failed to try to strengthen the administration by placing democrats in office.

The people hold a political party responsible for its acts when it is placed in power. The party is on trial, trying to make good its pledges. It has a right to select its own agents in carrying out its policies. A few months ago, through mistaken confidence in a republican who held office from the preceding administration, the department of justice was placed in a most embarrassing predicament and subjected to unwarranted attacks. The republican officeholder took advantage of his position to make political capital against his superiors, and then, to escape dismissal, he resigned. The incident confirmed the opinion of all sensible men that a political party in power not only has the right, but is charged with the duty of placing its own party men in places of responsibility.

We hope there will be an end to the hypocritical criticism of Mr. Bryan for his straightforward and honorable effort to put democrats in office.—Washington Post.

**DEFEAT THAT IS HALF VICTORY**

The vote in the house of representatives on the woman's suffrage constitutional amendment was one of those defeats which have some of the elements of victory. It must have realized the most hopeful expectations of those advocates who understood the situation and were not "a prey to the illusion of hope."

Today as a result of that vote woman's suffrage stands in a stronger position than it ever did before. The vote on the amendment—204 against and 174 in favor—is unquestionably more impressive than the usual comparison of the suffrage with the non-suffrage or even the partial suffrage states. It shows the great and growing hold that the movement has as nothing else could have shown it at this time.

It may be said that divers congressmen voted for the amendment who were not personally in favor of woman's suffrage and whose constituents would possibly not indorse it. But opposed to this we may place the argument that such complaisance from general motives of political ex-



pediency, is perhaps the most powerful testimony that could be had to the strength of the suffrage movement.

The defeat of the suffrage amendment will furnish additional ammunition for the prosecution of the campaign in the various states. It will give the plan a dignity and an importance which a number of states have been slow to concede it. And these gains are much more real than would have been even the success of the proposition to submit an amendment, destined at the best to defeat at the Lands of the solid south, with the aid of a few other states.

The defeat, moreover, leaves the woman's suffrage forces reanimated, undispersed and in a position which enables them to avail themselves of all the resources of good military and political strategy. They can take the opposition in detail in the various states, concentrating their national and local forces against it instead of attempting to vanquish the entire

anti-suffrage forces of the nation in one grand assault.

The constitutional amendment, like most short cuts to a desired object, naturally appears more attractive. But it is likely to be for a good many years a short cut to defeat instead of victory. Many states which don't want woman's suffrage themselves are quite willing for other states to have it. Many who do want it themselves—so strong is the influence of respect for local rights—would assuredly hesitate to impose it on states which do not want it.

In brief, the fight must first be won at home. Washington reflects but does not mold the sentiment of the country. It follows eagerly public opinion, once it is fully ascertained, but it never risks trying to interpret that sentiment too far in advance. When the time comes for a constitutional amendment there will be little need of it except to register a decision already rendered by the nation.—Chicago Herald.

**Essential to the Education of Girls in Practical Home Economics**

is the teaching in schools of the many uses of a sewing machine to save time and money, as well as to gratify a taste for the beautiful. The Singer should, as a matter of course, be the only machine in school equipment because it is in most general use. Its cost is no more than for less desirable machines, and it is placed in the school on such liberal terms of payment that no school officer can plead poverty as an excuse for not having it. Should the pupil enter employment in any of the stitching industries, her knowledge of the Singer will be of great advantage because it is universally used by such industries.

**THE SINGER COMPANY**

furnishes schools, without charge, large wall charts illustrating stitch formation, also text books for sewing classes.

SINGER SHOPS are located in every city, and machine repairs, needles, oil, etc., are easily obtained.