physical force is neither invoked to compel the contracting parties to submit the dispute to the commission nor to enforce its findings.

To those who believe in good faith and that it can only be educated, not coerced into action in conformity with the given word, as well as to those who regard public opinion as the universal and supreme sanction before which in the long run crowns are humbled and against which the mailed fist strikes in vain, these harmless agreements, for they can neither injure man nor nation, will be a comfort and a hope: a comfort that the persuasion of public opinion is relied upon instead of physical coercion, and a hope that other advocates of justice between nations will regard these treaties as precedents for further progress.

Any dispute that can be talked about can be settled; and dispute that is talked about must and will be settled in accordance with the dictates of an insistent and enlightened public opinion. JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

Washington, D. C., July 9, 1918.

THE NEW TRIPLE ALLIANCE

Now this is the story of the new Triple Alliance:

The Prime Minister of France, speaking in the Chamber of Deputies in December last, said:

"There is an old system of alliances called the 'balance of power'. It seems to be condemned now-a-days; but if such a balance had preceded the war — if England, the United States, France and Italy, say, had agreed that whoever attacked one of them attacked the whole, the war would not have occurred. The system of alliances, which I do not renounce, will be my guiding thought at the peace conference."

The President of the United States replied, promptly and directly, at Manchester, saying:

"If the future had nothing for us but a new attempt to keep the world at a right poise by a balance of power, the United States would take no interest in it; because SHE WILL JOIN NO COMBINATION OF POWERS WHICH IS NOT A COMBINATION OF ALL OF US."

In addition to this challenge to M. Clemenceau, the President also said:

"There can be no alliances or leagues or special understandings within the general or common family of the league."

Despite these particularly explicit and positive declaration to the effect that the United States would enter no combination of powers save a universal league of nations, and that no limited alliance could possibly be formed by any members of the league, rumors arose that in order to mollify M. Clemenceau and to secure the support of France for the league, the President was negotiating a tripartite treaty, of America, Great Britain and France, for the special protection of the last named. Referring to these, the President's Secretary, Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty, in April proclaimed to the world:

"In view of the fact that certain newspapers of wide circulation have intimated that the President had entered into a secret alliance or treaty with some of the great powers, I conveyed this information to the President, and I am in receipt of a cablegram from him giving POSITIVE AND UNQUALIFIED DENIAL to this story."

Since then the President himself has lifted the veil of secrecy with this authoritative declaration:

"I have promised to propose to the senate a supplement (to the treaty of peace) in which we shall agree, subject to the approval of the council of the League of Nations, to come immediately to the aid of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany."

Finally, the text of the treaty, implicating America, Great Britain and France, long carefully concealed, was made public. It showed that the President had negotiated and signed a treaty with France, pledging this country to come to her aid immediately upon an unprovoked attack by Germany, provided that Great Britain makes a similar but not identical treaty with France, and that the council of the League of Nations approves it by a majority vote.

Apart from the interesting self-reversal of the President, this sequence of utterances and incidents discloses or suggests —

That the President practically said to France: Relinquish your demands for stronger guarantees against German aggression, and the United States will protect you; PROVIDED that a League of Nations is formed, and PROVIDED that when it is formed it consents to our helping you."

That the President now asks the senate of the United States to do something which he said the United States would never do.

That the President apparently expects the League of Nations to sanction something which he said it would never sanction.

That the President proposes to have the right and power of the United States to make treaties or contract alliances dependent upon the assent of the majority of an alien body; and this upon the heels of his declaration that the treaty of peace "recognizes the inalienable rights of nationality".— Harvey's Weekly.

Is the Law Enforcement Code Reasonable?

The Anti-Saloon league has never asked for enactment of a law to issue search warrants for liquor in a bona-fide private residence. In many of the states we have asked for a search and seizure law authorizing the seizure of liquors in alleged homes which had become places of public resort or for the illicit distribution of liquor. When the Federal code was introduced this provision was further safeguarded to prevent any abuse by the enemies of the measure. It provided that a search warrant could only be issued in such cases when two creditable witnesses filed affidavits setting forth the above facts. Because of the misrepresentation of this section, the house judiciary committee struck out this clause and it left the bill so that every home could become an open speak-easy where liquor was sold daily and the supply could not be seized. This was so manifestly unreasonable that the house promptly amended it so that liquor may be seized in a home where the liquor is actually sold in the residence.

The provisions relating to possession of liquor in the home and the right to seize such liquor are as follows. Sections 34 says:

"Every person legally permitted under this title to have liquor shall report to the commissioner within ten days after January 16, 1920, the kind and amount of intoxicating liquors in his possession. But it shall not be unlawful to possess liquors in one's private dwelling while the same is occupied and used by him as his dwelling only and such liquor need not be reported; but such liquors must be used for the personal consumption of the owner thereof and his family residing in such dwelling, and his bona fide guests when entertained by him therein; and the burden of proof shall be upon the possessor to prove that such liquor was lawfully acquired, possessed, and used."

Section 26 of the code says:

"No search warrant shall issue to search any private dwelling occupied as such unless it is being used for the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquor, or unless it is in part used for some business purpose such as a store, shop, saloon, restaurant, hotel or boarding house."

The above provisions are not as strong as those found in the state prohibition laws.

The Anti-Saloon league has not asked for any provision they did not have a strong reason for, and that was not backed up by precedent in the states. If some of these provisions do seem strong, it is because of the fact that we deal with the most lawless traffic in existence. The supreme court made this comment in sustaining the validity of the prohibition law— 245 U. S. 304.

"And considering the notorious difficulties always attendant upon the efforts to suppress traffic in liquors, we are unable to say that the challenged inhibition of their possession was arbitrary and unreasonable or without proper relation to the legitimate legislative purpose."

The courts and most legislative bodies have ceased to treat the liquor traffic with the courtesy of an invited guest, but rather as a trespasser. It is in a class by itself to the treatment of which there is no analogy in the law. The reason for it is manifest because the supreme court has characterized the beverage liquor traffic (137 U. S. 36), as "a source of crime and misery to society",— a traffic that has no inherent right to exist in the states or in the United States.

The friends of prohibition realize that a reasonable code must be adopted. If the purpose, however, of the 18th amendment is to be carried out, there should be no loop hole left in the law by which the illicit liquor traffic may be carried on. Those who are now asking for weakening amendments, will within two years, be demanding stronger provisions because experience will prove it to be necessary in order to prevent violations of law made possible by the provisions which they are now championing. The vote of 287 to 101 for the code which passed the house, is indicative of the feeling of the people, that a reasonable and enforceable code must be adopted. This is all that the Anti-Saloon league is asking for.—Wayne B. Wheeler, Attorney for Anti-Saloon League.

INCREASE OF 88 PER CENT IN FOOD COSTS SHOWN SINCE 1913

A Washington dispatch, dated Aug. 2, says: Since 1913, the cost of foodstuffs has advanced 88 per cent, records in the bureau of labor statistics revealed yesterday. During this period, articles which increased 100 per cent or more were:

Sugar, 100 per cent; pork chops and ham, 103 per cent each; bacon, 107 per cent; potatoes, 111 per cent; cornmeal, 125 per cent; flour, 127 per cent; and lard, 154 per cent.

During the past year alone food increased 14 per cent. Onions increased 133 per cent; prunes, 53 per cent; coffee, 41 per cent; potatoes, 31 per cent; cheese 28 per cent; eggs, 26 per cent; milk, 15 per cent; and flour, 12 per cent.

Cornmeal decreased 6 per cent; chuck roast and plate boiling beef each decreased 5 per cent; and navy beans, 16 per cent during the same period.

Since December, 1915, there has been an average increase of 120 per cent in the cost of wearing apparel, 45 per cent for fuel and light, 125 per cent for furniture and furnishings, and 65 per cent in miscellaneous articles.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL ACTION TO CURB PROFITEERS

(Continued from page 6.)

that immediate relief was necessary to stop profiteering and reduce the cost of living.

LOCAL BOARDS

"Third — The state legislature should pass an act immediately authorizing, by a general law, all municipalities of the state to create local trade commissions with powers to investigate and summon witnesses, and provide funds for its use, said local commission to supplement the work of the state and federal trade commissions.

"Fourth — The legislature should pass a general law amending the charters of all municipalities in the state authorizing them to establish public markets, municipal slaughter houses, municipal coal yards, and municipal produce stores, and authorize all municipalities to provide funds for the same.

"Some of the municipalities have authority now to do some of these things, but others would have to amend their charters. Some municipal officials would be opposed to amending local charters and the profiteer would object, but the legislature can avoid delay and expense, and avoid local contests, by passing a general law authorizing the establishment of municipal food houses when necessary to protect the people. If this privilege is given to municipalities the people will compel action by their municipal officials or they would recall them. The establishment of municipal produce stores, supplementing the work the federal government is now doing, by selling supplies direct to the public by parcel post, will break the combinations in foodstuffs that is raising the cost of living to a prohibitive price, and is the chief cause of creating the unrest which foreshadows serious trouble if conditions are not remedied."

If the governors of the several states would call special sessions of the state legislatures and enact the legislative suggestions above, the profiteers whose work is confined to state lines (the greater number are local and cannot be reached by federal action) would soon be brought to task.