

man, a member of a community, has any such right, and the liquor business is entirely unwarranted. It has been said that the citizen is to be compared to a partner in a business. How long do the other partners put up with a partner who weakens himself through the liquor habit and becomes a burden on them? Not long? He has the same 'individual right' to drink under those conditions as under the constitution. Why does not the law force his partners in business to support him as it does his partners in government? "But the schools must be supported." Supporting the schools on the blood money wrung from the victims of the liquor habit, and those victimized by them, the license money is sanctified by the blood of the innocents—is as rational and moral a proceeding as it would be to turn the denizens of the saloon, the jail and the asylum loose in some Utopia of ethical self-supporting men and women, and expect it to remain a fit abode for decent people. Where the saloon is there is hell. Everyone who votes for and supports the liquor business is ethically insane, is an upholder of suicide, poverty, crime. Glorious trinity! The most flourishing product of American civilization! "The good people of the town are largely for license." Why call ye them "good?" "The majority of them are Christians." "What! Christians?" "Christians", and support suicide, poverty and crime? "Preposterous!" How can a man "love his brother" and license him to the "individual liberty" of ruining himself, his family and often become a criminal? A criminal is one who through his own act weakens or destroys his self-maintaining ability. The confirmed drunkard and the murderer are on the same level. But why this support of license to maintain the schools by Christian people? To save the small increase of personal taxation that would be required to support the schools! There is no other reason! Yes, there is one! General ethical ignorance and profound moral indifference! If the liquor business is based on "individual liberty", so is all business founded on individual necessity. That being so, the singling out of the liquor business for a special and penalizing tax is unconstitutional. If regulation is aimed at (it is not) that can be done without penalizing the liquor dealer. The primary idea of a high license may have arisen with the public on the assumption that the business is immoral and should pay for some of the harm it does. Were that so instead of supporting the schools with the license fund it should be used to maintain the families of those who pay the blood money. In point of fact the license is in favor of the saloon keeper, if the public protects him as it in honor is bound to do. It limits the number of saloons and is a guarantee to the saloon keeper that the public will aid him in suppressing oppo-

sition and giving him a degree of monopoly. The public is unethically insane. It burdens itself with expense. It lays itself open to the dangers of crime. It encourages breach of public peace. It is false to itself, false to its duty as individual citizens, and false to the constitution as members of a common country. The public is the criminal in the liquor business.

FRANK S. BILLINGS.  
Grafton, Mass.

ANDREWS REPLIES.

EDITOR THE CONSERVATIVE:

Most butter makers, the writer included, know there has been legislation, both state and national, restricting oleomargarine and other adulterations, intended to protect the consumer, and also know that the present laws do not "suffice," and that oleomargarine is being sold all over the world as butter, and at genuine butter prices, and enter no complaint against the manufacturer so long as he complies with the laws, but hope to remodel them or construct new ones in such a manner that he cannot become a party to the deceptions practiced. You have wonderfully expanded your "limitation on butter makers," and when you include those who have and will continue to contribute to the legitimate expense required for the enactment of laws to protect the consumers of butter, you overdo the matter, yet he will not resent the imputation, but when you class him who works for \$40.00 per month in the list with Senator-Clark-of-Montana boodlers, he simply smiles in derision at your feigned ignorance; he knows you know better.

Your list of ingredients proves that it was not the beef market you were so deeply interested in as you would wish us to think, for last, and least, if you would say so, is the oil from beef fat. Possibly lack of space deterred you from giving the per cent of each ingredient, and why was the per cent of cream given and not the per cent of beef fat, which you are so much interested in? Is it not a fact that the more cream the more respectable the cause, and the greater the cost of the finished article? Keep on increasing the per cent of cream and in time no legislation will be required.

Neither the writer nor Hoard's Dairyman charged the manufacturer of violating the law of branding or taxation, but do say that by the time it reaches most consumers all brands or birth marks have vanished, and it is sold as genuine butter. The writer's personal opinion is, that a ten cent per pound tax is unimportant compared to prohibition of coloring to imitate Nature's June tinted cream made article, for without that color its brand or birth mark is indelible.

Did THE CONSERVATIVE never see

those beautiful rolls of butter made by the good mother long before "butter coloring" was known? Does it not know that eighty per cent of creamery butter is not colored; that the coloring substance that will come the nearest to producing the natural June tint is the one that oleomargarine manufacturers are using, and the nearer that tint the more delighted his heart, the greater the sales and the profits; and does it not know that millions of dollars have been spent in the endeavor to produce a "substance" that would impart that tint? If it does, it must on second thought, blush at its assertion that "oleomargarine is not colored to imitate genuine butter."

N. S. ANDREWS.

Dubuque, Ia.

METHODISM  
DECLINING.

The bishops of  
the Methodist  
Church have issued

an appeal to the membership, calling attention to the decrease in attendance and account for this decline in the creed in this way:

"The decline in our membership is not an accident. It comes from a sufficient cause. The cause is the slipping cog in our experience, our lack of spiritual power. The gulf between capital and labor threatens us both sides. On one side, 'not many mighty, not many noble, are called.' On the other, strange forces are alienating the poor. The labor unions, organized most compactly, are much influenced by men hostile to the church. Their gatherings are generally on the Sabbath, thus keeping the men out of our reach. We seem in some places above our business."

A PORTO RICAN PLATFORM.

- First—Free trade with the United States.
- Second—Territorial government.
- Third—Good roads.—San Juan News.

In the District Court of Otoe County, Nebraska.

In the matter of the Guardianship of Geo. F. Wilson, Daniel P. Wilson and Herman F. Wilson, Minors.	In the District Court of Otoe County, Nebraska.
---	---

THIS cause came on for hearing on the petition of Thomas Wilson, guardian of Geo. F. Wilson, Daniel P. Wilson and Herman F. Wilson, minors, praying for a license to sell real estate owned by said minors, to wit, the north half of the northeast quarter of Section thirty-four, Township ten, north of Range ten, east, in Cass County, Nebraska, for purpose of better investment, and it appearing to the court that it would be for the best interests of the said minors that said herein described real estate should be sold on the terms and at the price mentioned in said petition, it is therefore ordered and directed that the next of kin, and all persons interested in said estate appear before me in open court at the court house in Nebraska City, Otoe County, Nebraska, on the seventh day of May, 1900, at two o'clock in the afternoon of said day, to show cause why license should not be granted to said guardian to sell said real estate for the purpose set forth in said petition, and to invest the money received for the sale of said lands and other money on hand belonging to said wards as prayed for in said petition, and that a copy of this order be published for four consecutive weeks in THE CONSERVATIVE.

Dated this 3rd day of April, 1900.  
PAUL JESSEN,  
Judge of the District Court of Otoe County,  
Nebraska.

EATON & TIMBLIN,  
Attorneys for Petitioner.