

prehends the facts, can approve a partnership which gives both partners part of the profits, but charges one of the partners with all the losses at the time of dissolution. This is neither just nor equitable. So it cannot be the right way out. The only course open for us is to support a square deal abolition of the liquor traffic."

The assertion that liquor is the cause of 75 per cent. of the crimes committed is absolutely false. Drink is not a cause, it is an effect. Judge John A. Perry says: "Idleness and not intoxicating liquor is the greatest cause of crime."

It has been said that if you cut out the booze that you will reduce the cost of criminal government. But the facts declare otherwise. There are more policemen and detectives in Prohibition cities and states than in licensed ones. Minneapolis, a licensed city, has one policeman for every 981 of its population, while Prohibition Nashville has one policeman for every 800 of its population.

Dry Memphis had 64 murders for every 100,000 of its population in 1912, while wet Milwaukee had only four murders.

Prohibitionists do not want absolute Prohibition. Notice how their Prohibition bills read: "That the sale, manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, or sale of liquors for beverage purposes be prohibited."

That is a very clever clause. You see it does not prohibit the manufacture, importation, etc., for USE. Any number of men can club together and manufacture for use. They can also manufacture, etc., for medicinal, scientific, religious, mechanical and other purposes. The act prevents manufacturing for sale and for beverage purposes.

Is it any wonder that blind pigs, and thousands of private distilleries jump into being in Prohibition places?

Which is the best for the health and safety of a city: to have your liquors sold under supervision or to have anybody manufacture liquors secretly, and thus supply you with poisonous stuff? Is it any