

in bars goes to pay for stock, wages, interest, rents, taxes, revenue, etc.

Why should women favor Prohibition? It is not going to help them one iota. They do not drink and spend their wages at the bar. Yet, they are the poorest paid of all workers.

Which is the most helpful economically to a town: to buy your liquors locally and thus employ local labor and spend your money at home and help build up your own city, or to spend your money in outside towns and provinces and thus encourage the mail order business and help build up the next town?

Don't be a dog in the manger. If you don't want to drink yourself, don't try to stop the other fellow.

The so-called Prohibition wave failed to cover several states that voted on the issue recently. These states are California, Texas, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Ohio, Vermont, each of which vetoed Prohibition with a big majority.

If Prohibition prohibits, how is, or why is it that the consumption of alcohol is on the increase?

In 1850 the consumption of wine, beer and whisky, per capita, in the United States, was 4.08 gallons; in 1914 the consumption was 22.50 gallons per capita. This fact in itself is sufficient to prove that Prohibition is a farce.

Mr. Clarence Gibbony, President Law and Order Society of Philadelphia, speaking on Prohibition and Compensation, said: "The only effective plan, it seems to me, by which we can permanently get rid of the liquor business is to pass a Prohibition amendment to the constitution—appropriate a sum of money sufficiently large to meet the requirements—provide for the appointment of some sort of commission, with authority to appraise all liquor establishments at their actual value, and in some such manner compensate the licensed dealers for some part of the actual cash lost, following the dissolution of the partnership, thereby enabling them to engage in some other business. . . . I cannot understand how any good citizen, if he com-