

The question stands

(2 Henry IV, Act IV, Scene 1)

Clubb in the Rochester Times-Union



Keep to the right

From B. L. Canfield, Geneva, N. Y.

Orr in the Chicago Tribune



Copyright, 1927, by the Chicago Tribune

We hope China hasn't been watching us handle Mexico

From O. B. Nelson, Kendallville, Ind.

Knott in the Dallas News



Leaving them till next December

Talbert in the Knoxville (Tennessee) News-Sentinel



Can he get away with that old one?

From Mrs. Patterson Miller, Russellville, Tenn.

House of Representatives will expire at midnight, March 3. Recently he was appointed Under-Secretary of the Treasury. The appointment was confirmed by the Senate. He tendered his resignation as Representative to Governor Smith, of New York. It was understood that he had ceased to be a Representative and had become an official of the Treasury Department. But he withdrew his resignation and announced that he would serve out his term as Representative. His appointment and confirmation as Under-Secretary of the Treasury, however, stood, and he indicated that he would assume the duties of that office on March 4. He was even quoted by the Associated Press as saying that until that time he would "divide his attention between duties at the Treasury and looking after certain administrative measures at the Capitol." Other despatches said authorities agreed that Mr. Mills had the right to do this.

A layman is inclined to wonder what becomes of that provision of the Constitution of the United States which declares that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office." The houses of Congress have not always been particularly expert in construing the Constitution, and it is perhaps just as well that they refrain from debating this question during the little time that remains of this Congress and of Mr. Mills's term.

Mr. Mills is recognized as having unusual knowledge of matters pertaining to taxation, and he will no doubt be highly serviceable to the Treasury Department as Under-Secretary. His knowledge of taxation is also useful to the Administration in connection with bills pending in Congress. He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, in which tax legislation originates, and has been particularly active in connection with the Green-Andrews Medicinal Liquor Bill, which the Ways and Means Committee has refused to support and for which it will draft a substitute.

Medicinal Liquor Bill Dies

THE Government will not buy whisky trade-marks and distillery good will.

The Green-Andrews Medicinal Liquor Bill is as good as dead. The Ways and Means Committee of the House voted 16 to 8 against reporting it, and Chairman Green, whose name it bears, himself was among those in opposition. But the measure was not, in fact, Chairman Green's bill. It was the Prohibition Unit's bill, approved and urged by Gen-

eral Andrews, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of prohibition enforcement.

Opposition in the Committee was led by Representative Garner, a Democrat, but the party line was not drawn. Members of both parties voted on both sides. The objections urged were, principally, that the proposed corporation would have a perpetual monopoly, not only of existing spirits, but of future supplies, and that the bill would legislate probably fifty million dollars of fictitious value into about twelve million gallons of liquor now in warehouses. As *The Outlook* pointed out a few weeks ago, the corporation would have had authority to buy, not merely liquor, but brands, trade-marks, trade names, and good will of distilleries; and, since payment was to have been made largely in stock of the corporation, the owners of these brands and trade names would have become in large part the owners of the Medicinal Liquor Corporation, essentially a private corporation financed with Government money.

The Ways and Means Committee, when it rejected the Green-Andrews Bill, appointed a sub-committee to draft a new measure. The purpose of the sub-committee will be to draft a bill which will avoid two dangers—first, that of putting the Government into the liquor business; and, second, that of creating a monopoly corporation under the wing of the Government. The substitute bill will provide for concentration and control of the present supply of liquor and, when additional supplies of medicinal spirits are needed, for their manufacture and distribution under Government direction at reasonable prices. There is no probability that such a bill will emerge in time for passage at this session of Congress. There is, however, a sincere disposition to give the Prohibition Unit the kind of legislation it needs if not the kind it has asked for, and the new bill will probably be in a favorable position for passage early in the first session of the Seventieth Congress.

Echoes of Mr. McAdoo's Speech

THE Toledo speech of William G. McAdoo has been, by those who oppose not alone prohibition but enforcement of the law, condemned as illogical and absurd. It has been, by Mr. McAdoo's admirers, lauded as "the Cooper Union speech" of the campaign for upholding the dignity of the Constitution. It may be neither the one thing nor the other, but that it has had a profound effect is proved by the number of

statements that it has called forth on the other side.

Two Democrats of considerable prominence, first Bainbridge Colby and then Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, attacked Mr. McAdoo's position and advanced proposals of their own for getting rid, in one way or another, of the necessity for enforcing a part of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Colby, in language very crisp and clear, made proposals which were rather turgid. The "intolerable evil" must be got rid of, but he did not undertake to say how. He held out the hope, however, that prohibition will not endure. It is an interesting coincidence that E. & J. Burke, Limited, disagreed with him by their actions. Before prohibition went into effect they shipped from Ireland and stored in New York 7,000 cases of ale and stout, in order to have it ready when the Prohibition Law should be modified. At about the time that Mr. Colby was issuing his statement the Burkes, having given up hope, put their ale and stout aboard ship and sent it back to Ireland.

Albert C. Ritchie, Governor of the only State that has not at any time done anything toward enforcement of the Volstead Law and which has objected most strenuously to having the Federal Government do anything, was much more definite than Mr. Colby in his proposals. If he was correctly quoted, his program is one of out-and-out nullification—of permitting each State to violate the Eighteenth Amendment at its pleasure.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, Republican, found occasion to say at a club meeting that no man not a wet can be elected President in 1928.

Will Those in Favor of the Constitution Please Stand Up?

AT about the same time as these statements came the report of Dr. Charles Norris, chief medical examiner of the Health Department of New York City, on deaths from alcoholism. The timing of this report, doubtless, was entirely independent of the political utterances, preceding and concurrent, but it may have helped along the cumulative effect. The report is extremely detailed and technical. It showed that 741 persons died of drink in New York City in 1926. It had much to say of poisoned alcohol—which, after all, means about as much as "poisoned strychnine" would.

The fact may be depended upon that all of these statements and the various