

movement, notwithstanding that it has been affirmatively settled by the courts of the country, including the Supreme tribunal of the land. In view of this decision it does not appear ingenious to contend that some other plan than prohibition would be more uniform with popular government. Such a contention might have some force if prohibition were not in harmony with American institutions. As it is in line with the genius of our government, it follows that if the people favor its establishment, it ought to prevail. Why then should objection be raised against permitting an expression of the popular will on the subject? The only incentive for it that I can conceive of is an apprehension that the result would be a popular affirmative.

It is pleasing to note that no objection seems to be raised on moral grounds, which are tacitly admitted to be all on the prohibitory side of the question. No sane person who happens to be honest, would be likely to make an assault upon the proposal from a moral standpoint, although it is somewhat difficult to anticipate what might not be expected when, at this late date, as already stated, the point of constitutionality is raised in a quarter where there ought to be familiarity with the law. Up to the present, however, the most enthusiastic advocates of the saloon as an institution have not assailed the moral effects of prohibitory legislation, and there is therefore but little need to give this feature more than a passing allusion. The whole object of the proposition is to prevent crime and consequent disaster and ruin.

It has become common for some people to assert that "Prohibition does not prohibit." It is not claimed that it does, but in this regard it does not differ from any other legislation. There are laws against stealing, slander and murder, but the crimes against which these statutes are aimed are of hourly occurrence. No person would, because of the inadequacy of these laws to prohibit, object to their existence. If they were removed from the statute books anarchy would reign in triumphant horror. It is correctly claimed that prohibition minimizes the most gigantic evil that afflicts humanity—the curse of strong drink.

Surely this is a sordid age. One is sometimes tempted to ask whether any question could be raised, no matter as to its moral status, that would not bring forth the common interogatory, "Will it pay?" It appears to me that anything will pay that will save host of men, women and children from degradation, want and unutterable woe, even if the reward should not come in the form of the potential dollar. Surely the souls and bodies of mortals are more precious than lucre. I believe, however, that prohibition would even pay financially, notwithstanding the abolition of the license revenue derived from the great liquid misery producer. The public expenses would be greatly reduced by the consequent diminution of crime. The bulk of the people of Utah have already an almost world-wide reputation for honesty, sobriety, industry and general morality. These commendable

characteristics have attracted many estimable citizens to take up their abode here. The extinguishment of the saloon as an institution would develop these fundamental qualities, and the good, the law-abiding and the enterprising would be attracted to this beautiful region as a place of repose, of safety, and where prosperity reigned. On the contrary, criminals, whisky-sones and corruptionists generally would regard it as a place un congenial to their tastes and practices.

The sum of peace, of industry and general financial prosperity would be increased and the new star on the flag of our nation would be justly esteemed as representing the model State of the Union—a light to the nation. I believe this to be her destiny.

The success of prohibition in Utah has been questioned, even if it should become a part of the supreme law of the State. Who can doubt its success, with such a community as there is in this Territory? It has a large measure of success in other states where it obtains, yet there are thousands who share with me the conviction that there is not a more favorable field for it in existence than is presented in Utah.

It has already been frankly conceded by a prominent and influential local journal which is opposed to the submission of this question to the popular verdict, that a very large majority of the people in the rural districts would, in case they were given the opportunity to do so, vote in the affirmative. In considering the proposal to point the members-elect of the Constitutional Convention from those districts are in duty bound to view it from the basis of the principle of popular sovereignty. Surely they will not act in opposition to what is so clearly and admittedly the will of the constituency they have been chosen to represent. To be consistent with the theory of our government they cannot do otherwise than cast their votes in favor of the submission of the question of prohibition to the people. Otherwise they would defeat the will of those who elected them.

JOHN NICHOLSON.

Salt Lake City, Feb. 23, 1895.

GOOD OLD DAYS NO MORE

As a citizen and taxpayer I have been for years noticing the changes which have taken place in the governmental and financial affairs of our Territory, and I have been led to believe that our present financial condition is due very largely to a lack of proper consideration on the part of the people in the selection of the members of our Legislatures, and the persons we have selected to fill the various city, county and territorial offices.

Those whom we selected in the various cities and counties to fill the offices for many years after the first settlement of the Territory were farmers and mechanics, or their sons, and they were in sympathy with the people, and labored faithfully and well in the interests of the people. They secured for their compensation a consideration commensurate with the earnings of the common people. They were satisfied and faithfully discharged the duties of the various offices they were selected to fill for a reasonable remuneration, and did not feel that

to have office was to fatten on the hard earnings of the common people. As a result no one was seeking office, but when men were selected to fill an office in the gift of the people, as a matter of honor they accepted the position offered and discharged the duties thereof honestly and conscientiously. The office sought the man, the man did not seek the office. The result was that city, county and territorial taxes were low, the cities were out of debt, the counties out of debt, the Territory out of debt.

But after awhile a change came. The wise and good men who had made a residence in this Territory possible; the Pioneers who had so wisely organized the Territory and had enacted the good and wholesome laws which had kept us out of debt and yet had opened up our canyons, bridged our rivers, built our roads, brought out the mountain streams for irrigating purposes, opening up this whole section of country for settlements, and at the same time kept the red man at bay—those great men began to wear out and leave the responsibility of continuing the structure they had erected to the care of those who should follow after them.

The result has been that our Legislatures began to be filled with men who had filled various local offices in their respective cities and counties and who had begun to seek office. They wanted higher salaries and more fees; and when once they had the legislative power in their hands they used that power to build up their own interests and disregarded the interests of the people. In order that they might receive more fees and higher salaries, the taxes of the people must be increased, and they increased them. They made the offices very desirable and from that time on our taxes have steadily increased and in the same ratio office-seekers have multiplied, until today to get office means to get a "fat thing" and to fleece the common people.

It has now reached a pass when office holders who work from six to eight hours a day think they should receive from \$100 to \$200 per month, while the laboring man is glad to get \$30 per month. There are but few, if any of these office-holders, such as county clerks, assessors, collectors, recorders, etc., who have the experience or ability of the common farmer; and yet they demand and expect more salary than the farmer can realize from his own labor and the capital he has invested in his farm and machinery. A girl from one of our district schools, where she decides to call herself a teacher and go into a school, expects more per annum than the well-to-do farmer (if there be any such) can realize from his farm. When a bill was presented in our last Legislature to cut down the fees of county officers a voice went up against it from those officers throughout the Territory.

I notice that the Bar association of Utah in their judicial department of the Constitution of Utah, provide that the district judges shall receive not less than \$5,000 per annum each, which is just about the earnings of ten good solid farmers on their farms. That same kind of legislative enactment has already plundered the Territory and almost every county and city into debt, and has sold many a home