

## NO ARGUMENT CONVINCED HIM

An Investigator Wants To Hear  
From a Friend of Anti-  
Prohibition.

ALL LAW RESTRAINS LIBERTY  
Necessity for Curtailment of Freedom  
Exists in All Nations—Views Ad-  
vanced Are Easily Refuted.

The "News" is in receipt today of the following communication:

Can you afford space for a further presentation on the subject of prohibition by one who has not been a teetotaler, and whose associates likewise are not prohibitionists in practice? Opposed to sumptuary laws I have diligently sought for argument against prohibition. The more I have sought the fewer I have found.

Briefly the essential result of my inquiries has been to disclose the fact that there is not advanced a single sound argument against legislation seeking the complete stoppage of the liquor traffic. This conclusion has been reached through inquiry of and discussion with those only friendly to the manufacture, sale and use of liquor. In no instance whatever has information been sought or the subject discussed with a friend of prohibition.

Few are the arguments advanced against prohibition deserving consideration. Even these consist of stock in trade assertions, spoken with a conviction and assurance that may mean much to the one employing them, but which, in the hands of an ordinary mental analysis, prove the person using them either mentally wanting or willfully misleading.

I would favor prohibition if it would prohibit. But the passage of a prohibition law only increases crime and deprives the people of a needed and deserved source of revenue.

Your readers have heard this again and again from the lips of men holding important official and moral positions—some of them men who do not touch liquor in any form. That prohibition does not absolutely prohibit no sane person can deny. If that fact, however, gives clear and unmeasurable justification for refusing to pass a prohibition statute, then the time has come for abolishing every law in the world—national, state and municipal. Nor is there left any basis for insisting upon observance of the laws of God or of conscience. There is no law given to man by God or made by man in the form of statutes, that is not violated—that is honored more in the breach than in the observance. That is why we have convicts, jails and penitentiaries, churches and preachers. If the fact that any law cannot always be faithfully observed is a reason for enactment, then the abolition of all legislative and moral restraints becomes a logical necessity, for none is faithful to the laws of God or man. Against such a conclusion there can be no resistance save from persons of unsound mind. If, on the contrary, and as is the case, prohibition is to recognize both moral and statutory laws—and so the wisdom of the world has decided—despite their repeated delinquency, then the statement that prohibition does not actually prohibit loses caste as a reputable argument against a prohibitory enactment. It must be pleasing to those striving to rid the world of crime, poverty and a nefarious political debt at the same time to realize that their honesty and logic are recognized at their true worth.

AS TO BUSINESS INTERESTS.  
Many gentlemen, including a majority of those composing the local real estate exchange, contend that prohibition will harm business interests. So, too, this same real estate association in the public debt that work may be begun on a state capital, we do not at this time need—and all that thereby a greater opportunity may be given the members of this association to sell more real estate—a worthy enough object, but hardly a justification for increasing the public debt. It may to some seem unfair to suggest this body as the bill recently suggested, which gives liquor-licensing power to the governor, has no honest purpose in view—but is designed by creating confusion, to prevent harmony among the legislators and so defeat any radical or valid effort whatever toward a salutary enactment. The bill is as infamous in method as it is in intent.

Now, as to the economic phase. If money not spent for alcoholics is wasted, as is a peach that rots for want of some one to eat it, then your saloon advocate would be right in holding that business would suffer if you destroyed liquor consumption; but even then it would not follow that such a business loss would not prove the wisest possible investment for the public. Who will contend that a dollar will not serve as a great commercial purpose when it buys beer as when it buys bread? Will not a dollar spent for potatoes hire as many men and prevent as much idleness as when it is spent for whisky?

How then can business suffer if the money devoted to the purchase of whisky is used in buying something more wholesome? It must follow that the money now spent for liquor will not be spent at all if the liquor trade is stopped, before the liquor interests can purchase. There is any loss to a community by the sale of liquor trade. The most blatant anti-prohibitionist will not undertake to prove such a result from prohibition.

SOME MEN WORK BETTER.  
The man who does not drink, and suffer in consequence, works, on the average, not only more hours, but he produces more and better in results in each hour he works. Therefore the dollar that is not spent for liquor not only does the entire community more good, but increases the general wealth, and by placing that wealth on a more stable and creditable foundation, increases the revenue of the state.

Taxes are used largely to meet court expenses. It were folly to argue with a man who would hold that drinking does not increase crime, but that crime adds to the demand for revenue to pay for handling the criminals drink has made. Diminish the number of criminals—as prohibition beyond the peradventure of a doubt does—and you have diminished the necessity for such revenue; and besides, you have necessarily raised the standard of public morals. This, of itself, is a complete answer to those who war against prohibition because the city and state need the money.

Think of it, fathers and mothers, think of it! You must sustain vice and permit the possible degradation of your homes, and allow the enrichment of those who tempt your young, because the whisky and beer maker and saloonkeeper tell you you can thereby save a few cents taxes! Was ever appeal made to a more Satanic spirit of man's kind? And what do you call those who make Satanic appeals? Have you elected and suffered to take office men who are pledged to aid those who advance such seductions in the vile faith that you can be so kind to include a continuation of the crime your hearts and faces are set against?

AS TO REALTY VALUES.  
Not a foot of ground rented for liquor houses or for brothels which does not lessen the selling and rental value of all property in the immediate vicinity. If it is to be used for reputable purposes, and we are safely told that prohibition would cause injury to property interests.

Any man who drinks intoxicants at all, however careful he may be—drinks too much sometimes, and so becomes a menace to the community. This declaration leads to another point advanced by those opposing prohibition. Every special pleader in behalf of the liquor interests concedes, nevertheless, that the right of regulation thereof, liquor men themselves assent to such control. Do they believe in such control? If so, why are they continually arrested for violating the regulations they are so free to assent to necessary? The admission that a close surveillance of their business is indispensable is a declaration that they may not be trusted and is made only because danger of drastic legislation threatens their liberty. Observe the practices of saloonkeepers in Bingham. Salt Lake City has dozens of saloonkeepers that habitually violate the fair regulations set forth in the ordinances, not alone as to the selling of liquor to minors, or on Sunday, but they permit gambling in and about their premises and they are known participants in the profits that robbery of the pockets of the people in their determination to make money. Who are these undesirable citizens are to blame if an outraged public rises against them?

AS TO PERSONAL LIBERTY.  
We are told it is an "infringement of personal liberty" to enact a law which declares he shall sell or buy alcohol in any form or for any purpose except as a medicine. So, every law in measure is in restraint of man's personal liberty. His personal rights are infringed when the law says he may carry weapons only under certain restrictions. His personal liberty is limited when he is denied the right to drive his horse or his automobile beyond a fixed limit of speed; and likewise his personal liberty is infringed when he cannot at will purchase opium, or cocaine, or whisky on Sunday, or commit suicide or gamble.

As a matter of pure logic, once it is conceded that the people, through municipal or state legislation, may limit the days in or the hours in which liquor may be purchased, the right of absolute abridgement and denial is also conceded. If the right of personal liberty warrants a man in buying or drinking at any specified time, it warrants him in buying or drinking every time he wills to. That the state gives him the privilege of doing these things at certain stated times does not warrant his assumption that it is an inherent right. It is merely a privilege that may be excluded or withdrawn altogether at the option of the state. A citizen has no right of personal liberty to drink—though he may be accorded that privilege. But we become extremely sensitive as to the personal right of man to do a weak or wrong thing, when, directly or indirectly, we have a selfish interest or advantage in permitting the man to do the weak or the wrong thing.

Finally, we are gravely warned that prohibition would involve a great wrong because such a law would in effect destroy the means invested in breweries and saloons—and the wrong would be doubly emphatic because the thing to be destroyed we had suffered to grow to its present magnitude. To give friendly ear to such a plea is to justify the endurance of every offense against public welfare—since it says that wrongs must continue to live because they have once been permitted to live. Such a plea is opposed to all moral advancement, because moral advancement means a lessening of those offenses, either against law or morals, by which some persons find a means of livelihood and often the power to amass great wealth.

A QUESTION TO ANSWER.  
Answers this, ye anti-prohibitionists: If the liquor industry is to be destroyed, what difference can it make to those destined to suffer the financial loss which that loss results from a great moral uplift which takes the people beyond the lure of intoxicants, or whether it follows from the enactment of prohibitory laws? The hour can make no possible difference here, if the loss is inevitable, but the buldest of you would not dare urge financial loss as an argument against a great moral movement strong enough to enforce itself without legislative aid. Yet, because the movement exists and is not strong enough to accomplish itself by moral suasion, and must therefore revert to statutory enactment, you strive to stem the rising tide by crying "confiscation" and "the destruction of vested rights." That is the last plea of the defeated in argument.

But, consider this phase in other aspect: Everyone will concede that the breeding of higher grades of horses, cattle and sheep is an upright and praiseworthy occupation. No one contends that the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for profit is very creditable. Now, in pursuit of my praiseworthy occupation, as a breeder I put every dollar I possess and can borrow into registered horses and cattle and import them into Utah. I am encouraged by the public and receive the recognition of my neighbors for follow-

## AFTER DOCTORS FAILED

Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound Cured Her.

Willimantic, Conn.—"For five years I suffered untold agony from female troubles, causing backache, irregularities, dizziness and nervous prostration. It was impossible for me to walk upstairs without stopping on the way. I tried three different doctors and each failed to do me any good. I received no benefit from any of them, but seemed to suffer more. The last doctor said nothing would restore my health, I began taking Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound to see what it would do, and I am restored to my natural health."—Mrs. ETTA DONOVAN, Box 260, Willimantic, Conn.

The success of Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, made from roots and herbs, is unparalleled. It may be used with perfect confidence by women who suffer from displacements, inflammation, ulceration, fibroid tumors, irregularities, periodic pains, backache, bearing-down feeling, flatulency, indigestion, dizziness, or nervous prostration.

For thirty years Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound has been the standard remedy for female ills, and suffering women owe it to themselves to at least give this medicine a trial. Proof is abundant that it has cured thousands of others, and why should it not cure you?

al and many exhibit on the part of a whole people which resolve to do away with the stimulation that the tea and coffee habit involves. So, too, would a unified and effective effort to stop smoking and chewing tobacco. No sensible person argues that the abandonment of these hurtful habits would be injurious to the state and the municipalities because they would involve loss to some kind of business. No sane opponent of prohibition by moral suasion ever dared contend that the advocate of prohibition was perpetrating a wrong should his success as an advocate lessen the consumption of liquor and as if anti-prohibitionists are correct—cause a loss to the city by diminishing license taxes and, as a natural sequence, increase the burdens of taxation to the people of the state by lessening the value of taxable property in the state. Such a contention—that an enactment in behalf of right living should fall because it would involve pecuniary loss never dared be advanced until the moral uplift of the people in their determination to conserve the public welfare and protect their children and homes had reached a stage so acute that it was likely to be made effective through legislative enactment.

ARGUED FOR GAMBLING.  
It is worth while to call attention to the employment of the same argument when there was a general demand for the suppression of gambling in Salt Lake City. "Such a course will injure business," is heard wherever a cry rises against horse racing, though the ruin of young and old follows in its wake because of the riotous robbery and gambling associated with horse racing. Every effort toward reform has been treated against extinction. Such a line of argument is invariably met by a base appeal to the passion of man for money. Open gambling was stopped in Salt Lake City. Who has observed the threatened business depression? It will be interesting to note the reply of any reputable citizen. Only the undesirable gambler—the parasite living wantonly on the toil of others, has ground to complain, and his voice is too weak now and his cause too nefarious to be heard.

Always, when all else fails, some special plea, or new suggestion is interposed to thwart the fair interest of those striving for the public good—just as the bill recently suggested, which gives liquor-licensing power to the governor, has no honest purpose in view—but is designed by creating confusion, to prevent harmony among the legislators and so defeat any radical or valid effort whatever toward a salutary enactment. The bill is as infamous in method as it is in intent.

Now, as to the economic phase. If money not spent for alcoholics is wasted, as is a peach that rots for want of some one to eat it, then your saloon advocate would be right in holding that business would suffer if you destroyed liquor consumption; but even then it would not follow that such a business loss would not prove the wisest possible investment for the public. Who will contend that a dollar will not serve as a great commercial purpose when it buys beer as when it buys bread? Will not a dollar spent for potatoes hire as many men and prevent as much idleness as when it is spent for whisky?

How then can business suffer if the money devoted to the purchase of whisky is used in buying something more wholesome? It must follow that the money now spent for liquor will not be spent at all if the liquor trade is stopped, before the liquor interests can purchase. There is any loss to a community by the sale of liquor trade. The most blatant anti-prohibitionist will not undertake to prove such a result from prohibition.

SOME MEN WORK BETTER.  
The man who does not drink, and suffer in consequence, works, on the average, not only more hours, but he produces more and better in results in each hour he works. Therefore the dollar that is not spent for liquor not only does the entire community more good, but increases the general wealth, and by placing that wealth on a more stable and creditable foundation, increases the revenue of the state.

Taxes are used largely to meet court expenses. It were folly to argue with a man who would hold that drinking does not increase crime, but that crime adds to the demand for revenue to pay for handling the criminals drink has made. Diminish the number of criminals—as prohibition beyond the peradventure of a doubt does—and you have diminished the necessity for such revenue; and besides, you have necessarily raised the standard of public morals. This, of itself, is a complete answer to those who war against prohibition because the city and state need the money.

Think of it, fathers and mothers, think of it! You must sustain vice and permit the possible degradation of your homes, and allow the enrichment of those who tempt your young, because the whisky and beer maker and saloonkeeper tell you you can thereby save a few cents taxes! Was ever appeal made to a more Satanic spirit of man's kind? And what do you call those who make Satanic appeals? Have you elected and suffered to take office men who are pledged to aid those who advance such seductions in the vile faith that you can be so kind to include a continuation of the crime your hearts and faces are set against?

AS TO REALTY VALUES.  
Not a foot of ground rented for liquor houses or for brothels which does not lessen the selling and rental value of all property in the immediate vicinity. If it is to be used for reputable purposes, and we are safely told that prohibition would cause injury to property interests.

Any man who drinks intoxicants at all, however careful he may be—drinks too much sometimes, and so becomes a menace to the community. This declaration leads to another point advanced by those opposing prohibition. Every special pleader in behalf of the liquor interests concedes, nevertheless, that the right of regulation thereof, liquor men themselves assent to such control. Do they believe in such control? If so, why are they continually arrested for violating the regulations they are so free to assent to necessary? The admission that a close surveillance of their business is indispensable is a declaration that they may not be trusted and is made only because danger of drastic legislation threatens their liberty. Observe the practices of saloonkeepers in Bingham. Salt Lake City has dozens of saloonkeepers that habitually violate the fair regulations set forth in the ordinances, not alone as to the selling of liquor to minors, or on Sunday, but they permit gambling in and about their premises and they are known participants in the profits that robbery of the pockets of the people in their determination to make money. Who are these undesirable citizens are to blame if an outraged public rises against them?

AS TO PERSONAL LIBERTY.  
We are told it is an "infringement of personal liberty" to enact a law which declares he shall sell or buy alcohol in any form or for any purpose except as a medicine. So, every law in measure is in restraint of man's personal liberty. His personal rights are infringed when the law says he may carry weapons only under certain restrictions. His personal liberty is limited when he is denied the right to drive his horse or his automobile beyond a fixed limit of speed; and likewise his personal liberty is infringed when he cannot at will purchase opium, or cocaine, or whisky on Sunday, or commit suicide or gamble.

As a matter of pure logic, once it is conceded that the people, through municipal or state legislation, may limit the days in or the hours in which liquor may be purchased, the right of absolute abridgement and denial is also conceded. If the right of personal liberty warrants a man in buying or drinking at any specified time, it warrants him in buying or drinking every time he wills to. That the state gives him the privilege of doing these things at certain stated times does not warrant his assumption that it is an inherent right. It is merely a privilege that may be excluded or withdrawn altogether at the option of the state. A citizen has no right of personal liberty to drink—though he may be accorded that privilege. But we become extremely sensitive as to the personal right of man to do a weak or wrong thing, when, directly or indirectly, we have a selfish interest or advantage in permitting the man to do the weak or the wrong thing.

Finally, we are gravely warned that prohibition would involve a great wrong because such a law would in effect destroy the means invested in breweries and saloons—and the wrong would be doubly emphatic because the thing to be destroyed we had suffered to grow to its present magnitude. To give friendly ear to such a plea is to justify the endurance of every offense against public welfare—since it says that wrongs must continue to live because they have once been permitted to live. Such a plea is opposed to all moral advancement, because moral advancement means a lessening of those offenses, either against law or morals, by which some persons find a means of livelihood and often the power to amass great wealth.

A QUESTION TO ANSWER.  
Answers this, ye anti-prohibitionists: If the liquor industry is to be destroyed, what difference can it make to those destined to suffer the financial loss which that loss results from a great moral uplift which takes the people beyond the lure of intoxicants, or whether it follows from the enactment of prohibitory laws? The hour can make no possible difference here, if the loss is inevitable, but the buldest of you would not dare urge financial loss as an argument against a great moral movement strong enough to enforce itself without legislative aid. Yet, because the movement exists and is not strong enough to accomplish itself by moral suasion, and must therefore revert to statutory enactment, you strive to stem the rising tide by crying "confiscation" and "the destruction of vested rights." That is the last plea of the defeated in argument.

But, consider this phase in other aspect: Everyone will concede that the breeding of higher grades of horses, cattle and sheep is an upright and praiseworthy occupation. No one contends that the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for profit is very creditable. Now, in pursuit of my praiseworthy occupation, as a breeder I put every dollar I possess and can borrow into registered horses and cattle and import them into Utah. I am encouraged by the public and receive the recognition of my neighbors for follow-

for whisky? How then can business suffer if the money devoted to the purchase of whisky is used in buying something more wholesome? It must follow that the money now spent for liquor will not be spent at all if the liquor trade is stopped, before the liquor interests can purchase. There is any loss to a community by the sale of liquor trade. The most blatant anti-prohibitionist will not undertake to prove such a result from prohibition.

SOME MEN WORK BETTER.  
The man who does not drink, and suffer in consequence, works, on the average, not only more hours, but he produces more and better in results in each hour he works. Therefore the dollar that is not spent for liquor not only does the entire community more good, but increases the general wealth, and by placing that wealth on a more stable and creditable foundation, increases the revenue of the state.

Taxes are used largely to meet court expenses. It were folly to argue with a man who would hold that drinking does not increase crime, but that crime adds to the demand for revenue to pay for handling the criminals drink has made. Diminish the number of criminals—as prohibition beyond the peradventure of a doubt does—and you have diminished the necessity for such revenue; and besides, you have necessarily raised the standard of public morals. This, of itself, is a complete answer to those who war against prohibition because the city and state need the money.

Think of it, fathers and mothers, think of it! You must sustain vice and permit the possible degradation of your homes, and allow the enrichment of those who tempt your young, because the whisky and beer maker and saloonkeeper tell you you can thereby save a few cents taxes! Was ever appeal made to a more Satanic spirit of man's kind? And what do you call those who make Satanic appeals? Have you elected and suffered to take office men who are pledged to aid those who advance such seductions in the vile faith that you can be so kind to include a continuation of the crime your hearts and faces are set against?

AS TO REALTY VALUES.  
Not a foot of ground rented for liquor houses or for brothels which does not lessen the selling and rental value of all property in the immediate vicinity. If it is to be used for reputable purposes, and we are safely told that prohibition would cause injury to property interests.

Any man who drinks intoxicants at all, however careful he may be—drinks too much sometimes, and so becomes a menace to the community. This declaration leads to another point advanced by those opposing prohibition. Every special pleader in behalf of the liquor interests concedes, nevertheless, that the right of regulation thereof, liquor men themselves assent to such control. Do they believe in such control? If so, why are they continually arrested for violating the regulations they are so free to assent to necessary? The admission that a close surveillance of their business is indispensable is a declaration that they may not be trusted and is made only because danger of drastic legislation threatens their liberty. Observe the practices of saloonkeepers in Bingham. Salt Lake City has dozens of saloonkeepers that habitually violate the fair regulations set forth in the ordinances, not alone as to the selling of liquor to minors, or on Sunday, but they permit gambling in and about their premises and they are known participants in the profits that robbery of the pockets of the people in their determination to make money. Who are these undesirable citizens are to blame if an outraged public rises against them?

AS TO PERSONAL LIBERTY.  
We are told it is an "infringement of personal liberty" to enact a law which declares he shall sell or buy alcohol in any form or for any purpose except as a medicine. So, every law in measure is in restraint of man's personal liberty. His personal rights are infringed when the law says he may carry weapons only under certain restrictions. His personal liberty is limited when he is denied the right to drive his horse or his automobile beyond a fixed limit of speed; and likewise his personal liberty is infringed when he cannot at will purchase opium, or cocaine, or whisky on Sunday, or commit suicide or gamble.

As a matter of pure logic, once it is conceded that the people, through municipal or state legislation, may limit the days in or the hours in which liquor may be purchased, the right of absolute abridgement and denial is also conceded. If the right of personal liberty warrants a man in buying or drinking at any specified time, it warrants him in buying or drinking every time he wills to. That the state gives him the privilege of doing these things at certain stated times does not warrant his assumption that it is an inherent right. It is merely a privilege that may be excluded or withdrawn altogether at the option of the state. A citizen has no right of personal liberty to drink—though he may be accorded that privilege. But we become extremely sensitive as to the personal right of man to do a weak or wrong thing, when, directly or indirectly, we have a selfish interest or advantage in permitting the man to do the weak or the wrong thing.

Finally, we are gravely warned that prohibition would involve a great wrong because such a law would in effect destroy the means invested in breweries and saloons—and the wrong would be doubly emphatic because the thing to be destroyed we had suffered to grow to its present magnitude. To give friendly ear to such a plea is to justify the endurance of every offense against public welfare—since it says that wrongs must continue to live because they have once been permitted to live. Such a plea is opposed to all moral advancement, because moral advancement means a lessening of those offenses, either against law or morals, by which some persons find a means of livelihood and often the power to amass great wealth.

A QUESTION TO ANSWER.  
Answers this, ye anti-prohibitionists: If the liquor industry is to be destroyed, what difference can it make to those destined to suffer the financial loss which that loss results from a great moral uplift which takes the people beyond the lure of intoxicants, or whether it follows from the enactment of prohibitory laws? The hour can make no possible difference here, if the loss is inevitable, but the buldest of you would not dare urge financial loss as an argument against a great moral movement strong enough to enforce itself without legislative aid. Yet, because the movement exists and is not strong enough to accomplish itself by moral suasion, and must therefore revert to statutory enactment, you strive to stem the rising tide by crying "confiscation" and "the destruction of vested rights." That is the last plea of the defeated in argument.

But, consider this phase in other aspect: Everyone will concede that the breeding of higher grades of horses, cattle and sheep is an upright and praiseworthy occupation. No one contends that the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for profit is very creditable. Now, in pursuit of my praiseworthy occupation, as a breeder I put every dollar I possess and can borrow into registered horses and cattle and import them into Utah. I am encouraged by the public and receive the recognition of my neighbors for follow-

for whisky? How then can business suffer if the money devoted to the purchase of whisky is used in buying something more wholesome? It must follow that the money now spent for liquor will not be spent at all if the liquor trade is stopped, before the liquor interests can purchase. There is any loss to a community by the sale of liquor trade. The most blatant anti-prohibitionist will not undertake to prove such a result from prohibition.

SOME MEN WORK BETTER.  
The man who does not drink, and suffer in consequence, works, on the average, not only more hours, but he produces more and better in results in each hour he works. Therefore the dollar that is not spent for liquor not only does the entire community more good, but increases the general wealth, and by placing that wealth on a more stable and creditable foundation, increases the revenue of the state.

Taxes are used largely to meet court expenses. It were folly to argue with a man who would hold that drinking does not increase crime, but that crime adds to the demand for revenue to pay for handling the criminals drink has made. Diminish the number of criminals—as prohibition beyond the peradventure of a doubt does—and you have diminished the necessity for such revenue; and besides, you have necessarily raised the standard of public morals. This, of itself, is a complete answer to those who war against prohibition because the city and state need the money.

Think of it, fathers and mothers, think of it! You must sustain vice and permit the possible degradation of your homes, and allow the enrichment of those who tempt your young, because the whisky and beer maker and saloonkeeper tell you you can thereby save a few cents taxes! Was ever appeal made to a more Satanic spirit of man's kind? And what do you call those who make Satanic appeals? Have you elected and suffered to take office men who are pledged to aid those who advance such seductions in the vile faith that you can be so kind to include a continuation of the crime your hearts and faces are set against?

AS TO REALTY VALUES.  
Not a foot of ground rented for liquor houses or for brothels which does not lessen the selling and rental value of all property in the immediate vicinity. If it is to be used for reputable purposes, and we are safely told that prohibition would cause injury to property interests.

Any man who drinks intoxicants at all, however careful he may be—drinks too much sometimes, and so becomes a menace to the community. This declaration leads to another point advanced by those opposing prohibition. Every special pleader in behalf of the liquor interests concedes, nevertheless, that the right of regulation thereof, liquor men themselves assent to such control. Do they believe in such control? If so, why are they continually arrested for violating the regulations they are so free to assent to necessary? The admission that a close surveillance of their business is indispensable is a declaration that they may not be trusted and is made only because danger of drastic legislation threatens their liberty. Observe the practices of saloonkeepers in Bingham. Salt Lake City has dozens of saloonkeepers that habitually violate the fair regulations set forth in the ordinances, not alone as to the selling of liquor to minors, or on Sunday, but they permit gambling in and about their premises and they are known participants in the profits that robbery of the pockets of the people in their determination to make money. Who are these undesirable citizens are to blame if an outraged public rises against them?

AS TO PERSONAL LIBERTY.  
We are told it is an "infringement of personal liberty" to enact a law which declares he shall sell or buy alcohol in any form or for any purpose except as a medicine. So, every law in measure is in restraint of man's personal liberty. His personal rights are infringed when the law says he may carry weapons only under certain restrictions. His personal liberty is limited when he is denied the right to drive his horse or his automobile beyond a fixed limit of speed; and likewise his personal liberty is infringed when he cannot at will purchase opium, or cocaine, or whisky on Sunday, or commit suicide or gamble.

As a matter of pure logic, once it is conceded that the people, through municipal or state legislation, may limit the days in or the hours in which liquor may be purchased, the right of absolute abridgement and denial is also conceded. If the right of personal liberty warrants a man in buying or drinking at any specified time, it warrants him in buying or drinking every time he wills to. That the state gives him the privilege of doing these things at certain stated times does not warrant his assumption that it is an inherent right. It is merely a privilege that may be excluded or withdrawn altogether at the option of the state. A citizen has no right of personal liberty to drink—though he may be accorded that privilege. But we become extremely sensitive as to the personal right of man to do a weak or wrong thing, when, directly or indirectly, we have a selfish interest or advantage in permitting the man to do the weak or the wrong thing.

Finally, we are gravely warned that prohibition would involve a great wrong because such a law would in effect destroy the means invested in breweries and saloons—and the wrong would be doubly emphatic because the thing to be destroyed we had suffered to grow to its present magnitude. To give friendly ear to such a plea is to justify the endurance of every offense against public welfare—since it says that wrongs must continue to live because they have once been permitted to live. Such a plea is opposed to all moral advancement, because moral advancement means a lessening of those offenses, either against law or morals, by which some persons find a means of livelihood and often the power to amass great wealth.

A QUESTION TO ANSWER.  
Answers this, ye anti-prohibitionists: If the liquor industry is to be destroyed, what difference can it make to those destined to suffer the financial loss which that loss results from a great moral uplift which takes the people beyond the lure of intoxicants, or whether it follows from the enactment of prohibitory laws? The hour can make no possible difference here, if the loss is inevitable, but the buldest of you would not dare urge financial loss as an argument against a great moral movement strong enough to enforce itself without legislative aid. Yet, because the movement exists and is not strong enough to accomplish itself by moral suasion, and must therefore revert to statutory enactment, you strive to stem the rising tide by crying "confiscation" and "the destruction of vested rights." That is the last plea of the defeated in argument.

But, consider this phase in other aspect: Everyone will concede that the breeding of higher grades of horses, cattle and sheep is an upright and praiseworthy occupation. No one contends that the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for profit is very creditable. Now, in pursuit of my praiseworthy occupation, as a breeder I put every dollar I possess and can borrow into registered horses and cattle and import them into Utah. I am encouraged by the public and receive the recognition of my neighbors for follow-

## Baby Laugh

It belongs to health for a baby to eat and sleep, to laugh and grow fat.  
But fat comes first; don't ask a scrawny baby to laugh; why, even his smile is pitiful! Fat comes first.

The way to be fat is the way to be healthy.

Scott's Emulsion  
is the proper food, but only a little at first.

Send this advertisement, together with name of paper in which it appears, your address and four cents in coin, postage and we will send you a "Complete Handy Atlas of the World."  
SCOTT & BOWNE, 409 Pearl Street, New York

ing a worthy and commendable pursuit. Due to no fault of mine, my horses develop glanders and my cows give plain evidence of tuberculosis. They are killed, and I am financially ruined. I am a criminal. Thus the state protects itself, and every brewer and saloonkeeper applauds the wise legislation which prohibits him from the unseemly danger that my diseased horses and cattle involve him in common with other citizens. It does not, however, occur to him that my "vested rights" have been invaded, or that my property has been "confiscated." Will you, gentlemen of the saloon and brewery side tell me why the state has a right which you recognize to despoil me for the public welfare, when my business is creditable, and why the state is wrong when for the public well it injures the business of the brewer and saloonkeeper which is not creditable?

WHERE THE LOSS?  
But, if prohibition does not prohibit, as anti-prohibitionists and officeholders declare, where is the wrong? Where is the property loss? or confiscation? Consumption must go on, if prohibition does not prohibit and manufacture follows consumption as inevitably as profit follows sale—if prohibition does not prohibit—and the vast wealth of the manufacturer remains unaffected. If perchance there shall be a loss in one place, it merely makes a gain elsewhere—if prohibition does not prohibit—and general conditions remain unaltered. Surely, the friends of saloons are not asking that it be made impossible for those engaged in the handling of alcoholic beverages to fail or lose.

Such are the stock arguments against prohibition. They set forth the strongest points all the forces the self-seeking liquor interests, with unlimited means to purchase the brains and language of alcoholic pandits, have been able to advance. How easily they may be answered is shown; how many additional facts can be set forth by way of reply neither time nor necessity will permit the stating of. The weak, vicious, self-condemned arguments made by men holding places of honor in this state to pay a political debt to a class that thrives upon the weakness and vice of the young and almost helpless. These officials opposing prohibition favor it in their hearts. The hesitating legislators favor it with all their hearts. Yet between a plain duty to the people and their obligation to God and the demands of the brewers they hesitate.

Strange, indeed, the spectacle! whether the obligation of those holding the power of immediate legislation to our citizens generally be honest, telling family raising citizens who ask only for a fair opportunity in Utah for their children against impulsive appetites and tempting vice, or the intention to make money through promoting temptations and making vicious conditions.

STILL SEEKS CONVICTION.  
Strange that we yet wait to see whether the cry of the child for food, for a decent life and for the good name of its father—and the pleading tears of its wife and mother for the preservation

HIDDEN DANGERS.  
Nature Gives Timely Warnings  
That No Salt Lake City Citizen  
Can Afford to Ignore.

DANGER SIGNAL NO. 1 comes from the kidney secretions. They will warn you when the kidneys are sick. Well kidneys excrete a clear, amber fluid. Sick kidneys send out a thin, pale and foamy, or a thick, red, ill-smelling urine, full of sediment and irregular of passage.

DANGER SIGNAL NO. 2 comes from the back. Back pains, dull and heavy, or sharp and acute, tell you of sick kidneys and warn you of the approach of dropsy, diabetes and Bright's disease. Doan's Kidney Pills cure sick kidneys and cure them permanently. Here's Salt Lake City proof.

Mrs. M. J. Steven, living at 1217 West Third South St., Salt Lake City, Utah, says: "For over thirty years I suffered from kidney complaint, and there has been times when I really thought I would have to give up. My back aches almost constantly, the secretions were irregular in action and I suffered from headaches, being often so dizzy that I could not attend to my household duties. At last I learned of Doan's Kidney Pills and procured a box at J. J. Hill's drug store. I am now feeling better than I have in a long time and trust that others may learn of the curative powers of Doan's Kidney Pills through my endorsement."

For sale by all dealers. Price 50 cents. Foster-McMillan Co., Buffalo, New York, sole agents for United States.  
Remember the name—Doan's—

New Styles  
For Spring

Now Being  
Shown—  
See  
Our  
Specials.

Lavis  
NON-RETRACTABLE SHOES  
238 MAIN ST.

of her home, husband and children will count for more among Utah legislators than the criminal pledges made by otherwise good men to the interests that find wealth in vice!

Who are we that we condemn China for permitting the profit making sale of opium to the degradation of its inhabitants when we license men to make merchandise of the lives of our children by permitting the sale of intoxicants that degrade and destroy them—and tolerate the advertisement of and allurement to the vice by every conceivable method?

What saloonkeeper, with pride looks toward the day when his little ones, reaching the estate of man and woman, shall become the habitués of barrooms and the associates of barrooms and back barroom huns and basts? I am still looking for a sane argument against prohibition.

But until I find some person manufacturing alcoholic liquors and selling them because they are a blessing to mankind and not for profit, I fear I have a weary seeking journey before me.

Respectfully,  
AN INVESTIGATOR.

WITHDRAWN FROM ENTRY.  
Request from Governor Spry Followed  
By Order Effective Jan. 18.

(Special to the "News.")  
Washington, D. C., Feb. 4.—Complying with the application of Governor William Spry, the government has withdrawn and reserved from agricultural entry, to take effect from and after Jan. 18, 1909, and continue until the expiration of 60 days from the date of the filing of the official plat of survey of said townships in the proper local land office, the following lands: Township 11 south, range 16 east, Salt Lake meridian; township 11 south, range 1