

But there is something bigger than newspapers--daily or any other; and Governor Spry has that. It is the love, trust and confidence of half a million people--and nothing can take it away from him.

GOODWIN'S WEEKLY

Library University of
Utah.
Carrier 14.

VOL. XXII. [Twelfth Year] SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SEPTEMBER 27, 1913 [5 Cents the Copy] No. 24

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Including postage in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. \$1.25 for six months. Subscriptions to all foreign countries within the Postal Union, \$3.50 per year.

Single copies, 5 cents.

Payment should be made by Check, Money Order or Registered Letter, payable to Goodwin's Weekly.

Address all communications to Goodwin's Weekly.

Entered at the Postoffice at Salt Lake City, Utah, U. S. A., as second-class matter.

P. O. Box 1253.

Telephone, Wasatch 2007.

513 Felt Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Goodwin's Weekly Publishing Company.

LEROY ARMSTRONG

Editor

SUTHERLAND ON THE TARIFF.

Not in any period of the past has the United States Senate listened to so nearly perfect an example of satire as that delivered by Senator George Sutherland on the Democratic tariff bill. The speech was brief, occupying perhaps half an hour in delivery, but no labored argument presented before that body in a year, on any subject, so stripped pretense from the position of opponents, so clearly revealed the ugly truth of proposed legislation, or so won applause even from the phalanx of the flayed.

Here is an extract from Senator Sutherland's speech. Considering the subject "A Tariff for Revenue Only," he said:

"Southern rice and New Jersey catgut and Virginia peanuts, constituting a charming trinity of diversified loveliness, rest in safety and luxurious ease under the protectingegis of its flexible shelter, while western wool and Minnesota wheat and North Dakota tow, homely and commonplace, possessing neither the pale beauty of the first, the melodious possibilities of the second--whether living or dead--nor the succulent charm of the third, are coldly relegated to the exposed and inhospitable frontiers of the free list.

The line of cleavage between those who are sincerely for protection as a definite and defensible policy of general application, and those somewhat rare individuals who are sincerely against any form or degree of protection, as constituting a perversion of the powers of Government and as being a robbery of the mass of the people for the benefit of the special interests is clear and well marked. In theory the orthodox Democrat regards it as a line of sharp separation, upon the one side of which lies the level field of equal rights to all and upon the other the artificial inequalities of special privilege. In practice, however, we are often called upon to mourn the said inconsistency which is presented by a very large number of Democrats, who persist in treating it as a zone of uncertain and fluctuating extent, becoming wider or narrower in response to the elastic demands of local expediency. When any Democrat of this somewhat extensive class, therefore, proceeds to put his theory of free trade into practical operation his major and minor premises become hopeless-

ly confused. In his major premise he asserts the unqualified wickedness of any degree of protection. Thus runs his theoretical generalization to which, by such sacred things as he is familiar with, he swears undeviating and unyielding adherence. In application, nevertheless, he introduces into his minor premise a qualification which, quite unconsciously of course, he fails to disclose, an ingenious and fallacious method of deceiving the unwary and confiding, which the logicians call the undistributed middle, or muddle, I have forgotten which. Upon the things his constituents buy his tongue and his hand are in perfect accord--but are free traders. When it comes to the things his constituents produce his tongue is a free trader, but his hand is a protectionist. And so we find that what he says upon the stump and what he writes into the law frequently exhibit--to borrow a form of expression from the charming vocabulary of the distinguished Senator from Nevada--an unfortunate disinclination to coordinate. I do not mean to say that this type of Democrat is insincere. That would not be amiable, and the law of amiability is one which no gentleman can afford to trifle with. I only mean to suggest that he regards the golden rule as a more or less tentative proposition; that his conduct is not calculated to add any appreciable luster to the jewel of consistency. The occasional Prohibitionist who preaches the gospel of teetotalism for the salvation of the masses, but keeps a bottle for private consumption against the treacherous demands of a capricious appetite, would welcome this sort of a Democrat as a genial and sympathetic companion--an own brother, so to speak--to be unhesitatingly intrusted with a duplicate key to the private locker. The out-and-out free trader, who really thinks free trade, and conscientiously does what he thinks, is at least consistent in his folly. He takes the medicine he prescribes for others. He practices the equality which he preaches, even though it be the equality of common ruin. But the Democrat who is for free trade on wool because his constituents buy wool, and for protection on rice because his constituents sell rice, stands for the comfortable sort of equality which the wolf proposed to the lamb, namely, that the latter should furnish all the meat and the former all the appetite.

Keen and convincing as it is, the address closes with an even more merciless punishment of the majority. The tyranny of the caucus, silencing conscience and overriding opinion, is painted in the colors of that peril of which it is a harbinger, and the appeal to the nation is made with a dignity which fittingly closes the really remarkable speech.

The incident should become historic. The conditions certainly are so. Few men can safely attempt satire. But on the lips of men entirely capable, that weapon is as terrible as a sword.

SENATOR SMOOT'S DILEMMA.

With the best intentions in the world Senator Smoot has attempted to serve the interests of Utah in the matter of mining claims on

school land, and finds that some sufferers would rather continue in pain than get relief at his hands.

That is the plain explanation of the fevered attack on the senator's bill.

Here is one evil condition, an abuse, that has continued since the state's admission to the Union. Senator Smoot proposes a remedy, basing his effort on an unusually accurate knowledge, and after consulting with many other informed men in the state. It may need some minor changes, but its principle is right.

There was no call for a fevered attack on the bill, and there was--and is--no warrant for the assumption that any citizen would be deprived of his rights in the event that the Attorney General and the Land Board of Utah might adjudicate his case.

There has been a rank and long-existing abuse of community rights. Those essaying the task of correction gain nothing by petty personal hostility, and would prove a better citizenship by emulating Senator Smoot's example, and good naturedly giving credit for sincerity to every advocate.

A just and equitable solution of the puzzle is all that is desired. And that should best be obtained by the employment of the methods of friendly discussion, and by courtesy commonly employed by gentlemen.

ONE HUNDRED SALOONS--NO MORE.

What is without all remedy should be without regard. What's done, is done.--Shakespeare.

The city commission having decided that there shall be no more than one saloon to one thousand population in Salt Lake, it is useless to debate the wisdom or unwisdom of the edict. "What's done, is done." It happens there now are somewhat more than the fixed number, but the commission will not strip licenses from the half dozen sagacious fellows who got in before the gate was closed, providing they do not fall under the displeasure of my other old friend, Chief of Police Grant. If they do, the number will adjust itself; and no new licenses will issue until the population shall provide an additional thousand.

The theory, as I understand it, is that additional saloons will be in districts away from Main street, and not associated with any of the clubs devoting themselves to the boosting of Utah, or otherwise illustrating in the persons of their membership the delights of residing in Salt Lake. The new rule will not affect the