

EDITORIALS.

A NOTED STATESMAN.

The whole country mourns the condition of Hon. Samuel J. Randall, whose usefulness has been cut short by disease and who is in a very critical state. When doctors dispute over a patient's symptoms and physicians experiment upon him, the public begin to look for an announcement of the end. Whatever may be the complaint from which Mr. Randall is suffering, it is serious enough to cause grave apprehensions and to suggest the probability of a great loss to the nation.

No one, however opposed to Mr. Randall's political views, will attempt to deny his great ability and his long and efficient services to his country. He is a "feature" of the House of Representatives. His knowledge of parliamentary rules and tactics is second to none. Whether on the floor of the House or in the Speaker's chair, he has always commanded respect and taken a course consistent with his political convictions and his sense of duty. The firm and honorable position he assumed when the decision of the Electoral Commission went against his party, commanded the admiration of his adversaries and could not be condemned by his associates.

His protection doctrines are contrary to the principles of the Democratic party on that question, but they are those of the district he is chosen to represent in Congress, and are advocated in undoubted sincerity. And notwithstanding this difference with his coadjutors, he has ever been ready to throw in the weight of his talents and influence on the side of his party in the great national struggles for place and power.

We hope to see Mr. Randall in his seat again, where his sagacity and statesmanship are needed and of more value than can be told. But we fear that this affliction is the beginning of the end, and that though he may rally and yet be of some further service to his country, he has passed the zenith of his powers, and be ore very long the nation will be in mourning for one of the most noted and worthy of its public men.

A STERLING DEMOCRAT.

The organization of Democratic Clubs, after the fashion of Republican campaign clubs, throughout the country was a wise step on the part of Democratic organizers. Another sensible thing was the selection of Chauncey F. Black, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of Pennsylvania, as the president of the whole organization. This was done at a convention in Baltimore on the 5th of July.

Chauncey F. Black is the son of Judge Jeremiah S. Black, who is honored in every part of this Territory as a fearless defender of popular rights, a peerless jurist, and an honest, Christian man. His son Chauncey was born in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, in November 1839. He was educated in West Virginia, at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, and at Hiram College, Ohio, where he was a fellow student of the illustrious Garfield. He studied law with his father and was admitted to the bar in 1861. He became noted in journalism and has done splendid work in the *New York Sun*. He is a writer of fine ability and a politician of great shrewdness and tact. His conversational powers are first class and he is a striking public speaker. He is tall, of fine presence and bears strong resemblance to his venerated father. He is married and has a happy and devoted family who reside in comfort at their elegant home near York, Pennsylvania.

Chauncey F. Black is a thorough Democrat of the Jeffersonian stamp, a man of sterling integrity and polished manners, and, we are pleased to say, has ever been found a friend to the cause of justice and freedom in Utah. While entertaining no religious sympathy with the "Mormon" creed, he has sympathized with the sufferings of the "Mormon" people and is proud of his father's able advocacy of their cause before Congressional committees and the country. We shall hear of Chauncey Black in national politics.

MORTGAGED UP TO THE HANDLER.

According to statistics in possession of the government at Washington, the farmers of this country are, many of them, in a most miserable financial condition. They have been "protected" almost to the vortex of bankruptcy. Taking seven large western States as a sample, the situation of the farming interest is startling. In 1883 the assessed valuation of those States was as follows: Kansas, \$275,500,000; Illinois, \$795,000,000; Indiana, \$793,000,000; Iowa, \$825,000,000; Michigan, \$850,000,000; Wisconsin, \$496,000,000; Ohio, \$1,071,000,000; total, \$5,507,500,000. The number of farms is placed at 1,399,100, and they are plavaged with mortgages to this extent: Kansas, \$235,000,000; Illinois, \$1,000,000,000; Indiana, \$635,000,000; Ohio, \$1,227,000,000; Iowa, \$567,000,000; Michigan, \$500,000,000; Wisconsin, \$371,000,000—total, \$4,521,000,000. This gives an average of mortgages

on each farm of over \$3,400. Thus the mortgage indebtedness of farms in those seven States is considerably more than four-fifths of their assessed valuation. Protectionists should reflect on these figures, and work up an argument to show how farmers flourish under protection, and what a benefit it is to them to have dear plows, dear machinery, dear implements of every kind the materials for the manufacture of which are made to pay a heavy duty, dear clothing, dear blankets, dear carpets, dear everything the price of which is kept up by a protective tariff.

The interest paid by western farmers to eastern capitalists must be a heavy burden to bear, and this, added to the prices they have to pay for almost everything they do not raise themselves, is sufficient to keep them under the harrow, with little prospect of relief until they are delivered from the wonderful advantages of excessive protection?

A STRIKING CONTRAST.

School teachers in this country often complain of the low salaries they receive for services which should command very liberal remuneration. They should compare prices with the "shabby genteel" school-masters of old England.

An illustration of their miserable condition is afforded by the case of a Yorkshire vicar's experience. He advertised for a village school-teacher, offering the munificent salary of \$125 per annum, out of which the teacher was to pay \$10 a year for house rent. The school-master was required to be a "certified student," to be recommended by four responsible persons, two of them clergymen, and to be able to play on the harmonium.

Strange to say, the vicar received numerous applications for the place, which shows not only that education does not command high prices in the old country, but that, there is a plethora of qualified school teachers there, ready to accept positions where the wages are down almost to a starvation standard, little more for a year than certified teachers here demand for a month.

We do not cite this example with a view to the depreciation of the value of school teachers in this part of the world, for we have always advocated adequate wages to every worker. We believe that to be both right and expedient. It is, in our opinion, for the welfare of society as well as for the good of the individual. There can be no general and true prosperity where the wage-worker is poorly or unfairly paid, and a good teacher is almost invaluable.

But a contrast of one's condition with that of others who are in the same profession or trade, but whose earnings are so much less and who are thankful for that which he would scorn with disdain and indignation, is sometimes better for the individual than comparison with the status of the high-salaried and wealthy, which brings discontent and makes present tasks and duties a burden difficult to be borne. "Honesty with contentment is great gain," so said an apostle and philosopher. It is good sense. "Be content with such things as ye have," is sage advice. It does not preclude honorable ambition nor shut out laudable effort to better one's condition. But it comprehends the enjoyment of that which is in hand, and the biding on to the substance instead of vainly pursuing a shadow. This does not apply to school teachers any more than to others. It is good mental food for all to masticate.

FURTHER FACTS ON THE WOOL QUESTION.

A PROMINENT wool-grower of this Territory, who owns very large flocks of sheep, was asked by the writer: "What do you think of the wool tariff?" He replied emphatically and without hesitation: "It ought to be lowered, undoubtedly." "But why?" was the next question. He answered: "Because there are few wool-growers while everybody uses woollen goods; the many should be studied rather than the few." That is the gist of the whole question; that is the position the DESERET NEWS has taken on this subject.

The argument against free wool, or the reduction of the tariff upon the raw material, is that it would ruin the home wool-grower for the benefit of the foreign producer. We have questioned this and expressed the opinion, which is shared by many persons who have given the subject much thought, that the repeal of the wool duty will benefit the home grower, because the chief imports of the raw material are of a kind not produced in this country and are needed to mix with the native wools, and that thus a full and free supply of this absolutely necessary material will secure a full market for the home supply.

The probable effects of a reduction or repeal of the wool tariff in future, may be fairly judged by the past. As a matter of fact, the prices of domestic wool have ruled higher under a low than a high tariff. During the four years preceding the low tariff of 1846, the average price of domestic clothing wools was 34 cents. In that year the duties on this raw product were reduced from 42 to 30 per cent. The following ten years, wonderful to relate, saw the average price of this class of domestic wools advance from 34 to 41 cents. In 1857 the duties were further reduced to 24 per cent, and

during the next four years the average price of clothing wools advanced from 41 to 42½ cents, the average price during the last year in which this tariff was in force being over 47 cents. During the 17 years of comparatively low tariff upon clothing wools the price of the domestic product averaged 43 cents; during the 27 years of the war tariff period, the average price was only 41½ cents. These figures are compiled by the *Financial Chronicle* of New York.

Hon. G. W. Griffin, United States Consul at Sydney, New South Wales, has furnished some facts bearing on this question which fully sustain the position that a high tariff has depressed the wool industry instead of "protecting" it. He states that from 1884 to 1887 there was a decrease in the production of wool in the United States of 23,000,000, and he offers the following reasons for this reduction:

"In 1840 the sheep in the United States numbered about 19,000,000. In 1880 the number had increased to 35,000,000, but in 1840 the bulk of the sheep were grazed in the New England Eastern States and none in the Southern and Western States. In 1880 the Southern and Western States grazed one-third of the whole number, while the New England and Eastern States only grazed half the number they had in 1840. The highest point was reached in 1884, when the number of sheep was 50,000,000. Of that number more than half were grazed in the Southern and Western States and only 8,000,000 in New England and the Eastern States, showing that the increasing population drove the sheep out of the Eastern and New England States towards the more sparsely settled Southern and Western States and Territories, the land being required where population was dense for agriculture and being too dear to profitably graze sheep.

"Since 1884 even the Southern and Western States seem to have become unable to sustain their former number, the result being the total number of sheep in the United States has decreased from 1884 to 1887 by about 6,000,000. As the population of the United States is increasing very rapidly (the annual increase being estimated at nearly 2,000,000) and continually pushing out west and south, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the reduction in the number of sheep which has been going on in the New England and Eastern States has now set in in the west and south."

This certainly cannot be attributed to the Mills bill. The free wool question is thus stated, in brief: "The present average protection on woollen manufactures is 68 per cent; on raw wool the mill men have to pay 41 per cent, so that the actual protection afforded the manufacturer is the difference between 68 and 41 per cent—27 per cent. The Mills bill, while it puts raw wool on the free list, advances the average duty on manufactured woollens from 27 to 40 per cent, and thus gives the manufacturers 13 per cent more protection than they have under the present law. Free wool, therefore, would give the woollen manufacturer a chance to supply the home market, instead of allowing European labor and capital to furnish nearly half of the woollens we consume. More than that. It would promise new life for a depressed industry, enlarged employment and better wages for labor, and relieve the consumers—all the people—from a needless tax amounting to many millions."

Mr. Breckenridge of Kentucky, one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives, in a speech on the Mills bill made these pertinent remarks:

"I have no doubt that I speak the experience of the great majority of farmers when I say that a small flock of sheep is of itself an advantage to a farm, and that, for the amount invested, the profit on a small flock of sheep is the very largest return of the farmer's operations. The vast majority of those who own sheep do not raise enough wool to clothe their families. The difference between the cost of their clothing by virtue of our tariff, and what it would be if wool were free, would in the great majority of cases cover more than the entire value of their clip—certainly more than any possible difference between the value of wools as 'protected' if all our adversaries claim for protection were true, and the price of wool as free; so that the wool-raiser is more interested in the revision of the tariff and the reduction of the duties upon woollen goods upon the basis of free wool than he is in the perpetuation of the present tax. But as there are only a million of flock-masters, the fifty-five million of people scattered all through America who are not peculiarly interested in the ownership of these flocks are compelled to pay an increased cost for all the woollen goods which they are obliged to use."

That places the question on the broad basis of statesmanship—legislation for the country and not for a section; for the whole people and not for a class. Thus our position is that free wool is not likely to ruin the wool-growers of this country, that it may not greatly lessen the price of the home grown raw material which will be needed to mix with the foreign product, and that in any case the good of the country should be the paramount consideration.

PRESIDENT ANGUS M. CANNON has been severely indisposed for a week. We are pleased to be able to state, however, that he was so far recovered today as to be able to drive around town.

"LIBERAL" LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

A SAN FRANCISCO grand jury, a short time ago, among other things reported as follows:

"Our elections, primarily and finally, are controlled to a great extent by 1200 to 1500 members of the criminal element leagued together and rendering quid pro quo, having so-called 'pulls' on men in authority and others incidental with those having power. Matters have reached such a condition here that to openly offend the directory of the criminal element seems to invite complete political ostracism."

How much better is that kind of politics than the so-called "Church rule" in Utah? Even suppose the latter to be a fact instead of a hollow fiction, would it not be infinitely better than the San Francisco system? New York, Boston, Chicago and other big American cities suffer from similar combinations, if their own press is to be believed. Is that the American style so much vaunted by some extremely "liberal"—to themselves—local politicians. Who would not prefer being ruled by a body of decent, God-fearing men, devoted to the welfare of the community, to being dominated by wire-pullers, office-seekers and criminals, linked in with officials greedy-eyed and plundering?

If the minority here were to gain control, is there any security that the same state of things prevailing in the cities we have named would not soon exist here? We have had an honest and economical administration of public affairs in this Territory, and it would be deplorable to see the kind of change for which certain schemers are always agitating.

There is no part of this great country where there is greater freedom to the voter than in Utah, nor where the public are better protected in their political rights. All the hue-and-cry that is raised near election times about "church rule" and kindred nonsense, is the worst kind of clap-net. It only catches a few feeble-minded and silly people, who think they are fairly sweating independence by wildly seconding the efforts of their own and the public's enemies to create division.

Who is there in Utah, having the statutory qualifications, that is hindered in the exercise of any political right, or compelled against his will to support any public measure or any candidate for office? Who can truthfully assert that he is subject to any kind of penalty or punishment for differing with others in his political actions or opinions?

As to pressure of party or domination of bosses, just watch the course of the opposition at any election, and see if there is not a hundred-fold more of those objectionable influences among them than are ever brought to bear in the People's Party.

The conservative non-"Mormon" of this Territory will be consulting their own interests, the permanent peace and prosperity of Utah, and the welfare of the whole people irrespective of creed or party, by quietly sustaining with their secret ballots the nominees of the majority, whose place on the People's ticket is a guaranty of fidelity to the public good. And no member of that party who has not lost his senses will play into the hands of the enemy by giving way to some personal objection, and scratching a ticket prepared by the People's delegates after full, fair and free discussion. We do not want any such local government as that complained of in San Francisco; and we shall never be cursed with it while the majority of the citizens retain control.

ALARMING INCREASE OF CRIME.

When intelligent observers speak of the alarming increase of crime in the United States, in spite of the growth of education, they are met by the optimistic assertion that the population has increased very rapidly and therefore it must be expected that the criminal statistics will show big figures. But an official who is said to be a reliable authority on this question—Warden McClaughey of the Joliet penitentiary—has announced in a public lecture that during the last thirty years the criminal class has increased twice as fast as the population. He places the known criminals at 500,000 persons, more than a third of whom are under 20 and half of them, that is 250,000, are under 21 years old. Only one tenth of the whole number are in confinement.

This is a serious condition of affairs. And the gravest item in the bill of particulars is the alleged increase of juvenile depravity. Readers of the daily news as published in the papers and particularly in the dispatches, must have observed the frequent commission of crimes by very young persons of both sexes. The dime novel is debited with a good deal of responsibility for this. But is it not clear that we must look deeper than into the inside of books, whether yellow-backed or red, for the causes of this criminal tendency in the young?

The outlook is not pleasant. If this is one of the results of the boasted civilization of the age, is it not suggestive of something radically wrong in that civilization? Would such election canvasses from being

not be as well to look for the roots of its defects instead of revealing so much in praise of its blossoms? If a young "Mormon," male or female, goes to the bad, it is the custom among a certain class to lay the blame on the religious of the parents. It matters not that this religion in its teachings and spirit is vigorously hostile to crime. That counts for nothing with its detractors. We do not lay the increase of crime at the door of any particular religion. But that there is little room for boasting of the superiority of "Christian civilization" when crime is increasing with increased facilities for the operation of that civilization, ought to be clear enough to cause a little more humility. And especially does this appear in the light of the fact that the children growing up under its fostering care, in a land of free schools and religious opportunities and institutions, are exhibiting in so many instances a marked and terrible criminal tendency.

The lack of restraint upon the rising generation in this country is one source of evil to society. Children are permitted to do pretty much as they please, and liberty is suffered to run beyond legitimate bounds. Parents who are strict in the government of their offspring are accused of being tyrannical, and so many are allowed to "run at loose ends," that any restriction placed upon a boy or girl is resented because of this general laxity.

The absence of practical moral and religious tuition in the common school system has also much to do with the prevalence of crime, which is sure to be an accompaniment of a decline in faith and a decadence of the spirit of devotion.

A lack of profitable employment is another cause of vice. If every boy and girl in the country could find something to do for which reasonable wages could be obtained, there would be far less lawlessness and fewer inmates of prisons. This is one of the pressing necessities of the times in Utah. Idleness is a crime-breeder. We have an immense juvenile population with few avenues of industry. We need factories and workshops. Their establishment would be a far more striking advertisement of Utah's opportunities and attractions than any amount of glittering allurements to catch outside capital.

Educational and industrial establishments should complement each other. Teach the children good principles as well as rules and figures, and then provide the youth with work. This will prevent much evil and it will be found cheaper to do this than to pay for the care of paupers and the punishment of offenders.

Outside of the Brigham Young Academy and College, where is the advanced educational establishment endowed by a Utah capitalist? And where is the industrial institution not built solely for the purpose of making money? Investments for the employment of young people, if they only paid expenses would be of advantage to the community and an honor to those who thus used the means entrusted to them by Divine Providence, and would certainly bring them the reward of those who "lay up treasures in heaven."

BALLOT BOX SAFEGUARDS.

The last legislature enacted a law "To prevent crimes against the elective franchise," with which all voters and citizens would do well to make themselves familiar. It is found on page 15 of the Session Laws, and contains some rather rigid provisions. Section 1 is as follows:

"That every person charged with the performance of any duty under the provisions of any law of this Territory or of Congress relating to elections in this Territory, who willfully neglects or refuses to perform it, or who, in his official capacity, knowingly and fraudulently acts in contravention or violation of any of the provisions of such laws is, unless a different punishment for such acts or omissions is prescribed by law, punishable by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment in the penitentiary not exceeding two years, or by both."

Section 2 relates to fraudulent registration. Sections 3, 4 and 5 are vital features of the law, and all suffragists and citizens should become familiar with them. To this end they are here reproduced:

SEC. 3. Every person not entitled to vote who fraudulently votes, and every person who votes more than once at any one election, or knowingly hands in two or more tickets folded together, or changes any ballot after the same has been deposited in the ballot box, or adds or attempts to add, any ballot to those legally polled at any election, either by fraudulently introducing the same into the ballot box before or after the ballots therein have been counted; or adds to or mixes with, the ballots lawfully polled, other ballots, while the same are being counted or canvassed, or at any other time, or fraudulently carries away or destroys, or attempts to carry away or destroy, any poll list or ballots, or ballot box, or willfully detains, mutilates or destroys any election returns, or in any manner so interferes with the officers holding such election, or conducting such canvass, or with the voters lawfully exercising their rights of voting at such election, as to prevent such election or canvass from being