

EDITORIALS.

POSTAGE RATES TO MEXICO.

On the First of July the new postal regulations between the United States and Mexico will go into effect. After that date, parcels of merchandise may be sent through the mails from and to our neighbor republic, at the low rate of twelve cents for each pound or fraction of a pound in weight. The limit of weight is eleven pounds, and the limit of size two feet in length and four feet in width. Prepayment of postage is necessary, and other regulations are similar to those of domestic postage.

There are other benefits to be derived from the new regulations between the two countries which will, no doubt, be duly appreciated by merchants and the public generally. The advantages of tariff reform will be experienced and illustrated, as trade will be relieved from custom house and consular charges, except the regular duties which have been greatly modified.

This will be of advantage to many of our readers who have friends in Old Mexico, as well as to residents there who have business relations with people in this Territory. The policy of this great nation should be to enter into closer and more fraternal relations with other countries, for the extension of commerce, the promotion of home industries and the interchange of ideas and sentiments, to the end that the world may become united by mutual interest and a common purpose.

A WOMAN IN IT, AS USUAL.

THE popularity of Mrs. Cleveland is undiminished. She remains the Queen of Hearts and is likely to cut an important figure in the present game of national politics. Although, as a matter of principle, the President's charming wife has nothing to do with political issues, it is generally conceded that she adds a sentimental strength to the cause of the occupant of the White House, and will be the means of bringing him many votes in November.

As an offset to this feminine influence, the Republicans are chanting the praises of Mrs. Harrison. Many anecdotes are being started "on the rounds" about her wit, her personal charms, her elegant manners and her fitness for the social duties expected of "the first lady in the land."

It is pleasant to think that whichever party shall gain the day in the gigantic struggle at hand, the Executive Mansion will be graced by the presence of a lady who, both in person and manners, is suited for the position. But we think that if the issue is to turn on woman's influence, Mrs. Cleveland is far more likely to prove the winning card than the doubtless estimable wife of the Indiana statesman.

GARFIELD ON "A PROTECTIVE TARIFF."

THE great issue of the political campaign of 1888 is the tariff question. The Democratic party advocate the reduction of the tariff, the Republican party its retention, and if necessary for the protection of American manufactures its extension and increase. The name of Garfield elicits enthusiastic applause at any Republican gathering where it is mentioned, and he is regarded as one of the party oracles. The following extract from one of his speeches sounds rather inharmonious when read in connection with the latest Republican platform:

"I hold, therefore, that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best game by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the price as they please. To this extent I am a protectionist. If our government pursues this line of policy steadily, we shall year by year approach more nearly to the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade. I am for that free trade which can be achieved only through protection."

New York was carried for the advocate of these principles in 1880. If the Empire State still holds to them, there is not a ghost of a chance for the nominees who stand on the Republican platform of 1888.

ABOUT WATER.

HOPKIN MATTHEWS, Esq., a citizen of Providence, Cache County, writes to the News as follows:

The inhabitants of Providence and Millville have been organized into an irrigating district, and I would like to ask a few questions and have the answers appear in your valuable paper.

1. Are we obliged to furnish water for domestic purposes, to parties that move on their farms when water is not plentiful?

2. Can a flour mill or any other machinery on a stream, claim the water to run the said machinery, when there is not enough for agricultural purposes?

3. When parties have not paid their tax for cleaning and repairing the ditches, during the year, can the amount due be charged to them the next season?

In reply to the first question, we will quote section 14 of an act passed by the Territorial Legislature and approved February 20, 1880:

Sec. 14. Whenever the waters of any natural source of supply are not sufficient for the service of all those having primary rights to the use of the same, such water shall be distributed to each owner of such right in proportion to its extent, but those using the water for domestic purposes shall have the preference over those claiming for any other purpose, and those using the water for irrigating lands shall have preference over those using the same for any other purpose, except domestic purposes. Provided, such preference shall not be exercised to the injury of any vested right, without just compensation for such injury.

From this section it would appear that parties having a claim upon a portion of the waters of a given stream, who need water for domestic purposes, must be given preference over others who want the water for a less urgent use. In our opinion, the fact that a claimant to water has removed his residence, perhaps from a town lot to his farm, does not, in any way, affect his right to use the portion of water which belongs to him. That water is his property as much as is his team, and he has a right to use it in the town, or on his farm, or at any other place to which he can convey it. If the place where he wishes to use the water is embraced in an irrigation district, as in the case referred to above, he would have a right to take his share of water from any point on any canal owned by the district, most convenient to him, unless others would be liable to be injured by such action on his part. He must, however, bear the expense of constructing the ditch which conveys his share of water from the district canal to the place where he wishes to use it. Such a ditch would be a private one, and the canal company or irrigation district, could not be required to pay for it.

To further illustrate: Suppose the settlers on a tract of country six miles square to be organized into an irrigation district. The trustees of the district assume control of all the irrigating streams flowing into it, and in order to give to each water owner his just share, by the most convenient and economical means, a network of canals and ditches is constructed throughout the district. A water owner has been using his share of the water on a certain piece of land, but for reasons of his own he desires to use it on another. He would have the right to take from any point on any canal in the district the amount of water owned by him, provided no one else were injured thereby. But if such a change in the point of diversion of the water owned by him should occasion any expense, such as the construction or enlargement of a ditch, he would have to bear that expense.

The theory of an irrigation district is this: Through its proper officers it undertakes to distribute, fairly and economically, the irrigating waters which are used in the district, in order that conflict and confusion, and a waste of the water may be obviated. Those officers have power to protect, to a certain extent, and in a certain way, the rights of irrigators, but they have no power to abridge those rights. They cannot lawfully refuse to give to a water owner the share which he owns, nor have they the right to make such a distribution of the waters of the district as to injuriously affect vested rights in those waters.

The second query of our correspondent is partially answered by the section of the territorial law above quoted, from which it would appear that the needs of irrigators take precedence of those of mill owners. But there are decisions to the effect that the trustees of an irrigation district can not take from any person owning water the portion to which he has acquired a vested right, provided he devotes it to some useful purpose and uses it economically. There are reasons for questioning the validity of a law which takes personal property from one private person, a mill owner, and gives it to another private person, a farmer.

In reply to our correspondent's third inquiry, we append the provision contained in an act of the Legislature approved March 9, 1882:

Sec. 5. . . . The rate of tax determined at said election by a majority vote shall be a law in said district; and shall constitute a permanent lien on the interest of the taxpayer in said canal or ditch and his right to the use of water therein flowing, from the day of assessment. Provided, no tax created or payable by this act shall be or create a lien upon the land."

SOMETHING FOR WAGE-WORKERS AND WAGE-PAYERS.

A PLEASANT event that occurred a short time ago at Lowell, Massachusetts, is worthy of record because it is out of the usual line of relations between employers and the employed.

Sarah Norcross had worked at the

Boott cotton mills in Lowell steadily for a period of half a century. Of course she was getting old and could not do as much at her "drawing in" frame as she could twenty-five years ago, for she was seventy-five years of age. Besides there had been great changes in the style and manner of work. New machinery had been introduced, and instead of coarse jeans and blue drilling, the finest fabrics known to the trade were being produced.

What did her employers do? Cast her adrift, and say she was now too old to be of any service to them? Cut down her wages to starvation point, and tell her if she didn't like it she could go? Inform her she was too old for modern business and must make way for quicker eyes and nimbler fingers? No; none of these. The following letter to the agent will best explain the course pursued toward the faithful worker:

60 STATE STREET, Boston,
June 16, 1888.

Dear Mr. Cummock:

I enclose a check to your order for \$100. Will you be kind enough to give this money to Miss Sarah Norcross, and say to her that it is a little present from the stockholders and directors in recognition of the fact that she has completed her 50th year of continuous service at the Boott Cotton Mills. This is a longer term than any of the rest of us can show, and it is pleasant to know that all through those years she has never found a reason for desiring to leave us. Please to assure Miss Norcross that her place shall be reserved for her as long as she cares for it, and that when she ceases to occupy it we shall still keep our interest in her welfare. Yours faithfully,

ELIOT C. CLARKE.

It was a cheering sight to behold, when the agent called her aside from her work in the big mill, and gathering the hands around, read her the letter and handed her the check. The old lady was astonished as well as delighted, and so were her fellow-laborers. But the sensation of the hour was complete, when Agent Cummock drew from his pocket a plush-covered case and revealed a handsome gold watch, which he handed to Sarah as a present from himself and a token of his appreciation of her fidelity.

The applause which broke forth was not only a sign of appreciation of this generosity, but of the good effect it produced upon her fellow-laborers who could not fail to be urged to emulate her steady and honest service. It is often said there should be "no sentiment in business." So much work for so much pay; the more of the work and the less of the pay that is possible being the motto of the employer, and the very reverse that of the employed. It is a mistake. Sentiment often sanctifies trade and takes away its sordid influence. And a bond of union between the wage-worker and the wage-payer, must be of mutual advantage. Those Lowell cotton-spinners will be bound to do better service than if Sarah Norcross had been discharged as old and incompetent after fifty years of steady work.

There are numberless ways in which laboring people can subserve the interests of their employers, who often have little sense of what they lose by the penuriousness which some of them mistake for economy, and the heartlessness which they erroneously consider is necessary to strict "business."

It will be found by experience that, in the long run, it pays to treat men and women, no matter how menial may be their occupations, as human beings of the same race as the rich, of the same original parentage as the highest and mightiest of the earth. They are the sons and daughters of the Almighty Father and have souls, and sympathies, and rights and a FUTURE. And in the cycles of eternal change and progress, who knows how the conditions of the present may be reversed, how the humble may be exalted and the haughty abased, and how he who in this life had a surfeit of good things, may come down to low estate and be thankful for a small favor from the hand of a former servant, "now exalted to a throne?"

Kindness, generosity, appreciation of faithful service are never entirely thrown away; for even if received with ingratitude, as they sometimes are, the bestower gains, in himself, by his magnanimity, and it is sure to bring its fruits, which are the very opposite of those that spring from the roots of selfishness, hardness and close-fisted severity.

We commend the example of the Lowell cotton firm to employers generally, and the pattern of steady, faithful and devoted labor offered in the life of the aged cotton-spinner, to those who toil for a living and to whom, either in this life or that which is to come; duty well performed will surely bring a rich reward.

BOTH SIDES.

THE Omaha World proposes to pursue a novel course during the greater part of the presidential campaign. It will give both sides of the controversy. Most "Independent" papers manifest a pretty palpable leaning to one side or the other, and the World will no doubt lean heavily enough toward the close of the struggle. But, in the meantime, articles will appear in the editorial columns alternately in the Republican

and the Democratic interest, an editor having been engaged for one party and another for the other. After the issues of the campaign have been fully argued, the World will give its own opinion. Meanwhile its subscribers will have the benefit of two opposing papers in one, and having paid their money they can take their choice, the World taking in the pecuniary profits. Another step in "enterprising" journalism.

PETITIONS IN DIVORCE.

ANOTHER libel test case has been decided in favor of the press. The ruling is, no doubt good in law, whatever it may be in morals. Some newspapers make a specialty of publishing all the particulars in divorce suits, particularly the gross charges which are so often set forth in complaints.

In Ohio, a few days ago, the petition in a divorce suit contained some very ugly charges against the defendant, who promptly sued for libel a paper which published them. The suit was dismissed when it came for trial, the judge deciding that a newspaper has the legal right to publish petitions for divorce and that such publication can not be held to be libellous.

It cannot be denied that petitions of that kind often contain accusations that are not sustained by evidence, and that fall to the ground when the light of truth is turned on them. It is a great wrong to defendants to publish such charges, unless the answer to them is also given to the public. And even then it is very questionable whether this airing of soiled family linen is the proper business of journalism, and whether society is not better without such prurient particulars as often give the flavor to "spicy divorce proceedings."

Doings in court are public matters, but the public need not be fed with all the slices of scandal and bits of immorality that are there brought out of the social larder. Discretion and fairness are both necessary to respectable journalism.

THE "PLUMED KNIGHT" ON THE "OLD ROMAN."

REPUBLICANS who try to belittle Thurman, who sneer at the red bandanna and attribute senility to the "Old Roman," should mark the following passage from "Twenty Years in Congress" by their bean ideal of protectionist Republicanism. James G. Blaine says of Thurman:

"His rank in the Senate was established from the day he took his seat, and was never lowered during the period of his services. He was an admirably disciplined debater; was fair in his method of statement, logical in his argument, honest in his conclusions, so catch phrases to secure attention, but was always direct and manly. His mind was not pre-occupied and engrossed with political affairs or with affairs of state. He had natural and cultivated tastes outside of those fields. He was a discriminating reader, and enjoyed not only serious books, but inclined also to the lighter indulgence of romance and poetry. He was especially fond of the best French writers. He loved Moliere and Racine, and could quote with rare enjoyment the humorous scenes depicted by Balzac. He took pleasure in the drama, and was devoted to music. In Washington he could usually be found in the best seat of the theater when a good play was to be represented or an opera was to be given. These tastes illustrate the genial side of his nature, and were a fitting complement to the sterner elements of the man. His retirement from the Senate was a serious loss to his party—a loss, indeed, to the body. He left behind him the respect of all with whom he had been associated during his twelve years of honorable service."

TAKE IT HOME.

THE New York World says:

We are somewhat inclined to deride the English for their ignorance in respect to affairs in this country. But how little does the average American know about Mexican politics? There is very little interest excited here by the fact that elections have just taken place in Mexico which give General Diaz another term as Executive. And beyond the impression that he has made a good President and that it is a desirable thing that he is to succeed himself our people have little or no knowledge of Mexican matters. And yet Mexico is our neighbor and "sister republic."

Precisely. But is this ignorance of a neighboring republic any worse than a dearth of knowledge in regard to important parts of our own republic? For instance, what the New York World does not know about Utah, her people, their faith, and their views and purposes, will more than offset the general lack of understanding of Mexican affairs and politics. And it is worthy of remark that papers which know the least about Utah have the most to say concerning her. Perhaps the same remark will hold good as to Mexico. We trust that the big New York daily will make personal application of its own well-meant lesson.

ANYTHING TO BEAT THE "MORMONS."

THE Methodists of this Territory are not quite so rampant on the "Mormon" question as of yore. At their recent conference in this city their resolutions and reports were more moderate in language than at some previous gatherings of a similar character. They have learned, no doubt, that such verbal intemperance as used

to be indulged in by Methodist ministers when attacking "Mormonism," does not look well in print and is not likely to produce abroad such an effect as milder diction and a less rancorous spirit.

The report of the committee on the state of affairs in Utah at the late conference contains strong anti-"Mormon" utterances, but vituperation and scurrility are avoided, which is a commendable improvement. The importance of making the assault on "Mormonism" the chief object of Methodist missionary work, however, is kept sharply in view, and every force capable of being utilized to this end is directly or indirectly commended. For instance, here is a section from the report:

"2. There is a wave of outside civilization which moved by an unseen yet irresistible impulse is rolling this way, while much of it is unchristian yet it brings with it the leaven of Christianity, and is all opposed to at least the one great overshadowing obstacle."

The "one great overshadowing obstacle" is "Mormonism." To overcome that, these Methodist ministers in conference assembled hall with delight even an "unchristian wave" moved by an "irresistible impulse," and they congratulate their fellow-missionaries on its advent, because it "all opposed" to a religion from which they differ, a system of faith which they cannot break down by the strength of their own.

A Christian debating society would find it an interesting question for controversy, to determine now an "unchristian wave" could carry with it "the leaven of Christianity," and how much of that leaven can be found in a liquor-drinking, reckless, adulterous, mammon-worshipping, profane and godless mass of modern civilization, opposed to Biblical principles and institutions.

The Christianity of Christ was exclusive in its character. "He that is not for me is against me," he said, "and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." And further, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the Sadducees." But the peculiar sort of Christianity which these pious gentlemen have imbibed, well comes any kind of leaven and any sort of impulse, however unchristian it may be, if it only opposes a creed and a system which they desire to destroy.

Is it not strange that a body of professing "Christians," and they too claiming to have authority to preach and administer in the Christian religion, prefer an unchristian element to one that in all its essential particulars is in perfect harmony with that which Christ taught? The doctrines of "Mormonism" are Bible doctrines. The articles of the "Mormon" faith are those of the New Testament. The "Mormon" Savior is Jesus of Nazareth; their God is the God of Abraham of Isaac and of Jacob; their ordinances are those prescribed in holy writ; their hopes for eternity and Christian hopes, and their confidence in them is founded on the promises revealed through holy men who "spoke as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost." And yet men claiming to be Bible believers and teachers, congratulate one another on the influx of an element "much of it unchristian," hoping it will help them in overcoming an eminently Biblical religion!

If there is anything in Methodism which can be fairly supported by the Bible, it will be found in "Mormonism;" if there is anything in Methodism which will stand the test of sound logic and Christian precept, it is embodied in "Mormonism." And yet they are radically different because the latter lacks the irrational and unscriptural tenets and spirit of the former, and repudiates its untenable claim to authority to administer in the name of Deity. But "Mormonism" does not oppose Methodism with force. It does not welcome infidelity as a weapon, against Methodism. It would not invoke the law, nor countenance violence, nor wink at or encourage any unchristian "wave" or element to overwhelm Methodism. In these respects it is essentially different from its aggressive antagonist.

Messrs. George E. Jayne, John Hansen and D. T. Hedges, who make this report, have manifested the real animosities of their class. "Anything to beat Grant," was once the cry of a certain sort of politicians. "Anything to beat the Mormons," is now the cry of this kind of small preachers. We are sorry for them. Sorry for their blindness and error, sorry for their willingness to fraternize with unchristian persons in a vain and futile war against true Christian principles. We wish them no harm. But we hope they will live to see their own folly and to regret their unchristian utterances, their bigotry and inconsistency, and to sense the fact that all they have ever said or done against what they call "Mormonism," has had no more effect to destroy it than the croakings of the frog in the slimy mud-puddles have upon the mighty, sun-crowned Wasatch-mountains.