

EDITORIALS.

THE CHICAGO "TIMES" AT IT AGAIN.

The Chicago *Times* continues the controversy with the *Deseret News* on the statehood question. It refers to the editor of this paper as "the most zealous and untiring advocate of the scheme." We can scarcely accept this credit, as our efforts in this regard have been chiefly devoted to meeting objections such as have been raised by our Chicago contemporary. It will be remembered by our readers that we turned upon that paper the charge it made that the "Mormon" Convention had resorted to pettifoggery. The *Times* now says that the pettifoggery with which it accused the Convention was in that "it injected into the frame of a political charter an argument on polygamy as a pretext for prohibiting the practice of that relic of barbarism."

We dislike to reply too much in the spirit of retaliation, but we can scarcely help calling attention to this renewed "pettifoggery" on the part of the *Times*. The Convention did not "inject" an "argument" of any kind into the political charter under consideration. The language referred to is not in the nature of an argument. It is a simple statement of a fact to show why an unusual provision had to be "injected into the frame of a political charter." It is neither affirmed nor denied that polygamy is "incompatible with a republican form of government." But the fact that it has been so "considered" is mentioned, to account for the peculiar provision, that is all. There is no attempt at "argument," therefore no "pettifoggery," the latter epithet is only applicable to the *Times*' method of trying to wiggle itself out of a difficulty.

If the announcement of a reason for a provision in a political charter is "pettifoggery," then nearly all the States in the Union are guilty of the offense, and the United States are to be condemned for a similar reason, for most of the former have something in the shape of what the Chicago *Times* calls an "argument," and the National Constitution opens with a statement of the reason why that instrument was formulated. The Chicago *Times*' charge of "pettifoggery" against the Utah Constitutional Convention had better be quietly abandoned.

As to the fact that polygamy had been declared "incompatible with a republican form of government" before the Convention cited it as a reason for making the special provision concerning the practice, we have already given ample proof, and if we thought the dispute worth continuing we could hunt up plenty of press utterances to establish it. But whether those who made the assertion "understood what they were talking about" or not, (the *Times* says not,) the Convention did not argue the point or admit or deny its truth, so all the attempts of the *Times* to bring odium upon that body on this account are unjustifiable.

We agree with that paper that if there is "no better ground for objection" to Utah's Statehood than that "polygamy is incompatible with a republican form of government," there is "no ground for objection at all." That is just our position and it has been so for years, so the *Times* cannot make a controversy with us on that point.

As to polygamy being "a relic of barbarism," that is another question and one that we do not propose now to discuss, although it could be shown that the saying, adopted by a Republican national convention, is very much of a mere catch-phrase and in the nature of "pettifoggery." Marriage in any form might be dubbed with the same title. And it is not the province of the National Government to make special regulations, or require special guarantees, against some social custom that may be considered "a relic of barbarism," unless it is "incompatible with a republican form of government," for that is what Congress must secure and preserve to every State in the Union.

There are many things open to the objection that they are "condemned and rejected by civilization throughout the world," in name, but still practiced widely and to the general knowledge of the people, which it is not considered the province of the General Government to suppress or prevent. The *Times* thinks we are in error, because we are inclined to raise a doubt as to the powers of this nation in this respect. We simply contend that the powers of the national government do not extend beyond those bestowed upon it in the national charter. That they are specified. That all others are reserved; and that if it steps over the limits therein clearly defined, it encroaches upon the liberties to secure which the government itself was founded and the great national charter was formulated.

But this is ground—upon which we have entered to meet the position of the *Times*—foreign to the main question; that is, the attitude and action of the Utah Convention. It has taken a solid basis, in view of the objections raised to Utah's admission as a State. Whether those objections were valid or invalid, they were given great prominence by Utah's enemies. Action was taken to settle the great controversy so far as it could be settled as a political question. If the Chicago

Times can point out a better way by which the Convention could have proceeded under the circumstances, let the way be shown, although it is a little late in the day. If not, what is the use of carping, not to say "pettifoggery," about a sentence "injected" into the Constitution to account for the course pursued? That is a little too small for the *Times* to continue to quibble about.

EXPORTING WOOL.

OVER half a million pounds of wool, grown in Tooele County, was sold, a few days ago, to an eastern house and will be shipped out of the Territory. And yet there are several woolen factories in Utah which are either idle the year round or which run only a portion of the time, said to be for the alleged reason that raw material is lacking. There is something wrong here. Mill men and wool men both concede this. What is the trouble? The wool men reply that the highest price offered by any Utah purchaser for the above lot of wool was nineteen cents per pound, and that an eastern party offered \$23.35 per hundred pounds, net, or over twenty per cent more for it.

This wool may go to Boston or Philadelphia, be mixed with the proper proportion of shoddy, manufactured into overcoats, blankets, etc., and then shipped back to the community of financiers out here in these mountains, to be consumed. Thus Utah furnishes employment to eastern mill operatives, and pays freight both ways on the wool she produces, besides the profits which eastern men make on the clip, both before and after it is manufactured. It is well that Utah has a beautiful climate, and a good soil; if she did not have some advantages to offset the fiscal policy she pursues in some matters, poverty would reign throughout her borders.

If Utah capitalists and financiers have any shrewdness, enterprise or patriotism to boast of, it is not in connection with the fostering of woolen manufactures. Their record in this regard appears in a still more unfavorable light when it is remembered that our population embraces an abundance of skilled laborers of the kind required in woolen mills.

But when we trace, step by step, the causes that produce the condition of things, in respect to woolen manufactures in this Territory, which all right thinking citizens deplore, we shall find that the blame for the existing state of affairs is divided between different classes of the community. The masses of the population lack the thoughtfulness and patriotism to ask for home made articles, when making purchases; merchants are too selfish and too lacking in public spirit to try to push home made goods; wool men are not so accommodating in the terms of sale they offer to small manufacturers as they might be, without detriment to their own interests, as they usually demand spot cash, which small mills cannot often pay, though worthy of credit; home made goods, like an honest man who takes no pains to appear to be what he is not, may in some cases be less handsome in appearance than they might be made, and hence less in demand; mill operatives here demand higher wages than the same class of labor is elsewhere paid, and the capitalist, in this new country, finds many lucrative fields of investment.

This question, to a certain extent, is an ethical one, and the remedy so much desired must be, like that for any public moral evil, the result of the co-operation of different classes of the community. One thing is clear: If the people will insist upon having home-made goods, a supply for their demands will certainly be created.

ANOTHER ELECTRIC INVENTION.

A FEW years ago Professor Marsh of Yale College made the then startling announcement that electricity, light, heat, magnetism, chemical affinity and gravitation were all different manifestations of the same mysterious force or principle in nature, and were interchangeable. Since then wonderful progress has been made in developing electric science but it is conceded to be yet in its infancy.

Thomas A. Edison, the leading electrician of the day, has added to his other important electric inventions, still another, which promises to be a household institution of great value and economy, and may lead to a complete revolution in the method of developing power from fuel. The new invention is based upon the principle that electricity and caloric are interchangeable, and consists of an apparatus so constructed that, while it serves the purpose of a furnace for heating a building, the heat resulting from the combustion of coal within it develops an electric current of sufficient volume to supply lamps for lighting the different apartments. The coal is dumped into a hopper, the furnace feeds itself automatically, no attendance upon the apparatus is required, and at dusk when lights are wanted, a button is touched, the electric current is turned on and instantly all parts of the building are illuminated.

It is quite within the range of probability that, since man turns darkness into light by the aid of electricity, the work of the kitchen, and laundry, and even of the farm, will yet be performed by this giant force of nature which he is so rapidly taming and subjugating to his purposes. To cook food, clean clothing, or plow land by means of electric power would be a feat less wonderful than the annihilation of darkness, or the transmission of intelligence, by this wonderful agent.

The problem now engaging the attention of mechanical electricians is the storage and transportation of the subtle and potent fluid. This problem solved, as it doubtless will be shortly, a revolution in the methods and surroundings of man will follow, in the contemplation of which the wildest imagination may revel at will without exceeding the bounds of the possible and practicable. To fly through the air at any height and for any distance, or to pass through water at any depth, and from continent to continent, are feats quite possible when the power of electricity is made portable, or a moving apparatus perfected for extracting from air and water the electric energy which is a constituent element of both, and condensing and applying the same to the purposes of man.

THEIR OWN LOGIC.

THE local anti-"Mormon" politician is nothing if not inconsistent. The chief cause of his complaint against the objects of his animus is that they vote solidly. He claims also that this result is attained by the issuing of an order directing the members of the People's Party what they shall do at the polls. Bolled down, the allegation is that the "Mormons" resort to machine politics. This species of political manipulation is prevalent all over the country to a very great extent. But what would be considered a political virtue elsewhere would be denounced as a terrible crime on the part of the "Mormon" people.

The real banion plucked by the political shoe is not that the People's Party vote with more than usual unanimity, but because they do not vote for the chronic office-hunters who are the chief cause of all the trouble fomented in the community. Let the political solidification said to be a peculiarity of the People's Party be exercised for the purpose of providing place for those enemies of the community, and all would be serene as a summer morning, and the "Mormons" would, in their estimation, be saints of the first water. But so long as the solidarity complained of is used for the purpose of protecting the commonwealth against the assaults of those who would prey upon it, the situation is all wrong. This political unity which characterizes the People's Party as a rule, is such a thorn in the side of chronic aspirants who have done nothing to entitle them to the confidence of the people, that their chief organ at one time predicted that bloody means would be resorted to to check it—a most atrocious sentiment.

The late vote upon the Constitution framed and adopted by the recent Convention is pointed at from the same quarter as an evidence of the usual political solidity of the People's Party in exercising the suffrage in relation to any prominent question. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." The position taken by the "Liberal" bosses on the question of the Constitution was that the members of that party, comprising the most fanatical anti-"Mormon" elements, should refrain from voting on the subject altogether. This order emanated from the head and front of the red-hot anti-democratic agitators. It was issued by men designated by one of themselves, in one of his self-adulatory extasies, as "political authorities." The result showed how thoroughly the Liberals are under the influence of those self-styled authorities. Practically the entire party refrained from voting either way upon the constitutional question. And why did they do it? According to the logic of the opponents of the People's Party, because they were ordered. The fact is undeniable, that the order was given, and the result shows that it was carried out with a solidity that is patent. Had the order not been given, doubtless the result would have been different. Taking the reasoning of the "Liberals" as they apply it to the People's Party and tag it on to themselves and they are clearly and unmistakably in the slough of political slavery; serfs who, having no will of their own are submerged in that of a few men whose dictum they follow like a flock of sheep rushing through a gap into which some of their number on the lead take the initiative in entering.

HOME RULE CLOSE AT HAND.

A NEWSPAPER published at Dublin, Ireland, called *United Ireland*, is of course strongly imbued with the righteousness of the Home Rule theory, and yesterday it branched out broadly, telling the landlords in plain terms that an Irish Parliament is inevitable and will be assembled as early as 1888, and advising them to make the best

terms they can with the Paruellites and to fraternize with the League instead of endeavoring to suppress it. The paper even goes so far as to announce that elections for the Home Parliament will be held in a few weeks. The writer is disposed to take a very rosy view of things; and while he may be right in the long run, he has placed his calculations too near at hand. Too near, for two reasons—Revolutions of a peaceful character involving the complete substitution of new measures and new men after a period covering centuries of the present order, of things, are not brought about in such very short order. And the exhibition of so much apparently confident haste will but serve to strengthen and solidify the ranks of the opposition who, on the very suggestion of things going out of their natural channels, would be reinforced from the friends of Home Rule in England, thus putting off the consummation devoutly to be wished indefinitely, just as it was some years ago. Nearly all the time intervening between the Phoenix Park murder and the present has been taken up in regarding what was then thrown away in one night; and a rash act, or the suggestion of it now, would have a precisely similar effect; Parcell's and Gladstone's labors would be devoted entirely to defense instead of quiet aggression and all they would be able to accomplish for some time would be merely a negation—that is, they would be laboring to prevent the cause from going further to the rear rather than spending useless effort in the task of trying to move it ahead.

The editor was enthused and naturally so, over the result of the recent elections in England, showing as they did that the Tory cause is merely hanging on to the shadow of power, while in reality the people are against it and so express themselves whenever an opportunity is afforded. Let things go on as they are and in a short time England will have a Liberal for Premier instead of a Conservative as now—and he is really the Executive of the nation—the House of Commons will be overwhelmingly Liberal, and then Home Rule will materialize in a day. But most of all announcements of what will be done when that takes place is just what the Conservatives like to have the Irish do—it is arresting the progress of that party to the rear, where it belongs, but where it will not be likely to go so long as it has a phantom to parade before the people.

Ireland should have the great object for which her statesmen have so long struggled and of course will have it if she will but be controlled by them. Home Rule, which is merely a modified form of autonomy, is as far as she can get and as much as she ought to expect. Her complete severance from Great Britain, and the establishment of another form of government than the one prevailing in the remainder of the Empire would not be advocated or even supported by any Englishman, and without such support the Irish need hope for nothing in addition to what they have. They are in a similar position to that occupied by the Southern States just after the war, which settled the fact that they had never been out of the Union, but they were then held in probation and without representation for a while until the rebellious disposition was clearly dissipated, and they were glad enough to accept a return of the blessings of home rule, the exodus of carpet-baggers (in Ireland, landlords as well as office-holders) and agree in all sincerity to remain in the national fold for evermore. The Irish political position is also somewhat similar to ours in Utah; excepting that we don't and never did desire to break from the Union, but on the contrary have persistently and continuously tried to get into it, the political situations are so nearly similar that words would be wasted in pointing out the resemblance.

As suggested before, let the Milesian editors indulge in exultation after Home Rule is a fixed, unalterable fact; let them be able to say what they are doing, not what they are going to do. They are now pretty close to the point at which the dream of past ages will become the reality of the present and the future. But there is still something to be done. Let it be done as Parnell and Gladstone and Aberdeen are doing it, and above all "don't hollow until you are out of the woods."

THE RULE OF IRON.

ELDER JOHN P. SORENSON, of this city, writing from the island of Ulkebuhl, near the coast of Schleswig, describes the condition of the people under German rule. The island was formerly a Danish possession, and the great majority of its inhabitants are Danish. Bismarck's policy in dealing with them, is one of great rigor, and seems, so Elder Sorensen states, to have for its object the driving from the island of all who are Danish in sympathy. Many of the latter are arrested and imprisoned, apparently for political reasons. All authority is vested in German officials, mostly what we here would call carpet-bag importations, from Germany, and their course towards the masses of the Danish inhabitants is one of tyranny and oppression. The school children are compelled to study the German language. Real estate has fallen in

value from two-fifths to one-half during the German occupancy, though equally as productive as before. The people are very poor and live only "from hand to mouth." The country is one vast military camp, and soldiers, police and gendarmes throng it in great numbers. The burdens of taxation under which the people groan, the curtailment of their personal liberties, their poverty and their gloomy prospects for the future as portrayed by Elder Sorensen, go to make up a cheerless picture.

NOT VERY RESPECTABLE.

A FEW days ago we published an account of a tragedy that occurred near Tombstone, Arizona. Marion Bagley, a young man who resided at Mesa City, was pursued and caught by a deputy sheriff and posse, he being wanted on a charge of horse stealing. The officer shot the fugitive dead. The reason alleged for the killing was that Bagley resisted arrest.

Recently a correspondent writing from Mesa, endeavored to give the impression that the killing was a murder, and that young Bagley, instead of resisting arrest was shot while in bed. Then he threw in a statement to the effect that the father of the young fellow is a respectable man and was going to have the action of the officer inquired into.

It is not supposable that at this distance we can judge of the degree of justification in favor of the officer, but the correspondent, according to reliable information we have on this subject, misrepresents the facts when he endeavors to create the impression that the head of the Bagley family, or its members generally are respectable. They belong, so we are informed on authority regarding which we have no question, that they have been a terror and a nuisance to the neighborhood where they have been located during the last few years. Although their depredations have been so cunningly conducted that they have hitherto as a rule escaped the clutches of the law, the community have been outraged by their conduct. Besides keeping a low-down whisky den, a rendezvous for all the thieves and desperadoes in that section of the country, Sam. Bagley (the father) and his sons have been credited with participation in numerous murderous and thieving schemes. Once when an attempt was made by the Bagleys and a couple of other characters of the same stripe to murder and rob a Chinaman, the citizens of Mesa held a mass meeting for the purpose of determining what steps to take under the circumstances. They resolved to pursue Marion Bagley and his two confederates, they having fled. They were not captured, but young Bagley returned about two months after and dared the citizens to arrest him then. The other two implicated with him not being within reach, and direct evidence being lacking, nothing was done in the matter.

Our informants say without hesitation that the people of Mesa will not be likely to mourn over the taking off of a young fellow whose very presence in that part was a menace to the community. His brother, Joseph, credited with being of the same character, recently fell from a horse and his injuries were asserted to be necessarily fatal. The Bagleys are said to have been associates of the notorious Tasker when that renegade was living.

It is only those who have lived in frontier settlements who know how much sorrow, annoyance and trouble one unscrupulous and thieving family can create in a whole neighborhood. It appears that the Bagleys belonged to that class.

GUILTEAU'S CURSE.

RECENTLY there have appeared in many of the newspapers of the country, statements of the alleged fulfillment of the malediction pronounced by Guiteau on all who took part in prosecuting him. Probably much that is said upon this subject has been manufactured for sensational purposes, but certain unchallenged statements of fact give strong color to the claim that there has been at least a remarkable coincidence of events with Guiteau's curse.

Dr. Gray, superintendent of the Utica Insane Asylum, whose testimony did more to defeat the plea of insanity set up by the defense than that of any other witness, was, within two weeks after Guiteau pronounced his crazy malediction, shot by a lunatic whom he had not previously considered dangerous. The foreman of the jury, who was a wealthy man at the time of the trial, was soon after it reduced to penury. It is asserted that within two years after the trial, four of the jurors died, and that another one became insane and is now confined in an asylum. This disposes of half of the jury; what happened to the other half is not stated. District Attorney Corbitt met with misfortune and died within a year, and Judge Porter, who assisted him in the prosecution, has lost his practice, and is said to be insane. President Arthur, who refused to pardon Guiteau, lost the Republican nomination and his health, and died. Blaine, who testified