

gested by the press, nor discussed among citizens. It is this: The Edmunds law authorized the Utah Legislature to pass laws providing for elections, and as soon as that body should do this, the functions of the Utah Commission should cease. The Legislature has passed a law providing for school elections; hence the functions of the Utah Commission have ceased so far as school elections are concerned.

The logical inference is that the Utah Commission has nothing to do with any election provided for by Territorial legislation enacted subsequent to the date of the Edmunds law, a proposition which is unquestionably in harmony with the specific language of the latter statute, and again gives prominence to the contingency upon which the life of the Commission hangs.

One result of this decision will be the complete severance of the Utah Commission from local school elections, including school trustees, school boards in cities, elections in regard to bonds, etc. Hereafter all these will be held under the auspices of local officers, as provided in the Territorial school law.

The decision does not say whether a school election is or is not an election within the meaning of the law of Congress. It is, however, in harmony with the contention of counsel for the appellant, Messrs. Sutherland & Judd, who urged that school elections were never intended to be included in those over which the Utah Commission were given supervision. But if it was the intention of the court to sustain this doctrine, and the consequent one that school elections are purely local affairs, to be conducted under local laws and regulations, it is not clear why the last sentence was added, which reads as follows:

"And we further hold that the qualifications of voters must be determined by the laws of the United States when any conflict arises between them and the laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature."

There is just as much reason why the local law should govern in respect to the qualifications of voters at a school election, as there is for holding that the latter is not a public election within the meaning of congressional statutes. If the decision is intended to maintain the latter proposition, it embraces an inconsistency; for a declaration that the laws of the United States govern in respect to the qualifications of voters brings the election itself under the operation of those laws, and hence within the jurisdiction of the Utah Commission, and it can be excluded from the control of the latter only for the reason that the present school law was passed subsequent to the date of the Edmunds

law, and its provisions relative to elections were contemplated and authorized by the latter. The last sentence of the decision is a contradiction of the contention of counsel who won the case, which, to say the least, is a singular circumstance.

We have no disposition to question the legality of the decision, but it is to be regretted that it fails to clear up certain vexed phases of the matter to which it relates. It leaves open the question whether or not a taxpayer, who is not a registered voter, has a right to vote on a tax or bond proposition, a purely financial issue, relative to which he might, under every rule of natural justice, be given a voice. But if persons only who are qualified electors under the laws of Congress, can vote at such elections, great injustice will be done to a large class of taxpaying citizens.

THE ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION.

THE American press is commenting quite elaborately though injudiciously on the "Royal Labor Commission" appointed a few days ago by Queen Victoria. Much of this comment assumes the character of prejudice and ill-founded criticism. The personnel of the commission is harshly judged. The appointments were made, it is said, from party and personal motives. And all these hasty judgments are rendered, without giving close or serious consideration to the matter. Conclusions are jumped at which a study of the question does not at all justify.

First of all, it is proper to learn the scope and duty of the Commission. Its object is, mainly, to enquire into all questions at issue between capital and labor. It is also instructed to inquire into the methods of organized capital as well as organized labor. It will endeavor to ascertain how far legislation can ameliorate the evils complained of in labor agitations. It has the power to summon labor reformers, capitalists and industrial philosophers from every country in the world, and pay them expenses by the sanction of the English Government. For information pertaining to labor, this Commission is authorized to expend \$1,000,000, and in fact, if needed, the expenditure is unlimited.

It will be seen from this, that the "Royal Labor Commission" of England was instituted upon the broadest and most comprehensive philosophic basis, on which anything of the kind could be built. Its aim is, in reality, an inquiry into the conditions of capital and labor, all over the world, and it will endeavor to ascertain the opin-

ions of the best minds in every civilized country, on these conditions. The Commission is composed of twenty-seven members, fourteen capitalists and thirteen labor representatives. The hypercritical says it is composed of twenty capitalists and seven labor men. This is not correct. Lord Hartington is Chairman of the Commission. It is said that he is not fit for the place by reason of his position and wealth, and because he is a seceder from Gladstone. This is all nonsense. No sane man would say that John Burns, of London, ought to be made chairman of such a body. Hartington seceded from his leader, because he thought the interests of Ireland and of England would be better conserved by maintaining the existing union. There are many statesmen and citizens who uphold this view, and who honestly believe that such would be the case, yet they favor Home Rule for Ireland. They see that matters have been so complicated and mismanaged in the past, that nothing short of autonomy for Ireland, with an Imperial federation between both countries will effect political harmony and real union. Hartington as a statesman has been broad and liberal and as chairman of the Commission he will exhibit the same characteristics.

It has been said that the labor element in Ireland was slighted because Michael Davitt was not placed on the Commission. This is folly. Michael Davitt was never identified with labor in Ireland. He is now, and has been for some time a citizen of London. He is editor and proprietor of a newspaper there. He maintains a connection with Irish politics in a factional way. He is, it is said, an honest though impulsive fellow, and, certainly, has always advocated the cause of labor. He is the man, of all others identified with British politics, the most unfit for a place in the Commission. As a witness before it, he can give his views, and as a journalist, he can watch its proceedings. In both ways he can still be of utility to labor, if he is so minded.

Another clique is out of sorts because John Burns, the famous London agitator was not placed on the Commission. Every sensible man knows that such an appointment would be a mistake. Burns is no doubt doing much service to labor, but he is too radical, too narrow, too shortsighted for the scope in view by the Commission.

There are thirteen members of Parliament in the body. Four are Conservatives, four Liberal-Unionists and five Liberals and Home rulers. This is certainly a fair distribution of political partisanship.