

understanding, never getting beyond the object lesson of the kindergarten.

"Moreover, the more we see of the invisible, the more we come to know that which passeth knowledge, the higher, the holier, the more infinite it seems to be. Force becomes almighty, wisdom becomes allwise, and we begin to write the invisible, The Invisible. What was so long rejected by the builders of philosophic hypotheses and scientific theories becomes the head of the corner—spirit is force and it is life. The very thing which materialistic science refused most stubbornly to recognize has become the most necessary datum in solving the problems of science. The great thinkers now say that there must be some great universe of spiritual force to account for the seen. Not only has this looking at the unseen—the gazing beyond phenomena to the principles and potencies which cause them—marked man's development, but every enlargement of that sense which farther sees than sight, brings a higher satisfaction, a purer and more permanent enjoyment."

### "PERSONAL LIBERTY."

The tyranny sought to be set up by some of the labor unions in this country and the wrong involved in it are thus pointedly and briefly presented by the *Boston Herald*:

"There are certain things that the labor organizations must learn; the first is that they cannot succeed in the absence of the support of public opinion. With this support they may not always succeed, but without it victory is utterly impossible. The next fact to be borne in mind is that public opinion in the United States will never countenance the invasion of personal liberty. With us each individual who has not by his crimes against society brought about his imprisonment is a freeman, and as such is not only entitled to the protection of the laws, but also has the right, so long as he breaks no legal statute or ordinance, to employ his time and energies in such manner and under such conditions as he may see fit. Of the 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 of workers in the United States, probably not 1,000,000 are definitely affiliated with labor organizations, and even if ninety-nine out of a hundred of our citizens were so affiliated, they would have no right to lawlessly impose their will upon the hundredth man."

### THE CHARGE MUST BE MET.

THE DESERET NEWS is accused by certain "Liberals" of trying to make a "sensational" out of the alleged appointment, by the Mayor, of a special officer at a good round salary, without authority or approval of the City Council. Mr. Wantland is reported as saying:

"The News asserts that the Mayor appointed Mr. Pendleton without consulting the Council or asking it to confirm his action. These are not the facts in the case. There was a resolution introduced authorizing the Mayor to appoint a suitable person for that position, and this resolution was referred to the Mayor with power to act. The attempt at sensationalism on the part of the News falls very flat."

If Councilman Wantland expressed himself in this manner he has not confined himself to the facts. The DESERET NEWS simply reported what was alleged by a member of the City Council. In comment-

ing upon the matter, we expressed the opinion that "probably there had been some mistake," and that "the Mayor may have been under the impression that he was authorized to proceed according to the resolution that was introduced but which failed to carry in the Council."

Mr. Wantland asserts that a "resolution was referred to the Mayor with power to act," authorizing him "to appoint a suitable person for that position"—that is, to watch the canyons in the interest of the city's water rights. In this he takes issue with other members of the Council, not with the DESERET NEWS as he pretends. But taking up the matter on his assumption, we now ask him to produce a copy of the "resolution adopted by the Council and referred to the Mayor with power to act." If he will furnish it to us it will be duly published in the DESERET NEWS, and will settle the controversy. This will vindicate him and us at the same time, for we expressed a doubt that the Mayor had intentionally made appointments which he had no right to fill.

We are of the opinion, however, that the Councilman cannot do this. Is it not a fact that a thorough examination of the records and search for the alleged document have failed to reveal it. And if so is it of any use for Mr. Wantland to try and make out that the DESERET NEWS has been raising "a tempest in a teapot," when this paper has tried to put the matter in the most favorable light possible for the Mayor?

Is not this the resolution which Mr. Wantland introduced and which he now has in mind?

"Resolved, That the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to engage the services of a suitable person for a period not to exceed six months, at a salary not to exceed \$150 per month, for the purpose of watching the canyons and protecting the water rights of the city, said employee to also perform such duties, keep such records and make such reports in connection with the irrigation and water departments and public grounds of the city as may be ordered by the Mayor and Council."

The record shows that this was introduced April 21, 1892, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and subsequently reported upon adversely.

Let it be understood that we have no fault to find with the appointment, if it is legal and the office was necessary. We believe the gentleman appointed fully capable of performing the duties named in the resolution. He is an old resident, a capable citizen, and is thoroughly familiar with irrigating affairs and the water rights of the city and of individuals. But all that cuts no figure in the question of the necessity for the office and of the right of the Mayor to appoint without the consent of the City Council.

This is no "tempest in a teapot," but unless the Mayor has been duly authorized to appoint, or acted under a mistaken impression as we suggested, it is a question of great importance that must be settled for good. If the Mayor has undertaken to create an office and fill it by the appointment of a friend, not only without the approval of the City Council, but in defiance of the adverse action of that body, as some of its members claim, he has assumed powers to which he has no

right, the appointment is illegal, the funds drawn in payment have been unlawfully appropriated, and the whole thing is wrong and should be stamped upon at once.

We have deprecated every sign of a disposition on the part of either branch of the municipal government to ignore or interfere with the rights of the others. We desire to see harmony prevail among them all. This cannot be promoted by such proceedings as are now alleged against the Mayor. If the charge is true, a full exposure should be made and proper action be taken to correct the wrong. If a mistake has been made by the Mayor this should be officially explained. And if the resolution claimed by Mr. Wantland was really adopted, let it be produced and we will only be too pleased to give it publicity and thus settle the ugly question.

Since the foregoing was written, a report made by the City Attorney has been found which throws more light on the subject. It appears that on May 12, 1892, that officer, to whom the matter of alleged interference with the water rights of the city in Emigration Canyon was referred, rendered the following report which was duly published in the DESERET NEWS:

"I was not furnished with any of the facts and consequently can give no opinion as to the legal status. From inquiry I find that the Council which just preceded your honorable body purchased certain water rights from persons residing on Emigration creek and received warrantee deeds therefor. These deeds I have been so far unable to find or learn who has them in possession. The former council also purchased a piece of ground, probably one hundred and sixty acres, who had title from the government and received warranty deeds to the land and water, the deeds to which I have also been unable to obtain for the same reason. With the exception of the last purchase spoken of the lands in the other purchases were quit-claimed to the city, the titles to the same being only squatter's rights with the title still in the government. I am also informed as to the last mentioned lands, they have been taken possession of and filed upon in the local land office by persons under the homestead and pre-emption laws of the United States and that parties are now improving the same by planting and seeding, etc. It is impossible for me to go on the grounds and investigate and ascertain what the actual facts in these cases are. I obtained all the information above referred to from ex-Councilman Pendleton, who, I understand, conducted the negotiations and made the aforesaid purchases for the preceding Council. I would recommend that the appropriate committee or a special agent appointed for the purpose of looking into the matter, collect the evidence preparatory to commencing action, should one be necessary to protect the legal rights of the city."

This was referred to the Mayor with power to act. But it is claimed that this is a very different thing to the appointment of an officer to perform the duties specified in the Wantland resolution of April 21 which was defeated. And further, it is claimed that when the Mayor took action and selected the man for this temporary purpose, the name should have been submitted to the Council for confirmation. This it is stated was not done, but the appointee's name has been on the regular pay roll without the consent or even