

sistent, democratic defender of the truth, St. Louis will be the most earnest supporter and admirer of Chicago, the Mississippi will empty into the Missouri and its waters be clearer than crystal, Salt Lake will be as fresh and fishy as the purveyer of news from this region, and the Mexican capital will be in the middle of Utah.

It is very generous of the *Globe-Democrat* to advise other people to be "liberal" in buying out the "Morrison leaders," but neither they nor their valuable properties are for sale, and it is rather premature to say of the Gentiles, who form not more than a fifth of our population, that Utah is "their Territory." What is the matter with the *Globe-Democrat*, anyhow?

COERCION ALL WRONG.

THE stonemasons and bricklayers who have been in the employment of Watson Brothers have struck. The reason for this action is that owing to the extensive business of the firm, they found it necessary to engage another foreman, in addition to the one already employed. The union, with which the workmen as a body are connected, objected to this because this additional foreman was not identified with that association.

It appears that the union only permits the engagement of one foreman not connected with it, and the men insisted on the discharge of the second one, otherwise they would strike. The man whose employment was objected to expressed his willingness to leave, and thus avoid the creation of trouble on his account, but said he would not join the union, having conscientious scruples about being controlled by any organization. Watson Brothers would not entertain the proposition about the man leaving if he chose to remain, as it was a surrender of a principle. They recognize the right of the foreman to use his own volition in regard to joining the workmen's union, and they cannot concede that it is the right of any organization to prevent them from employing him if they desire his services.

We understand that both employers and men expressed to each other that the difficulty included no personal feeling, only the latter were determined to control in the matter in controversy, while the former firmly insisted that they did not propose to surrender a principle

involved—their right to employ persons to work for them of their own selection without regard to their being connected with any society. The workmen struck, and thus the matter stands.

This is a singular state of affairs to exist in a community like this. It appears to us that it exhibits its tendency upon its face. There is no question in relation to wages. One object of the strike is simply to coerce the man with regard to whom the dispute has arisen into joining an association with whose principles and purposes he is not in sympathy. This is, in spirit at least, a breach of the liberty of conscience. Any attempt in that direction is opposed to the genius of natural rights—that of acting upon individual judgment when the rights of others are not thereby impinged. Another object is to coerce employers to engage the services of only one class—those who belong to a particular organization. This is necessarily of a piece with the pressure exercised upon the non-unionist foreman.

It is a matter of regret that such disputes should occur. We trust that the striking workmen, between whom and Watson Bros. the kindest relations have existed, will view their action from the standpoint of right rather than from what would appear to be self-interest. They are a respectable class of men, and as a rule inclined to thoughtfulness. It is to be hoped they will reconsider their course, which is in the direction of division, and is of such a character that it cannot carry with it the sympathy of the community.

NOT PARALLEL CASES.

FROM the Ogden *Standard* of May 28 we learn that Judge Henderson lately made some strong remarks in favor of the enforcement of the law against gambling. The keeper of a gambling house was convicted, and when brought up for sentence His Honor said:

"The statute is a very plain one and strict in its terms. It declares it unlawful to keep a place of gambling. I have no doubt but that what Mr. Smith says is true as regards your character, but you must appreciate our situation and that of the people. It makes no difference whether you and I practice gambling every day together, the statute cannot be overruled. You are well aware that the laws are strictly enforced in cases of unlawful cohabitation and adultery. These unlawful practices are rigidly enforced against a people many of whom are sincere in their convictions. Yet the government

insists that they must be discontinued. It is useless to strike at one crime and totally ignore another. I should feel it a reproach and a disgrace to daily sentence these people for crimes under the Edmunds' law and permit gambling to run openly without any restraint. You are a man of intelligence and I shall allow you to pronounce sentence on yourself. The government wants citizens not prisoners. Now discontinue running a gambling house, that is all I ask, it is all that the government asks. All you will have to do then is to pay the costs. I will postpone sentence for a few days and allow you to think over the matter and determine what sentence you will pass on yourself."

Uniformity in the execution of the laws is conceded to be necessary to command respect for the laws. Judge Henderson is entitled to credit for his action in this matter. The chief object of the penalties imposed for the offense of gambling is to suppress the crime and reform the criminal. If the offender ceases his wrong-doing the purpose of the law is accomplished. Whether the principle is sound that no penalty should be inflicted when the culprit agrees to reform is open, however, to considerable debate.

And there is a wide difference between the promise required of a gambler to cease his practices, and of a defendant convicted of the offense known as unlawful cohabitation under the Edmunds Act. The latter, as it has been construed by the courts, comprehends some things that many defendants find it almost impossible, with a due regard for honor, manhood and the obligations of family, to agree to. And this without any disposition to rebel, or defy the laws, or to be disrespectful to the court. At first sight there might seem to be a parallel between the cases. But on close examination it will be found that they widely diverge.

We hope the laws against the vices that have lately been permitted to flourish unchecked in Ogden will be enforced, with something approaching the vigor which has been exercised in other cases, and that Judge Henderson will continue to pursue his consistent course in relation to them.

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

THIS June 1st, 1889, is the eighty-eighth anniversary of the birthday of Brigham Young. He was the chief pioneer of all the vast region lying west of the Missouri River extending clear to the Pacific Coast. This fact alone would be