

The News recently published a lengthy article in response to a question on this subject, basing its reply on a little book issued at home and written by a resident of Utah, entitled "The Practical Politician." The features of that reply will be found to be correct in every instance, as does not appear to be the case at all times with those which come from abroad.

THE LESSON OF HOMESTEAD.

The collapse of the great strike at Homestead is an object lesson to the wage-workers of the United States which they cannot afford to overlook, and admonishes them once more that attempting to coerce capital by means of violence is simply playing with fire—that to try coercion at all is vain and disastrous. No matter whether the workers for Carnegie and Frick had just cause for organized or other protest against their treatment, it is shown that they have, as is invariably the case, lost the fight and incurred a long and serious train of disasters besides.

The press of the country, while mainly denouncing Pinkertonism and Pinkertons, have only words of cold comfort for the unfortunate strikers, where they express anything comforting at all. The following lines from the New York Press are a fair sample of what the majority say:

The great strike at Homestead is at an end. It cost thirty-five lives, more than \$1,500,000 in wages, and fully as much more to the Carnegie company. Was it worth the price? Has it made living easier, homes brighter, or the cause of organized labor stronger? If not—somebody has blundered.

This would seem to present the picture about as vividly as a few words can, and it is done in a manner as impressive as devoid of passion or rancor. The Cincinnati Post gives us another style of comment, resorting to a mixture of facetiousness and sarcasm:

Let's see! Was there not a strike at Homestead? Who made any money by it? That is, who will give thanks because of that strike? The workers? The Pinkertons? The national guard? Iams? The Keystone state? Carnegie? President Harrison? Who did you say? Louder if you please.

But by far the most if not the only encouraging words are from the New York World's review of the case, as follows:

It would be a grateful outcome of the whole affair if, the episode having passed into history, lessons in mutual forbearance and consideration could be read from it, by both capital and labor.

It will be a great era in our national history when we attain the lofty ground of settlement of disputes—especially labor disputes—upon the broad ground of fairness to both sides, and by appeals to intelligence, justice and reason. To accomplish this it may be necessary for both to concede something; but surely concessions, even when involving financial loss and the sacrifice of some desirable considerations, could never approximate the ruin, the loss to all the parties engaged and the embittered feeling which the Homestead affair produced; and the end is not yet.

HE WANTS TO KNOW.

ELSINORE, Nov. 29, '92.

Editor Deseret News:

Will you please answer the following question through your paper: If the president and trustees of an incorporated town receive their commissions from the governor, but fail to give bonds as the law requires, are their official acts legal and binding? Respectfully,

E. P. MANQUARDSON.

Officers who occupy such a position are known as *de facto* incumbents; that is, they exercise the power and hold the places without a legal title, but to prevent injurious results to those for whom they act and avoid the annoyance and confusion that would result from invalidating their acts, the same are given legal effect. This does not apply to cases where authority or jurisdiction has been exceeded; nor would the officers under such circumstances have a right to act if there were an old board, that is one that had preceded them, as such board, in the absence of proper qualification by the new, would hold over and they alone would have the authority to act officially. Summed up, the answer is: If this is the first set of officials the town has chosen, their acts are valid until others properly chosen and qualified take their places; if not, then they have no right to act, the old set alone having that power.

LOUD ADVERTISING POSTERS.

There is no doubt, says the Boston Herald, that illustrated advertising by means of show bills in the streets has been abused in the privileges afforded by it. A good rule in this respect to adopt would be to place there no picture that would not be allowed in the columns of a reputable newspaper. The whole system of street advertising is a great expense to the proprietors of theaters, and it probably might be curtailed to a considerable degree without pecuniary loss on their part. Some of them are good specimens of pictorial art and some are a long way from it, being as unseemly and unworthy as they are at times vulgar and even indecent. Show printing has become a distinct branch of the business, and it ought to be conducted in a legitimate and inoffensive manner; but it is not, always as the bill boards and dead walls of this city too often attest.

TAKE THINGS MODERATELY.

The injunction to be moderate in all expressions and temperate in all notions is a standing one, but the proneness of mankind to ignore it becomes more apparent every day. In nothing is this more pronounced than in the social enjoyments and pastimes which prevail where there are any considerable number of people living in proximity, and the larger the community the greater and more nearly continuous the indulgence in sensuous pleasure as a rule. The devotee of "society" is rarely found in the villages and smaller towns, but becomes apparent in the smaller cities and more numerous by ratio as the population increases; and in the latter class of cases the demand

is too often for an all but incessant whirl of gaiety garnished with blazing costumes and set to the pace of unappeasable demand.

It is not that we should be sober and serious and matter-of-fact all the time; nor is there any need that we eschew neat and becoming attire, or that we keep away from places of amusement altogether. This represents the other extreme, and extremes are what we are protesting against. Amusement should be a means of mitigating the acerbities of life, of imparting relaxation to the mind and of creating pleasurable though innocent diversion; it should not be as it is in too many cases, the sole aim and end of life. Those who would make of this existence an endless round of pleasures are cultivating an appetite which grows by what it feeds on. The keen enjoyment of yesterday becomes the dull monotony of today and must be sharpened and added to in order that it may be again relished, and thus it goes till the appetite for enjoyment is sated, nothing gives pleasure any longer, and the world becomes a gloomy vale with all things in it dull, uninteresting and even repugnant.

It is as proper to attend a theatrical exhibition where vice and immorality are excluded, as it is to read a chapter from a useful book; while it is as improper to permit the mind to be constantly immersed in theaters and things theatrical to the exclusion or even curtailment of the practical things of life, as it is to do anything else which has a tendency to impair our usefulness. Our minds should amount to something more than a mere receptacle for sensational, fanciful and unreal impressions, and our feet should at all times walk the paths of righteousness even when "treading the measures" of a dance; but the minds which find no time for the contemplation of religion, philosophy, science and the events of the hour, and the feet which are trained only in the exercises of the ball room, are a reproach to the Giver and the receiver alike. Be moderate, be circumspect, and above all remember the time to come.

JAY GOULD IS NO MORE.

Jay Gould, the Midas of real life, the wizard of Wall street, and one of the greatest financiers in point of successful operations the world ever knew, is no more. He had been ailing for several days, yet a favorable turn now and then suggested the possibility of his weathering the storm, but it was not so to be, and at a quarter past nine o'clock this morning his spirit took its flight. The cause of death was consumption. He was about 60 years of age.

Gould was immensely wealthy; what his exact possessions were will probably never be known, certainly not by the public. So much of it was in stocks of various kinds that it naturally fluctuated all the time, and the announcement of his death will cause something of a depression all along the line, though this may be only momentary. It is quite safe to say that his possessions in cash and property convertible into cash would not fall short of \$100,000,000. We believe there are no Gould institutes of learning, orphan asylums,