

has made enemies among the schemers who work for personal advantage, he has endeared himself to the people and has won the respect of the best men of Arizona.

If the last presidential election had proved a Democratic instead of a Republican victory, Arizona would very soon have been clothed in the habiliments of statehood, and Governor Zulick would have stood an excellent chance to represent Arizona in the Senate of the United States. As it is, his chances are by no means destroyed. The days of the territorial system are numbered, and if our neighbor on the south maintains its Democratic proclivities, the gallant gentleman now retired from the governorship will not be lost sight of when the people look for leaders. We wish him success in whatever line of life he may follow when he vacates the executive chair.

#### PATRIOTIC PARTISANS.

PARNELL and Morley had a glowing reception in London recently, St. James' Hall, where it was held, being crowded to the utmost. The alleged rule that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country" has no application in this instance, as in nothing that was said or done was there an indication that these two representative Irishmen were on any other soil than where they belonged; that though not actually in their own domicile nor the neighborhood where they reside, they were not still in their own country, their own national home.

The sentiments expressed by both statesmen will bear a careful analysis—not such an one, perhaps, as the *Times* would subject it to—but one devoid of prejudice, ill-will or partisanship. As things are viewed here, where the echoes of the great Home Rule strife do not penetrate, they seem to be masterpieces of the politician's craft and the able advocates' zeal. "Whether Home Rule shall be carried by the Liberals or the Tories," said Morley, "they can never deprive the Liberals of the glory of being the first to soothe the Irish distrust, extinguish British prejudice and extend the right hand of fellowship." This, while conveying the determination to surrender no point in the struggle for the desired end, shows no disposition to resort to other means than such as meet the approval of the civilized world and produce such results as, while establishing a separate gov-

ernment for Ireland, will still strengthen the ties which bind her to the parent power. This and similar declarations were received with great cheering, as was every scathing allusion to the course lately pursued by the *Times*.

Parnell was so enthusiastically received that he could not proceed for some minutes. As no condensed review of his remarks would come anywhere near doing him justice, we refer the reader to the speech itself or a comprehensive synopsis of it, which appeared a few days ago in the press dispatches.

#### SHOULD THE FEW RULE?

THERE have always been difficulties in the way of mixed public bodies in this Territory. Non-"Mormons" have been chosen on several occasions to public positions in Utah, but they have occupied unenviable posts because of the course taken by people of their own class. They were expected to do impossible things. If they did not oppose every measure of the majority and kick on every possible occasion, to exhibit their "independence," they were accused of lack of energy, and if they endorsed any public measure, no matter how much it might be for the benefit of the community, they were accused of being Jack-"Mormons" and controlled by the dictation of the Church.

This has aided very much in keeping up the distinction of "Mormon" and "Gentile," and in preventing that union of interests in public affairs that conservative people have deemed desirable. During the past two or three years there has been an honest effort to break down that division between business men and persons who take an interest in public affairs, which has arisen from a difference of opinion in religion and politics. And it has been to a considerable extent successful. It would be eminently so, if it were not for a few disgruntled and implacable persons who cannot be contented unless they have everything their own way, and who feed on strife and fatten on ruptures. Peace is disgusting to them and tumult a pleasure.

At the last municipal election four members of the City Council were chosen from the non-"Mormon" ranks. As it appears to us those gentlemen have done all that could be reasonably expected by their own party. They have voiced the views of the citizens whose interests they

are supposed to represent. On several occasions they have voted together, solidly, against the majority. On others they have divided as their judgments guided them. They have had free speech and free action. They have not been assailed by the majority for their difference of opinion. They have been treated respectfully by their fellow officers and by the public.

But now they are called upon by the organ of the radical obstructionists to resign their offices and forsake their posts. Why? Simply because they cannot in all cases control the Council in which they are the minority. The "gall" of the would-be rulers of this Territory is overflowing and amazing. One would suppose, to listen to their talk, that their idea of minority representation is the subjection of the many to the will of the few. That in a body of fifteen, four of the number should outweigh the other eleven. That is, provided the majority are "Mormons" and the minority "Gentiles."

We ask our non-"Mormon" friends to say, candidly, whether they expected that four members of the City Council were to outvote the others. Is it reasonable to suppose that because the great body of citizens were willing the smaller number should receive fair recognition and representation, therefore public policy should be regulated and made subordinate to the opinions and wishes of the minority? Are the few to be considered everybody and the many nobody? Is that what is meant by "Liberalism?"

We do not believe that the non-"Mormons" of this city—except the radical, obstructive few—entertain any such unreasonable views. It is not true that the four non-"Mormons" in the City Council are "not consulted;" that "their advice is not listened to;" or that they are "sat down upon" in any way, except the usual and inevitable rule of the majority in every legislative or other public body, throughout the civilized world. The published reports of the proceedings of the City Council demonstrate this beyond truthful dispute.

The demand, then, for these gentlemen to resign simply because they cannot rule, is childish as well as impudent. Because the other fellows won't play as they want, they are to take their marbles and go home. Who are to decide when there is a difference of opinion? The minority? Is that in accord with accepted rules of democratic