

from party plunderers and machine debauchees, the country would have more responsible government and one less imperilled by anarchy than ever before. Political parties can and will exist in their proper spheres; and where there are political issues to be agitated, there will be political organizations representing opposing ideas. Municipal government in England is divorced from national politics, yet every one observes that the conservative and liberal parties continue to divide the seats in Parliament. And we shall find in this country that with purer governments in local affairs the people will demand that the standards be raised in state and national affairs. So much is worth striving for.

"To adopt a phrase now current in another line of discussion, Mr. Low today stands for the municipalization of municipalities, which means the placing of great cities under genuine public control. And we must municipalize the municipalities before we municipalize anything else."

We have already quoted from the New York World, a staunch Democratic champion, and the Mail and Express, an equally stalwart Republican paper, on the same subject treated in the same broad way. The Citizen (Democratic) of Brooklyn, joins the procession, with a parcel of good strong advice to the Democratic leaders and party as to the thanks due from them to Mr. Low for the part he has taken and the warnings he has given them—his non-partisan platform and principles being such, according to that paper, as "cannot be antagonized by the Democracy without infidelity to Democratic principles."

Will the local spoliemen and place-seekers continue to see something sinister and unhallowed in the non-partisan movement in Salt Lake City after reading the foregoing extracts and remembering that a hundred more like them might be reproduced? Will the people, or any reputable part of them, be frightened or coaxed away from a plain, independent, courageous course by those who have everything to lose and nothing to gain by a reform of municipal government? It cannot be too often repeated that the highest compliment yet paid to the work of the citizens' non-partisan committee is found in the source from which the loudest part of the opposition comes.

THE GOVERNMENT AND ALASKA.

A subject which will necessarily receive some treatment at the hands of the President in his annual message at the opening of Congress next winter is the condition of affairs and the necessity of governmental action in Alaska. The United States has owned that vast territory for many years, but has never taken much interest in it—at least not to the extent of giving it suitable care and representation as a part and parcel of the great Republic. Current activity in correction of this neglect has thus far exhausted itself in supplying a company of soldiers; while on the part of the secretary of war there has been a manifestation of real interest in considering ways and means to aid and succor the American citizens who have rushed heedlessly toward the gold fields without once knowing how they were going to get there or preparing themselves with adequate subsistence while en route or after getting beyond the snowy barriers between the coast and the rich river beds far inland. Just what Congress can or should do, or what the President will recommend, is not now clear; but it is fair to predict that the news from the north during the

next sixty days will be of such a character as to make some decisive action compulsory. Unless all accounts and forecasts are misleading, there will be cause for much sympathy with the condition of the Klondikers before spring; and the part of humanity is to take steps as quickly as possible for the amelioration of a condition that looks as though it might easily become desperate.

A QUESTION OF "LABOR RIGHTS."

A case that may be deemed as of high importance as defining the "rights of labor," and also as having some bearing on the present discussion of the right of injunction to prevent men from interfering with other workmen, is occupying the attention of legal circles in England just now. The case is that of Allen vs Flood, and eight of the judges of the high court of justice have been consulted by the judicial members of the House of Lords as to the principle involved. The assistance derived from these high functionaries has not, however, enabled the court of appeal to make up its mind on the question. As summarized by the New York Sun, the facts are as follows:

"Two shipwrights were in the employ of the Glengall Iron company. These men were at work on the wood-work of a vessel, but it became known that when working for another employer they had done iron work. For a shipwright to touch work on a ship which belongs to a hollermaker, as does iron work, is a most serious matter. Accordingly, the hollermakers told the Glengall Iron company firmly, but politely, that if it continued to employ the two shipwrights they, the boiler-makers, must quit work. The company yielded to the pressure put on it and dismissed the two men. There was no question of breach of contract involved. The company had a right to dismiss the shipwrights, and the boiler-makers had, of course, a perfect right to quit work. The shipwrights, however, considered that the representatives of the boiler-makers who threatened the company and procured their dismissal had done them a legal injury, and they brought an action for damages. The court of appeals held that the boiler-makers were liable in damages for causing injury to the shipwrights by procuring their dismissal. Of the eight judges consulted, six say that the matter is actionable, two that it is not."

As stated, the case is regarded as having an important bearing upon the determination of labor questions in America; the final decision will have far-reaching results so far as defining the rights of an organization in the matter of bringing pressure to bear upon employers for the purpose of limiting the right of other men to work when they are willing to do so.

GET THEE TO THE EARTH!

In line with the suggestions in a recent issue of this paper with reference to the work of the industrial bureau in this city (with headquarters at the Presiding Bishop's office), attention should be directed to the invitation to home-seekers conveyed in almost every letter to the "News" from the outlying Stakes of Zion. Some of the southeastern portions of our own State offer fine inducements for families who are not afraid to start in bravely upon a piece of good rich earth and dig out an honest living. Arizona has had some terrors for emigrants from Utah, by reason of misfortunes with water, etc.; but prosperity in a marked de-

gree is now reported as the deserved reward of those who with pluck and industry have reclaimed its valleys. The New Mexico and Colorado settlements of the Saints are growing in strength and wealth; while Idaho's advancement, due to an influx of sturdy colonists from this State, is in several counties almost marvelous. More than this, there are still vast areas within our own borders upon which the life-giving fluid for irrigation has been or can be brought, and where prudence and thrift will not go without their certain reward.

Health and independence await hundreds of heads of families now living precariously in, or lingering aimlessly around, our principal cities; the nearer they get to the land, the surer they are of an honest living. A merciful Providence has given us abundance for all—but man's shortsightedness frequently fails to take advantage of the blessings offered. We need not grovel in the dust because we came from dust and to dust must return; but the best of us will be better and safer if we seek to acquire and make productive a portion of this fair green footstool of Omnipotence which we call our earthly home.

AN OUTRAGEOUS DOCTRINE.

Can it be that Congressman King is properly quoted as saying in a speech Monday, "No man has a right to advocate a cause or espouse a proposition that would detract from the strength of his party's position"?

Such a doctrine of party bossism as opposed to individual liberty is infamous. It proposes a condition worse than the slavery of the body, it is the serfdom of the mind. Not only does it by inference assert that parties are always right, and opposing individuals always wrong, but it goes still further and demands men's blind obedience to party interests, whether right or wrong. A speech or two of that kind will give the people such an utter abhorrence of the dictum and rule of politicians that the whole machinery will go down in ruin.

We find no fault with men who with any proper motive object to non-partisanship in city government or in school control; they have the right to hold to any view and to work on any lines they choose. But no office-holder or partisan, be he high as Olympus or gifted as Apollo, must be allowed to rise up in these late days of freedom and enlightenment and declare without contradiction that other men have no right to do as they please in anything that may affect "the strength of their party's position." No party is bigger than patriotism, no gang of partisans or clique of political manipulators is mighty enough to curb the free exercise of human judgment.

METHODS AND METHODS.

On the part of the Democratic brethren who have any regard for the jewel of consistency, we expect to hear no more fault-finding with the methods pursued by the non-partisan citizens' committee in the nomination of a municipal ticket. They had their convention yesterday, beginning soon after ten o'clock in the morning, and continuing, with a couple of recesses, until towards one o'clock this morning—and it was a daisy. If any delegate had anything to say and did not say it, it was his own fault. There were apparently very few, however, who were guilty of this omission—on the contrary it seemed a great part of the time as if they were all talking at once. As was