

ought to respect. If the differences can be settled by arbitration, that is the best and most satisfactory method. And whatever the employing company may claim of the rights of capital, by declining this means of satisfactory settlement it will not improve its position or gain the respect of the thinking public.

RAVACHOL EXECUTED.

RAVACHOL, the infamous French anarchist, murderer and grave robber, was executed, according to a Paris dispatch, at an early hour on Sunday morning. This person had been, perhaps, the most remarkable criminal of the age, Deeming, the Australian murderer, not excepted. He was a type of the fierce extremist in anarchy. He confessed to counterfeiting, grave robbing, and even murder, justifying himself in all his diabolical enormities by his peculiar political doctrine.

Ravachol's real name was Henri Konigstein. It will be remembered that a few months ago a series of dynamite outrages were perpetrated in Paris which startled the whole civilized world. For these he was convicted and sentenced to penal servitude for life. At the time the lenity of this sentence surprised the average citizen as much as the heinousness of the outrage astonished him previously. The jury gave out that there were extenuating circumstances, but the key to them was not given at that time. His conviction was celebrated by his comrades by blowing up the restaurant in which he was arrested for the dynamite offense. Very, the keeper of the place, had his leg blown off and died; Very's wife was hurt and subsequently lost her reason, and two patrons of the restaurant were badly injured. Threats were made that the judge, jurors, counsel and prosecuting officers would all suffer the same fate as Very, and for a time Parisian society was terror stricken.

In 1885 Ravachol murdered an old man and his servant at Vartzelle. In 1888 he murdered a man and wife at Chomond, and in 1889 another old man fell a victim to his murderous axe, the weapon used in all his terrible deeds. He also coined spurious money, robbed the graves of wealthy deceased persons, and plundered churches of sacramental articles.

In 1891 an old man named Jacques Brunel, known as the Hermit of Our lady of grace in Chambles, was murdered. Three days after the police traced the crime to Ravachol, but he fought so vigorously that he escaped. He went to Paris, assumed another name, and eluded the police until he was arrested for the dynamite outrages. He confessed his crimes and said he committed them for money to advance the cause of society. On June 21st last he was placed on trial for the murder of Brunel the hermit, convicted and is now executed.

Ravachol was also accused of the murder of two old ladies near St. Etienne, but he did not confess to this crime, unless he did so shortly before his execution. Paris may felicitate itself that it is rid of a dangerous member of its society, though it appears he had a following there which endorsed all his crimes.

THE COMING ISSUE.

THE annexed special dispatch from Washington was published in the Chicago Tribune under date of July 3:

"Utah's deal for Statehood has not yet been consummated, but there are Republican Senators who seem bound to help it out. The other day in the Committee on Territories Stewart and Carey joined the Democratic members in agreeing to report favorably an enabling act for the Mormon Territory, so that it will go before the Senate with a majority report.

"Stewart's position is plain. He wants Utah admitted as a State so that the talk of dismembering the pocket borough of Nevada and joining it to adjoining States will cease. Senator Carey's action, however, seems to call for explanation. Some weeks ago, when the Democratic House under a suspension of the rules passed enabling acts for Arizona and New Mexico, a chorus went up from the members who cried out 'Utah! Utah!' They wanted to let in the polygamous Territory, too.

"But Speaker Crisp would not give them a chance, and refused to recognize any member to make the motion and suspend the rules, so that an enabling act for Utah would be passed. It would be queer if a Republican Senate should have less regard for public decency than a Democratic House."

It is copied by the Tribune of this city, with comments containing a characteristic fling at Senator Carey, and the opinion that all the other Senators of the surrounding States favor the statehood movement. However, it does not accuse them of "a full understanding with the Mormon Church" as it does that gentleman, but it manifests a gloomy and sorrowful conviction that its efforts to prevent liberty for Utah will be abortive. It says:

"We refer to the matter that the Liberals may understand that with the election of Mr. Cleveland statehood will be given to Utah within a year, or certainly before the election in the fall of 1894. It is quite possible it will be the same with the re-election of Mr. Harrison, because it takes a strong man as President to refuse on a local question the endorsement of his party Senators in all the adjacent States."

This being the case, why should not the decent men among the "Liberals" fall in with the march of events, catch the spirit of the times, get out of their old and useless rut, and take part in the work that will soon be upon the people of this Territory? The "Liberal organ" says further:

"We are firmly convinced that the Republican Senators in all the surrounding States to Utah have an understanding which means statehood for Utah in the near future."

If that is the case, what is the use of fighting the movement and keeping up a struggle over dead issues? The miserable nonsense which the Tribune editor poured out before the committee at Minneapolis, and which O. W. Powers and his crowd repeated at Chicago, is behind the times. It did very well for Tribune purposes a few years ago, but it is too stupid and stale for the present. Anti-"Mormon" yarns are obsolete. Bugaboos about "Mormon" domination of the future State are understood to be stuffed dummies—"Liberal" scarecrows that only excite ridicule or disgust. What is the use of playing with them any

longer? Nobody who has sense and information believes that there will be any other dangers in Utah than those which the respective national parties always picture as the consequence of the triumph of the opposition.

It is of no use to lie about the "Mormons" any longer. It is babbling to keep up the false alarm about "Church rule" any more. Why not stop this foolery and make a genuine and sincere effort to secure the coming State to that political party which each citizen believes to be the best?

The old issues are gone, the old strife should cease. Let us have Republican principles and Democratic doctrines in dispute, instead of religious beliefs against irreligious onslaughts and sharp retaliation against malicious misrepresentations and ribald insinuations. Each party thinks its own success essential to the welfare of the community. Let each seek, in an honest way, to gain control of the coming State.

Those who linger and try to keep up the old conflict will find themselves left behind and counted as back numbers. A new epoch is approaching for Utah. Leaving the things that are behind, let us press onward to those that are before, and help to mould them for the best interests of the coming commonwealth.

INDIVIDUAL, STATE AND FEDERAL RIGHTS.

THE labor troubles in Idaho bring up a serious question. They also demonstrate a political principle. The question is, how far may labor combine without becoming destructive of true liberty? The principle is, that the Federal power cannot be exerted, whether under a Republican or a Democratic administration, in any State of the Union for the suppression of domestic violence, until the Governor or the Legislature of that State calls for Federal aid and declares the State unable to settle unaided its own internal difficulties.

The news from the north, contained in our morning dispatches, tells of a bloody conflict between the union and non-union miners at Coeur d'Alene. It looks as though the actual fighting was begun by the non-union miners. But whether that was so or not, it is a fact that the union men have combined to prevent men from working who do not belong to their societies. They have gone so far in this direction as to resort to violence. That consists of attempts to destroy the mills where non-union men are employed and to kill those workmen.

With the dispute between the employers and the employed we have nothing to do just now. The union men may be fully justified in refusing to work or they may not. We concede their right to quit if they choose, to demand such wages as they think they ought to have, and to organize peaceably for the maintenance of their views and claims. But we do not think they have the right to prevent other men from working at prices they refuse, or to injure the property or persons of employers or employees.

One of the worst forms of tyranny is that which seeks by force to prevent