

imals to be ridden no farther. But he regards their accomplishment as remarkable; and if the horses had been shod when entering on the more difficult roads they would not have been injured in the least. The ride was made by two cowboys, William and Albert Gabriel, and began on June 5. The animals never had been saddled or bridled before.

It is urged that such an accomplishment will change the opinions of agents of foreign governments as to the incapacity of the American range horse for military purposes. The only thing left is to increase the size of the horse a little to make him acceptable as an artillery animal. The advantage of the range horse in being more ambitious, independent and enduring than the farm-raised horse is greatly in his favor.

There is little doubt that if the Americans set about to furnish horses suitable for military purposes, it will be only the question of a short time before European armies rely largely upon the American horse for transport of that character. There is as good a chance for a world's supply house here in horses as in wheat, gold, or beef, if only the business be taken up.

STATE AND CITY.

Some of the voters in this State believe that the Legislature ought to offer bounties for the encouragement of industries, while others are very much opposed to such a proposition. A similar difference of opinion exists in relation to other features of the policy that ought to be pursued by the government of the State, as a sovereignty.

These conflicts of views necessarily give rise to party organizations. The thing is inevitable. Men who believe alike naturally come together and organize for the purpose of carrying into practical effect their views and wishes. Hence the machinery of political combinations. The "News" recognizes the fact that in state and national affairs we must have political parties; that it is wholly chimerical to advocate otherwise; and that it would be folly for any public man or journal to undertake to show that, under conditions now existing in this Republic and its several component states, there is any practicability, whatever in the proposition to abolish party organizations in the government of the nation or even of a state.

But there are broad and sharply drawn distinctions between the government of a state, and the management of the affairs of a municipal corporation. One is necessarily a political matter, the other is merely a business proposition. It is scarcely possible for any of the questions that divide voters in respect to state and national concerns to arise in connection with the affairs of a city.

Political parties in the state and nation must exist; and the "News" is not contending otherwise. Neither has this journal ever advocated or justified lack of fidelity to the party in which a voter has enlisted. Bad faith and vacillation are as detestable among members of a political party as in other relations of life. But we are opposed to witnessing a slavish subservience to party bosses, who seek to lead the voters in wrong and harmful directions; and party fealty ought not to be so strong as to impel the voter to endorse what his judgment and conscience condemn.

To give a political character to a purely business matter, is a violation of truth and reason, and all such violations involve penalties. This is why a city government should be kept out

of politics. What would be thought of a railroad corporation that appoints its officers on political lines? How many voters of this city would like to see our magnificent school system become the spoils of politics, and the superintendent and teachers, appointed in response to political pulls?

Every reason for excluding politics from a railroad corporation, and from the schools, applies in favor of its exclusion from purely municipal affairs. Not that non-partisanship is an absolute specific for the cure of the evils under which American cities so commonly suffer; for the possibility remains that incompetent or dishonest men may work themselves into power on a non-partisan ticket. But there is much less danger of that sort of thing, and a much surer cure for it when it does happen, under a non-political system than under the rule of party machines.

ABOUT IRRIGATING CANALS.

Complaint is heard from shareholders in irrigating canals in this vicinity that a change is being made in the method of repairing them which bears hard on the farmer. He is being required to pay in cash his share of the expense of making repairs, instead of being allowed to work on the canal himself, as has heretofore been the rule. The result is he is obliged to raise a sum of money which often amounts to a serious tax, and is deprived of employment which he used to have.

This is all wrong, and shows gross mismanagement. To compel the shareholders in a canal to raise money to pay for making repairs upon it, and then to stand idle and see others do the work and receive the money they have contributed, is inflicting upon them a needless and senseless burden. There has never been a period in Utah when the average shareholders in an irrigating canal did not have more time than money, taking the year round; and hence it has always been vastly easier for him to do a few days' work in putting a canal in repair, than to raise the cash with which to pay some other man's wage for doing the same work.

Of course when some improvement has to be done on a canal which can not be accomplished by manual labor, but requires the purchase of material which can be obtained for cash only, it becomes necessary to collect cash from the shareholders. The complaints referred to do not relate to such cases, however, but to the ordinary cleaning out and enlarging of the canals.

Some people seem to think that it is a good thing to put all business on a cash basis; but there are exceptions to this rule, and one of the exceptions is the business of irrigation districts. In them the infliction of cash assessments should be avoided, and opportunity to pay the cost of repairs, etc., in labor, should be given as much as possible.

In no one thing did the founders of Utah display greater practical foresight than establishing the rule that irrigating water should go with the land, so that the same person should own both. In many localities in the arid region, where large corporations control the water, the natural advantages offered to homeseekers are vastly superior to what Utah could originally boast. The climate and soil are better, and the water more abundant, yet the fact that the tiller of the soil must each year pay cash for irrigating water, makes it difficult or impossible for him to prosper and build up the country; hence localities where this condition prevails rarely grow and increase in wealth and prosperity as do

those where the water is held as an appurtenance to the land.

The charge of one dollar per acre for water seems at first sight to be a very moderate one; and canal companies truthfully assert that it will no more than keep up repairs and pay a reasonable interest on the cost of their plants. But to the farmer that irrigates no more than fifty or one hundred acres, it is a very heavy tax, and consumes a large share of his crop. Why is the tax so large to him when it is so small to the canal company? Because he has to pay it in cash instead of labor.

The principal of utilizing labor instead of demanding cash, in furnishing water for irrigation, is one of the great secrets of Utah's prosperity, and should never be lost sight of by irrigation districts and canal companies.

CLASS LEGISLATION.

One section of the Dingley law permits residents of the United States who go abroad to bring home with them, free of duty, "articles" to the value of \$100. These articles may be anything portable, and the duty on them, if imported by a merchant, may be the very highest.

Now as a rule it is only rich Americans who go abroad; they spend their money in foreign countries instead of in their own, and are the last persons in the world to claim special privileges at the hands of this government. Yet the permission to bring into this country, free of duty, \$100 worth of goods or personal property of any kind, is, without reason, logic or justification of any sort, granted them.

Why should a rich traveler be allowed to bring in free, "articles" on which a merchant, or any citizen who has not been abroad, would have to pay a duty, equal, perhaps, to half their value? It is a rare thing for such flagrant class legislation to be even proposed, and that it should have passed Congress is a matter of astonishment, and a cause of much disgust among the American people. At least in this one section, the Dingley law should be amended.

DISPOSING OF THE

There is a little discussion now as to what disposition shall be made of the surplus funds that may be left in the hands of the semi-centennial commission after the expenses of the Jubilee celebration have been paid. There have been several suggestions, one of which has been to distribute the funds to libraries, hospitals, etc., or to return it pro rata to those who contributed. To either of these there is serious objection, that to the first being that it would be clearly an illegal way to dispose of the funds; while that objection would hold good to the other proposition.

There should not be the slightest difficulty in reaching a conclusion on this point that would be in perfect harmony both with the law and with public sentiment regarding the Pioneers. The State contributed a large sum to the celebration; and if there is any left, the rule of law would be to devote it to that purpose most directly in line with the original object. To either distribute it to private organizations not associated with the Jubilee, or to disburse it among private parties, would ignore this principle of law. But there is a purpose directly in line with the original appropriation, and the contributions from public spirited citizens. It is the completion of the Pioneer Monument, the erection of which was as much a feature of the celebration—and per-