

another product, it no longer owns what it produced. Labor has the right to dispose of itself. When this is done it does not own what it produces; that belongs to the capitalist or employer who paid for the labor. Therefore labor, if the source of all wealth, does not rightfully own all wealth.

It is just such fallacies as that at the head of the platform of this new Federation which incites unthinking people to acts of lawlessness, prompted by discontent and the erroneous idea that capital is enjoying something that rightfully belongs to them. It is the worst kind of demagogism and laborers of every class ought to look through it, comprehend its error, and discern the motives of those who formulate these glittering sentences to dazzle and lead away honest but not logical minds.

Any attempt to set labor against capital or capital against labor is bad business. The experience of ages which has gone into history has demonstrated that capital as well as labor is needed for all gigantic enterprises. Labor unorganized, and without brains to direct it when organized, can accomplish but little. Capital is of course derived from labor and skill, but it is not labor nor is it skill. Those who possess it have rights, as well as the toilers without whose muscle and vigor it would be of but small value.

The rights of property must be maintained or there would be no progress of civilization. The acquisition of property is an incentive to labor. It is a proper object to hold in view. Whenever a laborer acquires more of earth's products than is necessary for his immediate wants he becomes a capitalist. Not because he owns all he produces, but because he is entitled to that which he acquires.

When a mutuality of interests shall bind the capitalist and the laborer together, this prolonged contest will cease. It can never be effected, however, by anything less than an influence which will touch the souls of men and make them brothers. There will always be inequalities of possessions because men are not equal in their abilities. But mutuality can be established without equality. Capital and labor are interdependent, and each should have its rights, determined on the principles of justice, mercy and fraternity.

Only the influence, and light and power of the Gospel, which establishes the Fatherhood of God and

the brotherhood of man, can bring about the change that is needed in the relations of employers and employed, of capital and labor. There will always be individuals who will have more property than others. It must be so in the very nature of things. But these ought not to prey upon their poorer fellows, nor be permitted to take any undue advantage of the power of property. And under the laws and rules and spirit of the Gospel, which embraces all that is good in government as well as theology, science and art, injustice will eventually be driven from among mankind, equity will prevail, and all people of every condition, ability and class will have their rights secured.

It is the lawful privilege of every laborer to become a capitalist to a greater or less extent. But under the present state of society it is impossible for thousands of laborers to save anything from their hard earnings beyond immediate necessities, and many have not sufficient to supply even them. This is all wrong. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." And that means proper remuneration and sustenance.

It is the right of laborers to combine for mutual protection and to resist the encroachments of heartless capital. But it is not right to do anything, whether individually or by organizations of any name or nature, which will limit the freedom of others, coerce the souls of men in any degree, or prevent a laborer from disposing of his labor as seems good to him.

But when labor claims, in general terms, to own all it produces, thus striking a blow at capital, at accumulation of property, at the very principle of sale and exchange, it makes itself a foe to progress, to civilization and to those incentives which stimulate itself and raise men to higher conditions, and thus defeats its own purpose and becomes an obstruction and a menace to the world.

#### FURTHER REFUTATION.

WE REGRET that it becomes necessary to notice any more the disreputable organ of the "Liberal" party on the matter of its libel against the Messrs. Mitton of Wellsville. We published the affidavit of those gentlemen which ought to have been sufficient to draw forth an apology from the sheet that attacked them, but it was never known to perform a gentlemanly act of this kind, nor to frankly and

fairly acknowledge an error when detected in falsehood.

That organ endeavored to make a turn and twist from the matter by assailing Mr. Buchanan, who signed his name as a witness to the affidavit. We replied to this attack, and showed that it was just as false as the statement of the purpose of the Messrs. Mitton in coming to this city, but the falsehoods against Mr. Buchanan were repeated, and his attention having been called to this, he has requested us to publish the following. That is our apology for again alluding to the subject:

*Editor Deseret News:*

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 2, 1889.—Permit me, through the columns of your paper, to reply to some statements made by the Salt Lake Daily Tribune concerning me. In its issue of the 26th ult. the leading editorial under the heading of "Being Caught, They Confess," which, by the way, is simply an effort to maintain its previously circulated libelous statement concerning Mr. Edwin Mitton and Mr. John W. Mitton, it says: "But now to the bottom facts in the Wellsville case:

"These two men named \* \* \* were notified by A. M. Buchanan, (who figures on the affidavit as witness to the two Mitton and Mitton signatures) to go up to the bank, that President Cannon wanted to see them. They went; and, on arriving, found the affidavit that is printed in the News, all ready for them to sign; they obeyed counsel and signed it."

The above is given as "the bottom facts in the Wellsville case; and I desire the public to remember this statement, while they read the following:

First. It is not true that I "notified those two men to go up to the bank." Second. It is not true that I "figured on the affidavit as witness to the two Mitton and Mitton signatures."

3rd It is not true that I "notified these two men" "that President Cannon wanted to see them."

4th. It is not true that "these two men" "on arriving found the affidavit that is printed in the News all ready for them to sign," and

5th. The statement that "they obeyed counsel and signed it" is another of the Tribune's libels on the Messrs. Mitton. No one offered either of those gentlemen any advice in regard to signing the affidavit that was printed in the News, but their signature being placed to the document in question was the result of their desire to vindicate their character and also to show to the public the utter falsity of the alleged Wellsville letter, which the Tribune says "is a sample of hundreds of such letters received at the Liberal headquarters."

I will here state that I have never spoken to President Cannon nor he to me concerning the alleged Wellsville letter or anything connected