

counties might have more criminal business than the nature of the subject in every case would justify; but there ought to be—there is—a way by which such offenders as those herein spoken of can be reached and punished adequately. For the sake of upholding the law no less than for furthering our fish and game interests it is demanded that such system be employed.

NOT A NEW IDEA.

An idea ought not to be condemned for no other reason than that it is new; for all ideas were new once. There would be, therefore, no force in the objection to the non-partisan idea on the ground that it is new, even were that allegation true, which it is not.

In nearly all the towns of Utah, from the time when party lines were drawn, there has been a tacit, and in some of them a formal, agreement between the parties that the control of the schools should be non-partisan. In some instances the proper committees of the respective parties have conferred together and agreed upon a non-partisan school board ticket. Every city in the State, so far as present recollection serves, has strenuously insisted on keeping its schools out of politics. Some of them have not thoroughly succeeded in this, but the good intention on the part of the better element has been there all the same.

Not only has the non-partisan idea controlled as to schools, but it has also governed in the election of some of the district judges, notably in this district. In 1895 Le Grand Young, Ogden Hiles and A. S. Howat were elected to the district bench by a vote that was at least claimed and intended to be non-partisan. They were nominees of the Democratic party, but that party invited Republicans to vote for them, an invitation that was widely accepted by the believers in a tariff. The Republicans who were invited to vote for these Democratic candidates had had no voice in their nomination. They would not have been permitted to have any voice in it had they desired to ever so strongly, because no Republican had been permitted to take part in a Democratic primary or convention. And yet the frank announcement by the Democratic central committee that the election of these candidates would not be regarded as a partisan victory removed all objection to the manner in which they were nominated, the non-partisan idea was very widely endorsed by Republicans, notwithstanding that they had candidates of their own for the positions on the bench that were to be filled, and this district was given a non-partisan judiciary.

The source from whence emanated, in 1895, the proposition for a non-partisan judiciary is now intensely hostile to the non-partisan idea; which goes to show how inconsistent and self-stultifying politicians can be, while posing as the champions of the "dear people."

There has been a strong sentiment, ever since party lines were drawn, that not only the schools and the judiciary, but municipal governments, ought to be kept out of politics; and this sentiment has been gradually gathering strength until this fall. In a number of the larger towns of the State, it is being crystallized into non-partisan tickets. Attempts have been made to show that the development of the non-partisan movement in several towns simultaneously is the result of some secret movement having for its ultimate purpose something very sinister, but what that something is has not been described. The simple fact, obvious to any one, is that the non-partisan sentiment is the out-

growth of the common sense of the voters in the different towns and that they think the example of the capital of the State in attempting to put it into practical operation is a good one to follow.

In some of the cities of the State members of the city council who chanced to be Republicans felt it their bounden duty to oppose any measure introduced by a Democrat, and vice versa. Each party has sought to prevent the other from getting credit for doing something good for the whole town; and to accomplish this purpose a really beneficial measure has sometimes been defeated. Such instances have been numerous in several incorporated towns of the State, where growth and improvement have been retarded in consequence; and the voters have become weary of and disgusted with such folly. The remedy for it is in a non-partisan mayor and city council.

WHEAT AND BIMETALLISM.

William J. Bryan has a long article on the rise in wheat and its relation to bimetalism in a recent number of the New York World. It is interesting reading, no matter whether the reader agrees with the conclusions drawn or not. Mr. Bryan has a trenchant way of presenting his thoughts, and the article in question is fully abreast of the best of his productions.

The subject is opened with the statement that the rise in wheat will aid rather than injure the cause of bimetalism. He shows that while some few may be disposed to give the administration credit or blame, whichever it may happen to be, for whatever occurs during its existence, all intelligent people reason from cause to effect. He then proceeds to show that wheat has risen because the foreign crop is short, the law of supply and demand being universal and extending to every commodity. He refers to the claim made by a Nebraska opponent that the advance in wheat being about equal to the Dingley tariff on that staple it followed that one was the cause of the other, and pronounces it an insult to the intelligence of the average Republican to suppose him capable of cherishing such a delusion, an assertion which is clinched by showing that wheat is higher in Liverpool (as it nearly always is) than in New York and a tariff could thereby have no possible effect upon the prices here. In a similar way he goes on to show that if the party in power desire credit for the high price of wheat they must take upon themselves the responsibility for the Indian famine, and he insists that rejoicing over the rise in the cereal is significant in that, while admitting such rise to be beneficial, the arguments made by the gold people last year are answered and those who then opposed bimetalism plant themselves squarely on the ground which its advocates occupied. He also scores rather neatly in pointing out that while it was claimed that an appreciating dollar was a national blessing, those who so claimed are now rejoicing because the purchasing power of the dollar has been somewhat curtailed; that whereas last year the wage-earners were advised that an increase in the price of commodities would be detrimental to them, they are now confronted with the spectacle of those who so advised rejoicing over the advanced price of the great staple of flour! "They praise a dear dollar but grow happy over the cheapening of the dollar in its relation to a few articles." It is argued that the price of wheat will fall when foreign crops again become normal, and that those papers and people that today are so

loudly calling attention to the advanced price of wheat are simply laying up for themselves additional trouble. As relates to the vast additional sums of money being received for the wheat crop, the writer says in substance that if we had enough money an increase would be an injury, but if an increase be justifiably the cause for so much rejoicing, is it not manifestly the case that we did not have enough?

The plea throughout is ingenious and not without logic; yet there be some, holding altogether different views from Mr. Bryan on the coinage question, who will feel able to turn his own weapon against himself by asking him how it is that silver three weeks ago was eight cents lower than now, unless he admits that with the white metal, as with wheat, a scarcity or famine somewhere else has made the local market that much more active. Wheat and silver both advancing hand in hand is a most pleasing spectacle; but the sight, and the causes that make it possible, are hardly susceptible of one-sided political use.

PRINCIPLES, NOT POLITICS.

It has been suggested that there is not much point to the practice sometimes engaged in by this paper of mentioning our forthcoming municipal election and that of New York city in juxtaposition, but of this others may judge. It is not that defensive or aggressive tactics here are seeking a prototype or that the Citizens' movement here requires the reflex of a similar struggle of greater proportions from afar to encourage it, but simply to show how it is that the best minds and most conspicuous talents of the day are being turned in that direction that such reference is used at all. It is, in fact, difficult to mention a fact favorable or unfavorable as relates to either case without its having a bearing in some degree upon the other, and the true journalist never apologizes for having an exemplar out of his own field to refer to now and then.

The citizens of the two great municipalities—one great nationally, the other locally—have in each case placed before the voters for their acceptance or rejection a candidate for mayor whose qualifications are beyond controversy and whose personal character is so excellent that even ridicule, usually a weapon of more or less effect in the absence of a better, falls flat and accomplishes nothing. The New York candidate is a Republican and the Salt Lake candidate is a Democrat, and yet in their present positions and purposes there is no political difference whatever. Each stands for good, honest, effective government in which the partisan's zeal and the swash buckler's yearning for reward will occupy no place whatever, and both want to see their opposites in politics have as good a chance for prosperity and protection as those who are of and with them; furthermore, they have the integrity to inaugurate such system and the stamina to carry it out. In a word, they will give no public favors to friends because they are such, nor visit invidious discrimination upon others because they are not friends.

The New York World condenses Mr. Low's letter of acceptance as follows:

"That if elected Mayor he will be Mayor, serving no party, and with the single aim of promoting the public welfare.

"That he is a Republican, but will not use public office for any party or faction whatever.

"That fitness, efficiency and economy, not party service, will dictate every appointment and removal.