

EDITORIALS.

TWO REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES.

FOR a long time John Sherman, of Ohio, has openly sought the nomination of his party for President, and it has been generally expected that the Republicans of that State would do what they could for him. This expectation was verified on the 19th inst. when the Republican convention of Ohio, in session at Dayton, adopted a platform in which John Sherman is named for President, and the delegates to the national convention are directed to use all honorable means to secure his nomination. Ohio is a great State, and her united and enthusiastic support of Sherman adds materially to his chances of success.

But other powerful States have favorite sons. Among them is Indiana. On the same day on which John Sherman was nominated in Ohio, the State convention of Republicans, sitting at Indianapolis, went solid for Gen. Harrison, and the delegates to the national convention are instructed to secure his nomination if possible. The fact that Indiana is a somewhat doubtful State, would seem to give General Harrison increased hope of being chosen by his party. His solid nomination by his state, it is suggested, effectually disposes of Judge Gresham's chances.

It is reasonably certain that at least two other states, Iowa, and New York, will put Republican presidential candidates in the field. The former votes on Allison, while Chauncy M. Depew may confidently be expected to be put forth by the Empire State. Several other states may also name a man to lead the Republican party.

John Sherman is a strong man. He is fifty five years old, a lawyer by profession, and has had an experience in public life equalled by that of very few of the most prominent men in the nation. At the age of twenty-five he entered political life, and became a delegate to the National Whig Conventions of 1848 and 1852. In 1856 he became a member of the United States House of Representatives, in which body he served four successive terms. In March, 1861, he was elected to the United States Senate, and was re-elected in 1866, and again in 1872. In March, 1877, he was taken from the Senate and made Secretary of the Treasury, retaining that position till the close of Hayes' administration. He was returned to the Senate again in 1881, and was president of that body from Dec. 7th, 1885 till Feb. 26th, 1887, having been re-elected in 1886. His term in the Senate expires March 4, 1893.

John Sherman is cordially disliked in the South, and by southern politicians. He has never ceased to flout the bloody shirt, nor has he regarded war issues as settled. His nomination by the National Republican Convention would intensify the solidarity of the South, and would be strongly antagonized in portions of the west, especially by silver producing sections, on account of his fiscal policy.

General Benjamin Harrison, whom the Indiana Republicans have nominated, is not by any means as well known throughout the nation as is Sherman. He was not prominent among the Union commanders, as he was breveted Brigadier General only a few months before the war closed; though he entered the army in 1862 as a second lieutenant, and served till Lee surrendered. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1880, taking his seat March 4, 1881. He did not succeed in particularly distinguishing himself, nor is he rated by the press of the country as a man of great ability. He may appear to his immediate neighbors in his own State, to be a man of towering strength and far reaching influence; but to the rest of the Union he will have rather the appearance of a dark horse of uncertain qualities and mettle.

Existing conditions justify the expectation that the main struggle for the Republican nomination will be between John Sherman and Chauncy M. Depew, with Senator Allison of Iowa a close third.

THE ROUMANIAN REVOLT.

The dispatches that have reached this part of the world regarding the recent revolt of the peasantry in Roumania have been exceedingly meagre, and no cause was assigned for the uprising. One would have supposed from the paucity of the information which reached here concerning it that it was only a small sized riot. On the contrary it was a fierce, bloody and destructive affair. The armed peasants demolished a great many houses in a large number of villages. The homes of land owners and farmers were sacked and robbed and granaries pillaged. Local officials fared badly many of them being barbarously ill-used and not a few killed outright. The territorial troops joined the insurrectionists and fired upon the troops of the line.

Final instructions were sent to the troops of the line to suppress the revolt at all hazards, by the severest

methods. These advices were carried out promptly, resulting in the killing of large numbers of revolvers, the wounding of many more, while bodies of them were taken prisoners by the wholesale process. In this way peace has been restored.

It is interesting to note the cause of the disturbance, being the same that preceded the last war of Russia with Turkey. The paw of the bear was introduced into Roumania in the shape of insurrectionary agents, who worked up the revolt. Those who remember the incipient causes of the late Russo-Turkish war will recollect that Muscovite intrigue worked up a similar situation in Bulgaria, when horrible atrocities upon the Christian part of the population resulted. Then the pious Russian felt it an imperative duty, in the interest of common humanity, to interfere, and stop the horrible scenes in the production of which he had been the exciting cause. His encroachments were resisted, hence the bloody war with Turkey, which came so near embroiling Great Britain and other nations. Perhaps the reason why he is now playing a similar game in Roumania will show itself soon. That the operation has an ulterior motive at the back of it is beyond question. That it is in line with the Russian aggressive policy for the extension of her prestige and empire is equally certain.

POWERFUL WAR SHIP.

THE most powerful war ship in the world was launched a short time since at Pembroke (England) dockyard. It is after a similar pattern to the iron-clad Trafalgar, which is the only vessel of the kind comparable to it. It is called the Nile, and may be briefly described as a twin-screw steamer, 340 feet long and 70 feet broad and 27 feet draught. Her displacement is 11,950 tons and her indicated horse-power 12,000. It is expected that she will steam nineteen miles an hour, and her 900 tons of coal will take her 6,000 miles at more than half that speed. Her external steel armor is from fourteen to twenty inches in thickness. Her offensive weapons comprise four sixty-seven-ton guns in turrets, eight five-inch in the box battery, and six thirty-six pounder and eight six-pounder quick-firing guns. There will also be eight torpedo tubes, for each of which three Whitehead torpedoes will be carried. She is divided into 120 water-tight compartments, and her pumps have a capacity of 3,000 tons an hour. She can discharge simultaneously 5649 pounds of shot, including four missiles of 1250 pounds each. Finally, her total cost will be about \$5,000,000—the most expensive ship ever built.

ALLEGED BREAKING AWAY.

A SHORT time ago a local contemporary of pronounced anti-"Mormon" proclivities uttered a grant of satisfaction over what it considered, a symptom of the disintegrating process of the Church. It was to the effect that professed members who were selling out their properties were throwing off their allegiance to their religion. We are not prepared to say how much of truth there is in this claim. It is, however, a theme deserving attention.

From the same source comes another expression of congratulation of a similar character. This time the cause of satisfaction is an alleged disregard by many who claim to be Latter day Saints, of the sacredness of the Sabbath. The statement is to the effect that that class, instead of devoting that day to the worship of the Creator, and as a day of rest, use it as a season of sport, amusement and recreation.

This is hailed with delight as an indication that these desecrators of the Sabbath are "throwing off the restraints of the Priesthood." While the statement is a damaging reflection upon a class who, while professing to keep the commandments of God are constantly guilty of their violation, it is unintentionally complimentary to the priesthood, who are constantly endeavoring to maintain in the midst of the people a course harmonious with sound Christian precept.

The exultation expressed over an alleged breaking away of professed religionists from such a plain Christian duty as keeping the Sabbath day holy, places those who manifest it and those whose course causes it pretty much on a level, so far as relates to consistency.

STRETCHING AND STRAINING.

IN Saturday's issue of the News a correspondent ("D. L. M.") passed some just strictures upon the manner in which the law was stretched and strained in order to convict some of the defendants placed on trial last week for unlawful cohabitation. The cases of William Jenkins and W. H. Tovey, both of whom had already served terms in the penitentiary for the same offense, were cited in point. They believed they were not violating the law, as they had not cohabited with their plural wives.

In these cases the plea was reached on Saturday when they were sentenced. The court was informed that, at the conclusion

of their former terms of imprisonment, each of them served an additional thirty days in lieu of the payment of fine and costs included in the judgment. In the face of this fact the full term of incarceration (six months) was imposed by Judge Zane, and also a fine of fifty dollars and costs. The fact of the inability of the defendants to pay a fine being clearly established, the effect of the judgment is imprisonment in each of these cases for a term of seven months. The maximum penalty imposed by the law is six months. How is that for law and justice?

FENCE OR NO FENCE?

SOME days since we received the following communication from James I. Steele, Esq., of Lake View, Tooele County:

Editor Deseret News: A dispute has arisen in relation to part of section 3 of the stray law published in the SEMI WEEKLY NEWS of the third inst. It reads as follows:

"In all other cases where said animals do damage upon the premises of any person, whether said premises are protected by a fence or not, the person aggrieved thereby may recover damages either by an action against the owner of the trespassing animals, or by impounding them in the precinct pound."

It is contended by some that stack-yards and orchards must be fenced whether the precinct where the parties reside have declared in favor of fencing or not.

Where there is a no fence law agreed to in a precinct, does the law as it now stands require the fencing of the stack-yards and orchards? You will oblige by answering.

In reply to the above we give sections 3 and 4 of the statute in question:

Sec. 3. If any nest, cattle, horses, mules, sheep, goats or hogs shall, First—break through a lawful fence or do damage within the enclosure or premises of any person in any county or portion thereof, where the inhabitants have declared or may hereafter declare in favor of fencing their farms; Second—break through a lawful fence within an incorporated city or town, or any lawful fence enclosing any city lot, orchard or stackyard, and do damage therein; Third—in all other cases, where said animals do damage upon the premises of any person, whether said premises are protected by a fence or not, the person aggrieved thereby may recover damages either by an action against the owner of the trespassing animals, or by impounding them in the precinct pound.

Sec. 4. Any county, or precinct thereof, may, at a general or special election, called for the purpose by the county court, by a vote of a two-thirds majority of its legal voters, voting at such election, declare in favor of fencing their farms, and allowing their animals to run at large. In such cases subdivision 3 of section 3 of this act shall be inoperative.

As the statute now stands, it provides a "no fence law" for all of the precincts of the Territory outside of incorporated cities; the latter have power to regulate the matter by ordinance. Any precinct wishing to have its farms, etc., fenced, and to allow its stock to run at large, must vote to do so, as provided in section 4, above quoted. Where the inhabitants of a precinct have not voted in favor of fencing, they need not fence any portion of their property. They may allow stackyards, orchards, town lots, etc., to remain unprotected by a fence, the theory being that the law protects them; and if damage is done upon the premises of any kind by trespassing animals, the owners of the latter are liable for the same. Such is the effect of the third subdivision of section 3, unless the same is suspended by the two-thirds vote provided for in section 4.

The first subdivision of section 3 is intended to provide for redress when animals break through a lawful fence and do damage in a country precinct which has voted in favor of fencing; and the second subdivision is a similar provision intended to be applicable to cities and towns. The third subdivision, as we understand it, is a "no fence law" applicable to and in force in all parts of the Territory outside of cities and towns.

While stackyards, orchards, etc., are not required to be fenced, in order to enable the owners thereof to obtain damages for injury done by trespassing stock, in precincts which have not voted in favor of fencing, it is the almost universal rule to surround them with a fence. A man who, in a neighborhood which is any more than very sparsely settled, allows a stackyard for example, to remain unfenced, will be very likely to either suffer serious damage, or become embroiled in petty and vexatious litigation with many of his neighbors. As a rule he will find it cheaper, as well as more pleasant and neighborly, to fence his stackyard. These are observations applicable to orchards; and it may be further remarked that a fence around the home and its immediate surroundings adds to the neat, comfortable and home like appearance of the premises. The cost of fencing a farm might prove a heavy financial tax, but the expense of enclosing an area as small as is usually occupied by the home, stackyard and orchard of a settler, is not very great, and it ought to be done, even though the law does not require it.

MORE DESTRUCTIVE EARTHQUAKES.

THERE is news of more terrible disasters in China. Ten earthquake shocks shook the earth with such violence that numerous buildings of various dimensions crumbled and fell, crushing thousands of people beneath the ruins. The killed and wounded are estimated at between four and five thousand, probably about equally divided between the two classes of casualties.

Surely the prophetic prognostication in relation to the latter days—destruction among the heathen such as had not been before heard of—is beginning to be fulfilled.

The details of the tragic affairs will be found in the dispatches in this issue.

LOOK TO THE FUTURE.

NOT long since we treated at some length on "the value of homes." The article was the product of reflection upon the situation that has prevailed in this community for some time in relation to realties. The views therein expressed received the unqualified approval of many thinking people, and no direct or intelligent attempt has been made, so far as we are aware, to refute its propositions and conclusions even by those who, from selfish considerations, do not desire to see them prevail.

While it adds nothing to the intrinsic force of truth to have it endorsed from unexpected sources, it is a cause of satisfaction to its advocates who have no thought beyond the welfare of the people, when such coincidences appear. We have before us an expression in line from the editor of the Omaha World. We formed a slight acquaintance with the gentleman while he was on a visit to this city and could not help being impressed with the evidences of his native ability. The city in which he resides has been one of the most diligently and persistently boomed towns the wave has yet struck. This fact adds force to his observations upon a subject of that character, as he has had ample opportunities to consider it in its variegated phases and results. The World thus treats upon an important aspect of this topic:

"Booms seem to be very fine things while they last but they almost invariably produce an evil two little dwelt upon—alien landlordism. The moment a boom is well started all sorts and conditions of people who live in their own houses sell out at what appears like a big advance on the cost and after putting their money into the bank, join the great army of renters. Few build because the boom makes real estate high. The purchasers are largely outside investors and the result is that hundreds of thousands of dollars made right here in the west is annually paid to non residents by tenants and spent not in the west, but in New York, Boston and Philadelphia. Booms bring a great deal of money into a city for a time, but they are apt to cause a steady drain outward for years after. The way to wealth is to sell goods, not homes. Then the long run profits will be on our side."

The truth so tersely set forth in the foregoing quotation is of general application and will fit the situation in this city as glove-like as it will anywhere. To the result at large may be added, as we have previously shown, the ultimate disaster to a large class of those who dispose of their homes. They exchange the basis of genuine wealth, the ownership of the domestic hearth, for that which is subject to melt into thin air, so to speak, by necessary drains upon it that the original transaction has created, and by the fitful breezes of financial changes that are liable to strike them at any moment. An unnumbered portion of the earth to which a person has a clear title is not ordinarily subject to such contingencies and is a continuous source of comfort and profit. Without it no family rests upon a substantial basis.

PERE HYACINTHE AND BOULANGER.

IT appears that Pere Hyacinthe recently endorsed Boulanger in a sermon. The reason given for this extraordinary statement from the pulpit was that he favored Caesarism, or the one man power. This expression of the Pere caused some commotion in the church in the shape of a demonstration from anti-Boulangierists who were present, but the interruption was promptly suppressed.

The real reason why the ex-monk should indulge in a politico-religious speech in the shape of a sermon is not quite clear. Perhaps he was holding his cap out to catch the current popular breeze. He probably imagined he had struck the prevailing sentiment, but there was a discord in his song. The venerable gentleman is liable to make mistakes of that character. If he is a friend of Boulanger's the latter may well request that he be saved from that species of friendship.

The expression of the Pere was to

the effect that Boulanger was aiming at a dictatorship and that the people wanted a functionary of that character. The course of Boulanger indicates that that is the very impression that he does not wish created. He desires to impress the French people with the idea that he thinks they do not have enough freedom as it is under the constitution of the Republic as it stands, and desires it so amended that the populace may have more liberty. But Pere Hyacinthe, who is a vague theorist, evidently misapprehended the situation and sustained Boulanger on the ground that the prestige of the people should be curtailed by the establishment of a dictatorial regime.

At this distance it appears to be presumable that one of the reasons—aside from his well known anti-german proclivities—why the French devote so much of their spasmodic enthusiasm to Boulanger is because of his professed solicitude for the establishment of greater freedom for the people and a corresponding relaxation of the prerogatives of the government. His professed intention is to place the French Republic more in unison with that of the United States. But Pere Hyacinthe sustains the present idol of France on the ground that he proposes to establish a condition quite the opposite of that.

The venerable ex-monk is not practical. He dwells in a hazy, theoretical atmosphere and is probably unable to catch on to the real status of an existing question. We had an opportunity of briefly studying him on the occasion of his visit to this city a few years ago. He is learned, and gives forth fitful flashes of intellectual brilliancy, but has not a great degree of practical insight into human nature. His sudden shoot on the leading topic in France will, however, give him considerable notoriety. If he likes that sort of thing, and he has given a good many evidences that he does, he will enjoy himself hugely for a season.

UNHEALTHFUL WEATHER.

METEOROLOGICAL extremes, especially in the way of excessive heat, are likely to affect unfavorably the health of the populace. Prognostications based upon this general rule, relative to the public health of this city during the coming summer, would be to the effect that it is likely to suffer, as such warm weather as we have been having for the last three weeks, is almost if not entirely unprecedented in this locality, the time of the year considered.

There is no occasion for excessive uneasiness upon this point. Such a state of mind is favorable to the spread of various forms of disease, and should be avoided; but there is a need for the taking of precautions in the way of hygienic and sanitary measures. The hot sun pouring down upon the heaps of rubbish and garbage which have been accumulating during the winter, draws out of them poisonous exhalations which float about in the atmosphere, endangering the health of human beings. It ought not to be necessary to urge a civilized community to clean up its back yards, but there remains the unpleasant and unhealthful fact, that in this city too many rear areas have been neglected.

The preservation of the public health is a higher function of government than the preservation of the public peace, and there should be no hesitancy in enforcing the laws which relate to this subject. But means more effective for warding off disease than any provided by law, may be exercised by citizens in their individual capacity. Exciting influences seem to be abroad in the air. These should be resisted. It is generally anticipated that there will be a great rush of tourists here this summer, and that it will be a great season for excursions, amusements and pleasure. Social turmoil should be avoided by all who desire to attain a peaceful old age.

It is freely predicted that, within the next few months, many residents of this and other towns and cities in Utah will have opportunities to make small fortunes, by speculative methods. A feverish pursuit of wealth is one of the most potent of those agencies which undermine the health without creating specific symptoms which can be treated with success, and should be avoided.

If the summer shall prove to be a hot one, conform personal habits, pursuits and surroundings to that condition. Eat light, healthful and nutritious food, and avoid high living. Keep in-toxicants out of the stomach and excitement out of the mind. If the social and business world around you whirls, take a position outside the sweep of the maelstrom. To retain health you should keep temperate, keep clean and keep cool.

IS PREACHING "LABOR?"

A CURIOUS question has arisen in New York City recently. A law of Congress prohibits the importation into this country of any person under a contract to perform labor of any kind. The officers of the church of the Holy Trinity, in the city named, apparently unable to suit themselves in this country with pulpits talent, made an engagement with Rev. E. Walpole Warren of England to be their pastor. The reverend gentleman arrived in September last, and began his pastoral labors.