

has been no such notorious and flagrant violation of law in this Sunday liquor selling as in other directions. If he was so very anxious for the good order, safety and protection of the city, why didn't he take hold at the point where the abuse is most flagrant? Why didn't he try and catch a few of the hold-ups which our lax police officers seem unable to do? Why doesn't he go after the bunco-steerers and the sure-thing men? Surely here he would be able to do some good work, and work that is needed to be done. But he apparently wanted something easy, where he could make an outcry with no trouble, and so make his points, against the Liberals, and the police officers do not fail to give him his chance. How would it suit Marshal Parsons if the police should do as a prominent city official suggests they could do—arrest a lot of cobabs he refuses to touch? And how does the loss of the revenue from the fines, diverted to the county from the city treasury, suit the city officials?"

This action is new "in the enforcement of local law in this city." There has been no need until recent times for the interference of the United States Marshal in such matters. Until "Liberal" influences ruled the city, the local laws were enforced without any aid from such sources. That the violation of the Sunday laws and ordinances has become a public scandal needs no canvass to demonstrate. It is common talk throughout the city. The score of persons selected to be interviewed on the subject, do not by any means voice the "public sentiment." Some of them are personally interested in the liquor traffic, others are simply disgruntled because the action of the Marshal shows up the inaction of the city authorities and reflects severely on the "Liberal" faction and its policy. Public sentiment overwhelmingly supports the enforcement of the local laws, and as they were not executed by the local officers the course of the United States officers is generally applauded. But the anger of the "Liberals" is aroused because the necessity for this action does show, as is admitted, that "the 'Liberal' party is not competent to manage city affairs." It is confessed that city officials whose duty it is to enforce the law, "have made up their minds not to do it;" that these officers are derelict; that they "trifle with their oaths of office;" that "the police officers" have given the Marshal "his chance." Well, then, what is the reason for this outcry? "Oh," it is exclaimed, "The United States Marshal is meddling with that which does not concern him." Indeed. What was the provision in the Edmunds-Tucker act for, which confers upon the United States Marshal and his deputies all the authority "possessed and exercised by sheriffs, constables and their deputies as peace officers?" And why is it made their duty to "cause all offenders

against the law in their view to enter into recognizances to keep the peace," etc.? The law of Congress says they "shall" do this. Where then, is there any room for complaint against them, seeing that "the city officials whose duty it is to enforce the law" have made up their minds not to do it? Are the statutes and ordinances to remain unenforced?

But, it is objected, this action of the United States Marshal is "political." In what respect is it political? That does not appear, except that in effect it reflects on the management of city affairs under "Liberal" administration, and that it offends an element that is depended upon by the "Liberal" faction for future support.

It puts that faction and its organ into a hole. It is notorious that the manager of the "Liberal" campaign of fraud enlisted the saloon and associate elements in the struggle, and did not want the city to be "too good." That the Chief of Police has been hampered in his movements by such orders as that issued recently by the acting-Mayor to prevent police raids on houses of ill-fame. That the understanding had with the liquor and gambling interests by the "Liberal" faction was such that the ordinances could not be fully enforced against them. It is useless to sputter, and call names, and cast blame on men who have incurred the anger of "Liberal" bosses because they do not submit to officious dictation. The fault is in the whole "Liberal" scheme to capture the city, and the bargains made to ensure it, and the natural consequences arising from it.

"A party of law and order" indeed! It has despised law and supported disorder, and even now is trying to suppress the enforcement of the law and trample on official efforts to secure social order. Its advent into power in Ogden was the signal for the furish of all the lawless and disorderly elements of low society. Its accession to local power here was the same. It encouraged them there. It has encouraged them here. The United States Marshal was compelled, in the performance of his duty, to enforce the laws which the Ogden "Liberal" officials would not execute. He has had to do the same in this city. Hence those "Liberal" tears, therefore these gnashings of "Liberal" teeth.

As to the Marshal catching a few of the hold-ups that the police fail to find; that would be all right, considering the fact that the city authorities do not protect the public. But meanwhile it is the duty of his deputies to arrest offenders "in their view," that is, in

their sight. They must not be black-guarded for seizing offenders in their view because it is desirable that they may capture offenders who are not in their view.

As to the arrest of persons who violate the Edmunds law, if any such there be, it must be borne in mind that while the police have the right to arrest offenders in their view who violate the city ordinances, they cannot arrest the persons referred to without a warrant, and that would be properly placed in the hands of the United States Marshal or his deputy. And we are of the opinion that, on a proper complaint, such warrant would be issued and such arrest would be promptly made. But while the United States Marshal has constabulary powers, the police have not United States powers, and sticklers for "law and order" should have some understanding of the former and not advocate the violation of the latter.

What the public want is the enforcement of the local laws and ordinances, the suppression of crime, the protection of the citizen, and the establishment of good government. If it is necessary to these that the United States Marshal and his deputies shall take official action, to supplement the police force if possible or to perform duties that the city authorities fail to discharge, the majority of the citizens will applaud the act and support the movement, even if all the "Liberal" faction—which we do not expect—shall rave and fume, because the lawless saloon element is financially injured and "Liberal" immorality is exposed. And the public will care very little whether the revenue from the fines goes into the city coffers or into the county treasury. Give us public order, and let us have Sunday peace!

HOME INDUSTRIES.

IT is pleasing to see a revival of interest in the subject of home manufactures. This was almost a hobby with the late President Brigham Young. His sagacious mind perceived the advantages which would accrue to the whole community by the production at home of those articles and commodities which are necessary for home use. He was not blind to the value of exports. But what he desired to see was the restriction of imports to those things which were necessary and could not be produced in the Territory.

Such home industries as we have were in the main suggested and fostered by him, and he not only advised continually the investment by men of means of their capital in home manu-