

parents or guardians of a child may deem the latter incorrigible, and yet the cause of his refractoriness may be largely the fault of those in charge of him by their applying the wrong corrective. It may be the course that aggravates instead of curing the untoward disposition of the child. This is, in all cases of application to have a youth sent to the Reform School, a necessary subject of inquiry on the part of the courts, who may, as occasion requires, give commensurate advice to the parties making the request.*

The establishment of reformatories is not to relieve persons of a private charge, except in cases of inability, from some reasonable cause, of the individuals to control the subject they desire to have relegated to the care of the public. One of the leading objects of the corrective institution is to protect the public from the contamination of the bad examples of youthful incorrigibles. It is thus operated to prevent the multiplication of criminals as well as to reform those who exhibit a depraved disposition. It does not appear to be according to the genius of the reformatory to take within its care very young children, because at an early age it not is competent to tell whether they will change from vicious to proper habits. Sufficient time should be given to demonstrate this point to such a degree as to place it beyond reasonable doubt. Otherwise there is great risk in rendering them more morally depraved than before their entry. When they enter the institution they go among black sheep, and it is almost impossible to classify and separate the inmates to such an extent as to entirely prevent "evil communications" which "corrupt good manners."

The position taken by Judge Zane in the case of the application for admission to the reformatory, considered by him yesterday, appears to us to be the only consistent one that could have been taken under the circumstances. There are many matters in which he exhibits unmistakable good sense and clear judgment.

THE TWO POLITICAL PARTIES AGAIN.

We give place to-day to an article by Professor Paul in relation to the two great parties of the country. We do this that he may have the desired opportunity to draw the distinction which he sees between

them. However, we do not perceive that he has shown any great difference from our position in the facts he cites.

The revenue question turns, just as we said, on the point of how the necessary reform shall be effected. Both parties claim they want to reduce the revenue. One may talk about tariff for revenue, and the other about tariff for protection, but the truth is, both parties want to raise revenue by a tariff, and both want to protect certain industries, direct or indirectly. The Democrats do not want free trade in its full sense, the Republicans do not want everything protected by duties.

We do not wish to defend or attack either the Mills bill or the McKinley bill. That is not the question. Both have defects as well as differences. But, as Professor Paul has admitted, the McKinley bill, like the Mills bill, was framed as a measure "to reduce the revenue." This is evidence that what we stated as correct, and has virtually the effect of sustaining the point he attacks.

So with many other remarks in the article. Most of them seem to show the thinness of the line between the two parties. Of course, there are measures devised by either party which the other unitedly opposes. They are party schemes and known to be such. If the balance of power were shifted, the Democratic members would be just as likely as not to take up and advocate measures almost identical with those they now obstruct, and their adversaries would be found on the opposition.

Ground has been shifted by both parties during the past half century, and many essential differences between them have been watered or washed out. That is what we have claimed, and the article we print in another column, in the main helps to establish our claim.

As to State Rights we said nothing. What we stated was in relation to the Territories. The supreme power of Congress over the Territories—a Republican notion, has been imbibed by the Democratic party, and its Congressmen and Judges have receded from the old position of the party advocated by such stalwart champions as Judge Jere Black.

The old Democratic doctrine declared the powers of Congress to be limited by the Constitution strictly construed. There is not a line in it, strictly construed, which gives Congress the absolute sovereignty

over the Territories which Democrats have conceded as belonging to it. That power has to be implied. It is not given in terms, and when a Democratic Supreme Judge said: "It is too late in the day to dispute this power," he paved the way to the near destruction of the Democratic defense of the right of local self-government in the Territories.

We said the Democratic party has gone back on its doctrine of local self government so far as it relates to the Territories, and we repeat the statement. It has gone over to the Republican notion on this subject, and that is another evidence of the thinness of the line which actually divides the twain.

We have not said there was any "identity between the two parties," nor that "there is no difference between the two parties." It is well to be exact when one attempts to criticize. We only claim that the line of demarcation between them has become, in some respects, rather indefinite, and that each has absorbed theories held formerly by the other.

We do not want to raise any party issues in our columns at present. When Utah obtains some political influence and cuts some figure in national issues, it will be time enough to divide, and then every party will, no doubt, have its advocates, and political opposition will move into legitimate and defined channels.

Our remarks should not be construed as either for or against Republicanism or Democracy. We merely called attention to a fact, and that fact, if disputed, has not been disproved.

THE HISTORY OF UTAH.

THE mass of the people of this Territory will be gratified to learn that the history of Utah is about to be written. This gratification will be increased when it is stated that this important work is to be performed by Orson F. Whitney, a native of the Territory, and a gifted writer whose ability is well established by products of his facile pen already in the hands of the public.

No part of the United States has manufactured materials for a narrative of deep and in numerous features thrilling interest with the same rapidity as Utah. In many respects the themes to be related by the historian are unique in the full sense of the term. They will be vividly yet truthfully portrayed by the gentleman who has under-