

ious. It is when a clergyman attempts to exercise his ecclesiastical influence over the political acts of his congregation that the churchman is wrong. The Republican neatly draws the line of distinction between what is the act of a man as a citizen and that of a man as a church official. A citizen who labors in a church capacity for the temporal and spiritual salvation of his fellow beings does not thereby close his lips or tie his hands in politics or any other calling that falls to his lot as a citizen.

RUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

One of the more remarkable signs of the time is the complete change of sentiment that has taken place in England with regard to Russia. Only a few years ago the British public considered it an axiom that Russia must be barred from access to the Mediterranean, and that England must dominate the Sublime Porte. The Crimean war, with all its attending honors, was solely for the purpose of maintaining this position, and the sensibility on this point has more than once brought Europe to the verge of war.

Today all that is changed. Russia is now the paramount power at Constantinople, and England has consented to take the second place there; and as for the opening of the Dardanelles, there would be no protest raised, should Russia demand it. Public opinion in Great Britain on these subjects is so completely changed that at the present time the policy of Palmerston and Disraeli is almost looked upon as jingoism.

The importance of this change lies in the fact that "old treaties become obsolete and merely dead letters, and as new conditions arise, a readjustment of political affairs will be demanded on a new basis. It is essentially the jealousy existing between Russia and England that has kept the Ottoman empire in power in Europe and made possible the atrocities in the Balkan states, in Greece and now in Armenia. A friendly agreement between those two powers would mean light and liberty to the oppressed Christians now under Turkish rule. Over fifty years ago, it appears, it was the desire of the Russian czar to act harmoniously with England on that question. A memorandum has now been published for the first time, drawn up by Count Neesselrode and embodying the czar's suggestions to the English government in 1844. It says in part:

By land Russia exercises on Turkey a preponderating influence; on sea England occupies the same position. Isolated the influence of these two powers might do a good deal of harm; combined, it may do much good. Hence the utility of a preliminary understanding before taking action. This idea was adopted in principle during the stay of the emperor at London. It has resulted, in a conditional engagement to the effect that if anything unforeseen should occur in Turkey, Russia and England would concert together as to what course they should follow in common. The objects with which Russia and England would have to come to an understanding may be thus formulated: 1. The maintenance of the Ottoman empire in its present condition for so long a time as this political com-

bination may be possible. 2. If we see beforehand that it is breaking up, a preliminary understanding to be arrived at as to the establishment of a new order of things, destined to replace that which now exists; and precautions to be taken in common, that no change occurring in the internal situation of that empire may threaten the security of our own states and the rights which the treaties guarantee to them respectively, or the maintenance of the European equilibrium.

If Russia could be convinced that Great Britain earnestly desires to give up her claims to superiority in eastern Europe, the basis of an understanding with Russia here outlined might before long be decided on. This would be fortunate for England. She would be in a position to extricate herself from an embarrassing position and discharge a grave responsibility. And as for Russia, her dreams of centuries of replacing the cross at the cathedral of Constantinople would be realized. Harmony between Russia and Great Britain would mean a new era for Europe.

ABOUT UTAH EGGS.

The Los Angeles, Cal., Express, in discussing the question of poultry raising, remarks:

It may be news to some people to learn that \$25,000 worth of eggs are shipped into Los Angeles county each year. They come from the north and Utah. This is money thrown away. It is cold coin wasted—money that should be kept at home.

The Express is considerably "off" in its assertions about "money thrown away" and "cold coin wasted." If there were either throwing away or wasting, there would be nothing in return which could be used to advantage. But in the circumstance noted, Los Angeles county gets the eggs, and good ones, too, or the trade would fall off. In the case of Utah hen fruit especially, we trust that the Los Angeles gets a particularly fresh and healthy food; these are characteristic of Utah products.

But in the matter of the \$25,000 being "money that should be kept at home," the Express is "dead right" from the standpoint of local interest. Of course Utah would not object to finding in that section of California a market for \$50,000 worth of eggs in a year and a very large amount of other products of this State, and to receive remunerative prices therefor. But from the standpoint of one interested in home progress, and in this light we must regard and therefore commend the Express' efforts, no matter how good the quality or how low the price of the importation, it is an unwise and unprofitable procedure to purchase from outside that which can be produced at home. For the good of the inhabitants of Los Angeles county, truly the money sent out in such a way should be kept at home for circulation there. But if the people must send it out, then the best place for it to go is to Utah, where it will be put to good use.

In this connection there is one feature which cannot give to the people here the satisfaction that comes with news that Utah eggs find a California market. This is that while exportations go on to a limited

extent, yet this State is a much heavier importer than exporter of hen fruit. Tens of thousands of dollars which should be kept at home are sent away annually for eggs. This is due largely to the lack of care on the part of keepers of poultry in getting their eggs to market in good shape. There are other causes also, all of which could be removed with care and ordinary business foresight. Utah should not only be a non-importer of eggs, but an exporter to a vastly greater extent than now, because of natural advantages that exist here for intelligently conducted poultry business.

THE TRUE STANDARD.

The Literary Digest of October 31 reviews a recent volume by Dr. Lyman Abbott, entitled Christianity and Social Problems, in which the author deals with the great question of the day: How are men to live together in one human brotherhood? It is a question with which the best thought of every age has been concerned and one which is likely to engage much attention in the near future. People are aroused to a realization of the fact that God's earth is not so small that the temporal happiness of the few can be secured only through the misery of the many. They understand that a chivalric era of peace and good will is within the reach of intelligent beings reflecting the image of the Creator, and speculative thought and practical experiments will naturally be directed toward finding the road to that happy goal.

Dr. Abbott in discussing labor and wages points out that the question of the superiority of the present system over feudalism and slavery has been settled long ago, but he finds that it is deficient chiefly in this, that it fails to provide steady work to all willing laborers, and also to give a fair equivalent in many cases, for labor. He believes, however, that the existing conditions are but temporary, and the industrial unrest is the result of a "blind struggle toward a democracy of wealth" which will finally result in labor hiring capital, not capital labor; and in men, not money, controlling industry, as they now control government.

The commonly accepted doctrine that labor is a commodity and therefore regulated as to its value by supply and demand, the author pronounces a heresy, "economically false and ethically unjust." On this point he argues:

When a workingman comes to the factory on a Monday morning he has nothing to sell, he is empty-handed; he has come in order to produce something by his exertion, and that something, when it is produced, is to be sold, and part of the proceeds of that sale will of right belong to him, because he has helped to produce it. And as there is no labor commodity to be sold, so there is no labor market in which to sell it. A free market assumes a variety of sellers with different commodities and a variety of buyers with different needs, the seller at perfect liberty to sell or not to sell, the buyer at perfect liberty to buy or not to buy. There is no such market for labor. The laborers are in a great majority of cases as firmly attached to their town by prejudice, by ignorance of the