

Brooklyn, which the Spanish called the "three-horned devil," is left out in the cold. But what can be the object of mentioning the mile-and-a-half range, and the statement that none of the Americans was within a mile of the enemy at any time during the engagement? Is it to show that the destruction might have been accomplished more rapidly or completely had the American vessels moved in and made it a yard-arm against yard-arm affair? Ordinarily an employer is satisfied when the employee's work is accomplished in substantial accordance with instructions, and assuredly that was at Santiago. Surely no job of the kind was ever before done so quickly and so completely, and yet a civil board which has not even visited the scene of the encounter and was never any nearer to it than now can sit in Washington and seek to overturn all the good impressions which the American people have received regarding the work of at least one brave commander on shipboard at Santiago?

As previously suggested, if any good can come out of such proceedings it is not even dimly discernible just now. The proceeding has an iconoclastic air that seems to have a political taint. It will be observed that Admiral Sampson is not altogether excluded from the roll of honor.

WHOM TO VOTE FOR.

Utah began her political career under much more favorable circumstances than she began her industrial career. The reason for this is obvious. The commonwealth had to be moulded out of crude and refractory materials, requiring an enormous outlay of time and labor for each little step taken in the march to empire; but when it came to erecting the political structure, the materials were all at hand and in perfect order. The experiences through which the great majority of the people had passed, while not essentially a school in which the genus politician was likely to vegetate and out of which there could scarcely be a graduation for him, yet imparted practical lessons in the grand philosophy of true statecraft to learn which was to acquire something not otherwise attainable; so that, when the time came, it only needed a little training in the modus operandi of applied politics—not at all a difficult matter or one involving much time—and presto! we became changed from merely work-a-day, matter-of-fact, business people whose first care was the salvation of the soul and the next the preservation of the body, into politicians among politicians. It is not herein implied that as a body we forsook one condition in order to enter the other, by any means. In individual cases this doubtless occurred. Some few there were who could not enter what has proved to be something of a noisome pool without going in all over and remaining there, but this is a circumstance that is not at all peculiar to Utah.

Suffice it to say we are all engaged in politics, some more moderately than others of course, and it is a fitting thing to do to occasionally remind the people that this alone will not clothe nor feed them. Good enough in its place and when carried on with moderation, it is still far from being the sine qua non of temporal existence. Through its affairs of daily concern may be reached, and in no way just now more decidedly than through the election of a legislature. Some few there be who seem to think that this body's functions relate only to the political things, and doubtless a candidate here and there has the same idea. The election of a

United States Senator and the enactment of such laws as will benefit the party to which the legislator belongs are, to that class, the be-all and the end-all of the situation. The more of these that are left at home to meditate on the ingratitude of republicans and the insincerity of partisans, the better for the people generally.

To be plain, there is no necessity for the Utah of old being effaced. The Utah of today would be a ricketty structure if it were not for the magnificent and enduring foundations upon which it rests as a result of the work which was done when there were no Democrats or Republicans, Populists or Socialists. It is also the case that a due regard for the living present and the promising future absolutely demand that we have "occasional recurrence to fundamental principles" and in no way can this be accomplished more satisfactorily than by a judicious selection of those who are to make the laws.

The subject of irrigation, for example, the most vital as well as most vexed of all the economic subjects with which we have to deal, is, like the poor, ever with us. It exacts our time, our talents, our money, and not infrequently our patience. Legislation bestowed upon it, if characterized by ability and experience, can scarcely be wasted. New conditions are constantly arising which cannot be anticipated and must be met as they unfold themselves. The political wheel-horse, the professional round-up on election day, the stalwart partisan who is for his party right or wrong, may have as well the necessary knowledge of the subject referred to, and unless his opponent is a better all-round man, let him go in; but if the qualifications enumerated are his entire stock-in-trade, let him pass out, no matter though you have to take chances on someone else.

Our mining laws are not perfect; they are not so anywhere, but the universality of this condition does not justify us in retaining it any longer or to any greater extent than can be avoided.

The unemployed poor in our midst should occasionally have a thought bestowed upon them, which when practicable should be crystallized into law through the various processes of legislation. Of course no such thing as direct aid is to be thought of; but where enterprises can be encouraged in a proper way by means of which additional avenues of labor will be opened up, it would be a wise and humane thing to do so. It is a source of some little pride to us that the list of such in Utah is comparatively small and daily growing smaller, but so long as it exists at all it must be looked after.

There are a number of other things that might be mentioned, but this enumeration will suffice for the present. Those who are equal to the task of grappling with such questions should be given the preference where other things are equal, and the candidate's politics should not be permitted to figure except as the merest incident. It takes no ability to vote for United States Senator. Only the names of acceptable men have so far been suggested for that high station and doubtless the choice will prove to be satisfactory, no matter upon whom it may fall. But to properly discharge the other duties of a legislator demands ability of a high order, together with a resolute and conscientious regard for the welfare of the whole people irrespective of party. Above all, let us have those in the halls of legislation who are not committed to the election of anybody to any place whatever and who are not looking forward to the senatorial contest as a means of replenishing a "lean and hungry" exchequer.

PERVERSION AND DIVERSION.

A morning cotemporary, in an article which might properly be called a labored and drawn-out sneer, refers to an editorial in yesterday's "News" containing suggestions as to how the people should vote. As usual in such cases the truth was not adhered to by the cotemporary, this paper being made to express thoughts which it never expressed. The burden of the "News" article was not that a relapse to old customs would be a good thing, nor can any such deduction be properly made from the wording or the meaning. Old conditions were referred to as a good foundation, but there was no suggestion of a return to the foundation. Whether or not there could be any doubt as to what candidates were meant when the "News" advised that the best and most capable men be voted for, is a matter difficult to determine; no one was in the mind of the writer at the time, but that doesn't figure in the least. Journalistic Don Quixotes and Sancha Panzas are gifted in the matter of evolving special references out of generalities and to deprive them of this pastime would be to work a serious hardship, especially before the campaign is over, and this we have neither the power nor the disposition to do.

Sagasta, the Spanish premier, is described as a stiffly built, frog-faced man, with a strong jaw, a wide, insincere smile and black, filmy eyes, as of an Arab or a gypsy. He has the glib word, the expansive manner and the exuberant gesture of the south. There is one charge which his most embittered enemies dare not bring against him—that of cowardice. If for many years he has proved himself as supple as a serpent his earlier history showed him to be as brave as a lion. As a lad of 18, when a student at the College of Engineers at Logrono, his native place, he hesitated not to withstand the behests of the dreaded Nervaes. For two years London, Paris and Ostend were the centers of his activity. He engineered the revolution of 1866 and drove Isabella II from the throne. It was because of his direct action in 1873 that the infamous Gen. Burrill shot eight Americans in one day and four days afterward shot Capt. Fry, Gen. Ryan and fifty-eight more. Indeed, of all prime ministers that Spain has ever had, Sagasta has been the most merciless and unreliable. He is a Talleyrand, with a strong flavor of Torquemada, says the Chicago Daily News.

The New York World is an enterprising newspaper. One of its latest and most characteristic exploits is set out in its own columns, and contains some little by way of suggestion and information as well as other things. It is as follows:

"The war investigation commission has offered only one excuse for excluding reporters other than those of press associations. That excuse is that there is not room in the apartments occupied. To remedy this, not in its own interest but in the interest of publicity, the World two days ago offered to the commission its choice of the seven best public halls in Washington, the World to pay the rent, provided the reporters of all the newspapers should be admitted to the hearings. Yesterday the commission in executive session decided to 'make no change.' That is to say, its pretense that the exclusion of reporters was due only to a lack of room was an insincere and untruthful one. Obviously the commission does not want reporters to hear and repeat the evidence given before it."