

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

OUR NEW STATE'S NAME.

Each time heretofore when the framing of a constitution preparatory to the admission of Utah into the Union has been pending the name to be given to the new State has been the subject of discussion. In a communication which appeared in yesterday's News, "Historicus" opens the same theme, urges that the name "Deseret" be given to the new State, and invites us to give the subject editorial treatment. At the present time we do not care to take sides in the controversy which our correspondent would invite in respect to the christening of our commonwealth, but have no objection to indulging in some reminiscences upon the subject, and giving place to suggestions bearing on both sides of the question.

A footnote on pages 34 and 35 of Bancroft's History of Utah says:

The word Utah originated with the people inhabiting that region. Early in the 17th century, when New Mexico was first much talked of by the Spaniards, the principal nations of frequent mention as inhabiting the several sides of the locality about that time occupied were the Navajoes, the Yutas, the Apaches, and the Comanches. Of the Utah nation, which belongs to the Shoshone family, there were many tribes. * * * There were the Pah Utes, or Py Utes, the Pi Edes, the Gosh Utes, or Goshutes, the Uintah Utes, the Yam Pah Utes, and many others. Pah signifies water; pah guampe, salt water, or salt lake; Pah Utes, Indians that live about the water. The early orthography of the word Utah is varied. Escalante, prior to his journey to Utah Lake, * * * finds the "Yutas" inhabiting the region north of the Moquis. This was a common spelling by the early Spaniards, and might be called the proper one. Later we have "Youta," "Eutaw," "Utaw," and "Utah."

Early in 1849 the provisional government over this region was organized, the constitution of that government giving it the name of "Deseret." But Congress, in passing the organic act of the Territory in 1850, gave it the name it now bears, notwithstanding a petition from its inhabitants asking admission into the Union under the name which they had chosen. We have not been able to learn just what person or persons should be held responsible for inserting the name "Utah" in the organic act, but the surmise seems reasonable that it was some member of a committee having the bill under consideration.

During the constitutional convention of 1872 a prolonged and earnest debate occurred on a motion to make the name "Deseret." Hon. Orson Pratt, who was a member of that convention, was persistent in urging the adoption of the motion, but it was voted down. In the constitutional convention of 1882, a similar debate occurred with the same result. In the convention of 1887 the matter was named, but not much was said about it. All three of these conventions were composed almost entirely of a class of men who might be expected to desire to honor the Pioneers, and respect their wishes and traditions, in the matter of choos-

ing a name for the new State they were seeking to have admitted into the Union. They listened to the arguments going to show how undesirable it was to have the State named after a low, degraded tribe of Indians, and how euphonious and beautiful, in the light of its significance, was the name given to the provisional State of Deseret. But the majority of them chose to retain the name that Congress had given.

Some of the objections to a change of name may be thus suggested: Utah has been called the "Cinderella of the family." Cinder-Ella was a scullion; her place was among the cinders; she occupied a menial position, and was the object of the scorn and unkindness of her sisters. But she had a friend whose power was marvelous, and she had a foot the like of which could not be found in all the land. She could wear the glass slipper of royalty, and when she became the bride of a prince she did not cast off the name she had worn in her humiliation. She was Cinderella still.

Is it desirable to change the name of Nazareth because it was formerly doubted that anything good could come out of her? Should a believer in Christ object to being called a Christian because the name was once a term of reproach? Those who have faith in Utah's future and object to a change of name may cite these examples, and urge that, as the founders of our glorious commonwealth have suffered and been stigmatized under the name of "Utah," a word which has been one of reproach, it will be depriving them of a sacred and precious right to prevent them from reversing its significance, and adding to their glory by making that same word an honor to them and their posterity forever.

But these valleys, wherein was found a refuge for the exiled toilers who have made Utah one of the most promising of all the sisterhood of states, will be always known as Deseret. That name can never be more firmly affixed to them, by law or otherwise, than it is already. The songs and poetry of the people, more unalterably than any statute could do, have christened this great mountain region. Deseret will be the poetic name of our State, as Columbia will of our country, while time shall last.

THE VOTER'S WORK WELL DONE.

That there has already been a marked improvement in the business and industrial feeling of the country since the recent election, is too plainly evident to be doubted. Indeed it would be very sad and very strange if this were not the case; for after the tension of so hot a contest, a sense of relief and a return of normal activity are the most natural things in the world and could only be prevented through the country falling into such a state of exhaustion that it could not rally.

But that the political result of the election—as showing the popularity of one particular party—is to be credited

with the improvement spoken of, cannot be honestly maintained. As we view the situation, the people have come to the conclusion that what the country needs just now in the matter of legislation is a good rest; and they have taken the best possible means of securing it. If there were a Republican President in the White House, we do not believe for a moment the Republican victory in the nation would have been so overwhelming as to give that party control of both houses of Congress. Such a result would have been as inimical to the proposition of rest as would have been the triumphant return of the Democratic majorities now existing in House and Senate. In their disappointment with the tariff law they were finally able to enact, radical Democrats have time and again declared that the battle for tariff reform had only begun and would be prosecuted with vigor. In their glee at the disputes in the opposing ranks, and in curious forgetfulness of a stinging rebuke recently administered, radical Republicans have promised and threatened a swift return to the policy of high protection. In silent might and with perhaps a keen enjoyment of politicians' perplexities, the great American voter made it his business to see that neither of these programs could be carried out; and, metaphorically speaking, he today stands between the parties, his arms akimbo, and quizzically wants to know what they are going to do about it.

The improvement in business, therefore, is not because the Democrats as such were defeated and the Republicans as such were victorious, but because the election is over, and because all tariff-tinkering for at least two years is also over. Uncertainty is thus dispelled, and people can go to work, feeling assured that during the term of any ordinary contract no meddlesome legislation need be feared. Protection amounting practically to exclusion—the dream of some Republicans—is as far distant as absolute free trade—the goal of some Democrats. The President and the Congress will be at outs on the matter of the tariff, and to the extent that they fail to see eye to eye, each will stand on the defensive against the other. This means very little legislation of a nature to affect industry and trade; and that means renewed energy, activity and prosperity in all directions. For this we can all be thankful and happy, whether Democrats or Republicans. The country is bigger and better than any party or than all of them combined.

REMEMBER THE POOR.

One distinctive feature of the teachings that have been given to mankind through revelation is the duty of tenderly caring for the needy members of the human family. In the Mosaic dispensation most wise and beneficent laws were enacted for the relief of the poor, for the proper relations between creditors and debtors and for the treatment of those dependent on their fellow men. Our Lord, in the new dispensation, sets forth the principle underlying this duty, when He declares that benevolence shown to the worthy poor will finally be counted as exercised