

tion of British rule and expressions of fraternization with the British people. The second day's work, however, developed something quite opposite to that performed on the first. A resolution was adopted declaring the necessity of a home rule parliament in which the people of India should be directly represented. The destitution prevailing among the masses in certain sections of the country was also touched on. The conclusion was arrived at that the only way in which calamities of that kind can be either averted or diminished was by the establishment of a legislature to which the people of the famine-stricken districts could send representatives.

The expression of the Nagpur Congress is simply a mild way of inaugurating an agitation for home rule in India. It speaks well for the advancement and progress of that country that it comes forward in this truly British method of demanding reform. Perhaps it would be well for England not to discourage the movement. Russia is awake and looking wistfully towards sacred Delhi and holy Benares. With home rule in India under British protection, Russia would find it difficult to obtain a footing there.

The terrible Sepoy rebellion occurred in 1857. The situation has changed since then. British rule in India at one time was harsh, and perhaps there are grievances still, but the policy of government in that country has been changed. A number of wholesome reforms have been introduced, and the more intelligent of the natives see that their interests are being considered. The authority of Britain is more respected at present in India than it ever was before. The Marquis of Lansdowne, now Viceroy of India, who recently made a tour of the country, was received everywhere with the warmest cordiality. It therefore appears that there is a genuine feeling of friendship toward the British people by the native Indians. Perhaps a moderate measure of home rule would tend to intensify this desirable sentiment.

THE UTAH BILL.

ONE surprise follows another. The introduction of the Home Rule bill, as the Democrats call it, in Congress on Tuesday was a surprise to everybody in Utah but the committee who prepared it. Its reception by the "Liberal" faction of this city is another surprise.

The opponents of statehood, we would think, ought to accept this measure as a settlement of the statehood question, for as long as they have pro-

fessed to desire. They admit that Utah cannot be kept out of the Union very long. They only wish to postpone the matter until time has shown whether or not the "Mormons" are sincere in the steps they have taken in regard to polygamy and politics. This bill, if it should pass, would put off statehood at least as long as that faction have pretended to think essential to the welfare of the Territory.

But the "Liberal" organ attacks the proposition with as much vinegar and venom as if it were a bill for an enabling act. In one breath it declares it is a scheme devised by the "Mormons," in the next it calls upon the "Mormons" to repudiate it. In a burst of reckless assertion it avows that the bill "would put local affairs absolutely in the hands of the Mormon Church if they pleased to assume that control." Then in another tone and sentence it declares "it ought to be stamped out by the common sense of the Mormon people themselves." It intimates that the "representatives" of four hundred seceders from the "Liberal" faction have joined with the "Mormon" Church, "to formulate this document with the hope that it will be crystallized into law," and then says, "as a matter of common prudence the leading Mormons ought to repudiate this bill."

All this is very funny and also very suggestive. It makes one who does not regard the measure with special favor think there must be something in it better than at first reading appears. It is evident that no change which would give Utah a measure of real republican government would suit the "Liberal" faction. They are not only opposed to statehood but to liberty in any degree which could be enjoyed by "Mormons" in common with other citizens. It is the old bitterness revived, which progressive people of all parties and beliefs in Utah want to bury for ever.

The "Liberal" organ says this bill will kindle once more the heartburnings which were passing away. But why? Who will entertain them but the faction which that organ represents and which is becoming "smaller by degrees and beautifully less," every day? We see nothing in the proposition to arouse any "heartburnings" or "bitterness" if it is reasonably considered. But we are afraid the rampant "Liberals" will not look at any proposition without bitterness and heartburnings which will not be so anti-"Mormon" in its nature as to be distasteful to every patriotic citizen.

The assertions that this bill, if it became a law, would "give to this Territory every ordinary function of a State

without any of its dignity;" that "it would tie the Gentiles of this Territory hand and foot, and deliver them over to the tender mercies of the Mormon Church;" that "it practically gives to the man who would be Governor, to the Legislature that would make the laws, and to Judges who would have control of the Courts unlimited power without check or hindrance;" are all utterly absurd and untrue. They show that the writers who make them either do not understand the bill or that they want to represent it so that people who do not take the trouble to investigate closely may be blindly prejudiced against it.

The measure may be objected to without injecting into it provisions which are foreign to its text and purport. There is nothing in it which warrants any of these alarming forebodings. The power of Congress over the Territory would not be removed if the bill should pass. All the authority exercised by Congress to revise or annul the acts of the Legislature would remain unimpaired. Federal courts and Federal officers with power to adjudicate and enforce the laws of Congress would still exist in the Territory. None of those laws would be abrogated except certain specified sections which would be incompatible with the provisions of the new bill. We have carefully examined it and can find no such terrors lurking therein as the "Liberal" organ has worked up from the depths of its own imagination. They are not in it.

But the objections that it is a new thing in legislation for a Territory, and that while Congress is about it, statehood itself might as well or better be conferred at once, are sensible and to the point, and we coincide with them. We do not think the bill will pass. We think that the people might have been consulted before such a measure was introduced. We do not agree with the provision which causes Congress to legislate money out of the territorial treasury. But we see in it no reason for rancor, and think that it is far more republican in its character and much nearer to fairness in political treatment of a large body of American citizens than is the present Organic Act.

It would be much better to examine the bill critically before declaiming against it, and to point out its real defects than to denounce it for alleged horrors of which it is innocent, and attack it with invectives which must recoil upon those who hurl them. If the "Liberals" were sincere they would support this scheme instead of assailing it. Whether the "Mormons" want it or not will take a little time to find out. It has been sprung upon