

such deep interest in the public local welfare and shown such feverish impatience at the mere prospect of a delay of benefits, inform the stoical Senator from the State of Vermont that the passing of enactments by the Utah Legislature fixing the place of holding terms of court was a usurpation by that honorable body of "a power given the Governor." This was a power "never given to the Legislature." Therefore the conclusion is inevitable—the enactments were "contrary to authority and consequently void."

This is, on its face, a strong plea for tyranny and autocracy, and a knock-down argument against popular rule. Unfortunately for its safety the gentlemen who inade use of it overlooked the necessity for the preservation of the consistency of one part of their statement with the rest of it. Had they grasped this essential they never would have written the closing paragraph, which asks Mr. Edmunds—whom the Logan gentlemen seem to regard as the entire Senate—to "confer upon the Governor a power that is consistent with previous legislation on the subject by Congress and which will authorize him to exercise a power which it is doubtful whether he now possesses, and thus confer upon the people of Northern Utah a right long needed."

Such a statement as that after having previously asserted that Congress had already given such power to the Governor, and that to exercise it by the Legislative Assembly was consequently without authority and void, is, to say the least, a trifle absurd. If the astute Senator from Vermont critically examined this document it would be interesting to know what he thought of the legal elucidation. He could hardly have been infatuated with its logic, although he has given ample evidence that he is in line with its sentiment—the reduction of home rule in Utah and its concentration in a few officials in whose selection and appointment the people have no choice.

The correspondents of Senator Edmunds appear to have forgotten that Congress empowered the Legislative Assembly to enact laws "on all rightful subjects of legislation." This certainly includes authority to designate the places of holding terms of court. Surely the representatives of the people ought not to be charged with usurpation for performing a duty so simple and so plainly within their right as that.

It is the duty of every patriotic citizen to contend for the rights of the sovereign people, opposing every encroachment upon their prerogatives

under a republican form of government. This contention should enter into the minutest details, and it is regretful that men can be found in the community who, on account of creating local professional business, will urge a reduction of popular rights and their bestowal upon an official who has exercised all the energy and cunning of which he is possessed to obtain a kingly power over Utah. He has also sought, by all his resources of device, to produce the disfranchisement of the majority of the people—including, we presume, the correspondents of Mr. Edmunds. No man should perform any act or utter a word that would in the smallest degree, tend to the production of fetters which would shackle himself.

We will here introduce, as a fitting conclusion, a striking paragraph clipped from the *American Sentinel*:

"If the citizens do not regard their liberties with a jealous care, if they do not vigorously oppose the first indication of despotism, if they do not resist the first steps in unjust taxation, if they do not antagonize the minor violations of the principle of religious equality, the time will come, and it may not be very far distant, when the rights of the people will be trampled in the dust. This is a danger that has been seen and emphasized by the greatest of our American statesmen. It is a trait of human nature too manifest to escape the observing mind. Some of the most important of the writings of our early statesmen utter this warning to the American people, and the truth of their words is so evident to the lover of our free institutions that we cannot disregard them with impunity."

DEATH AMONG ENGLISH ARISTOCRATS

THE "old nobility" of England has experienced quite a shock within the last few weeks. Two dukes and two earls died within a few days of each other, and after a very brief illness on the part of three of them. All four represented ancient and proud families. One was the Duke of Bedford, whose ancestor was raised to the peerage by Henry VII. Bedford represented the famous Russell family. He committed suicide, a very vulgar thing for a duke to do. But he did it, nevertheless, by blowing out his brains, or whatever matter existed where the brains ought to have been. He leaves a son, the Marquis of Tavistock, who is said to be a very eccentric person.

The late Duke of Bedford was both a rich man and a very learned one, but he enjoyed the distinction of being the most unpopular man in England. Before ascending to the dukedom, he was known as Hastings Russell, the tyrant and bad landlord. He is said to be the original of Anthony Trollope's "Plantagenet," though the ideal duke is somewhat better than the original really was.

Another of the nobles who departed this life was the Duke of Somerset. The coronet worn by him can be traced back to the early Tudor kings. The late duke owned four country seats and a town mansion, yet he lived a solitary life in a half empty house in Berkeley Square, London, and spent most of his time walking about its empty rooms. He did not even keep a conveyance of any kind. And his penuriousness was such that the London cabmen all knew him, and would not drive him, except when compelled by law.

One of the others who died was the Earl of Devon, known as Lord Courtenay. At one time he was popular and brilliant, but he fell into vice and extravagance. A few years ago he became a bankrupt. Of late he used to make a railway station in London his headquarters, and was an object of curiosity to many. His title was one of the oldest in Europe. He traced his descent from the Plantagenets of England, and he was allied by marriage with a dozen of the English Kings.

The last of this "Big Four" was the Earl of Caithness, the family name was Sinclair, and his descent traceable to the oldest Chieftains and rulers of Scotland. The predecessor of the late Earl was well known in the United States as Lord Berriedale. He had a vast capacity for whiskey. When he died, he left his estates to a boon companion. It was thought the title would become extinct, as no heir was known at the time.

A bank clerk was found in Aberdeen, who established his title and became 16th Earl of Caithness. But there was only a few hundred a year to maintain the splendors of Earldom. The man was far happier as a poor quill-driver, than as bearer of all the glories, honors and weaknesses of the historic Sinclairs of the past. He died a very unhappy man after all. The son who is to succeed him as 17th Earl of Caithness was a poor farmer in Dakota, but it appears that he has cast the mud of that State off his feet and is now on his way to grasp the strawberry coronet, and to die unhappy as rich lords and American millionaires generally do.

HOLDING TWO POSITIONS.

AN interesting and altogether new question of a public and political character has arisen in the Empire State, bearing upon the duality or otherwise of the Governor's present office-holding. It will be remembered that about a month ago, the Chief Executive of New York, David B. Hill, was elected