

that name, the question of expense would not have been sprung. But under its provisions the Territory would be still a Territory, with all its disabilities, except the power to elect the Territorial officials. It would still be the creature of the national Government, its vassal and subject, with no more independent legislative power than now, and liable to the direct legislation of Congress.

Whether this modicum of home rule is worth what the citizens would have to pay to support it, is an open question. It cannot be disposed of by calling those "sordid" who think the game is not worth the powder. That the power to elect the officers who are now appointed, to make our own choice instead of being compelled to submit to the choice of others, would be a step in the direction of that liberty which Utah ought to enjoy, is beyond debate. But there is ground for fear that this would be regarded as such a settlement of our political question as would postpone instead of hastening that full liberty. And as it would be nearly as costly as the real thing, the question of expense is a proper subject of consideration, and not open to the stigma of stinginess.

People who would say nothing about the cost of statehood, do object to the price that would have to be paid for the smaller measure of freedom, and in this they are not inconsistent. That which is called "home rule" in this instance is not, as claimed, statehood with all its advantages except representation in Congress and in the Electoral College. It falls far short of that, and therefore the question of cost is pertinent, and it devolves upon its advocates to show that the good to be gained is really worth all that the people would have to pay for it.

### THE NEWSPAPER OF TOMORROW.

FOSTER COATES, managing editor of the *New York Mail and Express*, in an address before the Press Clubs at San Francisco a few days ago, made some startling statements with regard to "The Newspaper of Tomorrow." First, it will be bigger in point of size, and in saying this, he never uttered one word of sympathy for the reader of tomorrow. The day is not far distant when a forty-page paper of the same size as the *San Francisco Chronicle* can be printed on one press. In the making of presses the advance has been greater than even that made in newsgathering. The modern perfecting printing press is one of the marvels of the age.

Mr. Coates entertains little hope for the editorial of the future. Either it must go altogether, or else be written by

a specialist. Already he thinks the editorial is becoming a bore, and that the average reader knows more about the matter than the scribe who penned it. Work of this kind is conscientiously performed, but in most cases it is perfunctory. A man cannot write on a half-dozen different topics and give new light on all.

The coming great man on the newspaper is the reporter, and even in this line speciality will be the rule. The police court reporter will not do for the theological conference, nor will the dramatic editor be suited for the political convention.

Illustration will be the marked feature of the coming newspaper, and in that department great rewards are awaiting the future scribe. Mr. Coates, however, did not mention that the founder of illustrated American journalism, Mr. Gleason, is either in a workhouse at present, or died in one a few weeks ago.

The most important part in the make-up of the "coming newspaper," is the advertisement. Genius of the highest kind will be required to write for this department. Already the work of composing acceptable advertisements is the most difficult branch of journalistic literature. Mr. Coates thinks that the richest rewards of the future will lie in writing advertisements.

### CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR.

THE following article, from the *San Francisco Chronicle* ought to have a local interest:

"The review of the sugar trade of 1891, published by James Dunn, of Glasgow, an acknowledged authority on the subject, contains some suggestions very pertinent to the topic of sugar making in the United States. The paper in question says, among other things, that the business of importing and refining in the Atlantic States continues to show a rapid development and progress which throw all other countries into the shade. For the eleven months ending November 20th there passed through the four ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore 1,431,195 tons of sugar, which, with the stock of 53,749 tons left over from last year, gives 1,484,944 tons as the total for manipulation up to that date. Taking out the exports of refined and crude sugars, it appears that the American demand, as met through the Atlantic seaboard, was 1,403,383 tons for the period of eleven months, and that the total consumption of the United States was 1,745,000 tons, against 1,400,000 tons in 1890, or an increase of 345,000 tons in eleven months.

"From these figures certain logical deductions are drawn which will not occur to the casual reader. The Dunn circular says that a quantity equal to more than all the crops of marketable sugars of Demerara, Trinidad, Barbadoes, Jamaica and British India put together was absorbed by this addition to the requirements of eleven months, and, says the writer, it may mean, in conjunction with similar if less important strides elsewhere, the beginning of a common danger

to the European markets by upsetting the equilibrium of values and perhaps turning the scale against production.

"The conclusion from this is easy to draw. It is that unless the United States wants to pay through the nose for her enormous consumption of sugar she must aid and encourage her home production, not only as a means for keeping prices down, but to avoid the danger of an actual shortage in sugar. To repeal the bounty clause of the McKinley bill, thereby discouraging the American sugar producer, would be to offer a premium to the foreign producer to put his own price on his sugar, and even that might not avail to prevent the turning of the scale against production. If we pay a bounty of two cents a pound for American sugar we pay it to ourselves, we produce an abundance of sugar and we keep a check on the prices charged by the foreign producer, all of which is extremely desirable in the economic aspect of the sugar question."

### UNITED STATES SENATE REFORM.

REFORM in the method of electing United States Senators is assuming the proportions of a national demand. Already in the present Congress several joint resolutions have been offered in both houses urging the election of Senators by direct popular vote. Both parties seem equally desirous of adopting the new scheme. Palmer of Illinois, a Democrat, is no more earnest in the movement than Johnston of North Dakota, a Republican.

Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States says:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

This provision governs the method now in practice. The proposed amendment would take from the State legislature the power of electing United States Senators and confer it on the people directly.

Even at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution this question was earnestly, and, in truth, bitterly discussed. However, the present method was agreed on as a sort of compromise. James Madison, writing in the *Federalist*, away back in 1788, said:

"It is equally unnecessary to dilate on the appointment of Senators by the State Legislatures. Among the various modes which might have been devised for constituting this branch of the government, that which has been proposed by the convention is probably the most congenial with public opinion. It is recommended by the double advantage of favoring a select appointment, and of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the Federal Government as must secure the authority of the former, and may form a convenient link between the two systems."

At that time the opinion prevailed among some prominent men that a pure democracy would be the best form of government. Therefore they desired all appointments and elections to come from the direct vote of the people.