

yond measure when the House of Representatives passed the Edmunds-Tucker bill with the clause in it giving him the power to appoint all the officers in the Territory. He imagined the fruit he so much desired was already in his hand, but on squeezing it he discovered it to be but a Dead Sea apple, which turned to dust. The action of the conference committee, who subsequently handled the measure after it went back to the Senate took all the juice out of it.

Mr. West still pursues the phantasmagoria of his official dreams, although in a modified though far from modest form. He has descended a notch and is now willing to share his prospective appointing power, as much as to say, "There's nothing small about me." Witness the magnanimity he displays when he says: "A territorial commission acting in conjunction with the governor, which would control all appointments, would suit us exactly." Isn't he becoming generous? At first he wanted to wholly deprive the people of a voice in the selection of officers to do *their* public business, and have the appointing power centered in his own proper person, so that he might be the grand autocrat of Utah. Now he consents to be satisfied for a commission to act in conjunction with him. He is disingenuous when he says that would suit him exactly, however, as the first autocratic authorization he fished for would have been much more to his liking.

With this latest conjunctive authority dealing out power and place Mr. West glowingly exclaims, "Utah would enter upon an era of prosperity such as no other Territory has ever known." If he had wished to be believed out here, instead of merely where he thinks his flatulent utterances will do him the most good, he could correctly have substituted the word corruption for "prosperity."

It is remarkable that scheming politicians can express such views in this free country and be listened to with even a modicum of patience. It seems so absurd for a man to make use of such expressions relating to the robbing of a people of the right to select any of the officials who are to do their public business, so incongruous under a government like this, that such an individual ought to be frowned down. The matter wears a still worse aspect when it is considered that, coupled with this proposition to rob the people of their rights, one of its advocates unblushingly

asks that he be vested with the popular prerogative after the consummation of the steal.

There is a specially weak point in connection with the Governor and his political games. It ought to be fatal to his prospects of success. As a witness against the people he seeks to wrong he is utterly unreliable. He has on different occasions made statements regarding them that are totally and unqualifiedly untrue. This is notoriously known. Such being the case beyond all controversy, as we have in the past demonstrated, he should not fail to carry a "sack of salt," because if his anti-"Mormon" averments are not well seasoned, they are in danger of not being swallowed by those to whom he proposes to feed them.

Mr. West dips his brush in black and draws a dismal, imaginative picture of the consequences that would follow certain contingencies. It is a distorted representation, and bears no resemblance to the future situation he professes to depict. He is not ingenious, but exhibits his genuine "inwardness" at every step. He might just as well write under his gloomy picture—"If the contingency in question should arise, my political cake would have no yeast in it." He is a very transparent man, but he does not seem to know it.

A NEW DEAL.

For the first time in the history of the State, Delaware is to have a Republican United States Senator. This is almost as wonderful as though such an event had been brought about in Kentucky or Missouri, and is all the more so from the fact that the Democrats carried everything but the Legislature in the election on the 6th of November; that body has a Republican majority of two on joint ballot. Naturally, pretty nearly every Republican in the State, of any prominence, is on the anxious seat, and to choose from so many is already proving a difficult task. The election takes place, or will be begun, on the 15th instant. Meantime the Democrats look at each other and the procession alternately and have nothing to say, except it be to fall back upon the chilling comfort that they have at least upset bossism by rendering it impossible for the Saulsbury family to come to the front any more.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

THE discussion in the United States Senate on the resolution in-

troduced by Mr. Sherman has been one of the broadest in its scope and most indicative of statesmanship in that body of any in recent years. The resolution has particular reference to the Panama Canal project of M. De Lesseps, and is in general a reaffirmance of the principle of national polity embodied in the Monroe doctrine. It has, as everything else seems to do in Congress, shifted itself around so as to become a somewhat partisan proceeding, the Republicans generally for and the Democrats mostly against it; however, they do not support or oppose as such, other reasons being given on either side for the positions taken. On the part of those who concur with the author of the resolution, it is claimed that interference with foreign affairs is a procedure which unchecked will grow; that while purely commercial enterprises and business relations may be instituted and maintained, these should be limited so as not to trench upon the sovereignty or native authority of any power wherein such establishment of business may be made, and that the Panama Canal, if completed, would be such an infringement and therefore in violation of the Monroe doctrine. There would seem to be nothing unreasonable or suggestive of undue vigilance and alarm in this; it strikes us as being a very proper and statesmanlike enunciation of a just and well settled principle, a principle without which national comity could not exist and national safety would be jeopardized.

It must not be concluded, however, that the Democrats, or such of them as have spoken, oppose the doctrine, or the resolution *per se*. Quite the reverse. They claim, however, that the necessity for such a declaration *ex cathedra*, when we are not only on terms of profound peace but of the most decided amity with our first friend and ally, does not exist at present, and would have an irritating effect; that it would cause the friendship subsisting between the United States and France to perceptibly dwindle, and our relations with each other to become greatly embarrassed, if not strained; that there is nothing so far developed in Lesseps' somewhat visionary project to call for a resolution of displeasure or for any resolution on the subject; and that it will be time enough for this government to take a hand when the emergency actually arises.

All things considered, it must be confessed that the Democratic programme is the wiser of the two,