

a matter of too much concern for the people generally to misunderstand its import.

The most significant feature in the present movement as we look at it is earnest and determined advocacy of men who formerly bitterly opposed anything of the kind, and not only this—not only did they oppose independence for the Territory—but favored further restrictive measures in order that the mere shadow of sovereignty which we formerly possessed might be curtailed and kept on the way to extinction. This is another of those evidence that "the world moves," and more than that: it means that a question of claimed concrete principle is sometimes more a matter of abstract policy in which some other gain than ours is the chief object sought. This is, however, somewhat foreign to the subject proper.

If ever a commonwealth was abundantly equipped for that responsible and dignified position defined by the term statehood, our is and for many years has been. Superior in population and wealth to any of its immediate neighbors with one single exception; equal in intelligence to any similar part of the world; well informed as to the theory of our national government and thoroughly advised as to political methods therein; with a desire to be self-sustaining as relates to all things—what more should be required? With such recommendations and with an utter absence of the meretricious and self-seeking ends of mere politicians, we have repeatedly asked that the boon conferred upon less deserving territories be also given to us; that such petitions did but give those who passed upon them additional opportunities to revile, upbraid and humiliate—opportunities which they generally made the most of—went unnoticed, at least not noticed to the extent of preventing us altogether from peaceably assembling and petitioning for a redress of grievances. But it failed to come and each succeeding application did but have the effect of weakening the zeal which characterized such efforts, and finally the flickering light went out. Having ascertained to our entire satisfaction that supplication even when coupled with aggression was utterly futile, the proper, in fact the only thing to do was to give it up, satisfied that our whole duty to ourselves and our country had been performed.

If Utah is at last, now that petitions, remonstrances and supplications have ceased, to be taken into the sisterhood, well and good; there will be neither decided opposition nor active advocacy from this quarter. From this it must not be inferred that we are indifferent to the boon; far from it. The record above set out is at once a sufficient denial to such a conclusion and an explanation of the passive condition prevailing. In fact, it seems to matter but little what our position may be, unless, indeed, it be to show that it is not made the basis of action at Washington.

It would be very much more gratifying to most of the people of this Territory if they knew that the statehood so long waited and so persistently asked for were the result of an awakening to reason and justice on the part of the powers that be, and that what came

to us in the way of improved government was a recognition of our capability and deserts and nothing else—that, in short, it was an admission that justice had been delayed long enough. But no matter; in the future as in the past we will welcome all the good that comes and make the most that can be made of the bad, with a reliance made no less firm by reason of past events that all will come out for the best.

The territorial system of government is so utterly at variance with republicanism in its national sense that no one who is thoroughly in accord with our political theory as a whole and is fully advised upon the subject, either upholds or attempts to find any excuse for it. It is merely a relic of the frontier system which once prevailed of necessity because of there being a frontier while all beyond it was a dark continent into which the sunlight of civilization and Christianity had never penetrated, at least in modern times; and as rapidly as the wastes were reclaimed and communities of sufficient importance and capability formed to justify the national government in withdrawing its paternal control, this was done. But it was the means of engraving the system upon the body politic and of late years the territories have subserved purposes so convenient to those who make and unmake, that an admission to the Union is looked upon as a royal favor instead of a plain matter of right and a matter of course. But with all this understood, there are still many features of territorial life—especially as relates to Utah of late years—that are far from being undesirable. The least of these is the item of expense; the national government pays the greater part of our public burdens in a political way, and statehood would mean the withdrawal of such assistance; but it would be a very narrow-minded if not unpatriotic policy to oppose statehood on any such ground—in fact the question of expense is not to be considered in such connection except, as before set out, when we remember that under the territorial system we are saved so much. The most satisfying thing of all is that we are thoroughly familiar with that system, have become accustomed to such deprivation as having no voice in the government, are on reasonably good terms with one another, are bounding along the highway of prosperity rapidly enough, and present to the world the anomaly of having better qualifications for statehood than almost any Territory whose admission occurred during this generation had at the time of admission and better than many of them have yet. If we cannot be like other communities in respect to the matter discussed, we can be conspicuous by reason of being unlike them and still possessing as much capital as they; but this cannot last much longer, it would appear.

It cannot be overlooked that in our midst is an element numerically respectable and in many cases respectable otherwise who are honestly and determinedly opposed to statehood for Utah. While we would not defer to what we can but consider a prejudice, candor compels the acknowledgment, that the Territory's admission would afford more genuine pleasure if it were not opposed in any quarter.

WASHINGTON NOT THE FIRST.

A good many people do not understand that George Washington was not the first actual President the United States ever had; we question if a majority so understand it and among them may be found a great many who are well read and generally pretty well posted. It should be remembered that Washington was comparatively unknown when independence was declared and the colonies thus became a confederation in 1776. Between that year and 1789 the new country was governed by Congress and it by the states, which sent full representatives. John Hancock was president of this Congress and therefore the nominal head of the nation. After him came Henry Laurens, November 1, 1777, to December, 10, 1778; John Jay, to September 28, 1779; Samuel Huntington, to July 10, 1781; Thomas McKean, to November 5, 1781; John Hanson, to November 4, 1782; Elias Boudinot, to November 3, 1783; Thomas Mifflin to November 30, 1784; Richard Henry Lee, to November 23, 1785; John Hancock again, to June 6, 1786; Nathaniel Gorham, to February 2, 1787; Arthur St. Clair, to January 22, 1788, and Cyrus Griffin, who, though the Congress had adjourned October 21, 1788, remained at the head of the government until the organization of the first Congress of the United States, in March and April, 1789. Washington's term then began; he was the first President chosen as such in accordance with prescribed forms and solemnities.

THE INCREASE OF CRIME.

The Chicago Tribune recently published a record of murders, suicides, hangings and lynchings for the past year and it constitutes a rather gloomy chapter. The facts that the population is increasing at the rate of a million and a quarter a year and that with greater facilities the news is collected more readily and accurately do not, it seems, altogether account for the increase in respect to the crimes named. The feature, and perhaps the only one, out of which the optimist can derive consolation is that relating to embezzlements, which are smaller in number than formerly; while the deaths by disasters were much larger. This reminds us that in the last named respect the present year has commenced in a manner threatening to eclipse all former records.

Following is the exhibit of causes for which murders were committed:

| | |
|------------------------|------|
| Quarrels..... | 2937 |
| Liquor..... | 78 |
| Unknown..... | 769 |
| Jealousy..... | 513 |
| By highwaymen..... | 376 |
| Infanticide..... | 314 |
| Resisting arrest..... | 240 |
| Highwaymen killed..... | 148 |
| Self-defense..... | 81 |
| Insanity..... | 111 |
| Strikes..... | 25 |
| Riots..... | 6 |

This means that 6972 murders were committed in the United States last year, against 5906 the year before, 4290 in 1890 and 3567 in 1889; that is, in three years these crimes have nearly doubled. The circumstance that the number of judicial hangings has steadily decreased is then presented to