

because it was a matter of life or death to the nation.

Why, then, is it an "unjust censure" to say that rather than have a causeless war with a foreign power, rather than have gross and unjustifiable outrages heaped upon any class of our population through the operation of what at best is a law of questionable legitimacy, we would indulge the hope that the gentlemen of that august body who are disposed to look upon the act favorably might be caused to take the higher view and save us from such a calamity, because it is to duly take notice of the public weal if not the national honor to do so.

The News holds that the court is composed of wise men who are not altogether separate and distinct from the people, and we hope they may never be. And that the decision is not satisfactory, and seems to be the result of a hasty consideration is shown by the attitude of three, perhaps four, members of the court whose standing and wisdom are unimpeachable. Besides, why do supreme courts grant a rehearing in any case? They do so very often, and of course the idea is that something else came to show or that something shown has not received sufficient consideration, it being a possibility if not a probability that the action already taken will be modified if not recalled. We are unable to see any "unjust censure" in taking this view of the matter.

HOOTING AT THE PREMIER.

There is one public man in this life whose situation is more peculiar than that of any other man and he is truly a great one—William E. Gladstone. It is no longer questionable, it is a certainty, that he is more sincerely beloved and profoundly hated, more unfeignedly respected and thoroughly despised, more popular and unpopular, more and less influential among a wider circle of people than any other man of our times living or dead. How it is that at a time of life when most people woo the quietude of privacy if not seclusion, Mr. Gladstone is if possible more of a stormy petrel than at any time in his younger days; how it is that he can command a majority in support of an unpopular measure from a populace which bestows as a rule more of abuse than of praise upon him; and how it is that he can so bring together and make coherent in support of his policy struggling and incongruous elements when those who oppose him and his government are really abler and stronger than his own following, are problems which are not easy to solve. We can only wonder and let it rest with that.

It is proper to say, however, that those Englishmen who take advantage of the venerable premier's appearance in public places to hiss and hoot and howl at him are not giving themselves nor their country a very good reputation abroad. We are supposed to be somewhat untrammelled over here, and yet no crowd could be found in this country so lost to every point of decency and self-respect as to treat the President of the United States that way, or even his secretary of state.

Let the populace look upon the man as they may, his position in life and in the nation, his gray hairs and wrinkled brow and the eminent services rendered his country in the days of the mob's fathers and grandfathers as well as during their own time, should exempt him from such indecent outbreaks. If they cannot or do not appreciate him, they ought to remember that the better classes of their own people and the civilized world do, and let their opposition be confined to proper places and methods.

EDMUNDS ON CALIFORNIA.

Ex-Senator Edmunds is at present enjoying a visit to California. Why it is that he gave Utah and her hospitable people the go-by is not explained; the relations between the distinguished gentleman and our people may have been a little strained at one time, perhaps two or three times, because of the unceasing and unusual attentions bestowed upon us, but down deep in his system we hardly think he intended to be as severe as he sometimes made believe. He was in just a little too much of a hurry at times and wanted to pluck the fruit before it was ripe—a prevailing infirmity of his and one that may have figured as the principle impediment between himself and the White House. However that may be, let us hope he will favor us with at least a glimpse of his person on his return trip.

On Friday night of last week Mr. Edmunds was entertained in San Francisco by the society of the Native Sons of Vermont. The account before us says that the guest of the evening naturally addressed his hosts, and during his address he made use of the following expression, substantially, to which particular attention was called. He said: "I had but a faint idea of what California really was before I came. I have now spent nearly six months in traveling about this state visiting different points of interest, and you can, without exaggeration, call it the state of the Golden West. * *

* At the present rate of progress, should it continue, which I know it will, and with the great resources at your disposal, California must, in the near future, occupy a place among the most important states of the Union."

These remarks were pronounced not a surprise to the audience, this thought suggesting itself: If Mr. Edmunds, with all his ability, talent, knowledge and experience in public affairs had to come to California to learn what the state is and will be, what wonder that men of small caliber, in Congress and out of it, should not be able to form anything like a just conception of the state of the Golden West?

We should think there would be some little surprise to the Californians, even though transplanted Vermonters, that with the ex-senator's great fund of information and discernment he should place California's greatness among the important states still in the future. Even here in Utah we already look upon it as a great state and an important one—greater in area and productiveness than any other but one and equal in resources to any,

while only in the matter of population is it deficient, but still ahead of a majority of the states even in that respect.

The conclusion is reached by a San Francisco contemporary that California needs an infusion of the leaven which has leavened Chicago. "We need to blow our own trumpet, and to blow it so lustily that the world must needs listen. We must subordinate our glorious climate, our Yosemite valley and even the seals at the Cliff house to more material matters, and persuade people that this is a state of homes—a state where industry and economy can reap their due reward, and where the gifts of nature are ready for those who have the pluck and energy to grasp them."

There is nothing available in that either, for after all it is the number and quality of homes which a commonwealth can provide and contain that make up its true greatness. All things else are subsidiary, each useful enough in its place and some indispensable; but it is steady, healthful increase in the race of man and the manner in which he is sheltered and supported that bring the state to its fullest and grandest development.

THE COMMISSION'S FAIRNESS.

Everything which has of late years been done by the Utah Commission finds favor in the eyes of our cross-grained contemporary next door to that body. Its redistricting of the Territory has been the subject of a dozen or more defensive articles which bristled like quills upon the fretful porcupine. Referring to Dr. Groves's interview at Washington, it makes haste to put in a general denial to everything he said and to clinch the opposition thereto with that never-failing but awfully ugly epithet, "liar."

But what are the facts? It is in evidence that Salt Lake City was lumped together and given nine members because as a whole it had a Liberal majority, whereas had it been divided up into districts each electing by itself as is the case elsewhere the Liberals would not have chosen all the members, as is well known. As it was, 6000 Liberal voters got all the representation, while the 5000 opposition got no representation at all, just as the bosses designed should be the case. The same thing on a proportionately smaller scale was done at Ogden, and yet there be those to not only champion the injustice but apply low names to those who hold it up to the execration it deserves.

Mention is made of the fact that the Democrats had quite two-thirds of the last Legislature, which is true; but the point sought to be made thereby—that the commission did its work fairly considering that it was three-fifths Republican and with one exception unanimously and radically Liberal—miscarries in the light of a full consideration. It is only a question of arithmetic, and we will turn to the rule of proportions. In the last election for the Legislature the Democrats had more than twice as many votes as the Liberals, and the Democrats and Republicans combined nearly three times as many; (at the last election they beat the Liberals more than four