

form a ministry, but he declined, owing to the opposition of two of his French colleagues and the Orangemen of Ontario. It is understood that the new premier will adhere to the old line of policy pursued by the Macdonald government, until after the present session is closed, when the ministry will be reconstructed.

IS DE LESSEPS A THIEF?

THE great De Lesseps, whose name has been a household word for over a score of years, in every part of the civilized world, is about to be tried for fraud. The French capitalists who contributed to the millions that were sunk in the Panama canal project are not satisfied. They believe that De Lesseps, who set the work in motion and has been the foremost man in the scheme from the beginning, came out of the crash with too much money.

This will appear strange to the world who have always thought that De Lesseps of all men would be the last to pocket illegitimate gain in such an enterprise. The public have been led to believe that the perfecting of the Panama Canal was the ideal of De Lesseps' glory; that it had occupied his thoughts and imaginations to the extent of destroying his judgment and transforming him from the greatest and most clear-headed civil engineer the word has ever produced, to an untrustworthy visionary. They could never be made to suspect that a man whose dreams of mental acquisition, mounted to such heights, would ever stoop to the occupation of dishonorable money-getting.

The French government is belittling its own fame more than it can afford by the prosecution of this glorious old man. As a stroke of national policy it would be better to assume his obligations. He has done more for France than France has done for him, and his country should see to it that he dies in honor and with his fame untarnished.

ENTITLED TO CONFIDENCE?

WE FIND the annexed paragraph in the editorial comments of the "Liberal" ring organ on the meeting of the alleged Republican central committee:

"When men voluntarily come together, and it is found that with a single exception they, speaking for their constituents, are practically unanimous in a belief, that belief is entitled to the confidence of thinking men everywhere."

"What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," is a trite saying; and another which is equally pertinent to the subject is, "It is a poor rule that will only work one way." If the be-

lief of the eight persons who called themselves a central committee is entitled to weight because of their unanimity, should not the belief and action of several thousands of people be entitled also to "the confidence of thinking men?"

The Conference of the "Mormon" people was a voluntary gathering of men and women from all parts of the Territory, and they were practically unanimous on a question that they considered of the greatest importance. And yet the writer of the sentiment we have quoted is trying his best to belittle that unanimous expression, and to make it appear unworthy of the confidence of thinking men anywhere.

The Territorial Central Committee of the People's Party met by appointment and made certain declarations, "speaking for their constituents," and though at first there were a few exceptions, at last they were all unanimous in the expression of a belief; and yet the same writer has been trying ever since to throw dirt upon it and persuade thinking people not to receive it as in good faith.

The opinions of eight sincere men on any subject are entitled to consideration, proportionate to their intelligence and influence. But the belief of the eight persons who formulated the "Liberal" resolutions—even if they were persons of exceptional ability and importance, which they are not—when manifestly incorrect and uttered as bearing authority which was only assumed, is not entitled to any great confidence nor to very serious consideration.

When eight "Liberals" pretend to be "Republicans" and express a belief which is anti-Republican, and advise action which would be ruinous to Republican interests, it appears to us that no matter how "practically unanimous" they may have been, their utterances are more likely to provoke derision than confidence, and thinking men will be apt to regard them with contempt.

HOW DO THEY LIKE IT?

THE Republicans and Democrats of Utah, who are engaged in organizing clubs and educating the people in politics, must be charmed with the notices they are receiving from the "Liberal" organ of hate and misrepresentation. They are tasting a little of the treatment which the People's party and the "Mormon" people generally received for years from the same source.

The reports of political meetings which appear in the sheet referred to are specimens of the "accuracy" and "fairness" of the "American gentle-

men" who conduct it. They are not as vile and blasphemous and ribald as their reports of religious services in the Salt Lake Tabernacle. But they are tinged with the same false colors and bear the same marks of malice, vulgarity and low-lived spleen.

The Scandinavian meeting held on Monday night in the Social Hall, in the interest of the Republican party, was so large that about two hundred persons were unable to gain admittance. Forty-five new names were enrolled on the list of members for a club in process of formation. It is reported in the "Liberal" (pseudo-Republican) organ as "a dismal failure," and that, "About thirty-five sons of Sweden and Norway were present and in their own peculiar way discussed the matter." As there were prominent English speaking Republicans present who addressed the meeting, and it was a rousing, overflowing assemblage, the animus of the report needs no special indication.

The evident purpose of the "Liberal" scribes is to belittle the present political movement as much as possible. They may succeed for a short time among people at a distance who read their effusions, but their utter mendacity will soon be obvious to all.

In all probability there was no "Liberal" reporter present, but the kind of thing wanted was written up elsewhere, as many of the "Liberal" reports of Tabernacle services are. The organ stated on Monday that Apostle Moses Thatcher was the speaker at the meeting on Sunday afternoon. He was not present. Neither of the speakers resembled him in appearance or manner. On several occasions it has stated that Bishop John R. Winder opened the meeting, and on neither occasion was he present. It is the same in regard to other well known gentlemen, whose names are paraded in *Tribune* print as taking part in the services, when they were many miles away. Language is attributed to them that no one uttered, but that would not have been used if they had been there.

We mention this to show that the unprincipled thing is equally mendacious toward its former supporters as in reference to the "Mormon" people. It is utterly unreliable and is now seeking to deceive its readers in reference to a movement which, unless the sheet takes a short turn, will work its utter overthrow and the wreck of the party which it is desperately struggling to hold together.

The battle of Blenheim was fought on June 19, 1800, between the French and Austrians.