

cause a man did not support the Democratic platform in a case where the law required the appointment of one who did not give that support, but cast his vote in favor of the party which installed President McKinley by a majority of the electoral college, his confirmation was objected to. Thus the spirit of the non-partisan law was violated; for the test of party is the support of its platform and nominees. The objection was a surprising example of political bigotry.

It might be, indeed was, urged that the nominee was not "right" on the silver question: What is the test of being "right" on any question which has become a political issue? The declaration of a political party. Then if that be the standard, the silver party as practical force had all the representatives the law gives it, whether they were in or out of party alignments on other questions, and the law required the confirmation of one with other views. And it would be as consistent to refuse to confirm a Populist because he believes in government ownership of railways and does not hold the Chicago platform to be perfect on that point, as to refuse to confirm a Republican because he did not vote for the Democratic nominee for President. The fact is here: Where a national party exists, as is the case with the Republican, Democratic, Populist, and others, then no voter who does not support the chief nominee of such party is a member of that party in reality; for the voice of the party is perfectly represented in its choice of chief nominee. There may be differences as to inferior officers or portions of the party platform, but there can be none in the concentration which is applied to the chief candidate and general tenor of the platform. Hence it follows that Republicans cast their votes in favor of McKinley, while the party organizations of Democrats, Populists, Silver Republicans, Prohibitionists and others voted for their party choice.

But it does not follow in this State that because an elector voted for the McKinley ticket he is not a silver man.

That vote is his test as a Republican, for that was the Republican ticket. There were thousands in this State who did not like the Republican financial plank. They also disliked the Democratic plank on the Chicago riots, regarding it as a species of Van Burenism which withheld government protection to citizens when the state failed to do its duty, as was the case in Illinois during the riots. And on this issue they chose the lesser of two evils, as they regarded them. They voted for the McKinley electors, not because they loved silver any the less, but because they disliked the Van Burenism referred to the more. It was their way of making the choice. Hence to declare that everyone who voted for McKinley is not "right" on the silver question is unfair, illogical and intolerant.

Here is where every statesmanlike legislator will stand: When it comes to be his duty to confirm as member of a board an opponent in politics, he will measure him by his qualifications for the office as such political antagonist, and not as a political colleague. It is for political parties to determine their own policies; and it is not for a

Republican to define to Democrats what Democracy is, to Silver Republicans what Silver Republicanism is, or to Populists what Populism is, to them. Each party defines its own views, free from domination by the others, else there is no political freedom. The high example in this in our government is set by the Senate of the United States, which gives the President, when of another party, the cabinet of his choice when a political issue only is involved.

## TO GRAND AND SAN JUAN COUNTIES

The session of the Second State Legislature is nearing its close; only two days remain to finish up the necessary business. Yet in those two days the legislators should not forget the interests of the State in giving better and closer communication with Grand and San Juan counties than now exists, even if something else has to be passed by. On a former occasion the NEWS pointed out the necessities in this matter, to have a road made from the railway to Moab, Grand county, with a crossing over the river at Moab. It was urged that the best crossing would be a bridge; but this is a big undertaking, as the stream is very wide. If the legislators cannot feel to go to the expense of the bridge, and possibly they are of that opinion, they really cannot afford to leave the matter untouched. The least the assembly can do in this business is to establish a first-class ferry at Moab, with a good road from there to the railway.

There is a very large section of the State southeast of the Grand, and the Colorado, as the large stream is known after the junction of Grand and Green rivers. The people of that section are one with those of the rest of the State in their sympathies and interests. They are in a country whose topography is very rough in places, making it difficult of access. For the great work of making roads from their chief towns to the railway, they are neither numerous nor rich enough; for there is a long stretch of country between, and there is no immediate prospect of a railway building into their country. But there are enough of them to have extensive agricultural interests; they have fruit, and vegetable, and grain farms; they have important stock enterprises and grazing lands; they have a country of great mineral wealth which is just opening to development. Their inclinations are to do business with the State to which they belong; but existing barriers cut them off, and compel them to go to Colorado for trade relations, which advantage our eastern neighbor does not fail to improve. It is to the interest of this State to remove the barrier complained of. There can be no denial of that proposition.

There is also a way to remove the barrier, which the people of the State will endorse. There always has been a sentiment in the State to render material aid where needed to the outlying portions; for the comfort and building up of these is to the benefit of the whole. The few thousand dollars required to open a road from the railway to Moab and establish a ferry at the latter place is more urgently needed and can be better spared by

the State for that purpose than for many others that are clamoring for aid and yet are not undeserving. To us it appears that no legislator who examines the subject can fail to realize this fact. And certainly if the effect of investigation is so convincing, no legislator should shrink from it. The NEWS confidently anticipates that one of the good marks to be placed to the credit of the present Legislature is its record in opening a close, direct and convenient communication with Grand county by a good road to Moab, and a ferry there; and by that means San Juan also will be brought in and the business interests of that whole section be united and solidified with those of the rest of the State.

## REPLY TO THE ULTIMATUM.

According to all appearances now the main key to the European tangle is held by Sultan Abdul Hamid. With him it rests largely—speaking from a mere human point of view—whether peace shall be continued a little longer, or the thunders of war be let loose at once, to roll from one country to another. Undoubtedly the powers that supposedly control his government are putting forth every effort to restrain him from furnishing the spark that may cause the great conflagration, but what success can they hope for when the Turkish hordes are gathered together with the prospect of spoil and a glorious entrance into Paradise before them?

The view said to be prevalent at St. Petersburg is that the Greeks are bent on provoking war at all hazards, and this is probably correct. If so, they are simply following the policy, which once made Bismarck famous, of throwing the responsibility of the first step on the other party. Their attitude is one of waiting for the Turks to commence hostilities, in order that they may be justified in "defending themselves."

The reply of the Greek government to the remarkable "ultimatum" of the powers is hardly capable of any other interpretation. In this document it is pointed out with much diplomatic finesse that the time has come for Greece to annex Crete. In substance the reply says that Greece cannot afford, neither as a matter of morality nor of finance, to abandon the Hellenes on that unfortunate island to the joint mercy of diplomatic promises and Mohammedan fanaticism. It offers to place the Greek troops at the disposition of the powers, if the latter are willing, by their aid, to restore order, but it refuses to comply with the request of withdrawing them. It openly admits the intention of wresting Crete from Turkey, by proposing to submit to a popular vote the question of government. In view of the fact that the powers submitted their demands as an "ultimatum," and also another fact that assurance has been given the sublime Porte that Greece would not be allowed at this juncture to annex Crete, the reply must be construed as a daring challenge to combined Europe, and an invitation to Turkey to fight it out. How long will the powers interested succeed in restrain-