

public executions. Her capital punishment law is modelled somewhat after that of New York, before the recent change. Now that the reform in the New York law has been effected, many of the newspapers of Minnesota are agitating an amendment of the law providing not alone for press representatives at public executions but for the introduction of the repulsive electrocution methods of inflicting capital punishment as practiced in New York State.

CONCERNING SUGAR BOUNTIES.

In whatever light the action of the Utah Legislature towards the sugar bounty bill may be viewed locally, it can not be questioned that this action is in harmony with the general principles of the Democratic party. Only a few days ago Representative Scott of the Fourteenth Illinois district introduced in the House at Washington the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the committee on ways and means of this House be and are hereby instructed to report a bill repealing the provisions of the law providing for the payment of all bounties on sugar."

Mr. Scott in support of his resolution contended that the sugar bounty was oppressive because it took from the public treasury \$12,000,000 annually to enrich a few at the expense of the many. Besides, he claimed that the granting of bounties or subsidies in any form was antagonistic to the principles of pure Democracy.

Whether the mass of the Democratic party will sustain the leaders in this movement is very doubtful. Some benefits are already experienced by the people at large from this bounty. Sugar has been cheapened perhaps two cents in the pound. There are in this country 65,000,000 people. It is safe to conclude that each person, man, woman and child consumes twenty pounds at least annually. This would give 1,300,000,000, which when sold at two cents a pound less than formerly makes a saving to the people of \$26,000,000. Let Mr. Scott compare these \$26,000,000 saved to the working classes with his \$12,000,000 paid in bounties, and then try to explain his system of political economy.

It is true that if it could be shown that bounties of this kind were entirely for the benefit of a few private persons, the system would certainly be outrageously bad. But even anti-bounty men themselves admit it is a debatable question. The sugar industry in France and Germany has been built up by the aid of bounties.

In the United States during the past year the impetus given to beet raising

has been astonishing. Persons who read the papers can see that in several States farmers are making preparations to extend this beet industry. In Louisiana the cane plantations are being extended also. Even the cultivation of maple and sorghum has been stimulated under the bounty law.

Whatever abuses may exist in a high tariff, in the bounty system a minimum of abuse can be reached. There are many ways of cheating the Government and of discriminating between importers under a very high tariff regime. But in the bounty system there can be no discrimination and no cheating. The public as well as the officials can tell whether the quantity of sugar produced is equivalent to the bounties paid. In the case of Utah, the industry is in its infancy. It is well known that thirty years ago an immense sum of money was sunk by private citizens in trying to establish the sugar industry here. Now that it seemed to be in a fair way to success, the Utah Legislature might consistently give it needed encouragement for a year or two longer, or until it can sustain itself without actual loss.

We are opposed to bounties in general, but believe no rule should have a too rigid application. Exceptions occur and should be treated according to their requirements. Statesmanship rises above party, and the public welfare should be paramount. No bounty or subsidy should be granted to swell the funds of capitalists or in the sole interest of a corporation, but when it is clear that the establishment of a local industry will greatly benefit the community and that it cannot be made successful without temporary aid, that help should be extended for the common good. And we believe, on a popular vote, a further extension of the sugar bounty in Utah for a short period would be endorsed by an overwhelming majority.

LIVING IN A GLASS HOUSE.

THE Bourbon is described as one who learns nothing and forgets nothing. It has been the favorite diversion of some of the Republican press for many years to apply this term to a large element in the Democratic party, basing such application upon the assumed illiteracy of a portion of the latter party in the large cities and the interior districts of the South, also upon the well-known tendency of Democracy to conservatism and old-time methods. Nothing affords or afforded the class of papers spoken of greater diversion than to show how some sturdy old backwoodsman "down South" went to the polls

at the last election and voted for Andrew Jackson, or that "the gang" in New York or Cincinnati at a certain time could with difficulty be restrained from making an attack on a colored parade or a colored school.

In the entire list of papers of this class—whose chief justification has been the doubtful one of permitting exaggeration for the sake of making a point more conspicuous—we can call to mind none that has sung the discordant song oftener or louder than the *San Francisco Chronicle*. And it seems to have been less discriminating and more stolid in its use of the term than any other publication we know of with the possible exception of the *New York Mail and Express*. It has been Bourbon this and Bourbon that almost every time any Democrat or anything Democratic has been under discussion, until in those columns the word has lost something of its virility and become vapid and measurably meaningless.

It is not for this paper, or any other, to instruct the *Chronicle* or any other publication as to how it should be conducted or what its columns should contain, and it will be observed that we have all along steered clear of any such or any dictation, desire or request in that direction, and we certainly intend to so continue. But that does not prevent us from noting in a journalistic way, how those papers which are so extremely censorious and addicted to expletives occasionally betray something of the very defect which they so fondly hold up to the ridicule or contempt of mankind as existing in others. For example, the *Chronicle* cannot touch upon or even approach a subject with which "Mormons" or a "Mormon" may be in some manner connected, without exhibiting the old-time venom, bad judgment and, in short, Bourbonism, that have been its prevailing characteristics from the beginning.

A recent issue of the *Chronicle*, commenting upon the effort of the people of Arizona to acquire Statehood, could not very well say they had no claim, after so recently championing the cause of two new commonwealths whose population, if not wealth, were inferior to those of our southern neighbor; nor could it consistently oppose the application because a majority of the voters there are Democrats, after calling all the Democrats in and out of Congress hard names including "Bourbon"—for not being devoted to the proposition to let Idaho and Wyoming in.

But there are a few "Mormon" families in Arizona, and when this fact dawned upon the strained intellect of