

refused to wink at it. With every personal inducement to follow the government, it threw out the bill by an overwhelming majority. The preparations for the general election are now in full swing, and the cry of the imperialists and conservatives is "Down with the Democrats." Like many another election cry, this is delusive. The issue before the electors was put very plainly and with chivalric fairness in the forcible speech of Prince Zu-Charolath Schonaich last Saturday: "The electors are now practically called upon to choose between fairplay for German progressive thought, on one hand, and the grasping place-hunting aristocracy on the other. Democracy is a form of idealism which can contribute its quota to the forces of national progress, and to shut its mouth is to establish a dangerous precedent—a dangerous limitation on the rights of the people. But the peril is not confined to the curtailment of personal liberty; it also involves a degradation of political ideals. Men who are no longer permitted to labor for their country's good, according to the dictates of their conscience, become a dangerous element in society. The government cannot afford to treat its subjects harshly—to lose the moral force and energy of so many of its people."

The opening of the British Parliament does not seem to attract that attention which one might expect, owing likely to the fact that no dominant issue will come before it. Peace still stands guard all over the continent, a heavy sword by her side and ponderous armor on her limbs. Every year adds to the national burdens and develops international apprehension of the dread results.

The British-Portuguese embroglio seems to be in a fair way of settlement by arbitration. Lord Salisbury, however, has been able to distract public attention from the faults of his administration by alleged outrages on the British flag somewhere in the heart of Africa. By posing himself as the brave defender of British interests, Salisbury has renewed his lease of power. In fact, there are those who claim that political capital was made of the Gordon celebration in Trafalgar Square, on the 26th of January. As all will remember, Gordon was killed at Khartoum Jan. 26, 1885, and in 1888 a splendid statue of him was unveiled in Trafalgar Square. The late pilgrimage to the shrine of the lamented Gen. Gordon was not necessarily political, but the speeches that were made plainly intimated that if a Salisbury ministry had then held power Gordon would not have died.

J. H. WARD.

EUROPE, Feb. 3rd., 1890.

#### GERMAN POLITICS.

THE late elections in Germany are very significant in their results. They prove the rapidly increasing power of Socialism in that country. In 1876 the first law was passed which forbade any public propaga-

tion of Socialistic doctrines and organizations. The same law, substantially, has been re-enacted every two years since, as it has been allowed for some reason to expire each time at the end of that term. But it is predicted that, in consequence of the great increase in the number of Socialists in the Reichstag, this law will not be again re-enacted.

Should the government fail in the effort to have it passed again, the growth of Socialism throughout the empire will be rapid. There will be no law to prohibit the organization of Socialistic societies, and these publications will be scattered broadcast. The agitators of these doctrines promise to the laboring classes higher wages, lower taxes, and the abolition of the army, which entails such an enormous burden upon the nation, besides taking away from home the adult male members of families as it does. The masses are delighted and captivated by such promises, and will undoubtedly flock in vast numbers to the support of the theories of Socialism.

How far the agitation may spread, and what will be its results, are questions which Imperialism may well ask with apprehensive dread. The German nation is ripe for mighty changes in its laws, customs and institutions, and if the Socialists prove sufficiently strong in the Reichstag to prevent legislation hostile to their theories, it would seem that the nation will be shaken with the open agitation of them which must ensue.

#### A COMMENDABLE CHANGE.

THE *Tribune* came out in new and improved form Feb. 25—eight pages of eight columns each—the page being reduced in size from that formerly issued, and a commensurate increase in the number. The change is made so that the paper can be printed on a new Goss web perfecting press, just put in, with a capacity of 12,000 papers per hour. The paper has a much better appearance typographically than before, with the exception of the black column headings, which should be changed to type of neater and more modern style.

If with the change of form there should be a change of its language—as in the issue of today—the *Tribune* might be ranked among the respectable journals of the country. The leading article in last Friday's paper was one of the vilest that ever ap-

peared in an American newspaper. It was a gross and scurrilous attack upon a Council Bluffs editor who happened to differ from the black-guard that almost daily has defiled the *Tribune* with his natural venom, and was utterly inexcusable and detestable.

We do not look for a change of sentiment in the *Tribune*, but we hope, for the sake of common decency, that there will be a reform in its manners conformable to the change in its appearance, so that its presence in a respectable home may not be regarded as worse than a pestilence.

#### STATEMENTS BY POWERS.

O. W. POWERS is in San Francisco, presumably enjoying the \$10,000 reward paid for the delivery of the government of this city into the hands of a clique who, for certain reasons, were willing to pay that sum for the services rendered by a single man in aid of that project. In an interview with him, which appears in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the \$10,000 is referred to as a "present." The \$25 which medical students pay a "body snatcher" for a "subject" to be dissected is a "present" of a similar sort. More than one analogy might be drawn between these two "presents," or rather the transactions they represent.

Powers describes the *modus operandi* by which, as he alleges, the "Liberals" won the city election here. In so doing he says:

"And right here I desire to correct an impression that has gone abroad, that we were successful because of the fact that many Mormons were disfranchised by the Edmunds law. We won because we had the most people on our side. I have at hand a card giving the figures of our canvass as it stood on December 11, 1889. The total number of names then reported was 9648. Straight Gentile, 4827. Straight Mormon, 4372; doubtful, 449. This includes every man then reported as above 21 years of age. It includes the disfranchised polygamists, and it shows that, giving them the 449 doubtful votes, there is a Gentile majority over all. Salt Lake City is no longer Mormon. It is an American city. The Gentiles own more than one-half the real estate in value; fully one-half the houses; do more than one-half the business; pay more than one-half the taxes, and compose more than one-half the population. Statehood is not expected to be given us at once, but we are taking long strides in that direction."

"Figures can't lie," but men who put them forward frequently do. The statement that there is a Gentile majority of male adult residents in this city, giving all doubtful names to the "Mormons," rises like