

dropped upon the one taken from the *Chicago Times*, would observe that we do not anticipate that the anti-Catholic movement is likely to receive any vigorous support from government officials in ruling positions or from ambitious politicians anxious for place. Self-interest appears to be much stronger than patriotism with men who have political bees in their bonnets, and the demagogues among them being in the majority, antagonism to the Catholics from that quarter is not likely to be robust. This reticence is likely to be particularly apparent where the Romanists are sufficiently numerous to constitute a political factor.

The public journals are, as a rule, in the same box as the politicians. It is popular to abuse the "Mormons," who are supposed to have no friends, and therefore no rights entitled to respect. There are a number of honorable exceptions to this journalistic rule, but they are comparatively few. The majority will doubtless be as dumb as oysters in relation to the alleged threatened danger of Catholicism seizing the republic by the throat and strangling it. If not silent, they will as a rule deprecate the application of political disabilities to Roman Catholics, who constitute a power in the land.

Until a few months ago the Catholic church never took, so far as we have knowledge, any active part in persecuting the latter-day Saints, and in this particular was distinguished above most of her numerous daughters—the Protestant sects. Of late she has assumed a change of front in that respect, and, through Cardinal Gibbons and the Catholic conference held some time ago at Baltimore, signified her readiness to take a hand in the business. She expressed her willingness to join with other organizations in the formulation and application of such measures as would disable "Mormonism," which was falsely claimed to be a "menace to American institutions." Now that the great Roman religious power in the Republic is threatened with a dose of her own medicine, it would be interesting to know how she likes it.

CITY OF MEXICO, March 27.—Jay Gould and party are in this city. Gould says he is not here on business, but for pleasure. The impression prevails that he intends building a trans-continental line which will top the United States. Gould will be received by President Diaz today.

AN UTTER FAILURE.

THE *Tribune* of March 28th has an "interview" with ex-Marshal Dyer, in regard to his participation in the movement to convert the so-called "Industrial Home" into a general government building for this city. The gentleman explained that this movement was inaugurated before the scheme was adopted to obtain the half million appropriation from Congress, and that he was now desirous that the full appropriation should be secured. In the course of his remarks he is reported as saying:

The occasion was the fact that the home had utterly failed of the purpose for which it was intended, and ought to be put to some use. To be sure the managers had since rustled around and run in a lot of paupers; but the institution's failure was patent from Mrs. Ferry's reports alone. So the projectors of the scheme went ahead, and presently the proposition for building near the business center started and gathered strength.

How it would come out he did not wish to say, but he by no means receded from his claim that the industrial home was a failure.

It is noticeable that the *Tribune* abstains from using on this occasion the choice epithets and personal invective which answer with it for argument when others differ with it on any public question. Whether it be on marriage or bimetalism, or politics, or the location of a government building, a person or a paper that takes an opposite view is invariably called a "scrub" or "base born" or a "hired perjurer" or some other pet *Tribune* name still more opprobrious, and if his reasons are unusually strong and uncontrovertible, a "cowhiding" is mentioned as the proper sort of argument to meet them.

That the so-called "Home" has been a failure from the start is demonstrated in the report of its own officers, as Mr. Dyer is said to have stated, and for making similar statements the *DESERET NEWS* has been called all kinds of vile and black-guard names by the paper which now prints that gentleman's lucid and emphatic explanation, without an expulsive.

We repeat, we are not in favor of any project to take away from the centre of business the site for the government building which has become a necessity in this city, and it is a matter of regret that personal and property interests have been so conflicting as to damage the prospects of a sufficient appropriation for the end in view. However, a quarter of a million is not to be

despised, and in our opinion, it would be much better than nothing, and if untrammelled by any specification as to its site would prove a good beginning, and would be supplemented by a further and sufficient appropriation when the necessity therefor should be demonstrated.

All the same, the failure which we predicted, and have since pointed out, is a matter of fact in spite of all *Tribune* denials and abuse, and the proof of it has been furnished by the officers of the almost empty "Home."

AMERICAN SYMPATHY.

THE *Denver News* is of opinion that the Emperor of Germany is contemplating and preparing for another war with France, and that "it will be a struggle to extirpate from European soil the last vestige of republican government." The *News* says further:

"It will be a war waged in behalf of the tottering thrones of Europe, to suppress the growing sentiment in favor of popular government, and its results will be looked to with the greatest concern by the liberty-loving of all countries. It is needless to say that in this mighty contest the sentiment of free America will go out in an unstinted manner to its old time allies, the French people."

We question the accuracy of this forecast of American sympathy. While the American people have not forgotten Lafayette, nor the aid France rendered them in the darkest hours of their existence, and while they have a sentimental sympathy for the progress of republican institutions in any part of the world, and especially in Europe, there are reasons which to them would probably be stronger than either gratitude or sentiment that would restrain them from extending aid or comfort to France in case of a war between that country and Germany. Those reasons have a practical basis, and the American people are so thoroughly practical as to fully appreciate them. They are founded on the fact that the German vote is a leading factor in American politics.

The department official or congressman who would undertake to offend the German vote by favoring France, would quickly be clubbed down by his own party in addition to what he would suffer at the hands of his political opponents, and at the first opportunity he would be relegated to private life. On the other hand, the politician who would denounce France most loudly would capture the largest number of Ger-