

somewhere, as, their breath, like the battle, could be smelt afar off—further off each succeeding time. It is noteworthy that, towards the last, after they had tried their scheme three or four times, they left off swearing altogether, and in many cases, went off smiling and even laughing aloud. This shows that the treatment inside was overcome by the "treating" outside; but where the supplies came from is left to conjecture.

LEGISLATIVE MISTAKES.

WE regret to see the action taken on the sugar bounty bill in the Utah House of Representatives. The bill to encourage the manufacture of sugar in this Territory was killed on Tuesday, by a vote of 12 to 11.

We are gratified at the stand taken in favor of the bill by Mr. Lawrence who, we understand, is a Republican, and Mr. Olson who is a stalwart Democrat. They both spoke strongly in support of the measure, and gave reasons for its passage which should have had weight with members of both houses.

We are inclined to think that a too rigid regard for what is supposed to be Democratic doctrine influenced some members in reference to this measure. It is true that on general principles the party is opposed to subsidies. The bill in question is in its nature protective. For these reasons no doubt some gentlemen voted against the bill. But there are and should be exceptions to every rule. We believe this to be one of them.

Protection is a good thing within certain limits. The most ardent Democratic advocate of tariff reform desires the protection that comes incidentally from a tariff for revenue, and every sagacious statesman knows that a too close application of a rule, particularly in exceptional cases, is disastrous. A subsidy under some conditions may be the very wisest legislation. We regard the present instance as one of them.

The Utah sugar works have been a source of pride to the people of this Territory and have gained the applause of the country. They could not have started without the legislative aid afforded them, and a temporary continuance of needed help would not only have encouraged the Lehi enterprise, but prompted further efforts of a similar kind in other parts of Utah. We do not believe that the killing of the sugar bill was either good party politics or sound political economy. It was a mistake, however, that might possibly be repaired before the close of the session.

TINKERING THE CONSTITUTION.

Apropos of the situation in Utah the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* of February 4th has the following:

"The anxiety felt by certain of our legislators to have Utah admitted to the Union has driven them to that last resort of introducing an Amendment to the Constitution. The amendment in this case forbids the existence of polygamy in the United States, and it has, of course, but one reason for being, which is to allow Utah to acquire statehood. The idea of tinkering the Constitution in order to suit the exigencies of every occasion and of any section is objectionable at any time and whatever the pretext, but in this case it is utterly needless. While a number of distinguished and well meaning people have interested themselves in the case of Utah's admission, it is very doubtful whether the country at large will suffer if that event is postponed indefinitely, or whether the best interests of Utah herself demand its speedy consummation. As for the polygamy question, it is settling itself with reasonable rapidity. It is not a problem that requires constitutional amendment for its solving. The advice which profited Bo-Peep concerning her wayward charges may serve the champions of Utah concerning her lost sheep—"let them alone," and the final result will be eminently satisfactory."

The idea that the Constitution of the United States should be amended for the purpose of reaching an emphatically "dead issue," or that, if alive, would be nothing more than a local disturbance in one remote part of the country, has always seemed to us absurd. But we care little about it anyhow, and the Constitution tinkers may hammer away, make much ado about nothing and seek to gain notoriety with their nonsense. It may please them; it will not hurt us; and the only objection we would offer to their work is that it would make that grand instrument ridiculous which is now and ought to remain the pride of every American citizen.

NATURAL BUT NOT MAGNANIMOUS

THAT was a pretty "rough" interview between the retiring and incoming Governors of Nebraska on Monday—not rough in the sense of being hard, uneven, or any other of the dictionary definitions, but simply so because devoid of the customary amenities, and characterized by acerbity on one side at the beginning, with mutual asperities and ranklings at the close.

It seems that, on being apprised of Governor Thayer's willingness to surrender the place to him, Governor Boyd at once set out for Lincoln, and without ado or delay presented himself at the executive office for the purpose of taking charge. Being met at the threshold by the outgoing official, Thayer inquired, politely enough, after the other's physical condition, at the same time extending his hand.

But Boyd gave no answer and refused the proffered olive branch. "Do I understand that you refuse to shake hands with me?" said Thayer. "You may so understand it," replied Boyd. "Very well, it is a matter of the utmost indifference to me," said Thayer, as he retired.

It is scarcely worthy of question by even the most ardent Republican that Governor Boyd had grounds for feeling somewhat sore over the treatment he had received at the hands of his opponent—the latter, by the bye, having but little support at the hands of his own party and only abdicating thus early by reason of the direct pressure brought to bear upon him by his attorneys.

Of course the present executive has been put to great annoyance, inconvenience and expense, to say nothing of humiliation, and all with but slight if any foundation, for which the ex-official was personally to blame. And yet it hardly seems in accordance with advanced methods and the most approved sentiment to utterly refuse a tender of friendship, or a mark of courtesy, even though such tender was only making a virtue of necessity and was in fact a hollow-hearted pretense. However, Governor Boyd understands the situation better than we do, and he certainly knows his own mind, as past events have abundantly shown.

EDMUNDS ON THE POLITICAL DRIFT

EX-SENATOR EDMUNDS, of Vermont, has an article in the *Forum* for February under the suggestive title of "Perils of Our National Elections." He maintains that practices that were rare or unknown in our early history are becoming more and more common, "whereby injustice and unrepugnant advantages are sought and gained." He predicts that if the point shall be reached when "these practices of chicanery in politics shall have poisoned the communities of the majority, or even a less number of the States, there will be an end of the liberties of the people." He contends that true liberty is opposed to fraud and injustice, as truth is to falsehood. Of course, everybody ought to know that, but some people are not impressed by a self-evident truth unless it is asserted by some person who has become notable.

The astute statesman throws himself loose as he contemplates the national political drift, and says substantially that when that point of degradation to which he refers is reached, the votaries of such methods as those defined by him should throw off all disguise or pretense to rectitude and join in an