

report recently received at Washington, from a member of the commission engaged in the development and accomplishment of this hemispherical railroad, revives interest in the project once more.

As to the railway systems of Canada, the United States and Mexico they are already perfect in communication. But some time and thought were expended by the Commission in locating the most advantageous point of departure southward from Mexico. This point has been decided in favor of Ayutla on the frontier of Guatemala. The road will then proceed along the Pacific Coast, through Guatemala to Santa Anna in San Salvador, thence eastward to Guascoran in Honduras. It will cross over into Nicaragua, and intersect the proposed canal, then passing into Costa Rica will proceed southward to the Isthmus of Panama. The location at which the isthmus will be crossed is not yet determined, but it will enter the Aratro valley in Colombia, and then commence its South American route.

The main line will proceed through Columbia entering Ecuador, and passing by Quito and other towns will continue southward into Peru, thence to Bolivia as far as Huanchaca. From this point branches will be constructed into the Argentine Republic, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Chile.

The Chilean branch will terminate at some point on the Pacific. The Argentine branch, which has been already surveyed, will connect with the existing railway system of the country. The branch into Paraguay and Uruguay will connect with the railway systems of both countries, and bring Montevideo in direct railway communion with Chicago. The branch in Brazil will connect with the railway system of that country, and bring Rio de Janeiro within the international route.

A branch road will also be built from Bogota in Columbia, connecting with Venezuela, which country the main line does not touch. This shows that the Pan-American railway project has not expired. On the contrary, it is very much alive, and the governments of the South and Central American countries are taking active measures to complete it. It should be understood that most, if not all the existing systems of roads in these countries can be utilized for the perfection of the scheme. In some places it requires only the construction of comparatively small sections of road to connect the present systems in many of these countries. That the work will eventually be achieved seems to be a foregone conclusion.

### "SATISFACTORY EVIDENCES."

In the discussion of the question of statehood for Utah, it is frequently stated that should the enabling act proposed pass both houses of Congress, it would certainly be vetoed by the President. The ground advanced for this statement is the President's alleged opposition to such a measure, as set forth in his message to Congress. This is worth examining into with some care.

The probability of the passage of any bill relating to the political situation in Utah at this session of Congress is not very strong. We have expressed our impressions as to the fate of the Faulkner bill, and we have much doubt as to the success of the Teller bill. But we do not think the language of the President's message warrants the conclusion that the President would veto a bill for the future admission of Utah, if it gained the support of any considerable number of representative men of his own party.

The President did not say that "the power of Congress over Mormonism should not be surrendered," as is frequently reported in the discussion of this matter. He said, in reference to polygamy:

"The power of Congress over this subject should not be surrendered, until we have satisfactory evidence that the people of the State to be created would exercise the exclusive power of the State over this subject in the same way."

That is a very different thing. It is no more than what most of the leading men of both political parties have maintained for some time. From their standpoint it is consistent. But fair and magnanimous people, Democrats and Republicans, begin to concede that the "evidence" is "satisfactory." We believe that it can be made so to everybody but those who would oppose any measure of relief for Utah from political bondage, for fear it might be merciful to the "Mormons."

The proper place for provisions which would be "satisfactory evidence" on the ground desired, would be in the Constitution of the State. Not that there should be any unusual compact. The President expressed his opinion that such a compromise would not "be binding or effective." But the actual conditions of Utah, the course pursued by the Church and by the people, the improbability, aye impossibility, of a return to former conditions, with the restrictions and requirements that would form part of the State Constitution, would be all-sufficient to meet the demand.

These provisions ought not to be placed in an enabling act. But if it is

thought necessary, they can be inserted by way of amendment to the Teller bill. However, seeing that the State Constitution, after it is framed and voted on by the people, must pass the scrutiny of Congress and receive the endorsement of that body before it goes to the President, there appears to be no necessity for loading the enabling act with what does not belong to it, and no reasonable excuse for opposing the measure simply on the ground of the remote possibility of danger from polygamy.

The Teller bill puts off actual statehood for some time. Is not that delay sufficient? If not, let those who think so, move for an extension of the time. While the matter is before Congress why not make some final disposition of it, so as to suit reasonable people of all parties and factions? And, candidly, cannot the "evidence" be made "satisfactory" to Congress, to the President and to all rational persons concerned, that the obstacles in Utah's way have been removed, and that she will be thoroughly qualified, in a short time that might be specified, to take her place among the States of the Union, as a strength and a support and not a suspicion and a perplexity to the nation?

### AS TO THE EXPENSE.

THE out-and-out advocates of the Faulkner bill ridicule the objection offered against it on the ground of expense. They say the same objection would hold good against statehood; that home rule is always expensive; that it is worth all it would cost; and that nobody ought to be so sordid as to mention the price of it.

Well, there are at least two sides to the question. That the passage of the bill would entail great expense, to be met by additional taxation, its strongest supporters do not deny. That statehood would be just as much if not more expensive, also cannot be disputed. That the benefits of the latter would far exceed the cost, we believe will be generally conceded. And that only the sordid would object to it solely on account of the cost, we are not disposed to question.

But that the objectors to the Faulkner bill on the ground of its expense are open to this imputation, we think is a mistake. As we understand it, they would be willing to pay for it if the returns would be worth the money. They do not want to give something for nothing. They do not want to pay heavy taxes for comparatively small returns. If home rule were actually attainable under the measure called by