

Now that Mr. McKinley has been successful, and the impossibility of a free-trade regime being inaugurated, English manufacturers are in a sad way.

It is natural to suppose that the masses of the British people begin to understand something about the economic policy being pursued by Germany, France, the United States and other countries. The result is that the principle of protection begins to take hold of the people, and already the practical beneficence of free trade begins to be questioned. The vast majority of England's imports consists of food supplies. Taxing these means dearer bread, and it looks as though protection in that direction would only aggravate the evil.

FIGHT IT FAIRLY.

THE "Liberal" assailants of the Utah bill still base their objections on the ground that, under its provisions, the United States will lose their right "to approve or condemn any statute that the Legislature may approve," and would have no more power to "legally interfere" in the affairs of the Territory than "to interfere in the purely local affairs of any State."

It would be surprising to hear such remarks as those if it were not customary with their authors to put in a wrong light everything of which they do not approve. They do not furnish their readers with the text of the bill, that they may examine it for themselves, but from a clipped and garbled summary they draw conclusions which the text will not warrant, and thus create the prejudice they desire.

The most direct answer to these statements about the power of the Government is contained in the Revised Statutes of the United States.

"Sec. 1850—All laws passed by the Legislative Assembly and Governor of the Territory * * * shall be submitted to Congress, and, if disapproved, shall be null and of no effect."

In the act of Congress of July 30th, 1896, in relation to special laws in the Territories, is the following provision:

"Sec. 6—That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to abridge the power of Congress to annul any law passed by a Territorial Legislature, or to modify any existing law of Congress requiring in any case that the laws of any Territory shall be submitted to Congress."

If the Utah bill should pass, is there anything in it which would deprive Congress of this power? Not a syllable. On the contrary, it contains provisions in recognition of that power and the supremacy of the Government in the affairs of the Territory. The Utah bill says:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary shall record and preserve all the laws and proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, and all the acts and proceedings of the Governor in the executive department. He shall transmit one copy of the laws and journals of the Legislative Assembly within thirty days after the end of each session thereof, to the President, and two copies of the laws, within like time, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the use of Congress. He shall transmit one copy of the executive proceedings on the first day of January in each year, to the President."

This is in conformity with the old Organic Act of the Territory. The truth is that although the bill would give to the people of Utah the right to elect certain officers who are now appointed by the President and Senate of the United States, this local government would be still a Territory to all intents and purposes with the same limitations and disabilities as ever, with the exception of the election of these officers. And in this we see the strongest objection to the measure. The very thing which the "Liberal" antagonists of the bill allege against it and which do not exist, would to us be arguments in its favor.

The proposition is to let the people of the Territory elect their own local officers and pay their salaries, instead of the Government doing so. But it retains the surveillance of Congress over the Legislature, the power of Congress to legislate directly in territorial affairs, and the operation of the Acts of Congress specially framed for Utah, with Federal courts and officers to enforce them. It also keeps Utah without representation in Congress and without a vote for national officers.

How then can it be urged that the bill takes away the right of the United States to approve or condemn any territorial statute? How can it be said that under it the Government could not interfere any more than "in the purely local affairs of any State?" Why do not the violent persons who attack the proposition in this way take pains to understand it?

There is no Statehood about it. Statehood would be postponed by it. The Territory would have a bill of over \$80,000 a year to foot, and it would still be no more than a Territory. None of the liberties of a State would be secured, except the right to elect its local officers. This we do not deny is worth a great deal. It is a modicum of liberty. It is a step forward. It might prove a prelude to the full chorus of freedom. It would cause a clear division on party lines of all the people in the Territory. It would shatter the "Liberal" faction. It would bring to more even numbers the Republicans with the Democrats.

But it contains no such provisions or

probabilities as those held up in *terrorem* by rabid writers who seem afraid lest the "Mormon" people should obtain the least particle of political liberty. And we most emphatically deny that the scheme was consented to, or considered by, or known to the "Mormon" people or their leaders before it was sprung upon the public by its introduction in the two Houses of Congress. Let the measure be criticized on its merits and demerits, but do not seek to defeat it by misrepresentation which is sure to fail of its object.

IN MEMORIAM.

WE gratefully acknowledge the receipt from the family of our esteemed friend, the late Bishop John Sharp, his portrait taken Nov. 30, 1881. It is one of Savage's best and everybody who has seen the splendid work executed at the Art Bazar knows how much that means. We shall prize this picture and preserve it with pleasure. The donors have our thanks as well as our sympathy.

THE LATE KHEDIVÉ EGYPT.

A DISPATCH last night announced the death from influenza of the Khedive of Egypt, Tewfik Pasha.

This gentleman was born in 1852, and obtained the throne of the land of the Pharaohs in 1879, when his father, Ismail Pasha, had been deposed by a decree of the Sublime Porte, dictated by the governments of the powers of Western Europe, then acting more harmoniously than they are now doing in the Chinese question.

It was a critical time for Egypt when Tewfik Pasha accepted the responsibilities of a Khedive. Egypt had been brought to the verge of bankruptcy and the European powers demanded satisfactory security for the loans the country had accepted. The treasury was empty. The army had not been paid for years, and the taxes were hardly sufficient to maintain the luxury of the palace and to bribe influential dignitaries in Constantinople. But Tewfik Pasha applied his whole energy to the difficult task before him. The friendly powers which had placed him on the throne used their influence in Constantinople to secure for Egypt a measure of independence. A decree of 1879 gave the Khedive the right to enter into customs and commercial treaties with foreign powers and to control entirely the finances of the country, and to maintain a regular army of 18,000 men. For these privileges he was to pay a yearly tribute of 150,000 Turkish beutels, or over \$3,000,000.