PRESIDENT AND HAWAII.

He Stands on Higher Ground Than That of Mere Intrigue.

And Will Undoubtedly Do Justice to the Decisions of the Tribunals by Both Congress and the Nation.

DESERET NEWS BUREAU,
49 H. ST., N. W.,
Washington, Dec. 21.

Now that the Hawaiian matter has been considerably discussed in Congress, and the President's message with accompanying documents has been spread before the country, the public mind is beginning to shape itself into the form of a definite expression on the whole case. It is clear the President is say just as he, throughout the whole affair, (more) rather to the other second thought of the people than to the first flush of feeling that would arise in the love of territorial extension and national aggrandizement. The American people are naturally aggressive, and their patriotic aspirations have thus far received no serious repulse; but there is, nevertheless, an underlying sentiment of justice and right, and when that sentiment is appealed to, it gives no uncertain response; and it likely to cure greatly lost for technical discriminations and refined distinctions there in the West of Congress.

It has been the earnest hope of opposition leaders to get the President into a hole, the deeper the better. They have already enveloped him, as they suppose, in a cloud of technical and constructive embarrassments, but they have not observed that the President has spread out his cause on far broader grounds than they have endeavored to compass. He has been accounting for his action on the score of justice and fairdealing in their broadest application to human affairs, while the opponents have endeavored to identify him in relation to the devious and crooked zigzagging maxims of diplomacy and statecraft. They have thought to achieve a victory by showing him to have violated some minor rule of governmental etiquette, but the people have been framing their verdict in the light of general principles and universal justice.

It is concerning a great deal when the opposition concede that the intervention of Mr. Stevens is entirely indefensible, that he plotted and conspired with the revolutionists, was an accessory before the fact and existence, that only by his unwarranted intervention was revolution possible, that no power but that of the United States overawed the dusky queen, that the trains was laid and fired by the diplomatic agency of the American government. It is evident, too, that great haste was shown in consummating the transaction; but little time was consumed in deliberation; the public mind was not in the least enlightened; and the public judgement was completely forestalled by the grandeur of acquisitions of valuable and valuable national consequence. Our territorial possessions were suddenly enlarged; but the fraud, intimidation, chicanery and injustice of the procedure were kept carefully out of view.

Now that Cleveland has exposed the enormousness of the whole business, it seems scarcely less than boldness; and the country thoroughly understands that a wrong was perpetrated, a wrong which seems to lack in magnanimity what it requires in infamy by being wrought against a weak, confiding and defenseless nation. Had the same wrong been perpetrated against one of the leading nations of the world, there would have been a greater seeming of justification.

But the opposition are swift, not only to dismiss the Stevens episode, but to condemn its irregularity and enormity. They are willing even to supplement the President's condemnation with additional disapproval; but they are quick to insist that a series of wrongs all at once culminate in an invincible political right. The President has recognized the wrong, and he has gone to the extent of what he conceives to be executive prerogative in attempting restitution. Not that he approves or disapproves any particular form of government, but that he sought to restore what was unjustly wrested from a feeble ruler by the intrigue of an American minister. It is here that the opposition chose their ground for a contest. Acknowledging the injustice of the previous administration through the unlawful intervention of Mr. Stevens, they challenge the President for exceeding his prerogatives in counseling a restoration.

As a matter of fact it is simple justice to rectify a wrong, and to make restitution of what was wrongfully wrested from another. So far it is clear that the President is undeserving of censure. Furthermore, the queen relinquished her powers under protest, and in the same instrument she appealed to the government of the United States to determine her rights in the premises. There may be a question as to how far and in what sense the executive department represents the government of the United States, but it is certain that the active, ostensible and visible government is embodied in the executive. The President has been careful to abstain from the use of force in achieving whatever purpose he had in view. His agency has been restricted within the lines of moral considerations and solicitary counsels. Having exerted his official prestige in three ways without accomplishing his wishes, he has laid the matter before Congress for further consideration and action.

It is not at all likely that his friends in Congress will endeavor to prosecute further the policy of restoration, however much they may think it would have been the proper solution, had it been accomplished through the subjects of Minister Willis. Had the wrong been rectified on the initiative of the President in entering the treaty of annexation, on which ratification the provisional government had promised to resign, it would have been a wonderful solution; but the persistency of the provisional government, or its merger into some more regulated form, takes a new hold and there will be no general disposition to reopen it. But in the office and deliberation of the President's course in the Hawaiian affair, there will be far more than enough to keep the opposition busy in Congress and among the partisans here to which he belongs by the opposition political leaders of the minorities in Congress in an impact and even the opposition diplomatic intrigue, rather than the

---

THE DEMON OF DRINK.

A Warning From Within the Very Shadow of the Gallows.

PITTSBURG, PA., and Shadyside, Dec. 8, 1893.—Gentlemen: my mother has recently received a letter, and Shadyside, the place where I was brought to the office of Hood's Sarsaparilla. Just lately a young man, named Samuel Nelson, was condemned to be hanged for murder. At the appointed time a large crowd had gathered outside the jail, as is usual in such cases, and mean. It was a miserably wet morning. The clouds were threatening and the rain, in point of age. A few minutes before the hangman, in the jailyard, a young man, named Henry Beale, who was standing in a corner, saw a man, named Nelson, and as he saw him with the sentence of death which was to be executed upon him, he took from the pocket of his bottle of whisky, but says he felt some sign of penitence and repentance in his life. After swallowing the liquor he said, the gentleman who had to that hundred and one times broke the law, said:

"I have sat in this jail, I think, I remember sitting one day."

As soon as he said the sentence which he was completely overcome with drink and was unfit to die. He failed to realize his future state of misery, but says he showed signs