

a Bishop of that denomination, and pleading with the presbytery of that body for the adoption of religio-political anti-"Mormon" resolutions. This week he figures as "Duke of Utah," and, as a burlesque actor of no mean pretensions, doing homage to the carnival Rex. It is difficult to tell in what new role Governor-Bishop-Duke Thomas will next appear, and an anxious public will only have to wait in patient expectation.

Doubtless the latest title of "Arthur Duke of Utah" tickles the governor all over for he has aspirations to grasp prerogatives that belong only to autocrats, being such as absolute monarchs, princes, and feudal dukes wield where the masses are held in semi-slavery. To prove the existence of this proclivity one has only to point to his recommendation contained in his last official report to the Secretary of the Interior—that the power to elect all county officers in Utah be taken from the people and they be made appointive by "some Federal authority." The "Federal authority" referred to was of course Arthur, Duke of Utah. This has been demonstrated by the bill for an act now pending in the Senate—of which he disingenuously claimed to have heard nothing while in Washington—to create him a more than feudal Duke of this Territory.

Reverting again to the scene at Ogden, it may be well for our readers to take a teaspoonful of sal soda before perusing the account of it, to prevent nausea, otherwise such conditions may arise from the contemplation of the picture as may necessitate the administration of copious doses of *Sun cholera* mixture. It was to be expected that many ordinary and some extraordinary people would catch the carnival spirit and fall prone at the feet of the "counterfeit presentment" of royalty, but to behold the chief executive of the Territory in that prostrate condition was almost beyond intelligent conception. But, of course, as there are wide diversities of individuals there will always be a wide disparity of views in relation to what constitutes true dignity, and regarding the eternal fitness of things.

Taken as a whole, the entire exhibit shows a tendency toward the frivolous and unsubstantial that is not promising. Such manifestations of popular bent will draw the line strongly between the light-minded and the solid. We trust that

the visitors, as visitors, will receive a kindly and cordial welcome, but so far as participating in the frivolous burlesque now being enacted is concerned, the propriety of it does not appear to us to be a matter of question. Had the invitation tendered to the strangers been of the usual character, devoid of the grotesque absurdities associated with it, no dignity would have been lost, and the visitors could have been as kindly and hospitably entertained. As it is, let them be treated with all due consideration and all needful steps be taken for their comfort during their sojourn in our beautiful city. All this could have been better done, however, apart from the conditions of a gigantic joke.

THE TWO GREAT PARTIES OF THE DAY.

THE Republican party has given to the country many proofs that it is a party of force, determination and policy. Whatever it resolves to do it endeavors to accomplish, irrespective of present obstacles or of former views or attitudes. As Senator Ingalls would say, "to get there," is its object, and it permits nothing that it can remove or suppress to stand in its way.

Of late years it has adopted many principles and ideas that were once supposed to be the particular and peculiar property of the Democrats. If necessary to success it would adopt many others. It is thus progressive and, if apparently inconsistent in principle, this line of policy is consistent with its general course.

The line of demarcation between the two great political parties of the nation, so far as political doctrine goes, is quite thin and rather indefinite. The two organizations are as hostile as ever. But each has absorbed theories that were held by the other, and there are few essential differences of opinion between them.

There are Republican free traders and Democratic protectionists. And neither party would now advocate a complete policy on either principle. A modified tariff is the end sought to be reached by both Republicans and Democrats in Congress, and the difference between them is rather one of details than of principle. Of course each party misrepresents and exaggerates the views and acts of the other. But tariff reform, not free trade, was attempted when the Democrats were in power, and tariff reform, not

general protection, is now advocated by the Republicans. Mills and McKinley both work for a reduction of duties, not for their abolition or their imposition upon all imports. What they fight about is the manner in which the common end shall be reached, and the articles that should be relieved or protected.

So in regard to the doctrine of local self-government—an essentially Democratic doctrine. The party that has preached it for a century has gone back on it as it relates to the Territories, adopting the extreme Republican notion of the supreme power of Congress and other anti-Democratic ideas.

On the other hand many Republicans have become advocates of the rights of individual States, as against the encroachments of Federal authority in certain directions, while maintaining generally the principle of centralization and the power of the Nation, as a strong Government in the full sense of the word, and not a mere aggregation of independent States.

But whatever the Republican party adopts as a policy it perseveres in carrying out, and hence its advantage in a conflict with its old-time political opponent. The Democratic party lacks the courage, the will, the unity and the determination of its well organized enemy. And while it embodies the fundamental principles of republican government, it fails of its purposes and becomes an easy prey to its more vigorous if less principled foe.

The passage of the federal elections bill, and also of the Wyoming and Idaho admission bills, affords illustrations of the ways and methods of the two parties. The Republican party resolved on these measures. It went to work, straightway, determined to "get there" in spite of everything. The right or wrong of the matter, the constitutionality of the power conferred upon election officials, or the question as to whether the Territories named had sufficient population and other qualifications under existing rules, were not counted at all when the purpose was concluded and the policy was decided upon.

Let what may be said about individuals of the two parties combining to make States of Idaho and Wyoming, the fact is apparent that their admission is a Republican measure for party ends. Idaho goes in with its restricted suffrage constitution and its infamous test oath