

referred to were the Greenbackers of 1880 and the Anti-monopolists of 1884, both of which had no reasonable hope of effecting anything, and are only remembered now because they held their convention at Chicago.

Baltimore was the convention city of other days. It has a record of sixteen national events of this kind, but we can remember only four successes, namely Van Buren, in 1835; Polk, in 1844; Pierce, in 1852, and Lincoln in 1864. Cincinnati had six conventions and only two triumphs, Buchanan in 1856 and Hayes in 1876. Philadelphia had four conventions but only two victories, Taylor in 1848 and Grant in 1872.

The method of procedure differs somewhat in Republican and Democratic national conventions. In the former, as a general rule, individual members make the unit rule in voting, while in the latter the State delegation is the unit in voting. But in the Democratic organizations the two-thirds rule generally prevails, so that if two-thirds of the New York delegation voted in caucus for Hill, the whole delegation would be cast for him in the convention. In some cases a majority was deemed sufficient to carry the unit rule. The successful candidate for the nomination must also obtain a two-thirds vote of all the members composing the convention.

#### MITREPRESENTATION ABOUT MEXICO.

In another column will be found a card from Mr. A. J. Stewart, whose name has become prominent in connection with Mexican colonization. Mr. Stewart emphatically denies that his work has anything to do with "Mormon" settlement of that country. This has become necessary because the matter has been so much misrepresented by the press of the United States.

We have explained this several times. If a "Mormon" buys a ranch in Mexico, it is proclaimed all over the country that there is a "Mormon" exodus from Utah. If a "Mormon" becomes connected with any scheme to obtain concessions for any settlers in that country, the conclusion is jumped at at once that the "Mormon" Church is making arrangements to colonize the country, and press dispatches are sent to that effect in every direction.

Mr. Stewart has been engaged for some time in colonization projects and has obtained favorable concessions, so he informs us, from the Mexican Government, of a large tract of land at Santa Rosalie on the Conchos river, near the Mexican Central railway. To fill his portion of the contract he has to locate 500 colonists in families within ten years, of these, fifteen per cent only are to be Mexicans. He can give easy terms to families wishing to obtain land and make homes in that country. He is in the city and will give information to all who desire it.

Our object in mentioning the matter is to make it clear that this is not a "Mormon" Church project, nor a "Mormon" colonization scheme in any sense. It is solely and purely a personal speculation on the part of Mr. Stewart. It is his right to engage in it,

but it must not be regarded as authorized or participated in by the Church or its authorities.

It becomes necessary to emphasize this, because even some of our home papers give it the color of a "Mormon" arrangement. The Ogden Post on Wednesday, headed a long account of Mr. Stewart's project with: "THE MORMON COLONIES." And though there is nothing in the remarks attributed to Mr. Stewart to encourage the idea, yet the tenor of the whole article is to make it appear that the Santa Rosalie settlements are to be "Mormon" colonies, which is a great mistake.

If any "Mormon" people choose to go there, of course they will have the same rights and privileges as non-"Mormons" will. Europeans and Mexicans of any sect or party may settle there; only, the Mexicans must not number more than fifteen per cent. of the population.

We hope there will be no further misunderstanding or misrepresentation of this matter. There are, no doubt, many parts of the elevated regions in Mexico that offer desirable openings for settlement. But the "Mormon" Church is not engaged in gaining concessions or shipping colonies to that country, nor is there any intention of making an exodus from the fair valleys of Utah, for here we expect to stay and build up a grand and prosperous State in the great American Union.

#### THE UTAH DELEGATES AT MINNEAPOLIS.

THE seating of the bogus Republican delegates in the Minneapolis convention does not seem to give satisfaction to any class or faction in Utah. To a large extent it leaves the dispute which it was hoped would be settled, wide open for further bickering. There will be no stability to political affairs in Utah while the "Liberal" cabal continues. As soon as that disturbing element is moved, a square and general division will take place between all the Democrats and Republicans of this Territory, and politics will settle down to the conditions that prevail elsewhere.

The seating of the regular delegates gives them the pre-eminence. They go in with the prestige of straight and recognized representatives. They have places on the committees. They stand in the front rank. The others though admitted will really occupy a sort of secondary place. Their admission is a kind of quasi recognition. It is a sop to quiet them, and given to placate the faction that claims to be Republican, so as not to lose their fealty to the party in the time of coming need. But it shows a weakness on the part of the credentials committee, and a failure to fully comprehend the situation in Utah and the necessity for a settlement of our local difficulties. But the political significance of the movement is plain. The majority of the committee are Harrison men. It was given out that the regular Republican delegates from Utah were Blaine supporters, and that the "Liberals" were for Harrison. The latter were therefore admitted to neutralize the vote of the former. That is politics. But it

is short-sighted politics. For, if by preventing Blaine from scoring two points in the convention they should lose this Territory to the party, the actual and permanent gain would not be very perceptible.

The "Liberal" organ in this city is furious over the failure of the bogus delegates to get full recognition. Its editor is one of them. He is not conspicuous as a political success. But his paper, as is its custom when rattled, spits venom in every direction, and assails the party which it pretends to support, as follows:

"It is a poor delusion, one that we see no defense for in any precedent, reason or sense. It was, apparently, one of those odious compromises by which baleful principles sometimes creep into good company, and by virtue of hypocrisy and gall are accepted as of the same worth as truth and loyal service. It is the partial thrusting upon us here of a villainy as odious as was the villainy underlying the passage of the fugitive slave law, which sought to make every free man in this land a slave-catcher; as monstrous as the dictum of the Supreme Court that a black man had no rights which a white man was bound to respect. In the place of the absolute triumph which we had every right in precedent and loyalty to expect, we are given this wretched evasion. It is a scandal for which the Republican party is sure to be put on the defensive and repent in sackcloth and ashes.

The convention has sustained the report of the credentials' committee, though Delegate Frank Cannon made a gallant fight against it. His speech will be found in our press dispatches. Each delegate will have but half a vote, the bogus delegates receiving the same privilege. It is a pity that the contest was not decided on its merits; that would have saved considerable trouble in the future. But the Republican party of Utah, organized on the division movement, will, we are confident, stand its ground, and will not be injuriously affected by the outcome at Minneapolis.

#### A LADY LAWYER.

THE opponents of woman's advancement above the condition of a household fixture, not to say drudge, will feel much scandalized, no doubt, over the admission on Wednesday of a woman to the bar of the Supreme Court of Utah. Miss Emma R. Lye, who has been for some time in the office of Judge Sutherland, one of our most thorough and learned lawyers, was admitted after an examination which was pronounced very satisfactory. This is the first lady lawyer, we believe, who has had this distinction, although one or two have been admitted to practice in the District Courts.

There is no good reason why a lady should not be a lawyer if she has a legal mind and the ability to learn and practice law. There are cases in which a woman could consistently appear before the courts and in which their advocacy would be more appropriate than that of a male attorney.

It is not probable that because now and then we have a modern Portia the field of the law will be invaded by women. Nor would the study and advocacy of jurisprudence necessarily make a woman any the less feminine