

who have heretofore held offices and are anxious to attain to their old positions?

Perhaps the President will not fully appreciate the compliment that is now sought to be paid him by this request to warm up the official soup formerly prepared by President Arthur, and dole it out to the public. In our opinion he will prefer to supply the article fresh. The old stuff is too sour and stale.

There are a few obstacles in the way of the prospects of the office hunters whom Sam. Gilson is seeking to thrust into prominence. One is the manner in which they are going to work. The petition business in that connection is getting to be viewed as decidedly unsavory, and if a man wants to spoil his chances for office, all he has to do, as a rule, is to induce his friends to circulate a paper of that kind for presentation to the appointing power. It has generally come to be understood that a great many people will sign anything, no matter for what purpose. That class very rarely takes the trouble even to peruse the heading of the paper to which they affix their names. Some again are ever ready and willing to do it "to oblige Benson." Others are in mortal terror of giving offense should they fail to do as requested in that regard, notwithstanding that they often, in attaching their signatures to such appeals, offend their own good judgment—providing they have any, which is of course an open question. If they had they would most likely act upon it.

We were somewhat amused to read in a contemporary the following comment:

"The NEWS last evening devoted its first editorial column to an argument showing that the movements for appointments to Federal offices in Utah mean at bottom simply a war on the receiver and his attorneys."

This is an egregious error, being the opposite of the position taken by us, and to be correct it should have been stated as follows: "The movements for the war on the Receiver and his attorneys meant, at bottom, a scheme to get Federal offices." Evidence to that effect was offered during the investigation into the conduct of the Receiver and his attorneys, but Examiner Harkness declined to admit it. Therefore the explosion of the plot behind the war on the Receiver and his attorneys had to be delayed until now, when it is made plain to the gaze of

the whole public, the petitions being the smoke of the conspiracy. It has a rank political odor, and is suggestive of the *finale* of the present attempt on the part of certain "active politicians" to carry the Federal offices for the Territory of Utah by storm. The storming process was only resorted to on the failure of the conspirators to spring a mine under the present official incumbents.

We must give the contemporary referred to some credit for the following statement in a late issue associated with the same subject:

"While gentlemen here are making arrangements to ask for the various Federal appointments, we think they would do well to keep in mind the fact that there is no probability of President Harrison dismissing any office-holder in Utah, except for direct cause. If it can be shown him that any officer has failed in his duty, or is incapacitated to perform well the duties of his office, the President will probably move promptly to correct the evil; otherwise, he will adhere strictly to the theory in practice of civil service reform, and that he will not dismiss any officer simply because he is a Democrat and for the sole purpose of putting a Republican in his place. We suspect that President Harrison will be quite as strict on this point as was President Cleveland at the beginning of his term, and that officers who have been faithful to their trusts need have no apprehension of being removed during the term for which they were appointed."

This is in further confirmation of the theory—it is beyond a theory, being the actual fact—that a war upon the Receiver and his attorneys, in the hope of implicating the Supreme Court, had for its ulterior object the obtaining of the Federal offices in this Territory. True there is a conviction that General Harrison will not act rashly in the matter of removals and appointments, but with due consideration. It is improbable that men will be subjected to summary removal simply because they are Democrats. This would be opposed to the genius of legislation upon that subject.

This very conviction regarding the probable course of the incoming President, in the estimation of the "active politicians" or political disturbers of this Territory, made an assault upon the present office holders necessary, in the hope of, by hook or by crook, showing that those who are now in position had "failed" in their duty; or are "incapacitated to perform well the duties" of their offices.

That is the whole business in a nutshell.

GLADSTONE'S SPEECH.

THE press telegrams a few days ago contained the synopsis of a speech made in the House of Commons March 1 by Mr. Gladstone. It was upon the address in reply to the Queen's speech at the opening of the present session, and was quite lengthy. Of course the veteran statesman, while nominally attacking the government's position at all points, apostrophized the question nearest his heart—home rule for Ireland—and made it the burden of his theme. He doubtless realizes that in the natural order of things he cannot look for his lease of life to be greatly extended, and wants to crown his work with the consummation of the purpose which he has had in view for so many years past; and to permit other subjects to engross, or even occupy a considerable portion of his attention now, would be to diminish his labors and effectiveness in the desired direction.

It is not, perhaps, putting it too strongly to pronounce the effort a masterpiece. Any synopsis furnishes at best but an imperfect presentation of a prolonged oratorical and argumentative effort; but even the synopsis in this instance is fervid, earnest, systematic and analytical; between the lines we seem to read the words omitted and catch something of the orator's impetuosity and force. It must have been even greater than we conceive it to be by such methods when such a newspaper as the *London Telegraph*—notably conservative and independent in its utterances—says of it that it was historical; that Gladstone was on the war-path and his attack on the Liberal-Unionists was tremendous. It also says that "there was the great force of invective and sarcasm of the great master." During the speech Joseph Chamberlain, well known in and connected with this country by marriage, smiled nervously and glanced furiously at Gladstone. The peroration was spoken in the character of a prophecy, telling of the wrath to come, with resonance of voice and flashing eyes, and "It seemed," says the *Telegraph*, "like another Isaiah crying woe to the high places of Jerusalem. His last words gave signs of the coming dawn. He finished his speech amidst a tempest of cheers."

This, in a man past eighty years of age, can only be regarded as a most wonderful performance, physically, mentally and otherwise. Those of his opponents who have