

because of their hostility to anything that does not promise to feather their nests, are, virtually, arguments in favor of the proposition.

We confess that we are not in any raptures over this half-way measure of political liberty. We agree, in the main, with the sentiments of both Republicans and Democrats as well as some conservative "Liberals," that statehood would be preferable to this unique piece of special legislation. If Utah has arrived at a condition which renders her fit for local self-government, why not grant it at once? That seems to be the most rational view of the question.

However, we are not urging statehood at present. Although we believe that in every respect, without a single exception, the Territory is fully entitled to admission and is fit for the responsibilities and duties of a sovereign State, we are aware of the prejudices that exist, and the doubts that linger in the popular mind, and we are in no hurry to press the claims of Utah upon Congress or the country. We think we can all afford to wait awhile for the liberty that is sure to come.

But this bill does not mean statehood. It does not liberate the Territory from that Federal control which "Liberals" at home and anti-"Mormons" abroad allege to be necessary. It simply gives the voting citizens of Utah power to elect the officers of the Territory who are now appointed without their choice or consent. It abolishes the Utah Commission, but what difference would that make, except that a useless expense would be saved to the Government, and an unrepugnant exorcism would be removed from the body politic? Is there anybody here who sincerely believes the Commission is of the least real use or benefit, or that the services it performs could not be rendered at less than one tenth the present cost?

Supposing the bill should pass, which we think very unlikely, what would be the results to the non-"Mormon" population of the Territory? Would the Church be given any more power than it possesses today? If so we cannot see what it would be. The contest would be between the Democrats and the Republicans, and unless the "Liberal" faction dissolved, the Democrats would gain possession of most of the offices. With the dissolution of that faction the Republican vote would be greatly increased, there is no telling to what extent, because there is yet a great number of late People's party voters who have not cast in their lot with either of the national parties.

We believe that the Democrats favor

this measure, largely because they see a good chance in it to hold control of the Territory and shape it for a Democratic State. We believe the "Liberals" are so violently opposed to it and misrepresent it so flagrantly, because they see in it the certain end of their faction, without delay. In a territorial election they hold no prominence. They could not elect a single officer. They would have to divide and their organization would collapse. The rampant leaders and those who profit by its continuance are, of course, furious over a measure that threatens their discomfiture.

If the opponents of statehood who base their objections on the ground that Federal control of the Territory must not at present be relinquished were sincere, they would hail this bill with delight. For, while it gives to the people some semblance to a republican form of government, it yet leaves the National Government all the "supreme control," the "absolute sovereignty," and the right to make such "rules and regulations respecting the Territory" which it is claimed is vested in the Federal power by the Constitution. In this to us lies its chief objection, but why our opponents should object to it is difficult to determine, on any other hypothesis than their utter insincerity and their determination to fight anything that does not promise to put the "Liberal" bosses in control of Utah.

THE NEW CASTLE GARDEN.

It appears that though Castle Garden is no longer a landing place for immigrants, yet its name will survive in connection with the importation of raw material for American citizenship. For some time the United States Government has had absolute control of all matters pertaining to immigration. The propriety of continuing Old Castle Garden as a landing place has long since been abandoned. The government looked for a more suitable place and found it on Ellis Island, not far from the old ground. Buildings were erected, and all the necessary appliances for a fully equipped immigrant bureau established. On New Year' day the first immigrant was landed on the island, or, as it is now called, the New Castle Garden. By arrangement it was decided that the first person to land should receive a \$10 gold piece, and a hearty three cheers from the officials. When the gang plank was laid from the tender to shore two immigrants endeavored to step on at the same time. One was Annie Moore, a girl of 15, and a native of Cork, Ireland. The other was a big

German, named Herman Zipki, who, as described by the New York papers, "had a shawl twisted thirty or forty times around his neck." But Miss Moore got ahead of him and now enjoys the distinction of being the first to land at the New Castle Garden, of having received three cheers, a hearty welcome and a \$10 gold piece.

Charles M. Hendley, private secretary to the late Mr. Windom, came all the way from Virginia to be present at the opening. He asked Col. Webber to be permitted as a favor to register the first arrival. And he it was who immortalized himself and Annie Moore in the annals of the Immigration Bureau. Little Annie was much surprised. She had heard "fairy tales" of American wealth, greatness and hospitality, but her experience on Ellis Island seemed to confirm them.

FINANCIAL DEPRESSION IN ENGLAND

GREAT dissatisfaction prevails in England towards the protection laws of this country. Great Britain is at present experiencing an important crisis in her financial and trade interests. Business in that country is unprecedentedly dull. Domestic as well as foreign trade is in a serious condition. Railroads are not paying their usual dividends. In the iron and coal mining districts the people are on the verge of starvation. Land values are depreciating to an alarming extent. According to the figures of the 1891 census, very nearly 2,000,000 people in England and Wales are receiving relief as paupers. Foreign commerce has dwindled almost to insignificance. This is a feature of the depression which causes most concern; because the whole economic policy of England tended to the advancement, development and extension of that branch of her industries. Of course there are many reasons given for this state of things, but that principally dwelt on is the protection policy adopted by many European countries as well as the United States. Speaking directly on this issue the London *Financial Times* says:

"It is to be hoped that the American people will tear up the McKinley law, root and branch, and signs are not wanting that it will come about. The Welsh manufacturers have strong-sided champions in Chicago and elsewhere."

While the Ohio election was in progress the Manchester *Examiner* said:

"Mr. McKinley's success will encourage the establishment of tin plate and other industries, while his defeat would have a discouraging effect on the friends of the tariff. Foreign manufacturers could well afford, under these circumstances, to contribute the sum named in the *Record's* dispatch to bribe about Mr. McKinley's defeat."