

but it is said he claims that Powers made them out and he signed them. Powers, it is understood, lays the blame on Hiles. Hiles would scarcely proclaim in court that he was ignorant himself of the rules of pleading.

It is a very pretty quarrel, and may develop some more libel suits, or at any rate the exhibition of bad blood, the issue of which might be beneficial to some of the Tuscororas before they start for Chicago, particularly if the stories of the amount of fire-water and kindred liquids already provided for the trip are in any degree authentic. The Tuscs depart with a bad defeat as an omen.

#### A PLAIN CASE.

THE interview with Mr. John Morgan which will be found in our issue of today, explains the true inwardness of the Utah situation at Minneapolis. It was just as we understood but additional details are given which make the matter very plain.

The pretended satisfaction with which the defeated "Liberals" regard the result is not very creditable to their good sense. Their veracity is always questionable. But they ought to be shrewd enough if not truthful enough to make at least an appearance of consistency. What they really obtained was an empty honor, the mere shadow of the substance which fell to the lot of the regular Republicans. If there had been any intention to give the "Liberals" real recognition they would have had the national committeeman. This place being given to the Republicans settles the question as to which party is recognized in national affairs.

The including of C. C. Goodwin of the *Tribune* in the committee to inform President Harrison of his renomination, it will be seen, was a courtesy extended by the regular delegates, Messrs. Salisbury and Cannon. We regard it as a mistake, because it will not be appreciated in its true spirit, and will be misrepresented by the very persons whom it was intended to please.

There is now only one course for consistent men in this Territory calling themselves Republicans to take. That is to drop local factional disputes and unite under the recognized Republican organization. If the men sent to Minneapolis by the "Liberal" organization act in good faith on their return, they will advise this and be followed by all the decent men that belong to it. The lower elements, which are nothing if not anti-Mormon and malignant, can go their way and fight the wind and live on the carcasses of dead feuds as long as they can hold out. What they may do will not count in the sum of Utah's future affairs.

#### NOT THAT KIND A MAN.

The following is self-explanatory:  
*Editor Deseret News:*

"A man calling himself 'Charles Ellis,' and saying that he had been lecturing through Utah and in Salt Lake Theatre, has been in Leadville, Colorado, recently denouncing the Mormons. Do you know if he was the Charles Ellis who has been so long fighting the Liberal party?"

CRIZZAN.

The person to whom our correspondent refers is not Mr. Charles Ellis who is so well known to the public on account of the lectures he has delivered here and in other parts of Utah, on local subjects. It is fair to presume, however, that, for some reason at present unexplainable, the man at Leadville personated the gentleman with whose name the Utah public is so familiar. This presumption is based on the fact that no other person named Ellis except the latter has delivered lectures in this city. We have information as to the identity of the perpetrator of this mean deception, who circulated, while in Leadville, a large amount of absurd anti-"Mormon" slander. We are in possession of information to the effect that his name is E. C. Ellis, and that he is employed as an agent for an eastern firm which deals extensively in patent medicines.

The following is a description of him, furnished by Messrs. J. R. Stephen and H. J. Benson, of Leadville, both of whom heard him (tell) his anti-"Mormon" tale: "He has a short goatee; will weigh between 175 and 180 pounds; has one or two fingers off one hand—think it is the right; is full faced; has gray hair and beard; has two front teeth out."

We presume that our correspondent will be satisfied, from the foregoing, that the Leadville fraud is a very different kind of a man from the Charles Ellis who has struck so many telling stalwart blows for justice in behalf of the majority of the people of Utah.

#### BUTLER'S BOOK.

GENERAL BENJAMIN F. BUTLER in his recent work, "Butler's Book," gives a graphic account of the Democratic conventions of 1860. He was a delegate from Massachusetts to the Charleston convention, which was presided over by Caleb Cushing. He says:

"Having become satisfied that there was danger of an attempt to sever the union of the States upon the slavery question, I sedulously devoted myself to an endeavor to keep the peace, and keep the Democratic party together, because I looked to that as the only source of safety to the Union. Upon the slavery question Mr. Douglas was the leader of that part of the convention which advocated the principle known as 'squatter sovereignty,' that is, the right of a people who settle in any part of the territory of the United States, to organize themselves under such laws precisely as they choose to enact, and then to be admitted into the Union without being subjected by Congress to any conditions or any provision as to freedom or slavery in their statehood."

Gen. Butler did not fully endorse the "squatter sovereignty" idea. He believed that the time had come when another slave State could not enter the Union under any conditions. He also believed that Congress should retain power of admission over new States. The committee on resolutions of the Charleston convention consisted of thirty three members, of whom Gen. Butler was one. Sixteen of these favored the Douglas platform. Sixteen others were in favor of leaving the question of slavery as a State institu-

tion to be decided by the Supreme Court. Butler did not favor either. The decision of the "Dred Scott" case illustrated what the result would be should that court be made arbiter. It "satisfied neither party, and was decided by one and tramped upon by the other."

Here Butler endeavored to act the part of compromiser. He introduced a resolution, which was the exact platform of the Cincinnati National Democratic convention of 1859, and on which Buchanan was elected.

The result was that these reports were presented to the convention, one a Douglas platform, another anti-Douglas, and a third the Cincinnati platform pure and simple. Each of the sixteen members on both sides spoke in favor of their respective platforms, and finally the doughty general, got the floor to speak for his minority report of one. To his surprise he carried the convention, and with the exception of South Carolina his resolutions were adopted. This caused the Carolina delegation to secede, leaving the hall in body. The convention then adjourned for dinner, on reassembling balloting began. Butler voted seven times for Douglas, and on the eighth ballot voted for Jefferson Davis, and continued to do so on 56 subsequent ballots when the convention resolved to adjourn, and meet again at Baltimore on June 18.

The "Squatter Sovereignty" platform came up again at Baltimore, then Caleb Cushing, who was presiding, vacated the chair and withdrew from the Convention. Several Southern delegates also withdrew; even Butler himself left. Finally Douglas got the nomination, and the seceders organized a Convention of their own.

#### "NO COMPROMISE."

JUST before his departure for Chicago last night, the head of the "Liberal" party announced that, like the Spartan youth going to war, he would return with his shield or upon it. Of course this is not the exact language of the "boss;" his time has been too much absorbed by the stricter commonplaces and more practical affairs of life to admit of reading up on the classics; but he gave expression to an idea conveying as much, only, in his case, it sounded a great deal more like sheer buncombe than the declaration of a determined and courageous man. "There would be no compromise accepted," he also said. Very well.

If we are not mistaken, similar language was used by the head of the other wing of the "Liberal" party, when he also was contemplating a political pilgrimage east. There must be no half loaf in the matter—it was worse than no bread, because involving a sacrifice of principle. And yet, as the sequel shows, he and his colleague on that errand were very—awfully—glad to go in at the rear entrance of the convention when it was half over, take such seats as they could find, receive no other recognition than their half vote each, obtain no mention in the official record, and finally be ignored altogether by the National Committee, the little honor that was subsequently bestowed upon the gentleman particularly spoken of being the generous gift of his two successful opponents.