

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, DEC 21, 1887.

## THE "SUN" ON MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

If the New York *Sun's* description of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is to be credited, that noted personage, like most other great men, is somewhat peculiar. His eccentricity does not, it appears, run in the direction of conversational volubility on festive occasions. "He sat through the long dinner of the Chamber of Commerce at Delmonico's and listened to the flow of oratory and not the faintest indication of a smile or even interest flitted across his clear-cut features. Secretary Fairchild tried to engage him in conversation, and Mr. Depew, his next neighbor, seemed disposed to make things pleasant for the stranger. Mr. Chamberlain, with his gold-rimmed monocle stuck in his right eye, would show momentary interest in the courtesy of his two neighbors and relapse into his frozen state. He glared straight ahead like a soldier on dress parade."

Perhaps Mr. Chamberlain's thoughts were at work on far away subjects and he was unable to draw them in. He is evidently to center them upon feasting, frivolity and small talk. Had he poured himself out he would probably have been designated as a conversational monopolist. An occasional "brilliant flash of silence" is sometimes an indication of wisdom. The *Sun* should remember that one of the most popular Presidents of the United States was designated the "silent man." When Mr. Chamberlain gets upon his feet on the rostrum or elsewhere, to make a speech, he makes up for the lack of conversational loquacity.

Deliver us from that peculiar species of mortal whose talking apparatus is wound up to wag sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, an ability with which some of our local notables are credited with possessing. We rather congratulate the English statesman on his ability to hold himself in. Not long since we observed a somewhat amusing incident that illustrates the necessity of being able to hold still. A gentleman—one of the most amiable of mortals—who is somewhat noted among his acquaintances for the perpetual character of his conversation when he gets started, was on the sidewalk while his victim was in his buggy. A friend of both stepped out of his office and took in the situation at once. He cast a pitying glance at the victim and one of deprecation at the victimizer, at the same time exclaiming "O, let the man go." The joy of the relieved individual was expressed by the alacrity with which he took advantage of the opportunity the intercession offered him to make his escape.

Mr. Chamberlain has the reputation of being a worker, and it will not be denied that the habit of doing something useful is immeasurably ahead of the habit of saying something of the utility of which may be open to question, especially if the latter be repeated indefinitely in a tone and manner that would indicate that it was fresh from the mental mint of the profuse conversationalist.

## THE IDAHO DIVISION CASE.

The Territory of Idaho is in a somewhat similar position to Dakota as relates to division, not otherwise of course, for Dakota is clamorous for statehood and the former hasn't thought much of such a thing. There is a long strip of public and private domain which looks like a wedge on the map, and as though at one time Washington and Montana had been joined and this formation had been driven in between them and left there. This wedge is anxious to be annexed to Washington Territory, realizing, perhaps, that thereby it stands a good chance of becoming sovereign soil within a short time, while remaining with Idaho means territorial vassalage for an indefinite period yet. Delegate Voorhees, of Washington Territory, is earnestly engaged in the task of trying to get that slice tacked on to his dominions before statehood comes, while Delegate Dubois, of Idaho, is just as earnestly opposing the scheme. The two delegates are distantly related to each other, but that doesn't matter; family considerations, in this instance, have to give way to the public interests. Mr. Voorhees is actuated by the laudable purpose not only of disenthraling his people, but of slightly

advancing himself and his party in a political way that is, he would like to sit near his able father in the Senate chamber and have a vote as well as a voice in behalf of his constituents in the national councils. Washington is a very close Territory, politically considered, so close that the change of a few hundred votes will turn the tables completely. We believe the Delegate's majority at the last election was about 800. This is too close to rely upon. But the Idaho "panhandle" contains from 500 to 600 Democratic voters and very few Republicans, and with this added to Washington all doubts as to how the latter would go thereafter would be reduced to their lowest proportions. Mr. Voorhees is a Democrat of the most pronounced type, and the people where he lives must regard him as a good and proper man, or they could easily excommunicate him and his political objects. But why Dubois should oppose annexation is an unsolved mystery. It would make Idaho almost a tie politically, under the rascally test oath law which disfranchised 1,000 Democrats, and as his hopes of a re-election with the northern division remaining are reduced to a minimum, one would think he would act in concert with his relative and let the "panhandle" go.

## ASSAILING LAMAR.

The nomination of Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States is variously commented upon by our exchanges, some applauding, others condemning, and others still non-committal regarding the President's choice. This was to be expected, and it was also to be looked for that the opposition would come from Republican papers which still flout to the breeze what little of the tattered and ensanguined undergarment remains. To such an extent of virulence have some of them gone that they attempt to impeach the ex-Secretary's moral and personal character, showing, or rather trying to show, that he is a perjurer, a traitor and a knave, besides having no ability and but little experience. The *Chicago News* is one of the foremost of this class. It shows that "He is by nature and the environments of his life sentimental and effusive, in every way the antipodes of judicial and deliberate. As for legal attainments, he has none, his only practice of his profession being in the village of Oxford, Mass., before he was 30 years of age. It is needless to say that he never attained distinction as a lawyer. He went into Congress in 1856, and he has been an active politician ever since, except during a short period after the war, when he was a professor in some insignificant southern high school." All of which will be taken for what it is worth and that is very little, as Lamar's qualifications, both of a scholastic and legal nature, are known by people outside of Chicago to be unusually high. We very much question if Mr. James G. Blaine would concur fully in the *News'* verdict, for that gentleman has the reputation of being just to an opponent, and he will remember how, when both he and Lamar were in the House of Representatives, the latter gave him battle on a question involving one of the most abstruse positions of national and practical law and completely and fairly vanquished him, showing that the member from Mississippi was not only a legal philosopher but a ready and powerful debater. But the *News* goes on:

"Thus it appears that Mr. Lamar has neither the mental equipment nor experience to fit him for a seat on the supreme bench of the nation. But there are more serious objections to him. He swore support to the Constitution of the United States and deliberately and offensively broke his oath. He took up arms against the Constitution he was solemnly sworn to defend, and by every resource at his command sought the disintegration of the Union."

Just what part of the Constitution Mr. Lamar violated is not stated, and the assertion that he took up arms against it is an absurdity, an argument against all who espoused the doctrine of state rights which was abandoned about the time the government decided not to prosecute Jefferson Davis on the same charge.

It is not for us to uphold or condemn, but fair play and a "decent regard" for the rights of mankind suggest that such opposition as the above is utterly unwarrantable.

## A CATHOLIC JOURNAL'S COMMENTS.

The following vigorous and graphic comments on the tendencies of the times are made by the *Catholic Review*. Among the readers of the *News* there will be a general assent to the correctness of the *Review's* description of the results of "shutting out God and God's law from this world:"

"A class of men, have sprung up among us who declare that the American idea is a mistake from beginning to end; that American freedom is a fiction; that instead of being the freest we are the most downtrodden people on the face of the earth, and that our czar, our tyrant, is King Capital, which

buys up and corrupts to its own ends our legislatures, our judiciaries, our police, our courts of justice, our army and navy. If this charge be true, or in any large measure true, then the American Republic has lived in vain, and the great work of the fathers of the Republic, which was carried on and maintained by their loyal and patriotic sons, has been a failure—a failure, a magnificent failure, if you will—but all the more emphatic for its magnificence. As for a Supreme Being, a God, who would punish sins and crimes committed in this life, no man of them believes in such. One and all are steeped in the same pernicious doctrines. There is no God, no hereafter, no religion. There is to be no church, no government, no social order, no marriage, no property, no crime, no punishment for crime. Perjury, bomb-throwing, assassination, arson, robbery, are all trifling matters, once you succeed in shutting out God and God's law from this world. What would all this mean but a veritable hell on earth?"

## IVES AGAIN.

HENRY S. Ives, the "young Napoleon of finance," has been arrested again on the old and favorite charge of swindling, as we see by a dispatch in today's *News*. The worst of it is that he is Napoleon enough to pay no attention to reverses which do not completely reverse and which only annoy, and he has got so thoroughly accustomed to the annoyance that it is the fly on the ox's horn. The chances are that even now he is concocting some scheme by means of which a few of his credulous friends will be "bled" to the tune of a few thousands, and that he is hurrying his consummation along before being arrested again. It is really a matter of some little interest, if it was not such before this last business of Ives'. How long can such unblushing and unceasing knavery keep justice at bay in the way he does it, in a place where technical offenses and those of much smaller calibre are prosecuted with all the vigor three or four strong lawyers backed by an outraged public and encouraged by a powerful press can bring to bear? It begins to look as though Justice had removed the bandages from at least one of her eyes and that her scales were no longer evenly poised, one of the balances containing something more solid and ringing than a decree on paper.

## A CORRECT VIEW.

THE Philadelphia *American* makes a very sensible remark in relation to proposed legislation to limit immigration to this country, when it says, in reference to the proposal to include "Mormons" in the embargo: "It would be a dangerous precedent to shut out any class of persons for holding a religious belief." It would be dangerous because to take such a step is foreign to the genius of American liberty and opens the way for government to invade the domain of conscience in a more extensive shape. No statesman nor patriot would ever support such a measure, which is perilous in the extreme to the cause of human freedom and subversive of the principles upon which our institutions are founded.

## MISREPRESENTING THE MESSAGE.

THE press of the country is practically unanimous in giving President Cleveland credit for great courage in framing his message to Congress. Democratic journals very generally offer hearty support to its policy, and only by misrepresentation are Republican papers able to find ground on which to oppose it. They assert the message to be a free trade manifesto, notwithstanding that it contains emphatic sentiments to the contrary, and then proceed to assault the position in which they seem to imagine they have placed the President. But as he stands on other ground, their missiles do not reach him.

Of the comments of Republican journals, those of the Philadelphia *Press* are subjoined as a sample:

"A thousand thanks to President Cleveland for the bold, manly, and unequivocal avowal of his extreme free trade purposes! And a thousand rebukes and defeats for the false, dangerous, and destructive policy which he thus frankly and unreservedly proclaims! The message deserves all the glory of courage; all the praise of high public issue; all the condemnation of utter, ruinous heresy. It is a surprise in its method and a still greater surprise in its matter. It comes like the sudden, echoing boom of a great gun signaling a crucial fight on unexpected ground. In its immediate flash of light and in its broad bearings it looms up as one of the most momentous political events since the war. It plants the President and his party squarely on free trade; it clarifies the next Presidential battle as by a lightning stroke; it makes free trade vs. protection the overshadowing issue."

In reply to such misrepresentations of the President's message, it is sufficient to quote from the latter a few sentences:

"But our present tariff laws, the various inequitable and illegal sources of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended."

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the government's income; and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests."

The *Chicago Tribune*, though a Republican paper, comes much nearer the line of fairness than do most of its party contemporaries whose remarks we have seen. It says:

"The message is simply the tariff reduction plank of the republican party, adopted in 1884, expanded. It is neither more nor less than a textual sermon on that passage of the resolution which promises to 'reduce the surplus by correcting the inequalities of the tariff,' and it is certainly none the less binding on the republicans for being so endorsed by a democratic president. This is not a time, as the message justly claims, for the discussion of the theories of protection and free trade. Whatever difference of opinion there may be on general propositions of political economy, no one can honestly and intelligently deny that the present state of the public Treasury necessitates reduction."

The criticisms upon the message, and the sources from which they come, the latter being largely representative of manufacturing monopolies, prove the astuteness of President Cleveland in perceiving the motives of the opposition to tariff reform, and in locating the centers and tracing the origin of that opposition. As he intimates, manufacturers who are making enormous fortunes out of prices they are able to realize for their products, on account of a protective tariff, are the fomenters of it. For many years there have existed powerful combinations of such manufacturing interests and monopolies, whose efforts have defeated reformatory legislation. With a courage and directness that have not been surpassed by any act of any President since Lincoln's death, President Cleveland has assaulted the position of these oppressors of the people, and the fact that his position can be attacked only when it is misrepresented, proves its strength.

## A PRACTICAL PREACHER.

It looks as if the Gospel as revealed through Joseph Smith and preached by the Latter-day Saints was leaving the whole religious lump more rapidly than some people suppose. The doctrine of tithing-paying has been repeatedly denounced as one of the objectionable tenets of the Church. It appears, however, that some men of liberal ideas in the sects are beginning to recognize it as a part of the Biblical code and urge the necessity of its practice as a cardinal principle. As evidence of this we present the following, which appears in the December 12th issue of the *Chicago Mail*:

"It is as clearly our duty to give one-tenth of our incomes to the Lord as it is to give one-seventh of our time," said the Rev. J. M. Caldwell at the meeting of the Methodist ministers. The reverend gentleman then proceeded to make a long argument with this idea as a basis. Many texts were quoted to show that the old testament writers all agreed that one-tenth should be given to the Lord, and that this doctrine was reiterated in the new testament the same as is that of Sabbath keeping. Mr. Caldwell gave numerous examples to show how this plan operated practically on those who adopted it. He himself had always practiced giving one-tenth of his income, and had prospered by it. A few years ago he had supposed himself to be worth at least \$12,000 after his debts were paid. Suddenly he woke up to find his property all gone and himself \$5,000 in debt. It then became necessary for him to assume obligations to the amount of \$40,000. Notwithstanding these heavy liabilities he continued giving one-tenth of his income to the Lord. As a result of this his debts were now paid, and he was in better financial condition than before.

Dr. Caldwell gave many other similar and more wonderful cases even of prosperity, when he ascribed to Jacob's vow, or the giving of one-tenth to the Lord.

Dr. Strowbridge, in discussing the matter, thought that Methodist ministers should not be called upon to make greater sacrifices than at present.

Many of them now only got sufficient sufficient means to live, and it would be impossible for them to give the amount. He didn't think much of Jacob's vow anyway; most any mercenary man could take such a vow.

Most of those who discussed the paper, however, agreed with Mr. Caldwell.

We congratulate Mr. Caldwell as the possessor of something like a living faith—qualified by works—and a direct method of preaching the truth as it is in the Scriptures. To hear a Metho-

dist minister speaking of practical religious duties after the manner of a "Mormon" Elder and the genius of the Gospel is indeed refreshing.

Should the Methodist Church follow the precept and practice of Mr. Caldwell, it will have to look out for breakers, lest the governmental paw be placed upon its hard earnings.

## RAISING MULES.

"WITHOUT pride of ancestry, or hope of posterity," the mule is a perpetual butt of jokes and witticisms. But his value to man, for many purposes, is not equalled by that of any other animal, not even excepting the horse. Aside from blooded stock, the average mule everywhere brings a better price than the average horse, and mules of small size and light weight sell readily at good prices, in places and at times where and when horses of similar size and weight are practically without value. For example, a horse weighing from 600 to 800 pounds, is not a saleable animal; but a mule of similar weight exactly meets certain requirements. A writer in the *Denver Range Journal* truthfully remarks:

They are good, quick leaders for heavy ten and sixteen mule teams. Pony mules make the very kind of light double teams for buckboard service. Western men know their value as light drivers for rough mountain roads. What would mining towns do without the little pack mule? Again the pony makes an excellent easy enduring saddler for long horseback journeys."

Now this subject possesses a living and practical interest for hundreds of farmers and stock raisers in Utah. To engage in the business of raising horses, with an assurance that it will be profitable, requires capital enough to buy a sufficient number of good animals to start with, and these are necessarily expensive. Were they not so there would be no profit in raising them. With only "scrub" stock to breed from, it will be difficult if not impossible to make a success of the business of raising horses, especially in a section where good stock is becoming as plentiful as it is in Utah.

But for the purpose of breeding pony mules, almost any class of mares will do. Old "plug" mares that have the smallest market value, and from which it would be impossible to produce colts that would sell profitably, can be used to excellent advantage in raising small mules. The writer above referred to furnishes the following somewhat unique suggestions and figures:

"There is profit in breeding what Texans call Spanish mustang mules. The cost of a plant is small. Many men of limited means looking over the west desiring to engage in some branch of live stock business will find that it does not need much capital to start a mustang mule ranch."

## THE PLANT.

FIRST YEAR.  
Four large burro jacks @ \$40.....\$ 160 00  
One hundred old plug mares @ \$25 2500 00  
Personal expenses..... 250 00  
Taxes, say..... 50 00  
Advertising brand..... 1 50  
3073 50

SECOND YEAR.  
Figure for expense the second year:  
Personal expenses..... 350 00  
Taxes, say..... 60 00  
Advertising brand..... 12 00  
3496 50

THIRD YEAR.  
Expense the third year:  
Personal expenses..... 350 00  
Taxes, say..... 70 00  
Advertising brand..... 12 00  
Total cost plant for three years... 3927 50

RESULTS  
FIRST YEAR.  
Eighty yearling mules @ \$20..... 1600 00  
SECOND YEAR.  
Eighty two-year-old mules @ \$35... 2800 00  
Eighty yearling mules @ \$20..... 1600 00  
4400 00

THIRD YEAR.  
Eighty broke mules @ \$75..... 6000 00  
Eighty two-year-old mules @ \$25... 2400 00  
Eighty yearling mules @ \$20..... 1600 00  
10,400 00

Two per cent. per annum loss on mares for three years—100 less 6  
—94 @ \$25..... 2350 00  
Four burro jacks..... 160 00

Total value plant at end of three years.....\$12,910 00  
Less cost of plant..... 3,927 50

Gross profit in three years.....\$ 8982 50

Of course these figures will be criticized, and every one interested will affirm values and percentage of increase to suit himself, but figure as he may he will see that there is profit in breeding rough little mules from plug stock running loose on the range. This sort of stock is not intended for the blooded breeder who can employ his capital to better advantage producing more valuable animals. This is a poor man's opportunity, and opportunities for men of small capital are becoming very scarce. There are yet some little out-of-the-way ranges where several bunches of mares can be run with jacks without interference or complaint from any one. Let a young man having only a thousand dollars buy a couple of common large