

with Small. We believe sincerely that the causes of both these Reverend gentlemen are just, and we hope they will each be pursued until the wrongs of both are thoroughly satisfied, and that the interests of the public in the premises may at the same time be promoted.

"THE BILLION DOLLAR CONGRESS."

THE expenditure of the last Congress is being made a party issue. The Ohio State Democratic platform promulgated on the 15th inst. says:

"We denounce the Republican billion dollar Congress, which, by extravagant expenditure, exhausted the surplus in the national treasury left there by the Democratic administration and created a deficit."

The Democratic platforms of other States have also touched on this topic, while Democratic orators and newspapers have made it the basis for innumerable discourses and articles. The general reader would like to know, perhaps, what the Republicans have to say in reply. In an article dealing specially with this subject Charles Foster, Secretary of the Treasury, says:

"The appropriations made by the last Congress were, it is charged, larger in amount than has ever before been the case. Our Democratic critics have named it the Billion Dollar Congress. We reply that this is a billion dollar country, and when they denounce the extravagance of appropriation in mass we challenge them to criticise it in detail, and point out such items as could better have been omitted with due regard to the growth and constantly increasing demands of the United States. I do not pretend to say that all the appropriations made were beyond criticism, but in every instance it will be found that such appropriations as were improper were supported as much by Democrats as by Republicans. Appropriations made for government purposes are properly subjects only to the inquiries: 'Is the treasury in such financial condition as to be able to pay them? and are they in the light of the necessities of the people justifiable?' If these two questions can be answered affirmatively no reasonable objection can be made to the appropriations."

WE CONCUR.

WE cordially endorse the request of the *Herald* that this be a clean campaign. It is said to be for the purpose of political education. If that is so there is no need to descend to misrepresentation, nor to resort to personalities. Democrats are not "anarchists." Republicans are not "monarchists." Neither party is aiming at the destruction of the nation. Both are working for the same ends, though in different ways. The candidates on the respective tickets should not be assailed, nor their intentions impugned outside of their own utterances or the platforms and resolutions of their parties. Deal fairly. Strike as hard blows as you please

at error, but do not manufacture issues, pervert facts, distort motives or malign character. Set forth principles clearly, strongly, wittily if you can, and draw as sharp lines as truth will permit between the doctrines of the two parties. But let the whole debate and the entire campaign be clean, courteous and free from calumny.

HE IS NOT A "LIBERAL."

IT appears that Judge Rhodes, whatever he might have said in the haste of a hurried speech at the close of a convention, did not mean, as reported, to be understood as desiring to coerce anybody into voting the Democratic ticket in Weber County. He writes to the "Liberal" organ a disclaimer, and says:

"I lived seventeen years in Colorado; was State Senator from Second district for four years as a Democrat; was district attorney of Denver as a Democrat for three years, and my vote as a legislator and my official acts were always in favor of the laboring men, giving them the preference. Have always opposed corporation dictation in politics; also church dictation."

In reference to the "Mormons?" he remarks:

"When men are asked to do something that is right and they start to do it, I believe in giving them a show."

These extracts are sufficient to put the gentleman right on the main question. It is gratifying to learn that he does not favor the "Liberal" practice of coercion, nor join in the "Liberal" policy of fanatical obstruction. He would not resort to the "Liberal" tactics of compelling workmen to vote a certain ticket and discharging them if they come out from a certain party. Nor would he refuse to unite politically with citizens who obey the law, because they believe in something he does not endorse.

If Judge Rhodes really said what was attributed to him, that would not be Democracy. If a Republican had said it that would not have made it Republicanism. It would have been in either case nothing but "Liberalism," in theory and in practice. Judge Rhodes is not a "Mormon" and we are happy to see he is not a "Liberal."

FALSE PROPHETS.

FOR some time past, as its readers well know, the "Liberal" organ has been prognosticating all kinds of disaster, which are to overtake Utah if admitted into the Union as a State. Scarcely an issue of the sheet has been free from them.

Judge Rhodes of Ogden writes to the effect that when the editors "start to prophesy" he denies their "credentials," because he does not believe in

prophesying and does not put faith in any church except as "a sky pilot."

The would-be prophetic editors respond: "We have made no prophecies." If we were to come down to their own elegant English, we would say, as they say of some remarks in the *Times*, "The statement is a dirty falsehood." But we will leave the readers of their daily forewarnings to supply the epithets, and will only add this paragraph, which immediately follows their denial in the same column of the *Tribune*:

"From the so-called Democratic and Republican tickets certain names will be selected to be sacrificed. The rest will be voted for solidly by the Saints and by such sinners as have gone off from the Gentiles on party lines. The vote will be just as solid as the Mormon vote always has been, and after all the Liberals will make a clean sweep by a fair majority."

Now if that is not "making a prophecy," what is it?" We are of the opinion that it is a false prophecy, but will leave it for time to determine that. If such a coalition as there foreshadowed were to occur, we believe the predicted result would be the reverse of the prediction. But we do not believe any such "selections" as prophesied will be made, but that like a hundred other rash and stupid attempts of the "Liberal" writers to prophesy, their views of the future will prove to have been but fantasies of a brain disordered by excessive stimulants or opiates.

SAM SMALL AGAIN.

SAM SMALL has concluded to give up the gospel profession and take a turn at journalism. If there is any place in the world where such a person might employ his talents respectably, Small has struck it. His incendiary ravings will probably cost his company a half dozen expensive libel suits during the first six months' run, if it endures him that long. If the experience does not quell him entirely there are chances of its making a more or less useful citizen out of him. Small is versatile and vigorous enough for any purpose, but in his organism the moral balance that regulates other creatures of thought seems to have been totally neglected and so he has gone helter-skelter over the world, butting his head against pretty much everything that crossed his track on the lines of human decency. We shall hope with all sincerity that his new calling will make something of him that is of estimable value to the human race.

Daniel Webster was appointed Secretary of State in Fillmore's administration July 20, 1850.