

New York, or, as claimed by the latter, a positive violation of a clearly defined promise. The nomination of Robertson for the post of Collector of Customs at New York, should not have been a reasonable cause of wrath on the part of Conkling, unless some understanding or contract had been entered into with him by Garfield. It is clearly the right of the President to nominate any man whom he may consider suitable for an office in the Presidential appointment. Particularly is this the case with the post in question. It is strictly a government office. It is not like some other offices filled by the President and Senate, in which the local Congressmen and their constituents are strongly and locally interested.

The motives that actuated the President may have been paltry and personal. The removal of Merritt, to make way for a personal friend of Garfield, may have been prompted by other than public considerations. Most likely it was. But the right of the President to make the nomination cannot be disputed, any more than the right of the Senate to confirm or reject the nomination. The President is not required to accept the dictation of any Senator or political body, neither is the Senate compelled to submit to the dictation of the President. Senator Conkling, no matter how much he was displeased by the nomination of Robertson, could only act against the nomination, properly and lawfully, by his influence as a member of the body asked to confirm the appointment, and of the committee to which the matter was referred.

The resignation of the Senators from New York would appear childish and despicable, were it not part of a plan to give the promise-breaking or agreement-forgetting President a "Roland for an Oliver." The stalwart New York leader, smarting under a sense of indignity and disgusted by the breach of good faith involved in this appointment, certain that only defeat would meet his efforts to prevent the confirmation, determined to inaugurate a warfare which should ruin Garfield's chances for re-election, if not result in his own election in 1884. He calculated on the certainty of the New York Legislature, now in session, returning him to the United States Senate for a term which would take him over the allotted time of Garfield's presidency, and give him an opportunity of opposing every measure personally favored by the President.

The chances of the success of the scheme, and of the public endorsement in New York State of Conkling's hostile policy, are at present far from promising. The haughty statesman may find himself out in the cold and an enemy occupying the position which he deemed secure. It is quite possible that Conkling will see that he has risked too much on the hazard of a single die. But in any case he is a tower of strength in politics, not easily shaken. Whether as Senator or simple citizen, he is and will be a political giant to whom a host look for leadership, who will follow his lead with confidence and unanimity. In or out of the Capitol he is now Garfield's enemy, and there is not a stronger one in the nation.

If Garfield has set his heart already upon election for another term, which is confidently asserted, we think he is doomed to disappointment. We would rather guess on Conkling than Garfield for the next President of the United States. The new-fledged Executive commenced his career with an attack on the "Mormons." Perhaps the pressure brought to bear compelled him to say something strong on that question. But if reports, continually repeated, do not belie him, he has re-announced a hostile policy against the Saints, and he is animated by a paltry and unworthy motive. He seeks for popularity and fame by pandering to prejudices unworthy of great minds, and to a demand based on folly and fanaticism. His course, if pursued in olden times, would have been denounced by the Prophets, and it would be written of him: "And behold this thing displeased the Lord, and He raised up an enemy against him; also his house was divided against itself, and disaster overtook him, while the wisdom of his wise men came to naught, and the understanding of his prudent ones perished in council."

No prominent man who ever made it a chief point to oppress the Latter-day Saints, ever succeeded in his own ambition, or in achieving the purposes he desired. The rule will hold good in the future, and "Ichabod" may be inscribed upon

the tent of him who wrongfully and for personal ends makes war upon latter-day Israel. Chastisement may be needed when the Saints run into folly or become careless and neglectful, but the rod that smites them will be broken. "Offences must needs come, but woe unto them by whom they come."

The future does not bear much portent of encouragement for the Republican party in this great nation. It looks as though it would be split wide open. The confirmation of Robertson puts him into an important post which with the patronage it controls, makes him a power for Garfield in the State where Conkling has ruled by the force of machine politics. Backed by the Administration, the anti-Grant men and all who have been restive under the Conkling autocracy, he will have a formidable division wherewith to oppose the Conkling strategy. And the great State, whose vote secured the triumph of the Republicans last November, being thus split up, the Democrats, unless smitten with political blindness and paralysis, will walk through to victory. The whole Republican party throughout the nation will be affected by this division, and if these events had happened a little nearer to the great quadrennial struggle, it would be easy to predict the consequences.

As it is, the President will find his position far from anything like a bed of roses or a seat of repose. Unless he takes a short turn, his term will be a stormy and disastrous one, and he who entered upon it with the fairest prospects and the best wishes and expectations of the whole nation, will retire without glory and slide down into comparative insignificance.

UNREASONABLE REASONS.

The Boston *Watchman*, whose pious untruths concerning the "Mormons" we exposed a few days ago has an editorial on the subject of Hon. George Q. Cannon's article in the *North American Review*. It says:

"We receive what Mr. Cannon says with some degree of distrust, for two or three reasons. The first is that he is a Mormon, and though the Mormons are 'Latter-day Saints,' they have always seemed to us distinguishable from the former day saints, the apostles and prophets and martyrs of antiquity. Their sainthood is of a peculiarly modern aspect, and has not kept them in all cases from whitewashing themselves at the cost of the strict truth. Another reason is that Mr. Cannon is a politician by profession, and owes his seat in Congress to Mormon votes. And the ordinary politician, even without the added temptation of Mormonism, is not apt to write that about his constituents which will deprive him of office. A third grain of salt with which we wish to take this article is the past record of Delegate Cannon, who is understood to have sworn several times that he has but one wife, and who is now known to have five, and to have had several at the time he was asserting his monogamic virtues."

These three "reasons" of the *Watchman* for distrusting our Delegate are as good specimens of unreason as often appear in a public journal. The first would shut out all Latter-day Saints from self-defense. Governed by it the world would receive evidence against them, but none in their favor. As "they who are not for us are against us," the statements of dissenters are to be received as facts, while our replies and refutations are not to be credited. Suppose primitive Christianity had been judged in the same fashion. It would have been utterly condemned. The reputation of Jesus the Nazarene was bad; the leading religious sects and teachers denounced Him and His followers; His chief Apostles were ignorant fishermen; and the society he founded was "a little sect everywhere spoken against." The fact that a man was a Christian, on the same rule that condemns him if he is a "Mormon," would be enough to expose him to suspicion, stamp all he might say with distrust, and be deemed sufficient reason for rejecting his testimony in toto.

That the "sainthood" of the "Mormons" is of a "modern aspect" is no reason why their veracity should be called in question. Indeed, seeing that they are Latter-day Saints, we fail to perceive how it is possible to be of an

ancient aspect, in this respect they are certainly distinguishable from the former day Saints, while their doctrines, aims and Church polity are precisely the same.

The statement that "Mr. Cannon is a politician by profession," does that gentleman gross injustice. He is the Delegate from Utah by no seeking of his own. He occupies the position from a sense of duty, having been elected by the people to represent them in Congress. He has been five times returned and each time without any effort on his own part. None of the political tricks and wire-pulling, stump speaking, promises, protestations and self-vaunting peculiar to the "profession" have been resorted to in his case. He has not sought the office but the office has sought him. His profession is not and never was that of politics. He is a literary man, a theologian and a preacher of the gospel, and his present position is an incident in his eventful career. Personally he is in no way to be identified with the politician. He is a gentleman of worth and standing whose name is without reproach among those who know him best and whose word is as good as his bond.

The "third grain of salt" is altogether gratuitous. If Mr. Cannon has been "understood to have sworn several times that he has but one wife," he has been egregiously misunderstood. He was accused by an antagonist of marrying and cohabiting with several women, in wilful violation of the laws of God and man, to which charge he entered a specific denial. His response was true and cannot be refuted. He is one of the last men to claim that for which he has no title, or to recede from a position which he has taken on principle. Mr. Cannon acts on the principles which he avows, and has never denied the practice of that which he has taught.

The *Watchman* criticizes Mr. Cannon's showing of the school statistics of Utah, and says:

"The comparison, to be fair, should be made with the other Western States and Territories of equal age, in which case it would not be so favorable."

It is now the turn of the *Watchman* to make good its assertions. Give us the figures and facts. We challenge comparison with the school affairs in the regions surrounding us, and if the *Watchman* can show any superiority over us in this respect, let the exhibit be made. But that pious journal does not deal in proofs when assailing the "Mormons," it is content with assertions, and not only declines to substantiate its own charges, but even to fairly consider the defence that is offered. Here is another paragraph on the school question:

"We happen to know that the Mormons are very much like the Romanists in one respect: they have no objection to an education which does not carry the child far enough to emancipate it from their control, but they throw obstacles in the way of its advancement beyond that very moderate limit."

If by this the *Watchman* means that we do not approve of the instruction of our children by teachers of a hostile faith, we acknowledge the charge. Would the editor of the *Watchman* send his children to a school taught by a Romanist who had avowed his intention of leading away from the faith of their fathers all Protestant children placed under his care? Yet this is a parallel to the position here. Sectarian teachers have been sent to this Territory for the express purpose of leading away the juveniles from the Church of their parents. True Latter-day Saints do object to placing their little ones under such influence. And should we not be inconsistent and from our standpoint wilfully culpable if we permitted the minds of our offspring to be moulded and tutored by persons who are hostile to the principles which we deem vital and divine? There are other points in the *Watchman* article which we find that we have not space to discuss to-day and will therefore leave them till another time.

SUGAR.

The article of sugar, second only to that of iron as one of the leading items of home production, received full recognition at the hands of Zion's Central Board of Trade at the late meetings. A communication upon this growing industry was

read to the Board by Secretary T.G. Webber on Thursday last, and as we deem it of interest and importance to the community generally, we publish the communication in full:

GUNNISON, May 10th, 1881.

To the President and Members of Zion's Central Board of Trade:

Gentlemen.—The undersigned respectfully makes the following statements and suggestions, on the thirteenth subject of the President's letter to the Stake Boards of Trade:

1. The average yield of sorghum on the bench land in our valleys, qualified for its growth, is about 1,500 lbs. of syrup to the acre, with a density of 12 lbs. per gallon. Of this about forty per cent. will crystallize. Hence 900 lbs. of syrup, and 600 lbs. of raw sugar can be calculated on as an average crop per acre.

Good cultivation and harvesting, adopting the best sorghum implements and machinery now in use, should not cost more than \$15.00 per acre.

Over twenty years the sorghum has been raised in our Territory, and people are well acquainted with its cultivation. There seems, therefore, to be nothing in the way of making sugar production and manufacture profitable.

The reports from many places in Utah, that the un-neutralized and raw molasses granulates sugar in the barrels, is erroneous. These grains are not sucrose crystals; but are what in sugar technicalities is called dextrose. Under 100° heat, it all washes through the centrifugal; and is what it was, only molasses. What sucrose there is in the sorghum juice will crystallize by the proper process, which will have to be modified according to soil and altitude. Upon this point I must humbly confess, that as yet I know very little, but that local experience is necessary.

2. Professor Peter Collier, of the United States Agricultural Department, analyzed our beet syrup as follows:

Sucrose.....	52.40
Glucose.....	.85
Ash (soluble 6.48, largely carbonate of potassa, insoluble, 2.18.....	8.66
Water.....	24.51
Undetermined.....	13.58
	100

The 6.48 per cent. largely composed of carbonate of potassa, is the only enemy to beet sugar making here. How to separate it from the beet juice shall be my object as soon as practicable.

Our ripe beet contains about 13 per cent. sugar.

If beet can be raised anywhere in these valleys, free from carbonate of potassa, probably it would be more remunerative to make the beet sugar than the sorghum sugar, as factories could then be run the year round, by drying the beets to avoid deterioration, and as such be made remunerative to capital invested in machinery.

Our average beet crop, with good cultivation and on good bench soil, is about 25 tons per acre; or about 2,000 pounds of sugar per acre. Cost of cultivation and harvest about \$20 per acre. It is therefore no wonder that the beet sugar industry has become a national benefit to many a country.

3. If people could afford it, through an abundant production, we would use yearly, at least 50 pounds of sugar per capita. And it is undisputed that, if well applied in the household, unadulterated sugar forms a very healthy and nutritious part of our food.

Already, at present, our sugar import is an enormous outlay. It is therefore not more than rational to apply the perseverance and energy needed to make the sugar home industry a success.

4. For the sake of economy, probably the raising and manufacturing of linseed for oil, and the grinding and slacking of ochre, and other applications of power, might be connected with a sugar factory.

5. Finally, I would respectfully suggest that a committee be formed to push forward the home sugar industry of Utah.

Very respectfully,

C. A. MADSEN,

Member of the Sanpete Board of Trade.

FREE

Send for Catalogue of best selling articles on earth, World Mfg Co. 122 N. 3rd St. N. Y.



BEST SIX CORD SPOOL COTTON

FOR SALE AT WHOLESALE

Z. C. M. I.

d w dm

Do Your Own Printing!

For Young or Old.

33 Press for cards, envelopes &c. 14 other sizes, \$8, \$14, \$25, \$44, etc. Type setting easy by printed instructions. Do your own printing and advertising. Money made fast in any place jobbing or running a paper. Catalogue of Presses, Type, Cards, &c. for 2 stamps. Kelsey & Co. Manufacturers, Meriden, Conn.

NOTICE.

In the Probate Court in and for Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah.

In the matter of the Guardianship of the persons and estates of Adelaide Hampton, Grant Hampton, William Hampton, Benjamin Hampton and Ray Hampton, Minors.

PURSUANT TO AN ORDER OF SAID Court in said matter notice is hereby given that Wednesday, the 18th day of May, A. D. 1881, at 10 a. m. of said day has been appointed by said Court the time and the County Court House of Salt Lake City the place for the hearing of a petition filed therein on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1881, praying for an order of said Court authorizing the Guardians of said minors to sell the property of said minors consisting of 5-6 undivided interest in the following described property, to wit: Sixty feet west front by twenty rods back off the north side of lot 4, of block 97, plat "A" Salt Lake City Survey, when and where all persons interested may appear and show cause if any why the prayer of petitioners should not be granted.

Salt Lake City, April 18, 1881.

D. BOCKHOLT,

Clerk Probate Court, Salt Lake Co., U. T.



w 15 e o w 4



THE ONLY BLACKING that meets the demand for a quick and brilliant polish.

"BIXBY'S BEST"

absolutely nourishes and preserves the leather.

J. M. Bixby & Co. 173 & 175 Washington St. N. Y.