

ridden over by one man, exercising arbitrary power in an unlawful manner. That is all there is of the matter.

The Governor vetoed the appropriation for the World's Fair because the Legislature named the persons who were to spend the money. But he signed the bill which contained an appropriation for the Agricultural College, although the same rule was followed as to its expenditure. Here is evident inconsistency. If it was "rebellion" and "disloyalty" to name the persons who were to spend the people's money for the World's Fair, was it not the same to name the persons who are to spend the people's money for the Agricultural College? If so, then the Governor is a party to the "rebellion" and "disloyalty" in the latter case, or else there was nothing of these in the former case. But the Governor, in a very petulant final message to the Legislature, says he would have treated the latter provision "as it deserved" if it had been sent to him in a separate bill. Now what difference does it make in principle to a measure, whether it is in a separate bill or incorporated with other matters in a general bill? If it is "treason" in one case it is treason in the other, and so with "rebellion," "disloyalty," and the other pet terms which the ridiculous *Tribune* so ridiculously uses when it flies into passion.

The truth is, the Legislature did nothing to "insult" the Governor, by naming the persons to spend the people's money, in either case. But there are a good many people who think the Governor insulted the great majority of the people, in his selection of two persons from a factious and small minority to attend to the people's business at the World's Fair. And there was no "insult" to the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural College in the creation and naming of a Board of Construction, for a special purpose under a special appropriation. It is very easy to construe anything that some people dislike into an insult to themselves or somebody else.

It is unfortunate that there is not perfect harmony usually between the executive and legislative branches of our territorial government. But the discord that has prevailed has arisen from two causes. First, the un-American and extraordinary power conferred on one Federal official and the disposition to use it in an arbitrary manner without regard to the wishes of the great body of the citizens. Second, the identification of the Executive with a faction always inimical to the interests of the majority and bent on ruining it if it cannot rule.

There can be no effectual remedy for this but the abolition of the autocratic and anomalous one-man power, and the legal establishment of the people's right to elect the officers who are to manage public affairs. While any official is the master instead of the servant of the people, there will be trouble in any American community not disposed to bow like serfs to the dominion of a Dictator.

DES MOINES, Ia., March 22.—The Hatch county option bill was indefinitely postponed by a strict party vote, the Republicans for, Democrats against.

AN ERROR.

IN the sketch of the administration of Sister Zina D. H. Young as President of the Relief Society, prepared for the Sisters' jubilee, it is stated that she was appointed to preside over the Relief Society April 8th, 1888, by President John Taylor; it should read "by President Wilford Woodruff."

NO PRESENT DANGER WAR OF WITH ENGLAND.

ERASTUS WIMAN, the well-known economist and financier, is represented, by an Associated Press agent, as having expressed an opinion to the effect that war between England and the United States is probable. He bases this view upon the pressure being brought to bear by Canada upon the mother country to preserve for the former equal rights with America on the high seas where important fisheries exist. He also thinks that the necessity for the Conservative government doing something startling in the line of a spirited foreign policy before the approaching crisis in British politics may have an influence in the direction of war with this country.

While Erastus Wiman is doubtless a sagacious business man, it does not follow that he is an authority on international diplomatic affairs. Senator Sherman hits the subject right when he asserts that it is absurd to presume that two such great nations would go to war over such a small matter as that involved in the present controversy between Great Britain and this country. For either to engage in a bloody struggle over a subject so comparatively insignificant would be a poor commentary on the diplomatic ability and resources of both.

In a war with this country Great Britain would have everything to lose and nothing to gain. The United States would probably be taken at a disadvantage to begin with, but the extent of our nation, the energy, ingenuity and patriotism of the great bulk of the people, combined with the inexhaustible resources of the country, would, doubtless, in due time, settle the point in our favor. The only thing that this nation would have to fear in the event of such a war, would be internal dissension that might arise through the existence of so large a proportion of a lawless and disturbing element in the population which has been immensely recruited from abroad.

We do not believe that there is any idea in Great Britain—among her statesmen at least—of going to war with the United States. Even if the desire existed, the danger to her of such an undertaking would prevent the step, except on the ground of great aggravation, which this country does not intend to give. Not only would England hold back from engaging in a conflict with this country on account of doubt as to the result, so far as would immediately relate to the operations of the combatants in chief, but also because should she engage in such a struggle her European rivals would doubtless take advantage of her situation to humiliate if not destroy her.

We do not believe that Mr. Wiman's views on the subject in question are sound. There is no present prospect of war between this nation and the mother country.

BETTER KEEP TO THE TRUTH.

THE directors of the so-called "Industrial Home" do not coincide with the views of the Utah Commission and others, as to the conversion of the building to some legitimate and useful public purpose. This is not to be wondered at. It is quite natural that they should wish to hang on to the concern as long as possible, and persuade Congress to keep up the appropriations that have been made for its support.

But all the same, it is a fact patent to everybody that the institution was a fizzle from the beginning, that it never answered the end desired, that Congress was induced to spend the public funds for something that was never needed, and that the continuance of the concern is a fraud upon the nation and a conspicuous mark of national folly and failure. Everybody here who is candid and truthful must acknowledge this, and it is useless to deny it.

If the directors of the alleged "Home" want to keep it up in spite of all the proofs of its uselessness, they had better not seek to do so by misrepresentation, because this provokes explanations and the presentation of disagreeable facts in rebuttal. It is not true, as they allege about the "Home," that "It has been strenuously and persistently opposed by the Mormon Church as a reflection upon the teachings of years that polygamy was right." This assertion is all of a piece with the falsehoods by which money was cozened out of Congress for the building and its support.

The "Mormon" Church has done nothing and said nothing against the concern at any time. Those who continue to state the contrary should cite something to prove their allegations, if they expect anybody who thinks to believe them. This, however, they have never done, and cannot do. Therefore they content themselves with a repetition of the gratuitous untruth, forgetful, apparently, of the command: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

THE DESERET NEWS has, on several occasions, exposed the falsehoods used by the promoters of the scheme for this pretended "Home"—a burlesque upon the sacred name, and in that way this paper may be said to have opposed it. And this was necessary, because of the vile and filthy stories, told to Congressional committees, which were utterly devoid of truth. They were published in the *Congressional Record*, they were refuted by affidavits from the persons—all non-"Mormons," who were alleged to have furnished the purported information, and they were nothing but scandalous and libidinous fabrications told with professedly pious lips, for the "Christian" purpose of defaming the "Mormons" and drawing money out of the national treasury.

But the "Mormon" Church has been silent on the subject from the beginning. And the assertion of the di-