

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - JAN. 16, 1884.

## THE GOVERNOR OF DAKOTA.

THE people of Dakota are taking earnest steps towards the removal of Governor Ordway, who has made himself obnoxious to them in many ways, and is accused of bribe-taking and other fallings of professional politicians and office-seekers. He seems to have pursued his own course without reference to the wishes of the great majority of the citizens of the Territory, and to have consulted his own notions and profit rather than their interests. For instance, in the location of county seats, it is charged that he has made it a matter of real-estate speculation instead of public convenience, securing a personal interest in land likely to become valuable by reason of such location.

The Philadelphia American calls attention to the fact that "the Governor of Dakota was not selected as their Executive by the people of the Territory, and that he has been strenuous in his opposition to the steps taken to transform the Territory into a State." Exactly? When is a Governor selected by the people of a Territory, we would like to know? Are not the Territories the political dumping grounds of the Administration? What would the successful candidates for national honors do for places with which to reward their small-fry supporters in the struggle for office, if there were no Territories on which to foist them without regard to the wishes of the people? What President or Senate has ever cared a cent about the will of the citizens, in any Territory in which a living was desirable for a friend or hanger-on.

Of course Governor Ordway has "strenuously opposed" the progress of Dakota towards Statehood. They all do it. Territorial Governors do not want a change which would deprive them of an easy post—almost a sinecure—and a fair salary. If the incipient State desired their services as Senators or Representatives in Congress, or in some other fat office, you would not find them "strenuously opposing" the proposed transformation. Utah's admission is always strenuously opposed by the Federal officials imposed upon it without regard to the wishes of the citizens. It is not at all remarkable, all things considered, that they should take this course, because they invariably set themselves against the interests of the majority of the people, and therefore cannot expect to receive any favors from them at the ballot box; and the change from a Territory to a State would mean for them a loss of daily bread and butter, to say nothing of whisky and cigars and the prestige which their titles afford.

Dakota ought to be a State, or rather two States, and the whole territorial system ought to be sunk out of sight by the admission of enough States to abolish the anti-American anomaly for ever. It is at variance with republicanism, is utterly hostile to true democracy, and is disgraceful in a government said to be "of the people, for the people, and by the people."

Meanwhile, no matter what may be the facts in regard to Governor Ordway's doings in Dakota, the fact that he is personally distasteful to the large majority of its citizens and does not possess their confidence or good will, ought to be sufficient, in a republic like this, to warrant his removal at once from office. The people should be accorded some rights, even in a Territory of the United States.

## IMPORTATION OF CHINESE LABORERS.

THUS far Utah has not been appreciably affected by the labor troubles by which other parts of the country are kept in almost constant commotion. That phase of the question in which the Pacific Slope is more especially involved—the Chinese branch of it—has had scarcely any bearing here at all. The few Mongolians residing in Utah have mostly confined their business relations to the cleaning of clothes and the creation of nuisances. In these departments, the white population could well afford to concede them a monopoly.

A good many Chinamen have been employed in the construction of railroads in this region, but as that is transitory work, it has cut no permanent figure in the question of labor. But if reports be correct the entering wedge of Chinese labor has already been or will soon be driven into this market. It is stated that the Pleasant Valley coal mines are to be

operated almost exclusively with Chinese workmen.

This may appear a trifling circumstance on its face, but does not take so slight a shape upon closer inspection. It means a material reduction in the rate of miners' wages, for the white laborer in that line will have a competitor in the field with whom he cannot cope successfully. The larger amount of work that can be done in a given time by the white man is more than offset by the greatly reduced rate at which the Chinaman can afford to work, for he can live on what the other would starve upon.

The object of employing coolie labor in the mines is of course the production of coal by the company at the cheapest possible rate, enabling them to so reduce the price to consumers as to, if possible, command the market. This will, as a natural sequence, cause rival coal companies to cut down their operating expenses, either by reducing the wages of white employees or the employment of coolie laborers, the blow in any event falling upon the workmen, whose condition does not as a rule receive the consideration to which it is entitled.

While the effects of competition are in some respects beneficial in others, they are disastrous. It compels reductions in the prices of products and the aim of corporations and business men generally is to bring down prices so far as practicable without a corresponding depreciation of profits.

Every man who is willing to labor to the extent of his ability, be it much or little, has a common right—whether it be recognized or not—to a decent living. What we mean by that is that he is entitled to sufficient food, clothing and shelter for himself and those who may be helplessly dependent upon him. While this right—which we hold to be inherent—is generally recognized in theory, it is, under existing conditions, frequently ignored practically. Having this view, we hope the example set by the company operating the Pleasant Valley coal mines will not be extensively followed, and that it will not largely enter into the labor avenues of Utah. A coolie labor question would be a disadvantage to this locality.

## CAN WE HAVE A LEGAL CITY ELECTION.

THE municipal election to take place in this city on February 11th, will be of considerable importance to the citizens. If there is any doubt about its legality, that ought to be removed before the time fixed for conducting it. If the omission of some preliminary is likely to render the election void, that ought to be clearly understood so that an invalid election shall not be held. The people of this city do not want to go to the polls simply to complicate municipal affairs. If there is any probability that the newly elected officers would not be allowed to act, or that being installed their official doings would be liable to question on the score of illegality, it would be better to have no election at all, but let the present officers hold over until their successors could be lawfully elected and qualified. This matter is of sufficient importance to demand more than the brief and general notice given in our last issue.

The City Charter authorizes the City Council to provide by ordinance for the manner of voting at elections, contesting the same, keeping the poll lists, canvassing the votes, certifying the returns and all other things relating thereto. The latest ordinance in relation to elections in this city was passed Nov. 1st, 1879, and was made to conform to the Act of the Legislature approved Feb. 22d, 1878, and particularly the provisions of Section 24 of that statute. The ordinance provides for the registration of voters, and specifies the times when copies of the registry list shall be obtained from the County Clerks, when the registration shall take place, when the revision of the lists shall be made, and when the lists shall be returned to the City Recorder. The Assessor was made the registration officer. The Judges of Election were to be appointed by the City Council, the City Recorder was to give due notice of the election, and the same officer was to oversee the counting of the returns made by five citizens selected by the Mayor, and also to declare the result.

The Edmunds law vacated all the registration and election offices of every description in the Territory, and provided that the duties of these offices should be temporarily performed, by competent persons appointed by the Commissioners. But that law further provided that those duties should be performed "under the existing laws of the United States and of this Territory." On June 18th, 1883, the Utah Commissioners issued an Order in relation to municipal elections, in which it is provided that three Judges of Election shall be appointed for each municipal ward; that the Presiding Judge shall procure from the County Clerk, "at the expense of the city," a certified copy of the last preceding registration list, and "on the day designated by the City Charter" he shall proceed to erase therefrom the names of all persons who have died or removed from the precinct, or who are disqualified under the provisions of the Edmunds Act. The Judges are appointed a board of canvassers, the returns are to be made to the Secretary of the Territory, and where there are more

than one election precinct in a city, one of the Judges, to be designated, is to receive the canvass from the others and make returns to the Secretary, who is to issue the certificates of election.

Now there is no "day designated by the City Charter" as the time when the revision of the registration lists shall take place. That was an error of the Commissioners. The time is specified by ordinance. In Section 5 of the registration ordinance referred to above, the week commencing the fourth Monday in December preceding each election is fixed as the time for that work. That time has passed by and the revision has not been made. It is explained that Salt Lake City did not respond to the call of the Commissioners for information from all the City Recorders concerning the time for holding their respective elections, and that this was the reason for the apparent neglect concerning the revision for this city. But the Judges of Election have been appointed, Thomas C. Bailey, the Registration Officer for Salt Lake County at the last election, has been designated as the officer to receive the canvass from the other Judges and transmit the returns to the Secretary, and certified copies of the registration lists have been obtained from the County Clerk, and placed in the hands of the Judges for revision. The words "at the expense of the city," in reference to getting the certified copies of the lists, looks at first like a stretch of power in the Commissioners, but is in accordance with the provisions of the City ordinance.

Section 6 of the City ordinance provides that:

"Voters removing from one municipal ward to another may appear before the Assessor at any time previous to the delivery of the registry list to the City Recorder, and have their names erased therefrom and they may thereupon have their names registered in the ward to which they may remove."

The time fixed by ordinance when the lists are to be returned is mentioned in section 7 and is "on or before the second Monday of January preceding each election." Substitute "Judge of Election" for "Assessor" and Presiding Judge for Recorder, and the Order and this section harmonize. There is time then left under the ordinance until next Monday to make up the alphabetical revised lists for the election, and for persons who have removed from one precinct to another to have their names properly registered.

But it cannot be denied that the dates fixed by ordinance for the discharge of some of these duties has not been complied with. The question is, will these omissions or irregularities invalidate the election? It would seem that the rights of the citizens should not be placed in jeopardy through the neglect or oversight or even wilful wrongdoing of a ministerial officer. The people have the right to a choice of municipal officers every two years. That right has been somewhat curtailed by the Edmunds laws and still more by the extreme and, as we consider, unjust rules of the Commissioners, but the registered voters of this city have an undoubted right to express their choice on the 11th day of February, and ought not to be deprived of it through a mere technicality. We believe the courts would so decide if appealed to in legal form. But there is something more than opinion on this subject. Section 24 of the City ordinance provides that:

"Any omission or irregularity of any assessor or other officer pertaining to election matters shall not invalidate any election or authorize the rejection of any legal votes cast."

This appears to settle the question so far as the omissions or irregularities complained of are concerned. If copies of the registration lists are posted up in each municipal ward, and a proper notice of the election is given fifteen days before the election, and the officers appointed to conduct it proceed under the provisions of the ordinance, we do not think there will be any barrier in the way of the officers who shall be then elected when they obtain their certificates of election from the Secretary of the Territory.

And the public must bear in mind that we are still under a peculiar regime. The Commissioners have done a great many strange things. They have gone so far as to legislate, "when the existing laws of the United States and of this Territory" did not go far enough to suit them. They have taken it upon themselves to say that certain officers designated by the Territorial statute to be elected at a certain time should not be elected at all. They have excluded citizens from the franchise whom the law does not exclude. They ruled that an election for certain officers should be held before their terms fully ran out. And if they now say that the municipal election shall go on notwithstanding these few irregularities, on it will go, no doubt. And as the rights and interests of the people will be best subserved by the election, we will say that, in our view, the best thing the citizens and all parties concerned can do is to pass by these technical objections, get ready for the election and put good and true men in the City Council who will be worthy successors of the faithful servants of the public now transacting the business of this municipal corporation.

## WARLIKE WORDS.

ON the 13th of last month in St. James' Hall, London, General Sir Garnet Wolsey gave expression to some significant views. The occasion was the

distribution of prizes to the successful competitors in the Second Volunteer battalion of Royal Fusiliers, in which he took part. In a speech he announced himself as a firm disbeliever in universal peace, and characterized those who did believe in such a condition as belonging to a visionary class of people. He believed in accepting things as they existed. At the present time every nation in Europe was arming. "There must be some object in this." Said he:

"The most sensible people, not those carried away by warlike or party politics, must feel that there is coming over the world some terrible war. The English, it has been told, are not a military nation, and if that were true we should present a very poor comparison to the large armies of the continent; but the fact is that we are the most warlike nation in the world. No other nation has been so frequently at war, and we must be prepared for and look forward to this great war, with which England, as its army is at present constituted, will be unable to cope."

Such expressions coming from so high a professional authority on the subject of war must be received as having considerable weight. They coincide precisely with views recently uttered on the same topic by a high dignitary of the Swiss Republic, and on this side of the Atlantic General W. T. Sherman sounded a similar note. Pere Hyacinthe has also expressed a belief that a gigantic European conflict of arms will break out not later than 1885, and he would not be astonished if the crash should even occur before the fading of the present year.

The idea that the arming of all the nations of Europe must "mean something" is strikingly true. If it does, then it signifies a gigantic war, the proportions of which will cause all the conflicts of past history to pale into insignificance, not only because of the multitudes who will participate in the struggle, but the tremendous increase of facilities for destruction.

"The days will come when war will be poured out upon all nations," in fulfillment of the revelation on the subject given through Joseph Smith the Prophet, Dec. 25th, 1832, a portion of which has been literally verified in detail.

## A SIGN IN THE HEAVENS.

ACCORDING to a dispatch in the Cleveland Herald, Newcomerstown, Tuscarawas County, Ohio, had a mysterious visitant a few nights ago. A short time after dark a large bright light appeared suddenly in the eastern sky a few degrees above the horizon, and started in a direct northern path. The object had the appearance of an almost square volume of white light, and in its flight across the heavens left a bright trail which lighted up the woods just east of the town over which it passed so brilliantly that small trees and bushes could be observed distinctly by many persons who were watching the object. A very singular circumstance was the remarkable slowness with which the object traversed the heavens, it being seen for a long time by the numbers of citizens who were observing it. There were many hypotheses as to the cause of the singular astronomical phenomenon. Some persons were of opinion that it was an aerolite, but the slowness of its progress across the sky does not bear out that theory. Many of the people were seized with awe on beholding the unusual spectacle.

## THE BIBLE AND THE BOOK OF MORMON.

THE Christian Union for Jan. 3rd has an article on the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures, in which reference is made a number of times to the "Mormon Bible." An attempt is also made to draw a contrast between "men's Bibles and God's Bible." By the term "men's Bibles" is signified the Koran and the Book of Mormon, and by God's Bible the volume containing the Old and New Testaments.

The writer is in error about the "Mormon Bible." The Bible used by the "Mormons" or Latter-day Saints is the same that is in general use in Christendom. The Book of Mormon is not put forward in place of the Hebrew scriptures but in corroboration of the truths they contain. The two records come from different localities and were written in different languages, but they present the same divine source. If the Book of Mormon is true the Bible must be true, but the Book of Mormon should not be called the "Mormon Bible," because the only Mormon Bible existing is that which the Christian Union calls "God's Bible."

The Union article states that "the man-made Bibles are given in the very words which God is supposed to have used." But that

"God's Bible was produced in a very different way. It was over fifteen centuries from the time when the first book was written until the time when the last book was written. No one knows when or by whom the books of the Old Testament were first gathered together in a single volume. No one knows by whom or when the churches determined what of the various books

used in the first century should make up the New Testament. Our Bible was not manufactured; it grew. The authors of some of the other books are not known with certainty. No one pretends to know who wrote Kings, or Chronicles, or Job. Scholars are not certain who wrote portions of the Psalms, or the book of Ecclesiastes, or the Epistle to the Hebrews. There was no miraculous preservation of the writings. Very few of us read them in the "very words" of the original, or think it necessary to do so. A few scholars study them in the Hebrew and the Greek, and we are content with our German, French, and English translations. And justly so; for while the value of the man-made Bible depends upon the "very words" the value of God's Bible depends upon the spirit and the truth. In the man-made Bibles the supposed sacredness was in the thing—the contents of Mohammed's chest, the plates discovered by Joe Smith. But in God's Bible the sacredness is not in any thing."

Now the Book of Mormon does not profess to be "given in the very words" which God is supposed to have used. It contains books written by different individuals inspired by the same spirit, but who wrote according to their own language, the imperfections of which they admitted and deplored. Some of them wrote merely a record of the history of their times to the best of their personal knowledge; others wrote an account of the prophecies and revelations given through prophets by the Lord. But it was recorded in the words of men, and in the preface to the book which is a compilation of these records, it is declared: "And now if there are faults they are the mistakes of men: wherefore condemn not the things of God, that ye may be found spotless at the judgment seat of Christ." Moroni, one of the prophets, writes: "And I said unto the Lord, the Gentiles will mock at these things, because of our weakness in writing; for Lord thou hast made us mighty in word by faith, but thou hast not made us mighty in writing."

Wherefore when we write, we behold our weakness and stumble because of the placing of our words; and I fear lest the Gentiles shall mock at our words. And when I had said this the Lord spake unto me saying, fools mock, but they shall mourn," etc. The son of Mormon writes, "Condemn me not because of mine imperfection; neither my father because of his imperfection, neither them who have written before him, but rather give thanks unto God that he hath made manifest our imperfections that ye may learn to be more wise than we have been."

Neither was the Book of Mormon all written at one time. Its writings cover a period of nearly a thousand years. If the fact that the Bible is made up of books written at different periods through several centuries is any proof that it is divine—which we do not admit—the same claim is good for the Book of Mormon. And we fail to see wherein is the advantage of doubt as to the compilation and authorship of many of the books of the Bible, nor the peculiar virtue of translations uninspired and various. It appears to us that if books were written by inspiration and preserved and translated by divine interposition and power, they would have the advantage in comparison with a book of dubious authenticity and translation.

It is a mistake, too, to suppose that the value of the Book of Mormon depends on mere words and not upon "the spirit and the truth." It is on these very things that the record of the ancient inhabitants of this land depends for internal tokens of its divinity. It is not merely because it was translated by the gift and power of God that it is of such great value, but because of the truth it contains and the spirit that bears witness to them. And we cannot for the life of us see wherein is the disadvantage of a "miraculous translation" compared with a translation confessedly "man-made" and of doubtful accuracy.

If the Christian Union writer and his associates are "content" with the latter, we will not complain, but we see no reason to exalt doubt above certainty. The sacredness of the Book of Mormon is not thought to be simply in the thing—the plates discovered by the Prophet Joseph, but in the revelations and prophecies and declarations of doctrine therein contained; so in this respect it stands in the same position as the Bible.

We should like to know what the Union writer means by the statement that the Bible "was not manufactured; it grew." Why, he states further on that the writers of the books of the Bible wrote the words down "in their own words and in their own way." The Book of Mormon "grew" if the Bible grew, and in the very same manner. But it has this advantage, that its writers and compiler are known, and its translation is authentic, while, according to the Union writer, many of the Bible authors are unknown—the authority for its compilation is doubtful—and its translations are various and contradictory.

Another point of difference the Union article endeavors to make is that:

The man-made Bibles have prevented a spirit of inquiry; they have stifled free thought; they have forbidden men to think for themselves; they have made them worshippers of the letter; they have carried death. God's Bible has invited men to think; it has set them to investigating the questions who wrote the various books, what sort of men were they, what did they mean by what they wrote.

Here is another grave mistake, if the Book of Mormon is referred to, as it is undoubtedly. That book does not prevent inquiry; it creates a spirit of inquiry; it does not stifle, but it promotes free thought; it does not forbid, but it requires men to think for themselves; it has not made