

Good Hope, Newfoundland, and the eight provinces composing the Dominion of Canada.

The crown colonies are the Bahamas, Barbadoes and Bermuda, Western Australia, Guinea, Mauritius and Jamaica, New Guinea, Senegambia, Sierra Leone, Ceylon, Gibraltar and St. Helena.

The self-governing colonies are locally independent, they have separate governments and their own legislatures. The governors are appointed by the crown. They protect themselves by their militia, their volunteers and their armed police. The population of the self-governing colonies will aggregate about 10,000,000.

In the crown colonies some have two legislatures, one appointed by the crown and the other an elective assembly. Some have only one legislative council appointed entirely by the crown. In Gibraltar and St. Helena the governors make all the laws, rules, etc., subject to the sanction of the Queen.

France has recently been making a study of the British colonial system in order that she may profit by it in governing her own colonies. France has not one single self-governing colony, while all of England's colonies, except two, are self-supporting. The French government has appointed a commission to give the colonial system special study, and to outline improvements which would place the French colonies on a par with those of England.

ACTIONS AND MOTIVES.

"It seems to me unwise to attempt to interpose as an obstruction to a right action that it is prompted by a bad motive."

The foregoing sentiment will strike reasonable people as just and well expressed. It is the language of ex-Governor West, in reference to the present political movement in Utah and the opposition to it from the "Liberal" faction.

The position is this: The alleged reasons for excluding the "Mormons" from political power have been, the practice of polygamy and the union of Church members in one political organization. The Church has declared against future polygamous marriages, the People's party has determined to dissolve. In the opinion of non-"Mormons" everywhere, are not these actions right? Are they not what was demanded of them by the general public voice? If the acts are right, who then has the right to impugn the motives that led to those actions?

The "Liberal" faction are driven to

an unwise and unreasonable arraignment of motives, because they cannot find fault with the actions. What the "Mormons" have done cannot be impeached, therefore their motives are made the objects of suspicion.

It has been shown many times in these columns, that the outcry raised against polygamy by certain writers and schemers, was but a pretext. That if it were abandoned they would be just as bitter and antagonistic as ever. Also that the claim so frequently made that the People's party was evidence of a union of Church and State, was mere clap-trap, and that if the party were disbanded the cry would be kept up all the same. The results prove that our arguments were correct. And we are certain that nothing the "Mormon" people could do, except to lie down in the dust and let their "Liberal" traducers and would-be rulers walk over them, would ever satisfy the ringleaders and scribes of that unconscionable faction.

It has been conceded by all who know anything about them—the "Liberal" faction included—that the "Mormons" are sincere, truthful, honest and worthy people. How irrational it is, then, to impute evil motives to them when they unitedly perform a right action! How ungenerous it is when they move in the direction which they have been implored to take, not to meet them in the path, or at least give them credit for their course! And in what an unenviable light do they appear, who, while bragging that these movements of the "Mormons" are the result of their efforts, refuse to accept them as in good faith, and stand back, call names and impute bad motives to these good acts!

The sophists who appear in this attitude will probably jeer at our quoting the language of ex-Governor West, whose course in some things we have had occasion to denounce. But we are always ready to accept a truth no matter whence it comes, and to admire a good sentiment by whomsoever expressed. The position taken by that gentleman is so strong and fair and clearly defined, that we cannot but recognize it and accord it due importance. Besides, we hope always to be ready to meet an opponent half way when he is ready to meet us honorably on common ground. In this instance that common-ground is, in his words, "accepting this movement and allowing the members of the People's Party to identify themselves with the national party of their choice," and "no disposition or purpose to make war upon anybody's religion."

We are for religious and political

liberty within the lines of the law. The recent actions of the "Mormon" people indicate that this is their position. Those who meet them on this ground are no longer to be regarded as enemies. For, while the action is undeniably good, suspicious as to the motive should not be indulged in, to the prevention of that unity of effort and that courtesy of conduct which should exist among gentlemen and citizens of the same commonwealth.

Motives are to be judged, if at all, by actions. They are often beyond the scrutiny of the most prying eyes and the acutest discernment. And when all the indications are that people are taking a praiseworthy course, it is only the evil-minded and self-depraved who attempt to impugn the motives for that course and cover them with the odium of base suspicion.

DO THEY NEED COMMISSIONS?

THE ousted "Liberals" who have been figuring as City Councilors without being elected, wisely withdrew from further contention and did not attempt to take their seats on Tuesday, June 18th. The duly elected councilmen presented themselves with their certificates of election, but were met with another technical objection, this time on the part of City Attorney Hall, who stated that they could not take their places until they each produced a commission from the Governor.

It is time that the question as to what officers must obtain a commission from the Governor was judicially determined. The Organic Act provides that the Governor "shall commission all officers who shall be appointed to office under the laws of the said Territory." This was understood for years just as it reads, that officers who were appointed should be commissioned by the Governor, while those who were elected received their certificates of election from the proper official. Some of them, however, were required by law to obtain commissions from the Governor. But as governors and secretaries were changed, and new incumbents wanted as many fees as possible, commissions to elected officers became general and resistance to the exaction was not insisted upon because the fee was small and there was no desire to make unpleasantness over so peculiarly insignificant a matter.

But if the view most people take of the law is correct, there is no need to keep up this custom. And seeing that a number of the "Liberal" Councilmen took their seats without produc-