

than sugar is worth." It is confidently expected that in a reasonable time sugar will be produced at a cost something less than sugar is worth, and that this will be margin enough to make fair dividends to investors. But just now it costs more, because the industry is but just started and there is inexperience not only in the manufacture of the article but in the production of the beets from which it is made. And the question turns, then, upon the right or wrong of extending aid to a struggling industry out of the public treasury.

We will repeat here that, on general principles, we are opposed to bounties and subsidies. When they are given for the benefit only of an individual or corporation, or to maintain a monopoly, we regard them as indefensible. But when a bounty will aid in the establishment and maintenance, for a reasonable period, of an industry that is clearly for the general welfare, and that could not be started without it, we think it is wise statesmanship and sound political economy to grant it.

We do not care whether this is Republican or Democratic doctrine, or for or against the general policy of either party. There are or should be exceptions to every rule, and a party platform that cannot recognize exceptions is unsound. We do not view the Democratic opposition to subsidies and bounties as so rigid and fossilized as to be unadaptable to exceptional circumstances. If it is, it ought to be broken. But we know there are as sound Democrats as any in the land who, both in and out of Utah, recognize the necessity of temporary and occasional departure from the general rule on this question. And we will say further, that unreasoning conformity to a supposed inflexible policy, will do more damage to the Democratic cause in Utah than can be at present calculated.

This sugar business is no monopoly. It is not established for the sole benefit of a corporation. It is clearly and undeniably for the public welfare. It is indeed a great necessity. What is asked is but temporary assistance. The arguments about taking public funds for private emolument do not apply in this case. Nobody asserts that the sugar company started with "the expectation that the Territory would make good any loss that it might incur." All that is foreign to the issue. We believe it would be a good thing to continue the sugar bounty granted by the preceding Legislature, for two years more, and that we believe would be sufficient.

The maintenance of "protection" to "infant industries" that have become

financial giants and grasping monopolies, we are opposed to with all our might. But every question of public policy should be viewed on its own individual merits, and we submit that the present case comes under the category of public benefits, and we hope it will be viewed in something more than the light of mere party dogma.

LYING WITH FIGURES.

COUNTY CLERK ALLEN, who holds an office that rightfully belongs to Mr. F. Ferguson, has been pleading against political liberty for Utah in support of Powers and the "Liberal" faction. His effort dealt largely in figures. They were alleged statistics. When we inform our readers that he said fully eighty per cent. of the assessment of Salt Lake City property is "Gentile money;" that five counties in Utah are "Gentile counties;" that their population is 96,989 out of the 210,762 total of the Territory; that these pay sixty-seven per cent. of all the taxes in the Territory; that fully three-quarters of the population of Salt Lake City are "Gentiles;" and that not more than 300 "Gentiles" have joined the Democratic and Republican parties, they can understand how, while figures do not lie, some awful lying can be done with figures. Mr. Allen's reputation in this regard has been established already on the stump. His perversions and falsehoods on the school question have been exposed pretty thoroughly. And no doubt before the other side concludes the argument, Allen's "statistics" and their application will receive the attention they demand. Allen is worthy to row in the same boat with ten thousand dollar Powers.

A FANATICAL SHEEP-OWNER.

On another page of this issue we reproduce a unique correspondence addressed to Governor Thomas by an addle-headed individual giving the name of Charles Heinhold. The communication, which is on the subject of the sheep bill, now pending in the Legislative Assembly, appears to have been given to the "Liberal" organ for publication. As to the reason for Mr. Thomas desirous to have publicity given to Heinhold's hash, that is best known to himself. It could not have been in the interest of creating a correct impression with regard to the bulk of the population of this Territory. To make this clear we here introduce an extract from Heinhold's splinters, thrown off from a disordered imagination:

"If this bill becomes a law, a sheep cannot exist, nor can they go up or down any canyon, and any Gentile owning a herd can be annoyed and driven out, and a Mormon can own the range. It is class legislation, and no just man, having the welfare of his fellowman at heart, would uphold such a measure. It is a Mormon measure, passed by a Mormon Legislature, and such bills have always been vetoed by the Governor, and we ask you as a piece of justice to veto this, the very worst measure of them all; we ask you to examine the section 2264 and see if that does not fill the bill."

The fellow who penned that epistle to his Excellency directly charges the present Legislature with passing laws that apply to one class of sheep-owners without having any bearing upon those of another class, and asserts that the present Legislature is composed of "Mormons," all of which is utterly false. "It is a 'Mormon' measure," he exclaims, when the fact is that the number of sheep owned by Gentiles bears no comparison to the herds of which "Mormons" are the proprietors. Consequently, whatever hardship or injustice would be entailed by the passage of the bill in question would fall with much greater weight upon "Mormon" sheep men than any others connected with that industry.

In connection with his request that the Governor veto the bill over which Heinhold has become excited, and which has caused him to exhibit his asinine tendencies, he declares that the existing statute on the subject (sec. 2264 Compiled Laws) covers all necessary ground for the regulation of sheepherds. We wonder if it was a "Mormon legislature" that passed that measure?

We do not see any use in the publication of such absurdly unjust advertisements upon the bulk of the population of Utah as are strung together in Heinhold's letter. They are calculated to create a wrong impression regarding the condition of affairs in this Territory, as everybody here knows. The only reason we have for publishing the attack of the fanatical ignoramus is to, so far as practicable, destroy its effect abroad, seeing that it assumes an air of importance through being addressed to the chief executive officer of the Territory and is published without comment by a leading journal of this city.

TROUBLES AT HOME AND ABROAD.

THERE is trouble everywhere. In France the members of the ministry have tendered their resignations to President Carnot. The question of Church and State is likely to become a complicated one among the effervescent Gauls. The Pope favors the French republic, but the Archbishops of Paris will not endorse the views of