

THE DESERET WEEKLY,

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, \$2.50
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50

IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

Saturday, . . . April 11, 1891.

POOR LAW AND BAD PHILOLOGY.

THE decision of Judge Anderson in the school bonds case is not surprising to us, nor indeed to most of the people who are particularly interested in the question involved. But, nevertheless, we do not believe it is good law or good philology.

He decides that the meeting provided for in the territorial statute, at which taxpayers may vote as to whether or not bonds shall be issued in their district for school purposes, is to all intents and purposes an election, as comprehended in the Acts of Congress regulating elections in this Territory.

His conclusion seems to be based on the meanings given to the word "election" in Webster's dictionary. Careful examination of them will, we think, show the very contrary of the Judge's opinion. Election means "a choosing," of course. But in the sense of the law it means a choosing of persons. Election in one sense means a "choice" of anything. But would any sane person think that the law, whether of Congress or of the Territory, is to regulate that choice except as it relates to persons to be selected for some office?

Under the reasoning of Judge Anderson, elections for officers of private corporations, which are provided for by law, may be regulated by the Utah Commission. Nay, even elections for changing their constitution or by-laws, or for any other purpose provided for under the statute, may, by the same logic, be construed as coming under the term elections in the act of Congress, and so be claimed as within the purview of the Utah Commission!

We hope this question will be tested thoroughly. It is a matter of property right, and the principle of taxation without representation is seriously involved therein. The Legislature which passed the law, and the Governor which signed it, undoubtedly intended to secure to every taxpayer the right which belongs to him of casting his vote in relation to the disposition of his own property. And this does not necessarily conflict with the Edmunds

Act or any amendment of it, because the language of that law plainly points to elections of individuals to office and the issuing to them of certificates of election.

The matter will be brought at once before the Supreme Court of the Territory, by whom we hope it will be duly considered without bias, and with due regard for a long line of precedents and the rights of the taxpaying population of Utah.

UTAH POLITICS AND PARTIES.

WE publish today a letter written to the morning "Liberal" organ of this city by a gentleman residing in Provo. He has been a "Liberal," but like a considerable number of other respectable and fair-minded non-"Mormons," has determined to work in future on the line of national politics. Being a Republican with pronounced views, he takes sides with that party, as he would if he resided in any other part of the Union.

But in addition to that, he is willing that "Mormons" as well as non-"Mormons" shall become identified with the great political parties of the country, so that by this means local animosities and those strifes which hinder the progress of the Territory may be swept away.

He thinks the great "vice of the Liberal party" has been a scramble for office, a fusion of opposing parties and factions, simply "to acquire numerical strength to capture every office and take absolute possession of the Territory." He has learned by experience that the stories told about the intolerance of the "Mormons" and their hatred for all "Gentiles" are erroneous, and he desires to make the party to which he belongs a political educator to the people of Utah, particularly to the younger men, who are said to be ignorant of the principles of government and unlearned in the politics of the times.

All this is gall and wormwood to the scribes on the paper to which his well written and temperate letter is addressed. With their characteristic blackguardism and dodging style of evading facts and arguments they proceed to berate and misinterpret him, and in two columns and a half of the thinnest kind of twaddle, run all round his pungent points without directly touching one of them. The gentleman gave them credit for honesty of convictions, and supposed they would concede to those who cannot endorse their policy the same honesty of purpose. In doing so he made a double mistake. In the first place they are not honest in anything they say or do

on the "Mormon" question. In the next place they will not concede honesty of purpose to any one who will not endorse their views and assist in their designs.

The proof of their dishonesty is in their daily writings, filled with sophistry, misquotations of their opponents, contradictions of their own statements and attempts at argument and abuse of those who do not see through their green spectacles. That they will not concede honesty of purpose to the writer of the letter is seen in their attenuated and long drawn out miserable attempt at a reply. Here are a few of the "arguments" offered in answer to his courteous communication:

"The mind of the writer is entirely perverted."

"He talks like the sorriest kind of a Jack-Mormon."

"This man says."

"This man thinks."

"If he had told the whole truth he would have said" etc.

"There have always been a class of men like the writer of the letter, men who saw no special trouble about the institution of polygamy, men who cared nothing at all about Church rule, and who for the purposes of trade have always been ready to endorse anything that was ordered from the head of the Mormon Church."

"That is all rot," etc.

"He is moving in the direct line of the plan to get Utah set aside as a State by itself, not an American State, but a foreign State—a Mormon State," etc.

"And he, coming here three years ago, dares to hold up the ignorance of these young men as a proof that the Liberal party has not done its duty."

"This man, with a tone of reproof to the Liberal party, asks that it shall lay down its weapons and admit that it has been wrong from the first."

"We believe he has been cajoled into his present wives. We believe he never did have any horror of polygamy or any horror of Church rule," etc.

The poor creatures who fulminated the foregoing, are blind to the signs of the times and oblivious to the movement in progress. Their minds are so warped with anti-"Mormon" fanaticism that they cannot perceive the high motives that actuate men like the writer of the letter that has agitated them, nor sense the fact that their bigotry and bile are sickening the better elements of the so-called party which they desire to perpetuate. And they have not the grace to acknowledge the candor and fairness which shine throughout the letter we have reproduced, but instead endeavor to misrepresent it.

There is nothing in the letter to justify the epithets hurled at the writer, or the statement that he condones "polygamy and Church rule," and is moving in the line to make a State that shall not be an American State. These *Tribunisms* are efforts to dodge the issue. The letter could not very well be ignored. The only thing for that paper to do was to publish it and