

is justly complained of by Jew, "Gentile" and "Mormon" alike?

There are two ways by which this can be done. One is to reduce the valuations. They are beyond all reason. They can be cut down. The assessor has made a grave mistake in his rendering of the requirement of the law, and has blundered in his valuations even under that construction. Let the City Council correct his errors.

Then the Council has placed the levy at four mills on the dollar, when two or two and a half mills will bring in ample revenue for all civic necessities. This levy can be lowered. That is the other way to cure the evil.

All party considerations and all ideas about future position should be discarded by the Council in considering this question. There are many small property-owners who cannot pay the enormous taxes levied upon them. There are large owners who feel that they are being imposed upon. The whole community is aroused. Something ought to be done, and that speedily, to allay the strong and indignant feeling which is manifesting itself in every direction. The remedy is with the Council. Will they not use it and that without delay?

CONFLICTING REPORTS.

WHAT would the veracious reporters for the eastern papers, and the country correspondents of the Associated Press, do if there was no "Mormon" question to fall back upon when news happens to be scarce? That seems to be their unfailing resource when a dearth of items is before them.

Just now there are three conflicting rumors in regard to "Mormon" migrations. One is that there is a wholesale immigration into Canada. Another is that the chiefs of the Church have made arrangements for the purchase of large tracts of land in Arizona, preparatory to the removal of great numbers of "Mormons" into that Territory. The third is that "the Mormons have abandoned any further attempts to colonize the American Territories, and are looking towards Old Mexico as their Canaan," and that "a considerable Mormon emigration" is now flocking into that country.

The varied reports, when grouped into the same paper as information by telegraph, have a rather comical appearance. The fact is, the whole matter is an absurd exaggeration. There is no "considerable Mormon

emigration" from Utah. A few colonists have settled in Canada. Arizona contains a number more. In Chihuahua, Mexico, there are also a few settlers from this Territory. But no large migration is taking place, nor is contemplated in any direction.

If our contemporaries desire to tell the truth on this matter they can use this information freely and rely on what we have stated. But as they appear to want sensations rather than realities, it is probable that they will continue to report the falsehoods and shut their columns against the facts.

When the untruthful character of most press dispatches on "Mormon" affairs is considered, strong doubts naturally arise as to the authenticity of anything that comes over the wires as news for the papers.

THE TWO PARTIES IN IDAHO.

WE publish in another part of this paper two different accounts of the Democratic Convention in Idaho. Readers can take their choice. One thing we wish to be understood in relation to the matter: There is no "Mormon" delegation from Bear Lake County. Men are not to be regarded as members of the "Mormon" Church simply because their fathers were "Mormons." Membership comes from individual and voluntary acts, not by birth or parentage.

There has been no "Mormon" primary or convention in Bear Lake County, and it is well understood there, as here that no member of the "Mormon" Church can vote or hold office under the laws of Idaho "as construed by the courts."

It looks as though the Republicans had by far the stronger following and the better prospects of success in the new State. The Democrats lost the "Mormon" vote through their own folly and lack of backbone. They deserve their fate. Then the course of the Democrats in Congress in relation to lead, and in opposition to the admission of Idaho, must damage the party somewhat in the State election.

It is a very pretty fight, though, and if the Democrats were only united among themselves and true to the principles of their party, they might stand a good chance of victory. As it is, the odds are at present in favor of the Republicans, as the shrewder politicians, having the stronger men, and bearing the prestige of victory in the admission of the new State.

THE DISPUTE ABOUT RUMEL.

THERE seems to be some misunderstanding as to the decision of the majority of the Board of Canvassers in relation to the returns of votes for John H. Rumel. The logic of the Board is called in question, and it is argued that if H. Page and Henry Page are held to mean the same person, then John H. Rumel and John H. Rumel, Jr., must be held to mean the same person. And it is inferred that because the decision was contrary to this, the certificate is to be given to Henry Page, and that John H. Rumel, Jr., who was elected to the office of Recorder, will have to contest the election from the outside of his lawful position.

The defect in this reasoning seems to be here: While it does not appear that H. Page and Henry Page are two different persons, it is a known fact that John H. Rumel and John H. Rumel Jr. are two different persons. True, the elder Rumel was not a candidate for office. But voters often cast ballots for persons who are not candidates. Yet the votes are counted, and hence the term "scattering" is used when a few votes for such persons are found in the ballot boxes.

This decision of the Board, however, only relates to their powers under the law. It appears to us that they have taken a consistent and legal stand on that matter. They have to go to the ballot box to determine how the votes were really cast. If it should appear that the judges of a certain poll made a mistake in certifying that the votes were cast for John H. Rumel and that they were really cast for John H. Rumel, Jr., the People's candidate will have all those votes counted in his favor in spite of the omission in the returns.

But if it shall be found that the votes were cast for John H. Rumel, it will be for a competent court to decide, on a proper hearing, what the voters intended when they cast their ballots. The decision of the Board shows that this may be done and also that the Canvassers have not sufficient judicial authority to determine the question.

It does not follow that because of the decision of the Board, the certificate will be given to Henry Page. When the ballots are examined it may turn out, as we believe it will, that John H. Rumel, Jr., received a majority of the votes, and he will therefore receive the certificate.