

If the lead should give out, where would the real estate of Salt Lake be?

The Governor talks about the necessity of public buildings in Salt Lake on a grand scale in order to impress people with the majesty and potentiality of the United States Government. He says there are buildings got up by private enterprise the size of which dwarfs our American imperialism. In Chicago we have one private enterprise building alone that would swallow all the public buildings in Illinois, and yet we don't feel that Uncle Sam loses any of his dignity by it. But the Governor wants an immense public building to teach an object lesson to Orlando the brave and to Caleb the callous. If Salt Lake needs a public building for public service she ought to have it, but the puerility of asking for it on the ground mentioned is obvious.

That philanthropic enterprise the "Industrial Home" is mentioned. It cost \$50,000 to build and equip it, but not one word is said of what it has done, or whether it has any inmates save the paid staff. This is one very important omission in the report.

Touching the Indians, the Governor says of the Saupete colony: "I am informed that they are being taught polygamy by the Mormon missionary who lives with them." He says, also, of the Kane County colony: "I am informed they practice polygamy." For a State paper these two utterances read badly. The Governor says he is "informed," but does not say by whom or by what means. Is it not his duty to ascertain the truth of "information received," and then report? Has he not an able staff of assistants for sleuth purposes? Or could he not visit these colonies himself? Suppose these Indians forwarded a memorial to Congress stating that the Governor was in error, where would he be then?

The Governor says there is an imperative necessity for appointing by a Federal agency selectmen, clerks, recorders, superintendents of schools and assessors. And it appears this necessity is caused by what he says is a fact, that a Gentle in some parts of Utah finds himself in a foreign land. The Governor himself admits that the "Mormons" are entirely composed of native Americans, Englishmen, Scotchmen and Scandinavians. Surely no American considers himself entirely a foreigner among Scotch and English, and as to the Scandinavians, there is good ground for believing that they were the original discoverers of this continent, that is, the original Caucasian discoverers. The best Americans today in this country are the Scandinavians, and the native American who visits their colonies is treated royally. Perhaps Mormonism changes a man; but hear the Governor himself. He says: "For human nature is not changed by the kind of church it enters." These are identically his own words. He must in truth be a queer kind of native American who finds himself a foreigner among Scotchmen and Englishmen, and

finds himself at home among Dagos and Clan-na-Gaels. He says that apostate "Mormons" are numerous, but that they are taxed and driven out of the country. Why did he not make allowance for this in his statistics of 16,000 "Mormon" foreigners, who he says are all alive and well since 1850?

But it is in his review of the situation that the Governor distinguishes himself as a jurist, logician and rhetorician. He says of "Mormon domination": "I am forced to express the opinion that it is not true, and feel that I will be performing a grateful duty if I can give the facts concerning the Utah of today in such shape and form as to enable Congress and the country to form clear opinions concerning them." That is just what we want. Facts clearly and explicitly stated; but the Governor says farther on: "I regret to say they were in error." That is, he regrets that the People's Party in Utah was not wholly defeated as it was in Ogden. Can we expect clear and honest evidence from a person who thus expresses his regret in a public document? Such an utterance would disqualify him as a juror in any court in the United States. Such an assertion would rule out his evidence before any judge in the land, Anderson included. Such an observation as this coming from an American Governor is treason to the genius of American liberty; it is a dishonor to American jurisprudence and an insult to the majesty of the American people. A governor has no right to rejoice over or regret the defeat or success of any political party. What would we think of President Harrison if in one of his messages to Congress he expressed regret because Iowa went democratic at the last election? Certainly, if the election was not fairly conducted there would be cause for regret. Or there would be cause for regret if a large number of citizens were disfranchised, as it is said they are in the South; and if we raise such an inferno because a negro is disfranchised in Mississippi, surely we ought to say something when a Scotchman is disfranchised in Utah. It is no excuse to say that it is the party of Judge Anderson that is doing all this disfranchising. It is no excuse to say that Iowa elected a democratic Governor because Judge Anderson left that State where he once was a candidate for Governor on the democratic ticket, and where his party and himself were regarded as rebels, traitors and disunionists, and where a few years ago a "Mormon" was more popular than a democrat.

The Governor writes quite a little essay on polygamy, but, in confidence, I will tell his Excellency that he will never get a grave in Westminster Abbey for essay writing. He proceeds to consider "whether the Mormons have ceased to enforce the doctrine of plural marriage" in a very unique way. Instead of plainly telling us how many plural marriages were celebrated for 1889, he proceeds to give a dissertation on the "Mormon" mis-

sonary system. He says the most ignorant are sought after. The fact is the contrary. The five countries which stand at the head of the civilized nations for intelligence are Scotland, England, Sweden, Germany and the United States. From these countries come the "Mormons." In one paragraph he ascribes to them ignorance, in the next intelligence. He says they are law-abiding except in the laws against polygamy; then if they don't abide by the polygamy laws, why not tell us how many polygamist marriages occurred in Utah last year? He says it is a poor tribute to their slincerity to say they have abandoned polygamy, and yet he says the masses of the Mormons are too sincere to make false pretenses. He says the strength of Mormonism lies in the sincerity of its people and of its officials, and yet he says they deal in evasions, ambiguities, and falsehoods. He introduces the Josephite Mormons in a way to leave the impression that Joseph Smith was murdered on account of polygamy. And then after all his praise of the Mormons for religious enthusiasm, sincerity, honesty, he says mendacity and deceit are their characteristics. The revelation on polygamy was given in 1843; previous to that Joseph Smith was persecuted by mobs and petty officials. He was murdered in 1844. So that the Josephites and polygamy, though introduced for a certain purpose, only reveal the weakness of the Governor's understanding.

In a few paragraphs he uses the word "probably" a dozen times as evidence that polygamy exists, and that Congress ought to disfranchise a community of Americans, Englishmen and Scotchmen on probabilities. Now, probabilities will do well for weather prophets, but in a court of justice that makes poor evidence.

He speaks about offices being held in families. Would he disqualify the present incumbent of the White House because his father was a distinguished man, or because the Harrison family holds a place in history 300 years back. He says "Mormon" money is spent among congressmen. Does he mean to say that the Mormons actually paid money to get the Edmunds-Tucker law. Or does he want the country to infer that the first legislative assembly in the world is a mere ring of shell manipulators. He says that a sheriff in Utah needs be a hurdle racer. That is just what a lord deputy once said in Ireland. His report reads: "These wilde Irishrie be uncommon swift of foot, and without the aid of bloodhounds it is impossible to apprehend them." It strikes me that if a few swift-footed Daniel O'Learys could be found they would outrun their swift-footed Scotchmen. We have in Chicago a number of Clan-na-Gael men out of office; why not import a dozen to Utah? They are swift of foot and will outrun bloodhounds.

We have the liveliest kind of a time here in the East just at present. Four movements of a politico-economic character are in active