

EDITORIALS.

GARBLED EXTRACTS FROM FINANCIAL REPORTS.

WE give space to-day to a communication from the Probate Judge of Box Elder County. The subject on which he makes some explanations is pretty generally understood, and the misrepresentations to which he refers have literally no influence upon the public mind. They bear the evidence of their own folly, and contradict the theory which prompted their publication. They contain figures of selected items which the writer with singular faculty imagined would work into his plan, but which act like a boomerang, striking a fatal blow at the scheme of falsification and slander under which they were projected.

It has been claimed by the same parties who put forth these garbled extracts of county financial reports, and sounded from one end of the Territory to the other, that public officers "neither make nor are they required to give any satisfactory account of the disbursement of public funds." This was one of the lying planks of the lying "Liberal" platform. The County Clerks are required by law, under severe penalties for refusal or neglect, "to keep an accurate account of all receipts and expenditures of their respective counties, also of all debts payable to and by said counties." Also to submit to the court, annually, on the first Monday in June a full financial statement in detail, showing the balance from the preceding year, the receipts, the expenditures, showing the amount paid to each officer, and for every other disbursement, with a statement of all debts payable to and by said counties. After the statement has been audited by the Court in each County, a true copy, approved by the Court, is to be published in some newspaper having general circulation in the county, and if there is none, to be posted up during the year in the office of the County Clerk. Under a former statute copies of these financial reports were required to be sent to the Legislative Assembly during the first two weeks of its session. As a matter of fact these reports have been made, furnished to the Legislature, and regularly published in full in its journals. By a change in the law at its last session, the copies of the reports are now required to be sent to the Auditor of Public Accounts instead of the Assembly.

In Salt Lake County these reports have been published; files of the DESERET NEWS can be produced in proof. The dispute which occurred between the House of Representatives and the County Clerk at the last session arose from different views of the requirement of the law; there was no accusation of improper expenditures. The House considered that the amounts paid to each officer and for every other disbursement should have been stated separately instead of being lumped, as they were in some instances in two or three counties, Salt Lake among the number. The reports in every instance of this kind were returned to the County Clerks, and were all corrected by them except in the case of Salt Lake County, the Clerk of which cited the law to show that it was the County Court, and not the Clerk, that was required to make the report to the Legislature. And the Court was finally requested to furnish another report which was ordered to be published and which appeared in the DESERET NEWS, making a double or repeated statement of Salt Lake County finances, as the annual report had been previously published in this paper.

We refer to this because so much has been said about it falsely, by the "Liberals," and as evidence that county officers are required to give satisfactory reports of the expenditure of public monies. That they do so, is proved by the extracts made from their reports, and published in a garbled form by the same parties who declare no such reports are made or required to be made.

Our friends in Box Elder County need not vex themselves over the vain attempt made to impute improper conduct to their officers. The style of the attack upon the county officers condemns it in the mind of every sensible person. Expenditures required by law are denounced as "illegal;" disbursements for pub-

lic and necessary purposes are called "private;" assumptions of improper appropriations are put forth without a particle of evidence or excuse for making them; the very figures quoted show that the amounts paid to the men who handle the funds and who are accused of stealing, in nearly every instance are ridiculously small; and the whole batch of mingled silliness, contradiction, bold assertion and villainous insinuation is self-condemnatory and only remarkable for its ostrich-like stupidity and blindness to its own exposure.

There is no need for other county officers to rush to the defence. No reply is requisite. We should have paid no attention to the matter but for the letter of Judge Burt. As a rule we do not notice in any way the medium through which the rubbish has been offered to the public; its character for defamation is sufficient to settle in the minds of the masses the status of anything it contains, and to cast a doubt upon the minds of its regular readers. And in these instances the strained effort to make out a case without any material except that fabricated or assumed by the writer, is apparent to everyone who has paid any attention to the nonsense, and such we have good reason to know are indeed few and far between.

THE ABOLITION OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE New York Herald of a recent date contains a report of an interview in this city with one of the Utah Commissioners—ex-Senator Paddock, in which the gentleman gave some of his views on Utah matters. Among other things he referred to the subject of woman suffrage. He gave figures to show that if the franchise should be taken away from the women, the "Mormons" would still have a very good majority at the ballot box, even if every "Liberal" in the Territory registered and voted.

Commissioner Paddock is reported as making this statement:

"The question of abolishing female suffrage in this Territory came up before the commission, but we had no jurisdiction in the matter. What may be said in favor of female suffrage elsewhere cannot be applied here. It is certainly odious as practised here. The women are completely controlled in their action by the Church authorities. No principle is involved in it—nothing but religious bigotry. Female suffrage has existed here about twelve years."

"A Gentle who was in the room was moved to say that female suffrage was a scheme of the Gentiles, they thinking that the women would vote against the Mormon Church in order to get out of polygamy; but it proved to be a boomerang, they voting for the Church to a man—or woman."

The gentleman has no knowledge whatever of the "complete control" of which he speaks. He has adopted the notions of others. If he had talked with the ladies here on this subject he could have obtained correct information. But he and his associates were too much afraid of being twitted with a leaning to the "Mormon" side of the question to put themselves in a position to learn the facts. Neither he nor any other man can give one good, solid reason, nor anything that can be accepted by an unprejudiced mind as proof that the "complete control" of which he speaks has any actual existence. If a woman wants to vote any ticket that she might make up, or a piece of blank paper, there is nothing to prevent her from doing so or to discover what she votes. The whole story about control of votes by Church authorities is moonshine and balderdash. Conversation with intelligent "Mormon" women would soon dissipate such a notion from the mind of any thinking man not swallowed up in the dense darkness of violent anti-"Mormonism."

The remark reported above about the women of Utah voting for the Church and polygamy, exhibits the common confusion of ideas which non-"Mormons" have on this question. The right of women to vote at elections has no bearing upon the subject of polygamy. They do not vote for it or against it, for or against any church or religion, at the ballot box. They simply vote for men to fill certain local offices. In voting for a Delegate to Congress, they did

not help to elect Hon. George Q. Cannon as a polygamist, nor Hon. John T. Caine as a monogamist; they with the male voters supported each of those gentlemen as a representative man who would sustain the rights of the people of Utah, and not seek to bring the majority of them into bondage nor misrepresent them at the seat of government. They did not vote against Mr. Baskin or Mr. Van Zile because they were lawyers, but because they were opponents of the masses of the people, antagonistic in their feelings to what the voters considered the true interests of the Territory. There has never been any issue of Church or no Church, polygamy or monogamy, for women or men to vote for or against at the elections held in this Territory. Such issues are dragged into the subject of the franchise by our "Liberal" defamers, because it suits their purpose of general misrepresentation. That's all there is of it.

We are not afraid of the abolition of woman suffrage in Utah. We do not believe it can be accomplished. After exercising the right for twelve years there is not the remotest vestige of evidence that they have used it improperly, or under any coercion whatever. The only complaint that can be brought against them is that they will not vote for their enemies, and that they will vote for their friends, they being themselves the judges of the enmity or friendship of the political candidates. The impudent "Liberal" cry: "Abolish woman suffrage in Utah because the women will not vote the 'Liberal' ticket," is enough to settle it in the mind of any Congressman with ordinary common sense. Then we have no fears as to the result, if it should be abolished. There would be still plenty of male voters to cast a strong majority for the People's Party, even with the strictest enforcement of the arbitrary rules adopted by the Commission, and the most ultra construction of the Edmunds Act. The abolition of woman suffrage would not help the "Liberal" cause in the least degree.

Apocryphal of this question of women voting, a friend at Omaha informs us that while the recent woman's suffrage campaign was in progress in Nebraska, at a crowded meeting in the Opera House at Omaha, during a joint discussion, a young lawyer cited Utah as a place where women voted and whisky was free as water. Miss Phoebe Cozzens, of St. Louis, indignantly denied the charge. She said whisky was not in common use there till brought in by "Gentiles," and instanced such towns as Logan, Brigham, etc., where whisky was not allowed to be sold. "No saloons, no billiard rooms, no loafers." She then drew a comparison with Ogden, where a large percentage of the population are "Gentiles." She said, to satisfy herself, she walked the streets of "Mormon towns at midnight, and found them as quiet and orderly as any city in the United States. There were "no dance houses, no variety theatres, no midnight brawls." Our informant, who is a non-"Mormon," adds, "Those who had visited Utah and knew she told the truth, applauded the eloquent lady for so boldly defending the right."

It is certain that while no valid argument can be brought against woman suffrage, in the main,—because none ever has been adduced by its strongest opponents, who resort chiefly to ridicule—no truthful objection can be specially urged against the exercise of that power by the women voters of Utah, who have used it at least as intelligently as most of the male voters in any State of this great republic.

ANOTHER ANTI-"MORMON" SENSATION.

A San Francisco Chronicle scribe has discovered a large mare's nest, big enough to furnish him with a subject for a tremendously long "solid" article with illustrations and sensational head-lines of startling significance. It is the Deseret Alphabet, which he has been led to believe is the "invention of a new language" concocted "so secretly that few knew or know that the attempt was made." The supposed object of this "secret" production is thus set forth in the Chronicle:

In 1863, if not earlier, the Regents of the Deseret University ordered that all the school-books should be printed in the new and strange

characters referred to. Above all the use of primers printed in this new character was insisted upon, and it was plain that this order was part of a deep-seated intention to rear up a generation of Mormons who should not only have a literature of their own, but who should be unable to understand that of any other people. The language once generally known, newspapers might be printed in it, notices issued, books published, documents circulated and a score of other methods employed of using it to the confusion of all except those in the secret. With the one exception that Chinese speak as well as read and write their language, San Francisco and Chinatown furnish a parallel state of affairs to that which would exist in Utah and the United States when this language became common, for what secret news is spread, what illegal proclamations are issued and what dangerous orders are given in documentary and poster form in the heathen quarter of this city is known only to the few initiated outsiders and to those who are to the Celestial manner born. Political and legal records could be kept in the Mormon character, and then with the coinage of a brand new vocabulary, the Gentile would be had upon the hip and lip."

The writer goes on to tell how the true meaning of the "Mormon cipher" was discovered by an expert, and how "ludicrous dismay" overtook the "Mormons," leading to the calling in of the manuscript in the printer's hands and the "rigorous suppression" of the work. But, he continues:

Fortunately for the bibliophiles, about ten copies were saved from destruction, one of which fell into the hands of M. M. Kalghn, a lawyer of Salt Lake City, and was by him presented to H. H. Bancroft, of San Francisco, who holds it as one of the treasures of his library.

This is all delightfully funny, but there is a great deal more of it, with a specimen passage from the supposed cipher book, a long paragraph "solving the cipher," and many comments on "the Mormon language," in an attempt to make these characters a reproduction of the engraving, on the plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated.

For the benefit of persons who may have been deceived by this rignarolle—which is quite likely to be copied into other papers, we will explain:

Some years ago the subject of phonetic spelling was agitated in Utah, as it was in many parts of the United States, and a method of spelling by sound was thought to be a great aid to children in mastering the elements of the English language. Many persons thought that all words should be spelled phonetically, and that if a practicable phonetic alphabet was introduced, with school books printed in such characters, education would be greatly facilitated. The Deseret Alphabet was arranged, and Pitman's well-known system was taken as the basis, many changes, however, being made in the characters and the sounds of the letters.

When the alphabet was constructed, it was publicly explained by means of the pulpit and the press; lectures were delivered on it, classes were formed to learn it, and the principles on which it was founded were discussed all over the Territory and elsewhere.

The design was not to introduce a new language, but to simplify the labor of learning to read the language in common use. It was in full accordance with the opinions of the advocates of "spelling reform" all over the world, only it was a step in advance of anything in that line that had been attempted. The Deseret University did not order that "all the school books should be printed in the new and strange characters referred to." The Deseret University did not and does not control that matter. A primer was printed in the Deseret Alphabet, and some "readers" and other works, but there was nothing secret about it, and it is not in the nature of a cipher, neither was it intended to be exclusive or of such a nature that it could not be easily read and understood by any person with the most ordinary perception. Children learned it in the schools where it was introduced, with perfect ease. And as proof that it was not "secret" or in the nature of a "cipher," the primer from which the veracious (?) Chronicle scribe copied the characters with which he intended to startle the public, contains a full explanation of every character, its name, sound, equivalent in the common alphabet

and everything else to make the matter clear and explicit.

How very fortunate for "bibliophiles and for the wonderful man of the Chronicle" that a lawyer of Salt Lake City should have secured one of the "ten copies that were saved from destruction," was it not? The lawyer of Salt Lake has simply been stuffing Mr. Bancroft after the common fashion of such "Liberal" deceivers. If Mr. Bancroft or the San Francisco Chronicle wants a thousand copies of this wonderful work "saved from destruction," we shall be happy to furnish them at the low rate of ten dollars a hundred. Every library on the Pacific Coast can be furnished with one of these treasures, counted so precious by the great author of the *Nathaniel Races*.

There are differences of opinion about the beauty of the characters of the Deseret Alphabet, also as to its utility for the purpose designed. But there can be no doubt as to the fact that it contains the principles for which the advocates of spelling reform contend, as essentials to a better system of orthography than that in common use. Neither is there any doubt that the San Francisco Chronicle has published a lot of rubbish and falsehood about it, with the intention of making one more sensation about the ever prominent and misrepresented "Mormons."

A SPIRITED DEFENCE.

BOX ELDER COUNTY FINANCES.

AN EXAMPLE OF "LIBERAL ECONOMY."

BRIGHAM CITY,
Nov. 22nd, 1882.

Editor Deseret News:

I recently learned from a correspondent of your city, that in an article in a disreputable Salt Lake paper, headed, "County Governments," it was alleged that about \$11,840.65 of the revenue of this county for 1881, had been "improperly expended." Being one of the officials charged with this "improper expenditure" of county funds, this information somewhat startled me; and I sent at once for a copy of that paper to see what the proof would support. Now, I had hitherto heard that the sheet referred to was not regarded for its honesty or veracity, but I had no conception before of the clearness and precision with which it misstated facts. For the benefit of the taxpayers of this county I would like a little space in your columns to briefly consider a few of these misstatements. The article assumes to be predicated on the County Clerk's account of receipts and expenditures; but the conclusions are purely the creation of the writer's brain, as we will endeavor to show. After representing the report of 1880, as that of 1881, and arbitrarily arranging the order thereof to suit his own convenience, he sets the machine in motion by which he reels off falsehoods by wholesale and retail, and vaguely alludes to a "blind entry" of \$2,615.04. This misstatement is calculated to mislead the unwary reader in the start, and was made either because the writer's simple mind is unable to grasp the figures, or the animus of his small soul was to wilfully misrepresent the facts. Hence we will now undertake to explain to even his simple mind the reasons for that "blind entry." If he will notice the report of 1881 he will see that the disbursement were \$2,617.04 in excess of the receipts, which were evidenced by outstanding warrants, that must be redeemed out of the next year's revenue, and an "entry" was made to that effect; "so much for the blind entry." He then further speaks of the "illegal expenditure" on roads and bridges of \$4,574.29, in the following language: "The item for roads is entirely outside of the law." * * * "And that the poll tax is the only resource from which officials may draw for the use of the roads." As to the first statement, will the reckless writer turn to page 11, of the laws of 1878, and reconcile his statement with the following: "That there shall annually be levied and assessed a tax for territorial and school purposes" * * * "and such sum as the County Courts of the several counties may designate for county purposes, not to exceed six mills on the dollar." Now is not this revenue, expended in maintaining and repairing county roads and bridges,