

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, . . November 14, 1891.

GOVERNOR THOMAS REPORT.

THE DESERET EVENING NEWS of November 4th and the DESERET SEMI-WEEKLY of November 6th will be found a full report of Governor Arthur L. Thomas to the Secretary of the Interior for 1891. No other paper has given all the tabulated and statistical matter it contains.

On the whole it is a valuable and comprehensive document. It includes a vast amount of information which will be useful for future reference. The progress of the Territory is displayed in the figures which the Governor has so carefully compiled, and they tell in louder tones than fine sentences could utter, the story of the material condition and prospects of Utah.

Upon the statements and explanations of the Governor on various subjects we have no criticism to make, until he touches on the educational question. He then displays a desire to depart from plain facts and indulge in some anti-"Mormon" opinions. It is true that the Church has appointed a board of education. It is not true that the Church schools are designed to "enter into competition with the district schools." If it is "wrong," as the Governor dogmatically says it is, for the "Mormon" Church to have a board of education with the view of establishing denominational schools in various parts of the Territory, is it not just as "wrong" for the Methodist, Presbyterian and other sectarian churches to do likewise? Yet he furnishes statistics of the denominational schools of the Territory with the amounts expended in their support, carefully excluding what the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is doing in this regard.

Does the Governor really mean what he says, that denominational schools "can only serve the purpose of narrowing the minds of those educated under their influence?" If so, all these denominational schools, which he takes such pride in parading, ought to be closed up. What will the ministers of those denominations and the sectarian boards of education in the East which have established many of these

schools, think of his official denunciation of their efforts?

If he means that the "Mormon" Church is "wrong" but the other churches are right in establishing denominational schools, where is the logic or indeed the common sense of his proposition? The Church schools he opposes come no more into competition with the district schools than do those of other denominations. In fact, they do not compete with them as much. For the "Mormon" Church schools are of a higher grade than the district schools, and specially designed for young people who have advanced from the district schools to higher studies. And if the design was to discourage the district schools, why were the school bonds voted for by the "Mormon" people, without whose support they could not have been issued? The Governor could have obtained the full facts, if he had desired to print them instead of the erroneous rumors to which he has given official utterance.

The polygamy question is treated in a fair and consistent manner from the Governor's standpoint, and he frankly states that when the General Conference adopted the manifesto he "accepted their action as a sincere expression of their views." He thinks further that "their action should be regarded as sincere until there is good reason for thinking otherwise."

In the main he is fair in his statement concerning the political movement which led to the division of the people into national party organizations. From the facts and dates he gives it will appear to the careful reader, beyond controversy, that instead of originating with the "Mormon" leaders, as claimed by many "Liberals," it commenced with Republicans and Democrats who were formerly "Liberals," and that the overtures to the People's party came from them. The Governor expresses the opinion too, that "it is a step which probably will never be retraced," and further that the mass of the people have gone into the party movement in perfect sincerity, and that it is their present intention not to retrace their steps."

In presenting the resolutions of the parties here, however, while careful to fully quote the "Liberal" platform, he gives but a scrap or two of the Republican and Democratic utterances, and entirely omits their resolutions in regard to the enfranchisement and amity of the "Mormons." It is perhaps too much to expect that a "Liberal" will be altogether impartial.

The terrors of immediate Statehood

appear to be as frightful to the Governor as to any of the "Liberal" faction whose cause the Governor proceeds to champion. He fears that unless it is postponed the people would "submit to the will of their leaders." What would be the awful consequences of "the will of their leaders" is not explained. But he says of the "Mormon" people, "they have been taught to believe and do believe that when their leader speaks he but gives utterance to the will of the Divine Master." This is as a complete a misrepresentation of "Mormon" belief, past and present, as could be put into words. We do not know whether Governor Thomas is so ignorant of "Mormon" doctrine as to think he is fairly explaining it, but we do know that what he says on this point is utterly false and misleading. If he cannot understand what the "Mormons" believe on this subject he is unfortunate; if he does, understand and purposely reverses, it we have no desire to express our candid opinion of his effort.

The Governor believes "it is the intention of the Liberal party to deal fairly with the Mormon people." If so his faith is sublime, in view of the course taken by that faction and its present attitude, and in face of his own statement that "In the meantime the Liberal party will maintain its organization and oppose Statehood with all the ability and power it possesses." Why statehood should be opposed, as the Governor views it, may thus be summarized: It would place the Territory under the control of the Mormon Church, it would be expensive and cause increased taxation, and the "Liberals" do not want it. That is all.

"What would happen if statehood should soon come and the leaders should raise the old standard" he admits he "cannot say." But this he has several times implied would be improbable because the steps taken will "never be retraced." And the very division on party lines which the "Liberals" oppose would be the strongest guard against the control he affects to fear. As to the increased expense, everybody knows about that, and also that Utah is far better prepared and equipped to assume it than was either Idaho or Wyoming, or is any other Territory seeking for admission into the Union. But why do the "Liberals" not want it? And why should a small faction of the community control in so important a matter. All that he urges against statehood is upset by his own closing remarks on the question: