nothing but proper to allow for a similar sentiment on the other side.

Should the agreement for a fusion ticket be consummated, would the other side adhere to the compact, or would they be liable to bolt and thus create disaster to the people? This question may arise with some. Such a query is hardly fair. We think we have heard of complaints from the People's side that they were being unjustly prejudged on some important political matters. Care should be taken against being guilty of the same thing. Besides, the minority are possessed of some political shrewdness and are not likely to do anything that would precipitate disaster upon themselves and enhance the interests of the people.

It is presumed that this movement, based on changed sentiment and circumstances, will, should the arrangement be completed, be honestly and fairly carried to a consummation.

"MORMON FALSEHOOD AND FRAUD."

"Let every man beware lest he do that which is not in truth and righteousness before me." This is the word of the Lord by revelation to the Latter-day Saints. The God whom they serve must be served and worshipped "in spirit and in truth."

There is an impression upon the minds of some people, uninformed as to the facts and misled by traducers, that the "Mormons" are not at all particular as to the truth when their personal interests or those of the Church to which they belong seem to be imperilled. Also that their religion justifies falsehood in communications with their enemies. This is all wrong. There is not a more truthful people in the world than the "Mormon" people as a body, and there is no creed more opposed to lying than the faith of the Latter-day Saints. Truth is the exalting and sanctifying principle of "Mormon" doctrine, and "the knowledge of the truth" is upheld therein as the grand object of human attainment, to be followed and accompanied by the practice thereof. The chief office of the Holy Ghost is to guide into "*all truth*," make it clear to the mind and enable its recipient to embody it in daily life and everlasting existence.

Correct understanding and right living are essentials in "Mormonism," and mere faith in what is true and right are considered vain and forceless without works in correspondence. Departures from this way of life are violations of the covenants into which men and women enter when they embrace the religion taught by the "Mormon" Church. If these are not corrected by true repentance which includes reform, the derelict are liable to excommunication.

"Thou shalt not lie; he that lieth and will not repent, shall be cast out."

"And if he or she shall lie, he or she shall be delivered up unto the law of the land."

"Wo unto them that are deceivers and hypocrites among you, for, thus saith the Lord, I will bring them to judgment."

These are extracts from the revealed law of God to the Latter-day Saints. They are standing regulations in the Church. No member or officer is exempt from their enforcement. Honesty of word and deed is absolutely essential to "Mormon" character and the enjoyment of the full benefits of the "Mormon" religion. And we are happy in the assurance that truth, honor and integrity are general characteristics of a great majority of the "Mormon" people.

But, as among all other societies, there are persons who do not fully practice the tenets of their faith or live by the rules of the organization to which they belong. Such persons are looked upon as unfaithful and unworthy of the respect accorded to the true and just, and if they continue in wrong-doing, are dealt with according to the rules of the Church and the testimony against them.

Some color has been given to the slander against "Mormon" truthfulness by the acts of individuals. These however should not be pointed out as indicative of the character of the community, or illustrative of the teachings or permissions of the Church, when both are so pronounced in opposition to them. Nothing can be more unjust than to charge upon a church or other association the wrong-doing of individual members, when it is in violation of rules to the contrary.

We have heard of some things lately that have given our opponents an opportunity to villify our people and creed. Some postmasters, in places where the postal business is very small and the remuneration next to nothing, have adopted a practice that is not uncommon in many parts of this great country. That is, of reporting to the Department as cancellations, stamps that have been sold or used in payment for various articles purchased by the postmasters. The income of these small postoffices is regulated by the amount of stamps *cancelled* therein. If a postmaster buys an article for which he manages to pay in postage stamps, he has no right to report them as cancelled. The act is a fraud on the Government and the report which he signs to that effect is a lie. For such action he is doubly liable. He is open to prosecution under the criminal law, and to trial for his fellowship in the Church.

We desire to state, on behalf of the people whom we represent, that fraud and falsehood are abhorrent to their feelings and opposed to their faith. Such acts as we have described are akin to petty stealing. They cannot be indulged in by the Latter-day Saints. Those who commit them cannot be fellowshipped unless they truly repent and refrain from repeating the offense. As proof that this is the practical view taken of the evil, we cite the action of the High Council of the Eastern Arizona Stake of Zion on a case of this character. At St. John's, June 16th, 1887, on the trial of J. K. P. Pitkin, postmaster at Ramah, it was proven before the High Council, Elder Jesse N. Smith presiding, that he had engaged in the deceptions we have described, and he was excommunicated from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, for defrauding the Postal Department of the United States, and denied re-admission until he should repent and refund to the Government such amounts as he had wrongfully obtained.

This demonstrates the truth of our position and will, perhaps, count more than words with people who do not understand the force of our faith and the character of our people.

We understand that special efforts have been made to discover infractions of the postal law on the part of "Mormon" postmasters. We believe that men may err through ignorance and that perhaps some have thought they were doing no actual wrong in following a common practice elsewhere. But anything that is not square, and truthful, and honest, and is done to defraud in ever so small a matter, is wrong in essence and contrary to the covenants of the Gospel. Therefore we cannot have sympathy for men who may have thus been specially singled out for blame or prosecution, for a Latter-day Saint is expected, by his very standing in the Church, to be above the ways of the world and firm in honor and integrity.

Let it be known to all the world that lying and fraud are discordant with "Mormonism," and that the majority of the people of Utah fully believe in the scriptural saying, that among those who will be cast out of the kingdom of heaven and the glory of God are them that "love and make a lie."

WHAT ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

"A Reader," writing under a recent date, from Morgan City, Utah, addresses the following query to the News:

"Please, through your columns, give the definition of the words 'Public schools of the Territories' as used in the Senate bill 1405, March 19, 1886, in relation to the study of physiology in said schools, for the information of school officers."

Schools which are wholly or in part supported by general tax are "public schools" within the meaning of the Senate bill referred to. In this Territory they are denominated "district schools," but their character with respect to their being wholly or in part maintained by taxation, rather than any local name given to them, brings them within the scope of the bill referred to by our correspondent.

A REAL QUEEN OF THE FOREST.

It is delightful to the average youth to read stories of thrilling adventure in the wilds of the Dark Continent. The courage displayed by and narrow escape of hunters of beasts of prey have for him a peculiar fascination. Even older people are not averse to perusing the sensational as it appears in works of travel and adventure. On the 27th ult. we gave an account of an exciting incident in which John F. Spencer, a young man of Randolph, Utah, displayed remarkable bravery and steadiness of nerve when attacked in the mountains near that place by what was supposed to be a mountain lion, after which having received a wound from a shot fired by Robert McKinnon, rushed toward its intended victim with howls of rage, lashing his sides with his long tail. Repeated springs by the infuriated brute toward young Spencer were met by shots from his trusty rifle, the fifth bullet killing it. The animal was described as measuring from nose to the end of the tail, seven feet four inches; height nearly four feet; around the forearm fourteen inches; across the foot six inches; length of tail, two feet eight inches; weight 175 pounds; it was poor in flesh.

The proportions given were so much in excess of those of any beast of the mountain lion species we ever heard of that we could scarcely believe that it belonged to that class. These doubts have been confirmed by a letter from John Snowball, of Randolph, by whom we are informed that it has been learned beyond doubt that the animal was a genuine African lioness, which escaped from Green River City last year. This being the case, John F. Spencer is a real lion killer, and with the exception of the wound inflicted by Robert McKinnon, which did not at all disable the beast, performed the work single-handed, at close quarters.

SUBSTITUTE ATTACHMENT BILL.

Following is the substitute for Marshall's attachment bill, which was killed in the House. It was introduced by the House judiciary committee, and passed the lower branch of the Assembly yesterday:

A BILL

Amending Section 410 of an act entitled An Act Revising the Code of Civil Procedure of Utah Territory Relating to Attachments.

"Section 1. *Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah*: That Section 410 of an act entitled An Act revising the Code of Civil Procedure of Utah Territory, approved March 13th, 1884, be and is hereby amended by repealing all after the word "cases" in the sixth line of said section, and enacting in lieu thereof the following: In an action upon a judgment or upon a contract, express or implied, which is not secured by any mortgage or lien upon real or personal property situate or being in this Territory, or if originally so secured when such security has, without any act of the plaintiff or of the person to whom the security was given become valueless against a defendant who,

1st. Is not residing in this Territory; or,

2d. Stands in defiance of an officer or conceals himself so that process cannot be served upon him; or,

3d. Has assigned, disposed of or concealed or is about to assign, dispose of or conceal any of his property with intent to defraud his creditors; or,

4th. Has departed or is about to depart from the Territory to the injury of his creditors; or,

5th Fraudulently contracted the debt or incurred the obligation respecting which the action is brought; *Provided*, That hereafter in the cases mentioned in subdivision 3, 4 and 5 of this section, the cause of action shall be deemed to have occurred and the debt or obligation to be due, any agreement of the parties to the contrary notwithstanding."

The Constitution of the United States declares that no state shall pass a "law impairing the obligation of contracts." Suppose a case like this: A man incurs a debt, an element of the contract being that he shall pay the same in one year; but some time prior to the maturity of the obligation he sees fit to remove from the Territory, such removal being "to the injury of his creditors;" can the "obligation of the contract" be so "impaired" as to make the debt due before the time stipulated, and hence before the debtor can, under established principles of commercial law and practice, be presumed to have prepared himself to meet it?

Any business man knows what hardship may result from making a debt collection by an attachment suit some length of time before the debtor expected to be called upon to meet it. Barring the question raised by the closing proviso, the bill is an excellent one. As that clause appears to contain a doubtful provision, would it not be proper for the Council to consider the advisability of striking it out?

THE BAIL BILL VETOED.

What has been known as the bail bill, passed by the Legislature and sent to the Governor for his official signature, appears in this issue. Annexed to it is the veto message of that functionary. That he should have declined to sign a bill so just and fair is not to his credit. It simply gives to appellant defendants who have not been guilty of murder, rape or other infamous crime, and who are charged with offenses for which the punishment does not exceed five years, the right to bail pending final adjudication. In the more aggravated cases named and referred to, the question of admission to bail is left to the discretion of the judiciary.

The chief point in favor of this bill is that it simply renders operative a direct provision of the Constitution, which prohibits the demanding of excessive bail. What can be more excessive in this regard than to deny bail altogether? Yet this measure simply provides that, under a certain limit, such an unconstitutional action would be impossible.

It is not a question as to whether as an actual fact any court or courts in this Territory would, unless legally inhibited, sit squarely down upon a constitutional right of a defendant whose case has not been finally determined. The point is that no such contingency should be practicable or even possible under the law. The present law is objectionable on the ground that the judicial discretion on this vital subject is too wide, and the amendatory statute which the Governor refused to approve, is therefore highly necessary.

The reasoning of the veto message is unhappy. The Governor inserts what he claims to be an expression of the friends of the measure. He attributes to that class the statement that "an imported judiciary hostile to the people of Utah have used the discretionary power entrusted to them as an engine of injustice, oppression and inhumanity." He does not state by whom this expression was used. If it or anything akin to it was enunciated during the debates on the bill in either house, we fail to remember it. We would be pretty safe in stating that it was never used in the discussions. In fact, the bill was so manifestly fair that it provoked but little discussion of any kind. In the House it was passed by an almost unanimous vote, there being but one negative, while in the Council there were two.

Instead of considering the justice of the measure, and the unanimity with which it was passed by the Legislature, the Governor appears to pay particular attention, as a basis for his action, to the presumed immaculate condition of the judiciary, whose purity has not been assailed in connection with this bill. When there is a question as to whether the constitutional rights of any class of people shall be defined and preserved by law, or left to the discretion of any class of officials, judicial or otherwise, the decision should fall in favor of the former.

The argument that under the law as it stands, "the innocent are less likely to be punished than the guilty to escape" is out of harmony with American jurisprudence. The genius of the institutions of this country is the here shall be *no likelihood* of the innocent being punished. According to the Governor's own showing such likelihood does exist, his chief reason for perpetuating the liability to so great a wrong being that it is not so great as the escape of the guilty. The gentleman is evidently not in unison with the sentiment prevailing in all civilized countries, to the effect that "it is better that ten guilty men should go free than that one who is innocent should be punished."

We unhesitatingly reverse the Governor's ground and hold that under the existing loose statute the innocent are more liable to punishment than the guilty are to escape. The former are under the risk, by a wrong exercise of judicial discretion to be held in imprisonment to their great detriment while the courts have not yet decided as to their guilt or innocence. If the final judgment be to the effect that they have not been guilty of the charges under which they had been placed, then they have been subjected to a grievous and irreparable wrong. Persons who are guilty are held under bonds that are provided to secure their punishment after final adjudication, and the chances of escape are meagre compared with the probability of innocent people being punished by the errors of courts which no sensible person will claim to be immaculate. The refusal of bail may in many instances entirely defeat the object of appeal by the administration of the full penalty of the law for the offense charged pending final determination.

The veto of the bail bill rests upon a flimsy basis.

A MANIFEST ABSURDITY.

The record made by Mr. Allen, a Liberal member of the House, up to Monday last, entitled him to be regarded as an intelligent gentleman, and an earnest worker in the business of legislation. But in the course of his speech in support of his amendment to the reform school bill, by which the power to appoint the directors of the proposed institution was sought to be conferred upon the Governor, he presented a proposition of a character so remarkable, and so far beyond the limits of ordinary candor and the usual views of intelligent men relative to the subject, that any effort to attempt a serious refutation of it will be difficult to make. The gentleman deliberately asserted that the people of the Territories are the property of the United States. When Mr. Thurman interrupted him and asked if he intended that assertion to be literally construed, he replied in the affirmative, adding, by way of emphasis and illustration, that he, as an individual was willing to "wear the brand" of the government. The context of Mr. Allen's remarks conveyed the impression that, in his view, the inhabitants of the Territories were absolutely at the disposal of Congress, that it was merely by the grace of that body that they enjoyed any degree of political freedom, and that the guaranties of the Constitution had no application to them.

Mr. Allen's doctrine, would, were it true, render patriotism impossible among the inhabitants of the Territories. It makes them chattels, without a country to love, being themselves owned by the country under whose flag they live. It annuls the Proclamation of Emancipation, makes a falsehood of the Declaration of Independence, and holds a principle which an African despot might blush to own as a part of his belief. "The people are the *property* of the government," is an assertion which signalizes the Assembly of Utah as being the only representative legislative body known to history in which such a declaration was ever made.

The logic of titles teaches that everything owned by a chattel is the property of him who owns the chattel; hence, if Mr. Allen's doctrine is true, all of the wealth existing in the Territories is the property of the government. The patents issued to settlers on the public lands in a Territory are delusions and snares. The farms, homes, mines and property of all kinds in the Territories are only part of the national treasury surplus. We repeat, that to point out absurdities resulting from Mr. Allen's doctrine gives to the discussion of the subject such an air of absurdity as makes it almost impossible to preserve to it an appearance of seriousness.

The Territorial system is based less upon that clause in the Constitution which gives Congress authority to "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," than upon a so-called doctrine of temporary necessity. Such is the holding of some of the most eminent American jurists, who maintain that the framers of the Constitution failed to foresee and hence to provide for the spread of population upon the the great western domain of the country; and that a duty was thus placed upon Congress to make temporary provision for the government and protection of the settlers.

But the people who leave the States and settle in the Territories do not, by such an act, become "the property of the government." They do not of right lose any attribute or privilege of citizenship. The quality of sovereignty attaching to them as citizens in the States remains with them when they emigrate to the Territories, and the most that can be said, with any show of reason, against the exercise of that sovereignty by the people of the Territories, is that they have placed themselves in a position where it is temporarily impracticable for them to do so. But this objection loses all its force as soon as society in them has become so far organized as to admit of local self-government.

Mr. Allen's address in support of his amendment was, for the most part, as logical as it could well have been, in view of the premises upon which it was based. It is perhaps, no more than fairness to him to say that his assertion that the people of the Territories are the property of the government, was made in the heat of debate and without reflecting upon the absurdities to which such a doctrine would lead.

Her Downward Course.

It will be remembered that several months ago Jane Jordan, of this city, left her home and eloped with a patent medicine man named Van Alstein, who we learn is now in jail. The following in relation to Van Alstein, is from an Oregon paper:

Yesterday afternoon Frank B. Van Alstein, who claims to be a traveling salesman for a patent medicine firm, was tried before Justice Tuttle on a charge of larceny by bailee. It appears that S. R. Barnhart, a countryman, left an overcoat valued at $12 in charge of Mrs. Van Alstein, which her husband subsequently wore off and put up in a saloon for the drinks. In taking testimony for the defense Mrs. Van Alstein was called to the stand, but before she could utter a word Barnhart flared up and said: "I object, your honor; she is not the wife of Van Alstein, she is the wife of a man in Utah, whom she deserted for Van Alstein." Assistant District Attorney Simon quickly shut him up by saying that he had nothing to do with witnesses called, and that he had better keep still. After hearing some long-winded testimony, Justice Tuttle held defendant to answer before the grand jury, which meets next Monday, with bonds fixed at $100. He also placed Barnhart under the same bonds to insure his attendance as a witness, as it seems he wished to withdraw from the prosecution, which Justice Tuttle could not see.—*Logan Journal.*