

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

PUBLISHED DAILY BY THE DESERET NEWS CO.

FOUNDED AND PUBLISHED BY

CHARLES W. PEPPER, EDITOR.

Friday, March 20, 1891.

NOTICE

The Fifty-first Annual Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, will commence at 10 o'clock, on Saturday morning April 6th, 1891, in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City.

All Officers and Members of the Church are cordially invited to be present at the meetings.

WILFRED WOODBINE,
George Q. Cannon,
John F. Smith,
First Presidency.

ENJOYING THE UTAH COMMISSION.

The Board of Education have, to our opinion, taken the wisest course to test the question of their rights in regard to the bonds election to take place on the 20th inst. Reference to the report of their meeting last night will show that they are in earnest in this important matter. They resolved to make an appeal to the courts to decide whether they or the Utah Commission shall conduct the election, or, meeting under the laws, to determine whether bonds shall be issued to raise money for the building of school houses in this city.

The difficulties in the way were clearly shown up by Mr. Price, who said, there are three questions involved in this matter. First, the legality of the bonds; second, who has the right to vote in this election; third, the authority of the Utah Commission to assume control of the election.

These are all of great importance. There is a conflict of law between the election, or, meeting provided for in the Territorial statute. This, if not understood, is likely to defeat the object of the election. If the Utah Commission conduct the election, there will be doubt as to its legality because the statute gives to the Board of Education, or, meeting, the power to do what it wants to do. If the election is held, the authority of the Utah Commission to issue bonds is in question. These young men are in earnest in this important matter.

But there was no "sense" of any person "found in the company" of Mr. Edmunds and his associates upon them, as can be seen by reading the article. As to the true "inwardness" of the matter, it is seen in the over anxiety of these young lawyers to have the District Court sit in Logan and thus increase the prospects for legal business. And it is not a fact that they did not seek the aid of Utah's Delegates, a friend to the people, but invited the help of the people's enemy, because they knew that the powers they wished to be conferred upon the Governor was in hostility to the work done by Utah's friend, and in the line of the assault made by Utah's foes.

We call attention to those persons who are to vote on the issuance of the bonds. The Utah statute that provides for them, rightly gives the power to decide whether they shall be issued or not to the *readied taxpayers*. But the acts of Congress in relation to elections in Utah provide that only registered electors and their ballots. If these laws apply to the election, or, meeting, for the issuing of bonds, then every person who has had his name placed on the registry list, whether he pays taxes or not, can vote on the property of taxpayers who may not be registered and who cannot vote in regard to their own property rights. This is manifestly unjust. But the question is, what is the law? That also can only be determined satisfactorily by a competent court.

Unfortunately there seems to be a discrepancy in the Utah statute relating to this matter. Sections 102 and 103 provide that for the levying of taxes and the issuance of bonds, as well as the election of trustees, the City Council shall appoint three judges of election in each municipal ward and that the election shall be held in each ward. Sections 102 to 104 provide that for the issuing of bonds the Board of Education shall call a meeting and appoint three judges to conduct the election thereof. This is a defect in the law that complicates the matter.

But these facts remain: The levying of taxes and the issuing of bonds are not in the same name as an election of trustees. The acts of Congress clearly contemplate by the term "elections" the choosing of men for office, and it is such elections only that come under the control of the Utah Constitution. Also that the law which makes the levying of bonds for school purposes possible, provides that the determining of the question shall be left to the taxpayers, whom are permanently interested in it. And by whatsoever the meeting, or election, for its determination shall be conducted, the taxpayers shall vote upon it, while an election for trustees shall be determined by the registered voters.

The quickest and best way out of the difficulty is to carry it to the courts, and a suit to enjoin the Utah Commission will bring up these questions on their merits, and, we hope, solve them, so as to make the election valid and the bonds sound and solid. Salt Lake wants more school houses, and the issuing of bonds is the easiest way to raise the funds necessary for the purpose. We believe the Board has taken the right step in accomplishing the end in view.

ENCOURAGEMENTS UPON POPULAR RIGHTS.

We write again today to an intrepid editor from some young men who have started the practice of law in Logan, and who appear very anxious to have issues of court of the Fourth Judicial District, newly created, heard in the beautiful capital of Cache County. We have expressed a few vulgar expressions in the letter, but have made no charge or omission in their argument.

Careful reading of the letter and of the article which they appear to think give occasion for it, and which we now reproduce, will show that they are themselves very unwise in their action. They have described the trial as being the only trial in their practice, the only trial of the kind being "these young men"—and that they have not met the objections offered by the State in their endeavor, through the shortest and most evident course, any Utah has in Congress, to end the Governor of this Territory with extra powers.

The fact that these powers were only petitioned for as "temporary," does not alter the question involved. The Governor has been trying with all his might and energy, to obtain supreme authority, to control the powers of the Legislature and to enlarge his own prerogatives at the expense of republican principles. The petition was to Senator Edmunds by "these young men"—there is nothing in that phrase that should excite the ire of any average person, in favor of a step taken in the same direction.

It also assumed, with judicial diction and manner, to decide a question as to the constitutional powers of the Legislative Assembly of Utah. It recurred upon the source of that body, to inquire of the people of Cache, among whom, we venture to say, there are not more than twenty-five or thirty business men, who would be fit to sit and draw the kind of people they attract in the poorest and most primitive city of Logan. And further, in addressing this petition for something that any congressional majority of the people do not want, to the man of all Congressmen who is most inclined to Utah's citizens, "these young men" passed by the Delegates from Utah, who is ever ready to advance anything that is for the true interest of the Territory, and thus exposed themselves in the just criticism of the friends of the people.

But there was no "sense" of any person "found in the company" of Mr. Edmunds and his associates upon them, as can be seen by reading the article. As to the true "inwardness" of the matter, it is seen in the over anxiety of these young lawyers to have the District Court sit in Logan and thus increase the prospects for legal business. And it is not a fact that they did not seek the aid of Utah's Delegates, a friend to the people, but invited the help of the people's enemy, because they knew that the powers they wished to be conferred upon the Governor was in hostility to the work done by Utah's friend, and in the line of the assault made by Utah's foes.

We call attention to those persons who are to vote on the issuance of the bonds. The Utah statute that provides for them, rightly gives the power to decide whether they shall be issued or not to the *readied taxpayers*. But the acts of Congress in relation to elections in Utah provide that only registered electors and their ballots. If these laws apply to the election, or, meeting, for the issuing of bonds, then every person who has had his name placed on the registry list, whether he pays taxes or not, can vote on the property of taxpayers who may not be registered and who cannot vote in regard to their own property rights. This is manifestly unjust. But the question is, what is the law? That also can only be determined satisfactorily by a competent court.

We call attention to those persons who are to vote on the issuance of the bonds. The Utah statute that provides for them, rightly gives the power to decide whether they shall be issued or not to the *readied taxpayers*. But the acts of Congress in relation to elections in Utah provide that only registered electors and their ballots. If these laws apply to the election, or, meeting, for the issuing of bonds, then every person who has had his name placed on the registry list, whether he pays taxes or not, can vote on the property of taxpayers who may not be registered and who cannot vote in regard to their own property rights. This is manifestly unjust. But the question is, what is the law? That also can only be determined satisfactorily by a competent court.

But these facts remain: The levying of taxes and the issuing of bonds are not in the same name as an election of trustees. The acts of Congress clearly contemplate by the term "elections" the choosing of men for office, and it is such elections only that come under the control of the Utah Constitution. Also that the law which makes the levying of bonds for school purposes possible, provides that the determining of the question shall be left to the taxpayers, whom are permanently interested in it. And by whatsoever the meeting, or election, for its determination shall be conducted, the taxpayers shall vote upon it, while an election for trustees shall be determined by the registered voters.

The quickest and best way out of the difficulty is to carry it to the courts, and a suit to enjoin the Utah Commission will bring up these questions on their merits, and, we hope, solve them, so as to make the election valid and the bonds sound and solid. Salt Lake wants more school houses, and the issuing of bonds is the easiest way to raise the funds necessary for the purpose. We believe the Board has taken the right step in accomplishing the end in view.

The Rev. Louis W. Newell of St. Louis' Church, Catholic, N.Y., was arrested in New York City on the 1st instant, charged with violating about \$500 in false pretenses.

NATIONAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES.

IS THE Government of the United States a first-class naval power? This is at the present time an appropriate question to ask. In honest truth, it must be admitted that it is not. However, it is but fair to say, that it is *fast* growing into a naval power of importance. Of this fact, the *New Register* for 1890, furnishes abundant proof. We are, at least, in a position to say that our interests are not entirely disregarded.

There are four new vessels added to the navy which do not appear in her Register. They are the *Florida*, the *Florida*, the *Arizona*, and the *Gloucester*. In process of construction are a number of other vessels, including the five ironclads, which are named the *Indians*, the *Massachusetts*, the *Arkansas*, the *New York* and the *Minnesota*. The first three are ironclads of 10,200 tons each, displacement. The *New York* will be an armament cruiser of 11,000 tons, and the *Minnesota* a long-hulled, bullet-proof, coast defense vessel of 4,800 tons.

There is also a harbor defense gun of 2000 tons now building at Bath. There is a fast triple-explosive protected cruiser of 13,000 tons in process of construction. A duplicate of the latter has been authorized by Congress to be built. In San Francisco there is a 2,500-ton vessel being built. The *Gloucester* and *Arizona*, two 320-ton cruisers, three 2000-ton vessels, and two 165-ton gunboats are also in process of building.

Three new frigates and a practice cruiser are also being set up at Elizabethport. In addition to all these, ships have been ordered for a new vessel capable of making 27 knots an hour in the open sea. This shows that the United States is not becoming a naval power, but it only waits one year longer, and will meet with a warm greeting on the part of the world if she sets a "beast."

THE RESOURCES OF ALASKA.

Most people regard Alaska as a dreary, seaway province, entirely destitute of ordinary resources. The census bulletin on that Territory affords a different view. The sources of wealth there are fine fish, minerals and timber. Since Alaska became a Territory of the United States the value of its total exports exported to foreign countries has increased from \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000 annually.

It is thought that the extermination of the seals would be a positive benefit, notwithstanding the amount of fur realized. This annual prey on the seal is such an extent that it almost穷竭s the fisheries of Alaska, irreparable. Were it not for the taking of herring, cod and salmon would supply the whole country. Red and King salmon have been caught in Alaska waters weighing 120 pounds each and measuring six feet. The waters of the great Yukon river, for 1500 miles stand with this kind of salmon. The seal lives the young of this fish, which is a extermination of the animal would be a calamity.

The whale fisheries for 1890 yielded 250,000 pounds of whalebone, 2000 pounds of ivory, and 14,000 barrels of oil.

The annual production of gold, due and bullion averages about \$10,000,000. Copper stands in the Territory, but the difficulties of transportation are such that at present it is not worth working. Lignite coal is found in several districts, but there is only one mine in operation. The quantity of merchantable timber is astronomical, according to the census bureau, especially as that of valuable timber in the yellow cedar, which is found only in isolated groves.

People who are conversant with the situation in Alaska, favor the opening up of the country to bona fide settlers. At present it is the prey of adventurers who denude it of its resources, and who have only a passing interest in its affairs. By colonizing it with industrious hardy families, it will have a far different showing at the next census.

SINGULAR CORRESPONDENCE.

Young Logan Lawyer Firing Popgun at the "Deseret News."

YOUR LETTER AND THE ARTICLE WHICH LED TO IT.

The annexed communication was received several days ago but more important matter has crowded it out of our columns until today. We print the entire letter with the exception of some few and epithets, as we find them of service to our readers. We will, however, have room for full and detailed principles, and will honor the "grumblers" who have remitted us dollars.

Logan Lawyer.

Your email arrived under the strange heading of "A Popgun." Your "popgun," requires a response from the "grumblers" who are represented by the letter you sent us. We will endeavor to do justice to your sonorous and somewhat learned way of the pen.

As we have no room for the entire letter, we will confine ourselves to the first portion of the communication, which we find most interesting.

The Government is an enormous, only world wide, working body, and it is only natural that it should be the first to assert its rights. That the Government was in the habit of doing this in the time and place of the Revolution, we do not deny. We do, however, deny that it is a wise course to do this.

The friends and supporters of the petitioners in our letter, which is the first of the kind, are not to be blamed. They were seeking changes in legislation to protect their property rights. As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.

As to the article in question, we do not know what it is, but we do know that the author of it is not a member of the Legislature, and that he is not a lawyer. He is not a man of the people, but a man of the rich, who is seeking to change the property rights of the people.