DESERET EVENING NEWS: FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1904.



PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING. (Sundays excepted). Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah. Charles W. Penrose Editor. Horace G. Whitney - Business Manager. SUBSCRIPTION PRICES. (In Advance):

NEW YORK OFFICE. In charge of B. F. Cummings, manager Foreign Advertising, from our Home Of-fice, 1127 Park Row Building, New York.

CHICAGO OFFICE. In charge of B. F. Cummings, manager foreign accertising from our Home Office 87 Washington St. Represented by F. S. Webb. Room 515.

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE. In charge of F. J. Cooper, 78 Geary St.

Correspondence and other reading mat-ter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR. Address all business communications

and all remittances: THE DESERET NEWS Sait Lake City, Utah.

Entered at the Postoffice of Salt Lake City as second class matter according to the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.

SALT LAKE CITY, - JAN. 15, 1904

DESERET NEWS 'PHONES.

Persons desiring to communicate by telephone with any department of the Descret News, will save themselves and this establishment e great deal of annoyance if they will take time to notice these numbers:

For the Chief Editor's office No. 74, 3 rings.

For Deseret News Book Store, 74, 2 rings.

For City Editor and Reporters, 359, 2 rings.

For Business Manager, 389, 3 rings. For Business Office, 389, 2 rings.

AN IMPORTANT POSITION.

The Descret News congratulates Vice-President W. H. Bancroft on the deserved recognition of his valuable services to the Oregon Short Line, shown by his appointment as General Manager of the great railroad system which comprehends the Union Pacific and Oregon Short lines. The blending of interests in railroad affairs in the great west, is likely to result in more perfect service and larger profits, and further facilities in travel. It is to be hoped that the rumor of Mr. Bancroft's removal of residence from Salt Lake to Omaha will not prove cor-We feel assured that unless the rect. increased business under his direction requires it, he will prefer to remain in the capital of Utah where the climate, the surroundings, the society and other inducements are so favorable and pleasant. The combined companies are also to be congratulated on availing themselves of the experience and abilities of a railroad man who is known of the country.

AS TO "MORMON LEADERS."

The Cleveland Plain-Dealer of Jan. 11 has a very temperate editorial on the answer of Senator Smoot to the charges preferred against him, as furnished to him by the Committee on privileges and elections. It states that the denial is "sweeping and places the burden of proof squarely upon those who demand the Senator's expulsion." That paper goes on to show that the polygamy part of the accusation is not seriously advanced, and argues that the point to be decided is the alleged claim of the "Mormon" Church, that it is "the only legitimate power that has the right to rule on the earth, and that the instruction of the Church how to vote must be observed.'

Of course the "Mormon" Church makes no such claim, and does not tell anybody "how to vote." The Plain-Dealer, however, is under the impression that though Senator Smoot repudiates the charge against the Church, the "Mormon leaders are not agreed" on the matter. In support of that notion it clites a couple of paragraphs from a paper which is not "Mormon," and the editor of which is in no sense "a Mormon leader." Neither his opinion nor the paper in which it appears, is in the smallest degree authoritative or representative of the "Mormon" Church.

The views of the paper supposed by the Plain-Dealer to be from "a Mormon leader," are most likely taken from a partisan standpoint. It claims the position of a Democratic organ. On the other hand, a Republican paper published in the same town, speaks out plainly from opposite grounds. The ed. itor is not a "Mormon" and never has been, nor is his paper an advocate of "Mormon" doctrine. But it is just as much of "a Mormon leader" as its opponent, and certainly has much the better side of the argument, which is in part as follows:

"Everybody in Utah was well aware of the fact that Reed Smoot was a candidate for the United States Senate before the Legislature that elected him was chosen. The Democratic press tried hard to convince the peo-ple of Utah that Senator Joseph Rawlins should succeed himself in the national Congress. Ex-Senator Rawlins is a non-Mormon, or a Gentile, or an anti-Mormon-take your choice; yet Gentile Ogden and Gentile Salt Lake as well as other non-Mormon com. munitles in Utab, voted for the candidates for the Legislature that every body knew would support Reed Smoot for United States senator, Why did they- vote that way if they did not want Reed Smoot in the Senate? If the Gentiles of Ogden and Salt Lake had voted for the opposition candidates for the Legislature, then Ex-Senator Joseph Rawlins, a Gentile, would have been elected. The issue was fought in the campaign, and the great bulk of the non-Mormon vote in Utah was cast for candidates for the Legis. were favorable to Reed lature who Why not let the matter rest Personally the Standard edithere? tor has no interest in the seating of a Mormon in Congress, other than re duty we owe to the Republican



trust go the way of all flesh.