

from the different States will soon be held, with a view of considering the best means for promoting trade and commerce. The President spoke encouragingly of this project. It is thought that something will be done to establish closer relations between Mexico and the United States, and that in the near future a reciprocity treaty embracing almost complete freedom of trade between both countries will be entered into. Mexico, it is said, would gain particularly by such an arrangement.

THE UTAH COMMISSION AGAIN.

WE publish today the majority and minority reports of the Utah Commission, dated September 1st, 1891. Gen. McClelland alone dissents from the majority report. He sets forth his views of the chief questions involved, in his own style and independent manner. No eloque or combination controls him.

The majority of the Commission pursue the course on which that body entered in the beginning, and assume that its functions are much greater and more varied than are warranted by the law which gave it existence. Reference to the ninth section of the Edmunds act will show what are its legal powers. They are simply to appoint proper persons to fill the registration and election offices before occupied by officers elected by the people, and to give certificates of election to persons duly elected to the Utah Legislature.

The various reports of this body exhibit the impression that it was specially charged with the duty of fostering a political faction which is in the minority, of putting down the majority, and of suppressing polygamy in Utah. The present report forms no exception to this rule.

The boastful manner in which the Commission speaks of its placing two "Liberals" against one of the People's party on the boards of election judges, thus giving one-fourth of the voting population double the representation accorded to the other three-fourths, its exultation over the success of the "Liberal" faction in Ogden, Salt Lake and Summit, and the spreading on its report of the whole "Liberal" platform and resolutions, are positive evidences of this. No wonder that blunt people have described the Commission as an "adjunct of the 'Liberal' faction."

The chief purpose of the present majority report is to impress the government with the untruth that the "Mormon" people are not sincere in their resolution to cease contracting further plural marriages and to divide on national party lines. This is the

position assumed by the "Liberal" ringleaders, and their charges are thus adopted and given official voice. The report in this respect is but an echo of well-known "Liberal" perversions.

The report charges that "the Mormon Church has invariably in the past dictated the political movements of its adherents." This is nothing more nor less than a "Liberal" falsehood without any basis for its support. The only attempt at proof of the statement is given further on in the report, and is simply the publication of correspondence between an apostate and the Bishop of the ward where he resided, and a note of the action of the High Council of the Stake in his case. From this it appears that the man joined an anti-"Mormon" league and his Bishop did not think this compatible with his standing as a "Mormon." His excommunication does not appear to solely have resulted from that one fact. But supposing it did, the ejection of a member for uniting with an antagonistic body was an act that any church or association would be justified in taking. It affords not the slightest particle of proof that "the Mormon Church has invariably dictated the political movements of its adherents." The production of this correspondence as the only thing the Commission could offer in evidence affords striking proof that the assertion which it was designed to support is utterly without foundation.

The report states that the "Mormon" Church has "denounced the Commission through all the years it has been administering the laws against polygamy." In this instance the Commission cunningly refrains from offering anything to substantiate the assertion. The Church never said anything against the Commission until the October Conference of 1890, when it voted to sustain the manifesto. In that there was no denunciation of the Commission, but only a flat denial of the statement to which the Commission gave publicity, that forty-one male persons had recently contracted polygamic marriages.

This utterly groundless untruth is repeated in the present report and the equally false statement is made that during the past year eighteen male persons with the same number of female persons have entered into polygamous marriage. If it is denunciation to deny these baseless rumors the "Mormon" Church has denounced the Commission on two occasions, namely at the October Conferences of 1890 and 1891. On no other occasion has the Church taken issue with the Commission.

The DESERET NEWS has occasionally

pointed out the partizan course of the majority of the Commission, and has also defended it when it acted impartially and was assailed by the "Liberals" who now seem to own the greater part of it. But we challenge the Commission or any of its members to point out one thing we have said about it that was not true.

Since when was the Commission charged with "the administration of the laws against polygamy?" There is nothing of this in the law. We have explained its powers as defined by statute. I has no others. And when the Commission takes to itself the credit of what has been done towards the suppression of polygamy, and the action of the Church in relation to it, assumption and absurdity bear about equal proportions to the claim.

It should be understood that these charges of recent polygamous marriages are not made in any definite manner. Unsupported rumors, of no more legal value than street corner scandals, are cunningly repeated by the Commission in such a way as to give them official support without assuming responsibility for their official publication. If we wished to denounce the members of the Commission who have made this cowardly and ineffably mean and paltry attack on the "Mormon" Church, this would be the time and place for such denunciation. We will not denounce them, we merely state the facts. The public can do the rest.

They give no names of informants. They give no names of persons accused. They are too cunning for that. The statements are totally false. Names attached to them would make them libellous and they would afford a means of proving their falsity. But leaving the sneaking charges in this vague and unpersonal manner, accomplishes the purpose of prejudicing the government and the public, and affords no means of demonstrating the villainy that prompted the slander.

The Presidency of the Church publicly and officially deny the charges. The Church in Conference endorses the denial. The DESERET NEWS repeats it, and defies the Utah Commission to prove what it has published. If it can offer no proof in support of its statements, surely we will not be required to prove a negative. Neither need we say what men are who publish falsehoods officially, and decline either to add any evidence in support of their statements or give us the names of their alleged informants.

They intimate that it is fear of "persecution" of the informers that causes