

the school law, but these noted call for early attention, and no doubt the wisdom of the Legislature will be directed to taking such action as will be most beneficial to the thorough working of the State school system.

MORE RELICS IN ARIZONA.

For nearly a thousand years of a period divided about midway by the date of the birth of the Messiah, the center of an advanced civilization on this hemisphere was in Central and Northern South America. North of the Isthmus of Panama the thickly inhabited country extended into the United States, and today a later civilization finds Arizona the most prolific spot in this country for relics of the earlier enlightenment which gave way, because the people became morally degenerate, before the savagery of warlike tribes of Indians who were themselves outcasts, either in person or descent, from the civilization they overthrew. The vast number of prehistoric remains Arizona has furnished has provided most interesting study for archaeologists, and still the work of exploration and discovery goes on. Last Saturday the following was announced in P. O. IX:

Engineers working on the surveys of this district have discovered prehistoric ruins of more than usual scientific interest. The remains of the buildings show a superior style and character of architecture, quite different from the modern, or even that of the Indians, who were the earliest occupants of the valley. There is much speculation as to who these people were and from whence they came, but it is probable they came from China, as the relics bear a close resemblance to those of similar age in the Flowery Kingdom. It is likely they crossed over Bering Strait when it was frozen, and drifted southward by degrees, establishing civilized homes here, in Mexico and Peru, but later being crowded southward by warlike tribes that inhabited the mountain region.

This finding of relics that show a superior civilization is so common that there is now no question among any well informed people as to a cultured race inhabiting the country prior to the wild Indian tribes. But the conclusion that they came from China by way of Bering strait is illogical and shows lack of acquaintance with archaeology in this country. If a civilized people had come that way they would have left some trace of their habitation in more favored localities than Arizona, which they would have passed in reaching there; but they did not, for the reason that they came not by that route. The fact of this particular class of ruins extending southward and not northward is incontrovertible evidence that the civilization came from the south and Arizona is near the northern limit of its progress in that age. As to the resemblance to Chinese relics, there is a still stronger resemblance in all those ruins to those in Western Asia and Egypt, and they give proof that the people who built them on the western continent obtained their styles from the eastern hemisphere, modifying them to suit changed circumstances.

The founders of this earlier American

civilization may have traveled through China when en route to America, but the proof is conclusive that they came not by the Bering sea route but across the sea and from South to North America; and their architecture and home life was based on the customs of ancient Judea, not the manners of the Mongolians.

THE OVERT ACT.

For months the News had reason to believe that a certain candidate for the United States Senate from this State contemplated entering the race on a platform which would assail a vital principle of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of which this paper is the official organ, yet not a word upon the subject appeared in these columns. We had reason to believe that a quiet canvass in his interest was in progress, yet said nothing. The plan and purpose of a campaign fraught with great peril to the peace of the State were maturing beneath the surface, but still the News preserved absolute silence.

It preferred to await some overt act on the part of the candidate, signifying his intention to engage in what he knew would be a conflict with the Church, meanwhile hoping that his own judgment and conscience, or the influence of his friends, would restrain him, and that the threatened evil might, after all, be averted.

But fate had decreed otherwise. Many candidates were in the field, and members-elect to the Legislature were being daily importuned for pledges. Some, perhaps many, were known to have committed themselves. This candidate evidently felt there was no time to lose, and he caused, or at least permitted, to be published an interview in which he formally announced his candidacy, and the platform upon which he stood, and made a strong appeal for support from that class of members in the Church whose discipline and interests he was opposing known as "Young Utah."

He had matured his plans and come out into the open; he had publicly heralded his declaration of antagonism toward the Church; he had called upon the flower of its membership to desert it and join his ranks, and had secured the co-operation of a leading political organ.

Even after he had done all this, the News still maintained unbroken silence. His next move was to procure the use of the columns of the recognized organ of the Democratic party in the State, for the furtherance of his candidacy; and still not a paper nor a politician in the State, so far as the News has learned, uttered a word of warning or protest against the inauguration of this attack upon the Church.

Then the News, true to a deferred duty, to the religious body it represents, and to the whole people of this State, sounded a warning note. It showed that an attack had been made upon a Church, that the latter might reasonably be expected to defend itself, and that it was extremely bad politics to precipitate such a conflict.

These are the facts, known to be such by thousands of citizens, and

susceptible of complete demonstration by any person. Yet in the face of them the attempt is made to claim that the overt act was on the part of the News. As well might a burglar, breaking into a house at night, and meeting with an unexpected defense of the premises by the owner, claim to be the victim of an unprovoked assault.

Only last year this same individual was a candidate for the same office, yet not a word of opposition to him appeared editorially in the News. Why? Because he stood upon a different platform then, one which assailed no Church, nor threatened any clash between Church and State. Why does the News oppose him this year? For the reason, and absolutely no other, that he stands upon a platform which, fairly interpreted, means nothing more nor less than war against a religious society.

The plea is made that, as the candidate has been stripped of all ecclesiastical authority, further opposition to his candidacy ought not to be shown by this paper, nor the Church it represents. This is a remarkably fatuous proposition, in that it ignores the subject matter of the entire controversy. That subject matter is the platform, not the personality, nor the politics, nor even the Priesthood, of the candidate. An Apostle of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, a Methodist bishop, a Catholic priest, a Salvation Army recruit or a pronounced agnostic; an advocate of free silver or a supporter of the gold standard; a free-trader or a protectionist, would be alike objectionable standing upon such a platform; for they would all appear as deadly enemies to the rights which American citizens hold most sacred, the rights of religion.

Has the candidate's deposition from the exalted ecclesiastical position he so long held, impelled him to repudiate, or sufficiently remodel, his political platform? When he does this, it will be time enough to require that not another word of opposition to his election to any office he may seek shall appear in these columns. But while he, or any other candidate for office, stands before the people of this State on a platform which avowedly seeks to break down and destroy the organic principles of any religious body, the News will claim and exercise the right to show the people the danger that lies in such campaigns.

ACTION OF THE APOSTLES.

The action at Thursday's meeting of the Council of Apostles, relative to a former member of that quorum, was of vital importance as to religious principle, and was taken only after the most prayerful, patient and careful consideration that such a serious matter requires. It was not the first time in the history of the Church that the same quorum has been called to do a similar painful duty; and as in other cases of a like nature, action was not taken until further delay would have been a violation of the sacred obligations which the Council of the Twelve owes to the Church and to the