

ligionist? They certainly do, and he had a perfect right to enunciate them, and base upon them advice to his co-worshippers. Any attempt, based upon that advice, to make it appear that he is an opponent of the public schools, would be equally applicable to leaders of other religious bodies, and is illogical and unjust.

### BAD "BREAKERS."

SOME of the "Liberal" "stumpers" are making some egregious breaks. The candidate of the opposition for marshal is probably as prominent as anybody in the campaign for the antiquated character of his material and for occasionally saying the "wrong thing at the right time."

It appears, from a report of his remarks in the Nineteenth Ward January 24, that he branched off on to the "royal families" humbug so often sounded by the party which owns him, and here is what he is credited with in that line:

He then sketched the policy that has been pursued by the People's party in regard to educating the young, and showed how that while the children of the royal families had been given good educations, the children of the poorer classes had been left to grow up in ignorance.

It is pertinent to ask if he does not, according to the iterated and reiterated assertions of his fellow partisans, belong to a family that has been thus strongly designated? But what does the foolish lad mean by making the ridiculous statement that the People's Party has had anything whatever to do with the education of one family any more than another? Perhaps Mr. Young will, as a "stumper," get over catching fragments on the fly, and take to reason and judgment for his basis, when he gets riper. He certainly should not undertake to handle the "royal family" "chestnut," for two reasons, one of which is the direction in which his own party has pointed it.

Another prominent "breaker" among of the Liberal "stumpers," is a "gentleman" by the intensely American name of O'Brien. He has just come down from Montana, and made his debut as a "Liberal" misrepresenter at Armory Hall the other night. He was named at that time as plain Mr. O'Brien. But there was not enough dignity about that undecorated cognomen, so on January 52 he was styled as "Colonel." In the Fourteenth Ward schoolhouse January 24, at a "Liberal" meeting,

he uttered "a horrible" warning, as will be seen from this excerpt:

Colonel O'Brien then arose and said that he wanted to put the people on their guard and inform them that it was true beyond a doubt that the People's Party had employed a number of high-handed murderers, known as "Pinkerton's Thugs," to shadow every honest American in the city.

These are the "See Some" Nichols thugs, we presume, and the same second-hand skull smashers afterwards mentioned by Hobgoblin Powers.

The "Liberals" claim that all the "honest Americans" belong to their party. According to Mr. O'Brien's statement "honest Americans" are either as scarce among them as hens' incisors, or there has been a very sudden and tremendous increase in the population of this city during the last few days, in the shape of "Pinkerton's thugs." For instance, the "Liberals" claim a registration of over four thousand. It is further claimed that they are "honest Americans." A shadow for each of these immaculates would certainly make quite a crowd.

It appears to us that it would have been just as profitable for the opposition to have imported "spouters" direct from the "ould sod" as to take second-hand material from Montana. They would not have been any more ignorant of local issues here, and their "breaks" could not possibly have been more ludicrously absurd.

### THRUST AT LIBERTY.

IN France, at the present time, a man who labors for the centralization of power, in other words, for the restoration of a monarchy, is deemed dangerous, a public enemy, and if he flaunts his theories too flagrantly, is liable to banishment. In republics, always, a man who has sought to take from the people the control of their own concerns has been looked upon as their enemy.

It is consistent with correct principles for the people of France today to show their repugnance towards the man who would take from them their liberties, and place them under the dominion of a one man power. It has always been right and proper for the people of republics to resent all attempts at taking out of their own hands the control of their own concerns. That sentiment of a free people which brands as a traitor to their institutions and government, the man who would take from them their voice in the

management of their own affairs, is just and laudable.

If the family is the foundation of the nation, the next higher row of stones in the national fabric are the schools. They sustain closer relations to the family than do any other public or social institutions, not excepting the churches, for a large percentage of the population are not interested at all in the latter, while concern in the former is almost universal. Hence, the taking from the people the control of the schools is closely akin to taking from them the government of their own family affairs, and prescribing what should be the food, clothing and domestic arrangements of the household.

The truth of the above generalities, if uttered in connection with some theme of past history, would not be questioned. But if they ever were truths, time has not changed their nature. This also will be admitted. In the light of them, then, let us consider the closing paragraph of the report to the Legislative Assembly of Hon. Jacob S. Boreman, Territorial School Commissioner, which is as follows:

"I feel confident that if we are to have a thorough free school system, one with thorough teachers and compulsory education, it will have to come to us from outside the Territory. Whilst no other agency which the government could adopt would be so effective in placing Utah upon a permanently sound and solid foundation, the result would fully justify Congress in assuming entire control and furnishing Utah with a school system abreast with the best that can be found in the United States."

"The result would fully justify Congress." Even Boreman seeks some justification for his proposition to take from the people one of their most sacred rights, and in so doing repeats the Jesuit's maxim, "The end justifies the means," a proposition of morals abhorred by enlightened minds in all ages, and which has been put forth in defense of every crime. No tyrant ever attempted or perpetrated an outrage upon the people, who did not urge that "the end justifies the means."

It is fitting that the false charges of "disloyalty," "un-American principles," and accusations of like character, which are being heaped upon the people of Utah, should come from men who, at every opportunity, make thrusts at liberty, and constantly work to undermine the most sacred institutions of their country. The record of current events in Utah will show to the future student of her history, as it does to the contemporary observer,