

low dives," and his insinuation that the Commission was not ignorant of the fact, the Commission has to say, that immediately upon the publication of Mr. Richards' statement made before the House committee, the chairman and another member of the Commission proceeded to Ogden and made

INVESTIGATION INTO THE FACTS.

They found that the registration officer of the precinct (Second) in which Mr. Richards lives, was one William Studor. That he had no such reputation as Mr. Richards attributed to him, was not known as a gambler, a saloon man, or proprietor of low dives. That his registration work had always been well done, that no complaints had ever been made to the Commission in regard to him, or the performance of his duties, and that none of the Ogden people of whom they inquired had ever heard of the charges until made by Mr. Richards before the Congressional Committee. The preceding municipal election in Ogden had a "Citizens' or Reform party" in the field, which was successful in obtaining control of the city government, and Mr. C. C. Richards was an active supporter of the candidates of this party. When it got control of the city government it bore testimony to the good character of Mr. Tudor by appointing him to a responsible fiduciary position under the city government—that of

DOG TAX COLLECTOR,

which, it is believed, he still holds. He has again, in August, 1892, been strongly recommended to the Commission for the position of registrar of his precinct. It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Richards was misinformed when he made the statement he did before the congressional committees.

Another charge of a serious nature is contained in the statement of one

H. W. SMITH

before the same committees. He said:

For every commission issued to any officer appointed in the Territory, the secretary gets the money in the first instance, but who gets it afterwards I do not know. The report of the Utah Commission shows that 744 of these officers were commissioned in 1891. That was the year in which but few officers were elected. During the year 1892 (the gentlemen who are with me and myself have discussed the matter), it is estimated that 1800 additional officers would be commissioned. Take it for the two years and something like 2,500 officers would be commissioned and the fees for their commissions would be \$12,500, a right comfortable little sum, more than any of this committee get. And that money is filched out of the pockets of the people without authority of law.

This statement refers directly to registration and election officers appointed by the Utah Commission, and he says "that was the year when but few officers were elected."

Had Mr. Smith desired to state the truth, he could easily have learned that not a cent had ever been charged to or paid by any officer appointed by the Utah Commission for issuing commissions to such officers. Further, that there is but one class of officers who are by law charged a fee of \$5 for their commissions, and they are Commissioners of Deeds for Utah in other States, and that the only other officers to whom is charged a small fee for commissions are those officers who, by

the Territorial laws, are required to be commissioned by the Governor. With these officers the Utah Commission has nothing to do, except such as are elective officers, and these receive their certificates of election from the Commission without charge or fee.

Much was said in those Congressional hearings in regard to the members being

NON-RESIDENTS

of the Territory, who only went there "once a year" about two weeks before the election, and sometimes not that early, and packed up and went away, "leaving sometimes while the votes were being counted."

It has seemed to be the policy of the government to appoint non-residents of Utah upon the Commission, probably upon the theory that such a Board would be less imbued with the local prejudices than one formed from the bitterly warring factions of Utah, and that disposed of the first position of the complaint. As to the time spent by the Commission in the performance of its duties, the Commission can hardly conceive how gentlemen like ex-Governor West and ex-Territorial Judge Judd could be induced to make such unfounded statements. At the very time they were making their statements before the congressional committees, and before they left Salt Lake to go to Washington, this Commission was in session in the City of Salt Lake—a session commencing on the 11th of January, 1892, and ending March 12, 1892, a period of sixty-one days. It assembled a month before the election and continued in daily session until after the votes were counted and certified. During the preceding year it held four sessions of 114 days. The average time spent in the performance of its duties annually since the organization of the Commission in 1882, has been about six and one-third months, and some years more than eight months. The sessions have never been held less than three times each year, and generally four times.

Here is inserted a table of the

TRAVELS AND SESSIONS

of the Commission showing:

Total number of days 2008, or 5½ years.
Average time each year. 61.3 months,
with two sessions necessary to complete
the work of this year.

This showing exhibits as much time spent in the performance of its duties as is spent by members of Congress in theirs, if not more; and yet the Commission was attacked on this score by the honorable chairman of the House committee on Territories in a speech delivered in the House on the 9th of July last. He seems to have fallen into the error of taking as true, statements such as have been quoted above. The *Congressional Record* reports him as saying:

"These gentlemen who have composed this Commission during the last ten years have found their duties so congenial, have found a junketing trip to Salt Lake City once a year so pleasant that they have held on with death-like tenacity year after year, and have on an appropriation bill some years since had their salaries increased from \$3000 to \$5000 per annum, and their contingent expenditures have more than equaled the sum paid them as salary."

Sir, the members of this Commission are paid \$5000 per annum and traveling expenses, for going once each year to

Utah, where they spend two or three months on a tour of recreation and pleasure. The remainder of the time they are at liberty to spend at their homes in the several States where they reside attending to their private business affairs.

Again, on the 14th day of July, he said: "We pay to five men \$2000 per year and contingent expenses amounting to \$10,000 per annum to go to Utah once in twelve months."

It is presumed the honorable gentleman collected his supposed facts from the statements made before his committee, but, unfortunately, these statements contained a vast amount of misinformation and very little that can be recognized as truth.

The Commission was authorized by act of Congress, approved March 22, 1882, and the members' salaries were fixed by that act at \$3000 per annum. Before appointing the Commission President Arthur requested Congress to increase the salaries to \$5000 on the ground that he could procure a better class of men to serve than at the low rate of compensation fixed. Congress complied with his request before any appointments were made, so it is not true, as charged, that the Commission, by lobbying, had their salaries increased upon an appropriation bill.

It is regretted that the honorable gentleman was misled by the misstatements and perversions of fact contained in the statements made before his committee.

That he had opportunity to hear the other side of the question, and especially to learn that the "junketing trip once a year" was a myth of the imagination, is evidenced by the following letter sent to him during the time the statements were being made and before the hearings were concluded.

A letter from Commissioner Robertson is annexed to the above:

THE DELEGATE FROM UTAH,

in a speech delivered in Congress July 14th, also attacked the Commission, and, in support of his statements, gives what purports to be letters from two prominent "Gentiles," "one of whom was formerly a member on this floor, and who has lived in Utah over twenty years," and "the other went there some years ago as a Federal Judge." He neither gives their names, nor does he state which of the two is the author of the statement in regard to the Utah Commission:

This communication has appeared in the Delegate's speech.

The statements contained in this anonymous letter are without semblance of truth, and it is difficult to believe that the speaker who presented it was unaware of their untruthful and venomous character.

It is not true that the Commission "has insisted upon exercising legislative, judicial, and executive powers."

On the contrary, nearly every annual report of the Commission has pointed out the want of power to enforce its rulings, and has suggested the propriety of having conferred upon it the powers it was expected and constantly asked to exercise.

It is not true that "by the false and scandalous representation and lobbying of its members, they have induced Congress to fasten the Commission upon the Territory."