

DESERET EVENING NEWS

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING.

(Sunday Excepted.)

Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Horace G. Whitney - Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES.

(In Advance)

One Year	\$1.50
Six Months	.75
Three Months	.50
One Month	.25
Special Edition, Per Year	.50
Semi-Weekly, Per Year	.50

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR.

Address all business communications and all remittances to THE DESERET NEWS,

Salt Lake City, Utah.

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

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 14, 1907.

A FUNNY PROOF.

The discussion of the question of Church interference with politics has had the effect of convincing many of the fact that there is absolutely no foundation for the charges of the anti-Mormon. Of course, the special pleaders for a partisan cause continue their assertions, insinuations, and sophistical deductions, in the face of the most convincing proofs to the contrary. But to the thinking and reasoning reader, the truth is clear enough. The Church has no political candidates. The Church does not aspire to political power. The Church does not interfere in the affairs of the state.

One of the most convincing proofs of this is furnished by the opposition press itself. For instance, the other day the anti-Mormon sheet had a story about one Mr. Bowen opposing an alleged "Church candidate" for a municipal office. We denied that the Church had any candidate at the time referred to, or any other time, for that matter. And we asked, at what Conference, or other ecclesiastical meeting, did the Church place a candidate in the field, that Mr. Bowen could oppose? We pointed out that, if there was a Church candidate, it should be easy to tell the public at what Church gathering his candidacy was proposed and accepted.

To this the sheet replied that Senator Smoot asked his associates, meaning the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve, for their consent for him to become a candidate before the Legislature for Senator of the United States. (Tribune editorial, Oct. 11.) This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

It reminds us of the story of the industrious farmer who was standing by his wood pile one day, shaping a tool. He was hard of hearing. Seeing a stranger coming down the road, the deaf man made up his mind that the first question he would be likely to be asked would be, "What are you making?" and he prepared his answer accordingly. But the stranger, in passing, merely said, how do you do? and when the farmer answered, "ax-handle," he naturally thought the poor fellow had lost his mind. Such is the Tribune logic. What a confession of utter defeat, is the resort to such gibberish!

As to the political rule which seems to bother the anti-Mormon sheet, it was proved in the Senate and accepted by that body as a fact, that its sole purport and effect is that High Church officials, filling positions which require them to give their time to ecclesiastical duties, shall not enter into any engagements of any kind, political or otherwise, which require them to abandon or neglect such ecclesiastical duties, without first obtaining the consent of the authorities of the Church. The rule itself, it was proved, leaves every man perfectly free. It provides that if any officer or the Church wishes to become a candidate for a political office, or to enter into any other engagement which will interfere with the duties of his Church office, he can do so without obtaining the consent of anybody, by resigning from his ecclesiastical position. Can any rule be fairer than that?

It should be remembered that the questions relating to this subject were thoroughly sifted before the Senate and found to contain no basis for the attacks upon Church officials, or the Church. Those who are now attacking the Church are at the same time leading in assaults upon the United States Senate, though they call themselves "American."

THE ENGINEER WEAKENS.

At last the public has heard from City Engineer Kelsey on the subject of macadamized roads.

Readers of this paper have been kept well informed as to the status and progress of the roads under that name now being laid in this city, as well as upon the merits and demerits of such roads in general.

Until now the Engineer has refused to speak. To all inquiries and remonstrances he has said never a word, though repeatedly addressed through the columns of this paper, and inquired of by interested tax-payers.

Now that the Engineer has found his voice, it is interesting to note what he says.

First, he points out that on heavy traveled residential streets the life of a macadam pavement is much shorter and the annual expense of maintaining much greater than in the case of asphalt and that in the long run asphalt is the cheaper pavement which can be laid in this section of the country.

Now, we doubt the soundness of this conclusion, without disputing the correctness of the premise. It is true that macadam roads do not last so long as the asphalt, but it is also true that if properly laid they will last a long time, and will probably be both less expensive and more agreeable for general comfort, than the asphaltum, especially on our wide streets.

The Engineer goes on to show in

what respect macadam is deficient, by giving a tabulated statement of the life of various forms of pavement and the annual cost of construction and maintenance recently made by the city engineer of Rochester, N. Y. The table shows the cost of the construction and maintenance of pavements on a street having a traffic of 100 tons per square yard per day. The tonnage world, it was explained, correspond to that of a rather heavily traveled residence street or a business street of medium travel in cities from 100,000 to 200,000 population. The table is as follows:

	Life of Annual cost
Material Pavement, per sq. yd.	
Gravel block .29 years	\$4.92
Crushed asphalt .18 years	.74
Brick .20 years	.29
Macadam .5 years	.512

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR.

Address all business communications and all remittances to THE DESERET NEWS,

Salt Lake City, Utah.

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

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 14, 1907.

A FUNNY PROOF.

The discussion of the question of Church interference with politics has had the effect of convincing many of the fact that there is absolutely no foundation for the charges of the anti-Mormon. Of course, the special pleaders for a partisan cause continue their assertions, insinuations, and sophistical deductions, in the face of the most convincing proofs to the contrary. But to the thinking and reasoning reader, the truth is clear enough. The Church has no political candidates. The Church does not aspire to political power. The Church does not interfere in the affairs of the state.

One of the most convincing proofs of this is furnished by the opposition press itself. For instance, the other day the anti-Mormon sheet had a story about one Mr. Bowen opposing an alleged "Church candidate" for a municipal office. We denied that the Church had any candidate at the time referred to, or any other time, for that matter. And we asked, at what Conference, or other ecclesiastical meeting, did the Church place a candidate in the field, that Mr. Bowen could oppose? We pointed out that, if there was a Church candidate, it should be easy to tell the public at what Church gathering his candidacy was proposed and accepted.

To this the sheet replied that Senator Smoot asked his associates, meaning the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve, for their consent before becoming a candidate before the Legislature for Senator of the United States. (Tribune editorial, Oct. 11.) This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they had any objection to him going before the legislature as a candidate for the United States Senate. Can any rational mind trace the connection between the question and the answer?

This is the most stunning logic that ever came under our observation. The question is: At what Church meeting was the alleged Church candidate for municipal office, whom Mr. Bowen opposed, appointed? and the answer is: Senator Smoot asked his associates if they