

## THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

### NOTICE.

To the Officers and Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints:

This is to inform you that at a meeting of the Council of Apostles held this day (Thursday, Nov. 19th, 1896), there being present Lorenzo Snow, Franklin D. Richards, Brigham Young, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, George Teasdale, Heber J. Grant, John W. Taylor, Marriner W. Merrill and Anthon H. Lund, which meeting was called for the purpose of considering and taking action on the case of Elder Moses Thatcher—and of which meeting and its object he had been duly notified—after a full consideration of all the circumstances of the case, and after each Apostle present had expressed himself upon the subject, it was unanimously decided that Moses Thatcher be severed from the Council of the Twelve Apostles, and that he be deprived of his Apostleship and other offices in the Priesthood.

LORENZO SNOW,  
President Council of Twelve Apostles.

### THE PROPOSITION IS PLAIN.

The breeze which was created by the formal announcement a few days ago of an additional senatorial candidate standing on a platform of his own make, and quite diverse from any structure ever endorsed by any political party in this community since national politics divided its people, is fast dying down to a dead calm, notwithstanding the efforts in certain quarters to magnify it into a storm.

As the people of the State grasp more clearly the precise nature of that platform, they see more plainly the scope and character of the issue which it raises. The candidate himself announces in terms so explicit as to defy misconception, that he bases his expectations of support on the fact that he has sought and is seeking to break down the doctrines and discipline of a Church; and there are but few citizens in the State who are willing to augment his boom by endorsing such a platform.

The fact that the Church which is thus assailed is the one of which the candidate has been a member since his childhood, is no part of the main issue, as affecting political matters in the State. Neither is the further fact that differences exist between him and his ecclesiastical associates. Neither is the still further fact of his suspension from official position in that Church. These and all other facts and circumstances extraneous to the real issue should be discriminatingly separated from it.

The candidate virtually says. "I am

endeavoring to break down the doctrines and discipline of a certain Church, and to prevail upon as many of its members as possible to aid me in so doing. Because such is my purpose, and the object of my efforts, I ask the Legislature to give me the prestige and power of a United States Senator, that I may make them the more effective; and that it may become fully apparent that the political party now in control in Utah is resolved to accomplish the same results for which I am striving."

Is there a person in the state so dull that he cannot see that the issue here raised is purely religious and not at all political? That an attempt is here made to prevail upon the Legislature of the State, and also its controlling political party, to declare war upon a Church? That the candidacy of the aspirant in question, because of his platform, not of his personality, is a menace to the future peace and welfare of the commonwealth?

Is the candidate put forth because he is a Democrat? No. Because he favors silver? No. Because he opposes legislative bounties? No. Because he is able and experienced, or qualified physically or mentally for the place? No. So far as these qualifications are concerned, he may have them all, and yet everybody knows that he would never have been named for the office because of them. His candidacy rests wholly and solely upon his hostile attitude to a Church, to which it is thought a rebuke would come from his success.

Let a man rise up and say to the members of the Utah Legislature: "I am at war with the Catholic church. I desire to prevail upon as many of its members as possible to support my efforts to break down its doctrines and discipline, and I ask you to clothe me with political power that my efforts may be more effective; and I also ask you, and the political party which elected you, to follow my leadership in a war upon that church." How many members of the Legislature would have patience to give such a man a hearing, even? How many papers in the State would give him access to their columns? And would the official newspaper organ of the Catholic church, if it had such an organ, be expected to keep entirely still and permit itself to be muzzled by the stupid cry of church interference, or a recurrence of old conditions? Were such an assault to be made upon the weakest and most unpopular religious body in the State, there is not a reputable voter or paper in it that would not cry shame upon the assailants; nor is there a man of influence in any political party who would not see the danger of admitting such issues into politics.

It is incredible that any member of the Legislature can be so dull by nature, or so biased by influence, as to be unable to see that an attempt is being made to prevail upon the State to war against a Church; and that the latter is acting solely on the defensive; while the greatest dullard among all our local politicians cannot help but see what political folly it would be to

force such an issue by pushing such a candidate.

Again the NEWS appeals to the reason and patriotism of the members of the Legislature, to be resolute in refusing to endorse the clashing of State against Church; of politics against religion; of vaunting ambition against the peace of the people, by emphasizing their refusal to support an aspirant whose candidacy means all these.

### THE SCHOOL ELECTION SQUABBLE.

From the opinion of the attorney general, published in Thursday evening's NEWS, it would appear that no school election can be held this year in the cities of the first and second classes in this State. The law directs that an election shall be held, but arranges no procedure by which the mandate can be obeyed, hence the city school districts referred to must let the matter pass by. From this view of the attorney general there does not appear to be much foundation for dissent, so the probability is that in cities of the first and second classes the present members of boards of education whose terms expire on January 1, 1897, will hold over until their successors are elected pursuant to legislation yet to be enacted.

No doubt in most of the city school districts affected the present incumbents are entirely satisfactory as officials, and no special worry will arise over their continuation in power. But the purpose of the law is to give the opportunity for a change, or at least of starting officials out on a new and definite term; one of the first acts of the Legislature, therefore, should be to provide this opportunity. The defect in the law must be remedied, or no elections at all can be held in the city school districts affected; and it may as well be remedied and acted upon early in the session.

While the Legislature is at this subject it could also make another change in the school law as it affects boards of education in cities of the first and second classes. The present members of the board are allowed a maximum salary of twenty-five dollars a month; the full amount is not paid in all cities, but the sum fixed is in no case excessive for the services performed. This compensation could not be cut off or changed for the term the members were appointed, for the Constitution forbids such alteration. But the new members of the board are to serve without pay. This provision in itself is open to serious objection. In the first place, the people do not want from one class of officers responsible services for nothing while they pay others large and even excessive salaries. Again, recent experience with judges of election is not favorable to the no-pay idea as affairs are at present. The laborer is as worthy of his hire in the case of members of boards of education as are legislators or other officers who are not required to bring any more time, responsibility and ability into the public service. The former provision of law is far superior to the present, for the reason that it is more just to both the official and the public.

Probably there are few defects in