

## THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

### ATTACK ON PRESIDENT CANNON.

The Washington correspondent of the Salt Lake Tribune has sent to his paper a brief synopsis of a seven-column article which appeared in the New York Times of the 13th inst., charging President George Q. Cannon with the political sale of this Territory to the Republican party, and with various corrupt and dishonest transactions in his own private business affairs; one of these being his acquirement of stock in the Bullion-Beck mining property, and this followed by the general charge that he has "made a political deal to help his business enterprises."

In the absence of the full text of the publication any attempt to reply explicitly to its accusations would be necessarily premature. But enough of the spirit of the article is at hand to show its utter baseness and infamy. President Cannon in a short interview obtained by a Tribune reporter, brands the telegraphed statements as false in every particular—a declaration which is surely not necessary among a people with whom he has lived in unshaken esteem and unquestioned honor for upwards of fifty years.

Nevertheless, he enters a categorical and emphatic denial to each statement made. Alluding to the charge that Republican success in the Territory of Utah was due to his efforts and his ecclesiastical influence, President Cannon says: "I took absolutely no part in Frank J. Cannon's election, quietly or otherwise, and, in fact, I was very careful to refrain from so doing because of my position in the Church. I wish to be understood and quoted as stating most emphatically that during the campaign I approached no one, indirectly or otherwise, with reference to Frank J. Cannon's interests, and did not contribute a single dollar to his campaign fund. Neither did I have any dealings with J. S. Clarkson or Jos. Manley relating to Frank J. Cannon's election, and for that matter, it is a well known fact that neither Clarkson nor Manley had anything to do with his election."

Referring to the statement that his family has lived from the profits of his Church position, President Cannon answers: "I do not draw a single dollar from the Church for my services, but instead, I pay my tithing from an income which I derive from legitimate business enterprises. I wish to state, further, that I have never made any money out of the Church in any form."

Coming to the statement that his stock in the Bullion-Beck and Champion mining company was secured by fraud, President Cannon says: "My holdings in the company have been acquired only by direct purchase, and whoever says to the contrary tells an unqualified falsehood." And on this subject Mr. John Beck, who according to the Times' writer was swindled out of his mining stock, very promptly comes out in a published statement in both the Salt Lake morning papers of this date to the effect that Mr. Cannon paid the cash for the stock he purchased, that

the transaction has never been questioned, that it was perfectly straight, and that any charge of fraud is ridiculous. There is no doubt that each other slander in the whole vile screed when it shall be received in its fullness can be refuted with equal ease, and without President Cannon's being put to the trouble of further noticing it at all.

Meantime the motive for the malevolence of the Times' writer (the article is said to bear a Salt Lake date line) naturally excites comment, and his identity gives rise to speculation. But whoever he is, and whatever his motive, his false and cowardly nature is shown in his bandiwork. Since almost the beginning of time there have been wretches vile enough to glory in the assassination of honest men's reputations—foul beasts whose pleasure was attempted at the destruction of character and the doing of evil. Such miserable beings are generally found out at last and their infamy shown in the light of day. In the present instance the intention doubtless was to malign more than one man or family—it was to defame and injure vast interests and a whole community. It will fail, as falsehood must ever fail; its author will have his chagrin for his pains, and even now, unknown though he is, his portion is every decent man's scorn.

### DO NOT BLUNDER.

We learn from our correspondents and also from brief notes in our Utah county exchanges that there is considerable agitation in the southern part of the county named with a view to the erection of a new sugar factory. A meeting is called for today (Thursday) in Spanish Fork, to discuss the subject, and the decision is to be communicated through committees to other towns in the county. If it should be favorable to the proposed scheme, meetings are to be held in other localities for the purpose of crowding the plans to a final consummation. Reference is made to this subject in a correspondence in another part of today's News. Those who are taking part in the movement are active farmers and leading citizens in various localities.

A sugar factory is an enterprise of such magnitude both as to capital and operation that its establishment should be a subject for thoughtful deliberation and calm discussion. Its necessary relations with the public make it an object of public interest and solicitude. A chief argument in favor of another sugar factory in the Territory is the fact that two-thirds of the sugar now used here is imported. At the same time conditions are such as to make the item of location for such a factory a matter of vital importance. A valued contributor to the News, whose articles appear each Saturday, has had much to say of the evils of undue competition, and these have been pointed out so forcibly and clearly, and made so patent to every careful reader, that we do not regard it necessary to detail any of them here. It appears to us,

however, that a menace of these evils in their most virulent form is one of the accompaniments of the new factory proposition, and therefore we suggest a serious consideration of the subject from every consistent point of view.

Ordinary good judgment would intimate that where a capably managed branch of manufacturing industry has great difficulty in maintaining its own in any field, the institution of another and similar plant to increase that difficulty by undue competition would be a very injurious proceeding to both. By force of circumstances for which it was responsible, the new comer would have to be regarded as a sort of "dog in the manger" enterprise which, while it might not be able to subsist in comfort itself, yet spoiled the food which would have given nutriment to the other. This illustration has been afforded more than once in Utah, whereby a rush to some particular branch of industry has swept away all operations in that line. And if, where there was not room for two, the second should crush the equally good one which came first, what benefit has come to anyone by the crushing process, to compensate for its injury?

Inquiry may be made as to whether anything of this nature can be applied to the proposition for a new sugar factory in Utah county. That county now has the Lehi sugar works. Whatever successes have been met with, one of them is not that of financial profit to the investors up to the present time. The operating expenses and the receipts have been such as to force the factory management to the alternative of cutting down expenses or ceasing to run. There is no dispute on that point, since it can be shown with mathematical certainty. Now, if the one factory in the county, whose management has been thoroughly economical and capable, has been unable to make anything, what would two do? Would they not be forced into undue competition, fighting each other as well as the imported product in the same market, with the result that one, and probably both, would collapse? Could anything be more favorable to the giant sugar trust than to have an ally in the shape of a local conflict of this nature? These are questions which private and public interests require should be answered without passion or prejudice.

No doubt there are some beet raisers who have felt aggrieved because their beets were not received at the factory; and perhaps their neighbors and associates consider they have cause to be offended. If there is any wrong existing in this respect, or in any other connected with sugar beet culture and the market, it should be set right. For this reason the News has opened its columns for all concerned, and has been pleased to note the free expression of the farmers on the subject and to give full publicity thereto. At the same time, these have never contained a suggestion that the sugar factory rejected any beets that came up to the required standard. Why should it? The factory is there to make sugar, and to turn away material that would enable it to operate would be foolish indeed. But beets which did not reach the standard have been turned away. Why? Because, as is well known, roots outside of certain grades cannot be made to produce