



GEORGE Q. CANNON.....EDITOR

Wednesday,....July 20, 1870.

GENERAL ELECTION FOR 1870.

MONDAY, AUGUST 1.

PEOPLE'S TICKET.

FOR DELEGATE TO CONGRESS:
WM. H. HOOPER.

COMMISSIONERS TO LOCATE UNIVERSITY LANDS:

JOHN VAN COTT,
LEWIS S. HILLS,
JOHN ROWBERRY.

REPRESENTATIVES FOR SALT LAKE COUNTY:

ORSON PRATT,
JOHN TAYLOR,
A. P. ROCKWOOD,
ENOCH REESE,
B. YOUNG, JUN.,
JOSEPH F. SMITH.

SELECTMAN:

WILLIAM C. NEAL.

TREASURER:

THEODORE MCKEAN.

SHERIFF:

ROBT. T. BURTON.

CORONER:

HAMPDEN S. BEATIE.

SURVEYOR:

CHARLES W. HARDY.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COMMON SCHOOLS:

ROBERT L. CAMPBELL.

POUNDKEEPER:

BRIANT STRINGAM.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE:

First Precinct, Salt Lake City:

J. P.—ADAM SPEIRS,
CONSTABLE—R. W. McALLISTER.

Second Precinct, Salt Lake City:

J. P.—SAMUEL W. RICHARDS,
CONSTABLE—B. Y. HAMPTON.

Third Precinct, Salt Lake City:

J. P.—LEGRAND YOUNG,
CONSTABLE—GIDEON H. C. GIBBS.

Fourth Precinct, Salt Lake City:

J. P.—JETER CLINTON,
CONSTABLE—JOHN READING.

Fifth Precinct, Salt Lake City:

J. P.—DANIEL CARN,
CONSTABLE—CHARLES I. ROBSON.

Mill Creek Ward:

J. P.—JOHN F. SNEDEKER,
CONSTABLE—E. F. M. GUEST.

Big Cottonwood:

J. P.—B. B. BITNER,
CONSTABLE—BRINTON.

South Cottonwood:

J. P.—SILAS RICHARDS,
CONSTABLE—RICHARD HOWE.

South Willow Creek:

J. P.—HENRY DAY,
CONSTABLE—JOSHUA TERRY.

West Jordan:

J. P.—THOMAS ALSOP,
CONSTABLE—SAMUEL BATEMAN.

South Jordan:

J. P.—WM. WINDWARD,
CONSTABLE—HENRY BECKSTEAD.

Fort Herriman:

J. P.—JAMES CRANE,
CONSTABLE—WM. FREEMAN.

Brighton:

J. P.—A. W. COOLEY,
CONSTABLE—

COLLISIONS WITH CONGRESS.

THE New York Herald says it is not to be denied that our national councils

and conduct are reduced to the smallest consideration of the smallest topics, and that while in Europe the statesmen of each nation always take a continental view of every topic that comes up, in this country all discussion is reduced to the level of ward politics, and all expediency is measured by the standards of the ward politicians. It asks what is the reason of this. It replies to its own question by saying that the line of conduct that Gen. Grant laid down for himself in his inaugural, and to which he rigidly adheres, involves a monstrous mistake. He declared that he would have no policy as distinguished from the policy of Congress. This is the great difficulty. Congress, it asserts, has no policy, or if it has, it is that each representative endeavors to secure the greatest number of fat places for his constituents, political supporters and personal relatives. The fear of a collision with Congress is a bad idea, it thinks, for Congress may be wrong, and when it is, collision with it may be the President's duty. It says that politically Congress is but an assemblage of cliques, and these cliques must be broken down or the Administration will become ridiculous in the eyes of the people. An issue with them is what the Executive must desire rather than fear.

The results of Andrew Johnson's collisions with Congress were of such a character as not to encourage his successor to repeat them; besides, there was a clear understanding between the Republican party and its candidate for President, that his policy should be in accord with that of Congress. The feeling was so strong against Mr. Johnson on this point that it is not probable that Gen. Grant would have secured the nomination and been elected President unless he had expressed a determination not to repeat the conduct of his predecessor. General Grant must have had an idea, if he reflected upon the history of the past and paid any attention to the difficulties which former Presidents had to contend with, that if he did his best, he would fail to give satisfaction. If he did not in the beginning think this would be the case, he appears to be in a position now where this conviction will be forced upon him. Many who have been his friends begin now to find fault with his policy, and make unfavorable comments upon his course. Yet if he were to carry out the suggestions of the Herald, break the leading strings which connect him with Congress and have a policy of his own, he would not, in the opinion of very many, mend matters; a terrible outcry would be raised, and everything be done by a large class to destroy his influence with the people and throw odium upon his administration. It may be all very pleasant for a President of the United States during the first year or two of his administration; but the last two years must be excessively disagreeable to every man of fine feelings. If report speak truly, General Grant has already begun to experience this. For awhile he was the popular idol; but the fickle public began to tire; they want a new object and a new shrine at which to worship. Every prominent politician hopes that he will be the new divinity, and he begins to intrigue to that end. To be successful, he imagines, he must find fault with the President, denounce his policy and thwart him in his plans. This is what the politicians are now doing, and they manifest no delicacy upon the subject; in fact, they seem to be laying themselves out to be little the administration and to bring the executive into contempt.

THE NOMINEES FOR OFFICE.

A MASS MEETING of citizens was held on Saturday afternoon, July 16th, at the Tabernacle. Judge Elias Smith was called to the Chair, and Paul A. Schettler, Esq., was appointed Secretary of the meeting. Speeches were made by the Chairman and the Hon. Geo. A. Smith. After which Hon. Wm. H. Hooper was nominated to be the Delegate from Utah Territory to the Forty-Second Congress. The vote on this nomination was entirely unanimous. A committee of thirteen, composed of the following gentlemen, Daniel H. Wells, Geo. Q. Cannon, John Sharp, Robert T. Burton, Elias Smith, Joseph F. Smith, B. Young, Jr., Reuben Miller, Isaac M. Stewart, Archibald Gardner, Andrew Cahoon, Hosea Stout and A. C. Pyper, was then nominated, for the purpose of ascertaining the offices to be filled at the next general election, and to report same to the meeting. The gentlemen whose names we have placed

at the head of our columns to-day as candidates for the suffrages of the people to fill the various offices at the next election were the unanimous choice of the nominating convention; indeed, unanimity characterized the entire proceedings of the meeting.

There is one feature about the political affairs of this Territory which is worthy of note—the men whose names have been presented to the people for their votes in years past have not sought the offices to which they were elected. Instances of men seeking office have been exceedingly rare in this Territory. The result has been that we have had officers who have labored for the welfare of the people, and have endeavored to fill their positions conscientiously and in such a manner as to promote the public weal. They have not been adventurers who have intrigued for office for the sake of the spoils; but staid and reliable men, whose interests have been identified with the Territory, and who in taking office have, in many instances, assumed its cares and responsibilities at the sacrifice of personal convenience and profit, prompted solely by the feeling that it was the duty of every citizen to serve the State to the best of his ability whenever in the opinion of his fellow-citizens his services were required. This is the case also with the present nominees, whose names we publish to-day. Not one of these men have aimed to secure the office for which he has received the nomination. All have been selected with a view to their fitness. They are all well known to the voters, having established reputations which entitle them to credit.

Not only has this rule prevailed where officers have been filled by popular vote; but also in all appointments made by the Legislative Assembly. Men of known character and influence, who had reputations to sustain here, and who were possessed of means aside from the pay of the office, have as a rule been selected. The result is that in no portion of the Republic has there been so little peculation, fraud and the misappropriation of public funds as in this Territory; and the public finances are in a healthy condition and debts do not exist. The people of this Territory have proved by all their experience since they came here that it is a great advantage to a commonwealth for its citizens to be united, and to frown down political divisions and parties and the appointment of political aspirants to office. They have proved that it is every way advantageous for the office to seek the man instead of the man the office.

In this connection we may with propriety allude to our Delegate, Hon. W. H. Hooper. He has filled his position in the trying circumstances which have surrounded him with eminent ability. His indefatigable industry and urbanity, and the dignity and firmness with which he has attended to the duties of his position have drawn forth encomiums from all quarters; and it is generally conceded that Utah is better and more ably represented on the floor of Congress than any other Territory. If there is any man who needs the confidence and the support of his constituents it is he; for his labors are of an arduous and frequently of an unpleasant character, because of the constant stream of misrepresentation and slanders which is poured forth against his constituency. At this juncture it may not be inappropriate to give an extract from a private letter, which we received from a prominent gentleman in Washington, not a "Mormon," who thus alludes to our Delegate:

"As I said the contending forces are resting after a hard fight, and for a time those on your side are victorious. For this your people have to thank their Delegate, W. H. Hooper. I never before saw such an admirable combination of pluck, patience and great good sense. He seemed to feel his way along to success with an instinct second only to the wisdom with which he pursued his arguments when the open fight became necessary. The delivery of his speech in the House was one of the bravest events I ever witnessed. Surrounded by the ablest men in the country who gave him undivided attention, curious to hear what he would say in defense of an unpopular creed—with the floors and galleries crowded and no friends among them—he calmly stood up, and delivered his earnest appeal in behalf of religious liberty in a way to awake sympathy if not to convict the reason."

"I think it but right that you should know this and that your people should appreciate their representative."

He as well as every other officer should have as strong a vote as the Territory can give. Election matters will receive further attention in future numbers.

DISCOURSE.

By President BRIGHAM YOUNG,
delivered in the Tabernacle, Ogden
City, July 10th, 1870.

REPORTED BY DAVID W. EVANS.

If I can have the attention of the congregation I will speak to them a short time. I frequently ask myself, what is the object of the people in coming together in their assemblies on different occasions. Sometimes when I have seen a gathering of the people, I have said "what in the world have the people come here for?" The answer has come to me "They have come to see and be seen, and to learn what is going on." When I see the people gather together, as they have this morning, I still feel to ask "What have we assembled ourselves together for?" What is the object of our coming into this house this morning? To see and be seen, to hear and be heard. The Christian world are in the habit of assembling themselves together at different times to worship God. I sometimes feel to ask them who they are worshipping. "Do you know the character that you call upon as God? Do you understand His nature and His requirements far enough to call upon and worship Him acceptably?" I recollect reading of a certain minister who was preaching through the world, and teaching the people how to be saved, who came along to a certain city and beheld an inscription on a place erected to the worship of God, and it read, "to the Unknown God." Is this the case with those who believe in the Old and New Testament as a general thing? Is it the fact that those who profess to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and in His Father, worship an unknown God,—a being that they do not in the least comprehend? How is it with the Latter-day Saints? Do we assemble ourselves together to worship a Being, who is unknown to us? In many respects and to a great degree we can answer this question by saying that we do not know Him as He knows us; we are not acquainted with Him as He is acquainted with us. He understands from first to last with regard to our being here. He understands the nature of His children; He reads their very thoughts; He understands every desire and the result of every act. This we do not understand of Him; but we understand, as far as it is necessary, the character of Him whom we worship as our Father and our God. He is our Heavenly Father. We acknowledge, believe and partially understand this. I say "partially understand," for we have but just commenced to learn that the inhabitants of the earth are the children of that God whom we worship, who dwells in the heavens. This is a thought and a reflection that can hardly be admitted by the Christian world, though they pray and say "our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth;" yet they do not realize the fact. The Latter-day Saints realize and understand, and feel the effect of, it. Unless we realize in our hearts feelings of obligation to Him for His mercies; unless we realize the truth that He has revealed, and its necessity to save the children of men; unless we love the truth because it is truth, and do not profess attachment to it for mere custom or fashion's sake, our worship of the Lord will be in vain; just so far as we render Him lip service only, just so far our worship is vain.

When I reflect upon the facts pertaining to the history of the Son of God and the gospel which He taught to the inhabitants of the earth it is one of the greatest marvels to me that everybody does not believe. What good reason had the Jews for their disbelief in Him? What argument could they bring against His doctrine, or against His practice so far as we have the history of it? Was there the least blot or stain upon His character, or the least sentiment of infidelity in all His teachings? Not one, not the least blemish; and yet the people,—the great multitudes that assembled at Jerusalem,—Jews and Gentiles, who heard the doctrines that He taught and became acquainted with the miracles that He wrought, and understood precisely the nature of His sentiments and teachings, rejected Him. One would think that all would have believed on Him. This is one view of the question,—the view through honest eyes, by the spirit of truth, the spirit of the gospel, the same by which Jesus taught. Looking at it in another light, or I will say looking at it in darkness rather than light, it is no marvel or wonder that the people, as a general thing, did not believe in and follow Jesus. And the reasons are simply these: The natural heart that is in man; the feelings and beatings of this life that we possess naturally, according to the sin and fall that is within each and every individual, leads to opposition to God. The natural heart is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, and hence it is no marvel that the gospel of Heaven is rejected. If every heart could feel the truth; if every eye could behold the truth, and discern the things of God from the things of the children of men, then every person, in the days of Jesus, would have believed on and followed Him. But after traveling and toiling for about three and a half years, teaching the