

listen to their utterances and then see if party teaching gives a political education. It is said that Utah farmers are not skilled in the fine points of party affairs. That may be so, and if so, is nothing to their discredit. There are no farmers in Utah who would be guilty of one-tenth the tom-foolery of the Alliance people in the Eastern States. Ask the Utah farmer, for an opinion on silver, or on the tariff, or on pension bills, or other important issues, and you will get a reply quick enough. Ask him the difference between a Democrat and a Republican and he may answer he does not see much if any. Is he wrong? Is he ignorant? Suppose the partizans who claim that this is ignorance should undertake to explain the matter. Could they do so satisfactorily, unless they say the chief issue is the possession of offices?

Men who failed to get office from Cleveland voted against him at the next election. It is the same way with Harrison. Because he would not appoint Farwell's heelers, and Shoup's strikers to office, both these orthodox Republicans will vote against him in the future. Does this not show that party politics are not so much a matter of education, or of principle, as of official boodle. The curse of our country is that we are giving to party what is meant for mankind.

Left-handed apologies are made here and there for the people of Utah because they are not cutting each other's throats on party lines. There is no need for anything of the kind. The Utah farmer can take care of himself. He is 100 per cent more intelligent than his brother of Kansas or of Illinois, when it comes to national issues. And if he has been kept out of party in the past by the ragamuffin and outlaws of each, it should be deemed a matter for congratulation rather than for regret. We are approaching an important crisis in our country's history, and this crisis cannot be tilted over by party politics, clan organizations or any kind of factionism. In this scene of wild political strife the Utah farmer should remain a reasonable, calm and unbiased and turn his reflections to national issues, rather than to party squabbles.

A PLEA FOR POPULAR STULTIFICATION.

The annexed communication was received several days ago but more important matter has crowded it out of our columns until today. We print the entire letter with the exception of some low and spiteful expressions, unsuited to our pages and giving evidence that the writers were too hot and ex-

cited at the expose of their attempt at influencing congressional legislation for Utah, to maintain the courtesy characteristic of gentlemen. In cooler moments they will doubtless be glad that we suppressed their vulgarity.

Editor Deseret News:

Your recent editorial under the attractive heading, "A Plea for Popular Stultification," requires a response from the victims of your uncalled-for vituperation. Had you taken time to investigate the case, your abusive article would not have found its way to the public.

In order to understand our letter to Senator Edmunds, the contents of the petition to Congress that it accompanied should be known. The petition in effect asked that Congress amend the bill to create a fourth judicial district for Utah so as to empower the Governor to temporarily fix the places of holding court for the relief particularly of the northern part of the Territory. The petition did not propose to take any authority away from Utah's Legislature; but contemplated a temporary right in the Governor to be exercised only until our law-making body should convene. It must be noticed particularly that this temporary right in the Governor was to be confined to a change of place of holding court in the district and not to change the districts.

The framers and signers of the petition, then, can hardly be held responsible for the amendment of the bill contrary to their request.

That portion of our letter which treats of the question to whom previously belonged the right to fix the time and place of holding court seems at first sight uncalled for, and gives rise, perhaps, to your charge of immodesty; but with some consideration, its pertinency can be seen. The Utah Legislature has already said that all causes of action arising in certain counties should be tried in certain places. If this be law, our petition asking that the Governor have the temporary right to change the places of holding court would be futile. Hence it was necessary to consider whether we were asking Congress to delegate its legislative power to our governor. As to whether our conclusion that the Utah law on the subject is invalid, is correct or not, we shall not stop to discuss. We are willing to let the public decide in the future whether we are right or not.

Will only say in answer to your statement that we "appear to have forgotten that Congress empowered the Legislative Assembly to enact laws 'on all rightful subjects of legislation,' that you omitted to add, "not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States."—the point upon which the question hinges.

As to overlooking "the necessity for the preservation of the consistency of one part of their [our] statement with the rest of it," will say, there is no inconsistency in giving our personal conclusion that the Governor already had the power in question, and at the same time say that it is doubtful whether he possesses the power—not doubtful in our minds but in the minds of others, among whom seems to be the News.

The true inwardness of your insulting and abusive attack seems to be that our letter was addressed to Mr. Edmunds and because you have no great respect for him, all found in his company are fit subjects for your abuse. We do not deem it necessary to explain why he was addressed, further than to say that it was he who introduced the bill into the Senate.

Want of age seems to be another of our conspicuous faults. As Mr. Pitts' reply to Walpole on a similar point is so well known, we refrain from expressing thoughts naturally suggested.

As to this bill as amended being "the reduction of home rule in Utah," we shall say little. Were we responsible for the measure, its probable consequences might be here considered. We leave the News and time to say in what way it is possible for local politics to affect the rights of people through this change. They can also tell us if the gentlemen who administer justice to us and who thus have in a measure our very lives and property in their hands, will exercise this insignificant additional authority to the detriment of any portion of the people. Another question will be whether it will be possible to adopt a more inconvenient system than the present—court held in a few of the principal cities only and the people thus compelled to travel great distances, at expense to protect their rights. We shall not take a pessimistic view of the case until some reasonable grounds for so doing can be given.

The editorial in question contains some good doctrine on the necessity for contending "for the rights of the sovereign people, opposing every encroachment on their prerogatives," etc., but all of this very good thunder (when rightly used) has been misapplied in this case. It is all very well for editors and others to be watchful of the people's rights, but when the "contention is carried to the minutest details," it is easy to overstep the bounds of prudence, and the would-be protector becomes a chronic grumbler, injuring the cause he would protect, by his Don Quixotic attacks of imaginary foes. Fellers may thus be forged unawares by the indiscriminate use of abuse.

We regret that you have villified us and thus brought us before the public.

Respectfully,

CHAS. H. HART,
RICHARD RICH.

LOGAN, Utah, March 11th, 1891.

So much for the letter. How much cause there was for this ebullition and how closely the writers have met the objection so farred to their effort to condemn the Utah Legislature and gain temporary powers for the Governor which he ought not to exercise, will best be seen by reproducing the article to which they essay to reply. It was as follows:

A PLEA FOR POPULAR STULTIFICATION.

There is a feature associated with the bill creating a fourth judicial district for Utah that seems to demand special notice. In the original draft the authority to establish the new district was vested in "the Governor and Legislative Assembly." It was subsequently amended by striking out "Legislative Assembly" and substituting therefor "supreme court."

The House committee incorporated in its report recommending the passage of the bill a correspondence which, on account of the quality of the statements it embodies, is somewhat interesting, and it is consequently here inserted:

"LOGAN CITY, February 7, 1891.

"Dear Sir—In the absence of Mr. Lomax, and in response to your letter to him of the 28th ultimo, we send you the inclosed petition, which we have assisted Mr. Lomax in circulating.

"It might have been as well to have noted in this petition the fact that citizens of Northern Utah have to travel from 70 to 100 miles to attend court, and that this great inconvenience will continue for a year unless your bill is so amended as to give the Governor the power to say that a term of court shall be held at Logan in the meantime, to transact a portion of the business that is now transacted in Ogden.