

what Mr. McBride said on Saturday. The latter is another third of the "capable" anti-"Mormon" delegation which evidently did not see eye to eye on the subject of robbing the Latter-day Saints. The Governor thought when he was advocating through the anti-"Mormon" interviewer the taking of the property of the "Mormon" people that he was in line with those whom he represented then in Washington. He doubtless is in spirit, but not in pretension. He reminds one of the possum in the story who was the possessor of a capacious facial orifice, into which he put his foot every time he opened it. He now announces himself squarely as in favor of robbing the "Mormon" people of their property.

This position is precisely what those whom he assumed to represent as a lobbyist are endeavoring with all their cunning and sophistry at their command to deny.

From what the Governor says subsequently he evidently realizes the probability of his being soon out of a job. He is consequently casting about for an easy berth, being willing to spend the balance of his time as a "capable" non-"Mormon" delegate at the Capitol.

This is the way he puts in his plea:

"The non-Mormons of Utah should never let another session pass without one or more capable delegates stationed in Washington, watching every Mormon manoeuvre and ready with a checkmate."

As he is so verdant as to be outspoken as an advocate for the robbery of the "Mormon" people, those who have the hiring of a "capable" delegation and do not want their true inwardness to appear, will doubtless exercise their prerogative to reject any and all bids, and drop him as they would a hot potato.

When Governor West made his advent to this city in his official capacity he was given a cordial, and, it might be almost said, a royal reception. The people of Utah did him honor by believing in advance that he would do his duty and be the Governor of the whole people, and not the fool of a contemptible clique of "active politicians," much less to become one of them.

He, at that time, rose to the sentiment of the occasion, and so expressed himself. He said the fame of the people of this Territory had reached him. He had heard of their hospitality, their industry and numerous other virtues. "If"

said he, "I could be untrue to such a people, I would be unfit to live;" and again, "If I know my duty I believe I have the courage to perform it."

How much fidelity is manifested towards a people by a person appointed to be the Governor of the whole population who will leave his official post and go to the Capitol as a self styled "capable" Gentile lobbyist, and there advocate the rightfulness of the wholesale robbery of the great majority?

If this desertion of his post and perversion of his official functions was an act of treachery on his part, has he not been untrue to a people who never harmed him, but have treated him, because of his position, with a courtesy, hospitality and kindness far beyond his personal merits? If this be the case has he not pronounced upon himself a terrible judgment?

If in acting in this way he has been performing what he considers his duty, his theory in that regard is warped indeed, and the degree of courage necessary to enable a man to fall in with a designing clique whose chief aim is the perversion of the institutions of the country by robbing a worthy people of their political rights and their property, might be injected into the Governor's eye without invoking an involuntary tear.

Consider the initial pretension, as to his future conduct, of the Governor on his advent to Utah, and make note of his present position—"Look on this picture and on that"—and "What a fall is there, my countrymen."

### HOW MUCH FOR ODIUM?

THERE are some grotesque phases connected with the claim set up to the effect that the compensation asked by the Receiver and his attorneys in the Church suit is "unconscionable." As to its having an abnormally swollen appearance there is no room for question. To set up, however, a point of conscience in relation to any phase of this robbery of a Church would be amusing if the subject were not so serious a one. No people who appreciate justice and esteem it will be able to discover any of the elements of that principle associated with the pursuing parties. What an absurdity it is for a man to talk of any act as "unconscionable" who has stated in effect before a court of justice that he had doubts regarding the constitutionality of the law under

which the suit was brought; and yet he, with his "brethren on the bench," decided it to be constitutional. His decision in that regard was unmitigatedly "unconscionable."

In considering this anomalous position assumed by the late Chief Justice of Utah, one is led to exclaim with the poet:

"O, wad some power the giftie gie us,  
To see ourselves as others see us,  
It wad frae mony a blunder free us,  
And foolish notion."

We take the ground, as will be seen, that even the incipient symptoms of the presence of conscience in this process of taking "a large amount of property" from its owners have never been apparent from the beginning till now. The estimate placed upon the labors of the Receiver by himself, judging from the price asked as compensation for them has been declared, as already stated, by the "active politicians" who have inaugurated and conducted the examination into his conduct and that of his attorney, to be "unconscionable." Let this be granted for the sake of the present argument, and in what light does it place Col. Merritt, Mr. Fred. Auerbach, Mr. George Y. Wallace, Mr. W. S. McCornick, Mr. J. E. Dooley, *et al.*?

If in this matter Receiver Dyer has acted without conscience, are not those who have aided and abetted in the performance of the act upon which this charge is based guilty of the same offense? If on the ground of unconscionable claims denunciation should be hurled at him, why not give those who have assisted him, as exhibited in their certificates of opinion regarding what he should be paid for his services, their due share of the consequent blame?

Of course what Marshal Dyer did was in an official capacity. What the others did was presumably from a business standpoint. If he is guilty in relation to making an exorbitant claim in an official capacity, the other named gentlemen are in one of two positions—either that the business capacity attributed to them is thin as air, or that they wilfully aided and assisted in an attempt to consummate an "unconscionable" act.

It may be claimed in their behalf that their estimates were framed without adequate information respecting the subject to which they related. This is untenable; a clear-headed business-man will not make an estimate concerning any financial question without first gathering