

## EDITORIALS.

## THE DUTY OF ALL PATRIOTIC MEN.

We publish this evening a communication from one of the merchants of this city, setting forth his views on the political situation and the measures proposed in Congress specially relating to Utah. We believe the gentleman to be honest and conscientious in his expressions of desire to see injustice prevented, but do not view the subject in the same light as that in which he appears to consider it.

We wish it to be understood in the first place that he is mistaken in his statement that the letter published in our columns, which called forth his response, was endorsed or sanctioned "editorially" or otherwise. The letter was inserted at the request of a respectable merchant of this city, and was given without comment. It was the opinion of one man unsupported by a single word from this paper. We have made no proposition to publish names of friends or foes in this connection, and have never entertained the idea of doing so, nor would we attempt to bring undue pressure upon any persons to obtain their signatures to a document such as that suggested.

Now in regard to the probable effects of the passage and enforcement of the Edmunds bill. We do not dispute the statement that the bill contains serious defects. We think they are apparent, looking at it from either a "Mormon" or "Gentile" standpoint. And the most serious one is its anti-republican and revolutionary provision for what our correspondent describes as, "a disorganization of the political machinery of the Territory." True, it provides for an "immediate reorganization," but upon what principle? Anything approaching a republican method? Is it not rather the very thing which the people here are so anxious to avoid? In that case, arbitrarily and despotically removes from office incumbents duly elected and qualified, and puts in their place appointed persons entirely irresponsible to the people whose affairs they are to manipulate? And those persons are to exercise more than common monarchical power, in the filling of all the election offices in the Territory. The simple expedient of five irresponsible persons—who in all probability will be entirely ignorant of the situation, and at the same time hostile in spirit to the masses of the people here—is to be more potent than the word of any President, Governor, Legislature, Court or other recognized power in the land! Is not this sufficient cause for remonstrance from all patriotic and liberty-loving citizens regardless of differences in creed?

The "difference in the number of votes," to which our correspondent refers, is a small matter. It is not that which we consider serious. It is the exercise of unconstitutional and tyrannical authority by a government based upon acknowledged human rights, that we view as dangerous to the welfare of the nation as well as oppressive and unjust to the people of this Territory.

In answer to the questions would it be right, or wise, or useful for "Gentiles" to sign a remonstrance against the passage of a bill which abridges the civil rights of polygamists, we answer "yes" to the first and second queries, and "test it and try" to the third. As our correspondent has admitted, "the rightfulness or otherwise of any relation of the sexes, has nothing to do with the subject." It is wrong to deprive an organized Territory of vested rights, and take from citizens who have never been convicted by law of crime, the elective franchise, on any such pretext as that advanced in support of the Edmunds bill, and therefore it is "right" for any one to protest against such measures. The proposed remonstrance, by the gentleman's own showing, would not relate to polygamy or monogamy, but to the right of local self-government and the wrong of destroying or dethroning it.

It is "wise" to do what is right. It would be wise for our non-"Mormon" business men to remonstrate against the wrong intended against Utah, because it will without doubt seriously affect their material interests in common with all other citizens. Such a revolution in our affairs cannot be affected without seriously damaging the business of this Territory, and wis-

dom would suggest the propriety of doing what is possible with a view to preventing the injury sure to accrue. If there are here but twenty "Gentiles" of influence that want to see injustice done to the "Mormons," it would be wise for the others to manifest their impartiality. They know that many of the statements of the score of malignants on which much of this agitation and consequent special legislation are founded, are utterly untrue. They know that the affairs of the Territory have been administered honestly and economically, that the ballot is free and secret, that peace and good order prevail, and that there is absolutely no need whatever for the abrogation of our political rights in this Territory and the establishment of an oligarchy. We think, then, it would be "wise" on their part to say so, like men, and not express such views in private and refuse to proclaim them when necessary in public.

As to "whether such a remonstrance would be useful," it is impossible to say with certainty. The best way to determine that is to try it and see. If nothing is attempted nothing will be done. When men endeavor to do what is right they have the chance of accomplishing something, but cannot expect results without effort. And in regard to numbers, the few business men of Utah know more about the facts than the millions who raise the clamor. It is not desired that "friendship for the "Mormons" should be proven, or manifested in the remonstrance. It is friendship for the rights of citizens, friendship for the principles of representative government, friendship for constitutional freedom that should be exhibited. The "quiet influence on the side of moderation and justice" referred to, is all very well so far as it goes. But how much will it accomplish if it utters no voice and is only exhibited? It is not needed? That influence is required to correct the errors on which the injustice and extreme measures are predicated. Men with sinister and wilful misrepresentations invoked the storm now gathering over Utah. Let those who know the truth be not ashamed nor afraid to declare it for the purpose of averting the outburst, which will be as disastrous to them as to those against whom it has been specially brewed.

Our correspondent "expects to continue to protest against what he deems unjust." And yet he says he would not sign a remonstrance against gross injustice, usurpation, oppression and flagrant wrong. We hope he will change his mind in that particular, for every fair man's influence is needed at this juncture, and it should be used in a manner calculated to make an impression. It is the principle involved in this proposed Commission that should be objected to by every lover of republicanism rather than the class of persons to compose it. That is a minor consideration. Yet it is one worthy of thought. If some of Utah's ablest and most upright citizens were appointed, it would certainly be better than for strangers not able or upright to lay hold of the reins of power. But it is by no means certain that in attempting to get Utah citizens in that Commission, the ablest and most upright would be secured. Just as likely some of the very men who have been plotting and lying and defaming the people, would obtain positions therein, as that fair and honorable men would be selected. This, it is evident, is one of the objects the schemers have had in view.

Our correspondent is entitled to his opinion about the uselessness of a remonstrance, and the utility of a request for Utah citizens to compose the commission, but we consider that it is every just man's duty to lift his voice and use his influence against the perpetration of the infamy proposed, against an organized Territory of the United States, whether the likelihoods are for or against the success of the protest.

These are our opinions, and we freely express them, not with a view to urge business men to any course against their wishes or judgment, but in answer to the arguments set forth in the letter we publish. The effects of the Edmunds bill on polygamy we regard as scarcely worth consideration. But the blow it aims against the very groundwork of American institutions we regard as dangerous to the cause of human rights, and calculated to be turned at some time in other directions, and therefore we are in favor of a manly protest from every Utah

citizen who desires the maintenance of popular liberty, whether he be a "Mormon" or a "Gentile," a sinner or a saint.

## WHY NOT?

THE New York Herald, of February 18, has the following:

"SALT LAKE CITY,  
February 17, 1882.

At a meeting of prominent Gentiles of Utah last night, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:

Whereas, The Legislature of Utah, now in session in this city to-day, adopted a concurrent resolution protesting against the passage by Congress of any bills disfranchising polygamists, and praying Congress to send a committee to investigate the condition of things in Utah.

Resolved, That said action is merely a trick to gain time, and that if it wins, these very men will claim it as a divine interposition in favor of polygamy and use it to excite the masses of the Mormon people against the just authority of the national government; that the fact that three-fourths of the Legislature are themselves practical polygamists exposes the condition of things in Utah without the intervention of an investigating committee; that their action in this case betrays their fear that the disfranchising of polygamists will break up polygamy, and therefore indicates precisely what Congress ought to do; that we most respectfully urge Congress not to be deterred from perfecting the good work in which it is engaged by the protests of men who are acknowledged polygamists themselves, and who adopt this deferential attitude only because their ordinary attitude of defiance will not apparently serve them in a moment of emergency; that there need be no fear of convulsion or disturbance if Congress now adopts effective measures to settle Utah affairs, but that if it does not, the simplest duties of statesmanship will have been disregarded, as they have too long been, and the chance of peacefully settling Utah affairs will by this much have been placed in jeopardy."

Who is there in this city that knows anything of the "meeting of prominent Gentiles," or the passage of any such resolutions as the above? We doubt very much that any meeting at all of the kind was held. In all probability one or two of the villains who have been sending forth falsehoods by telegraph and otherwise for some time past, concocted the "meeting" without endorsement from anybody.

But supposing that a few anti-"Mormons," without public notice of any kind, have combined to represent the situation and influence Congress, is not that a good reason why honorable "Gentiles" should present the truth, utter their voices in refutation of the slanders that are working mischief to the material interests of the Territory, and remonstrate against hasty Congressional action founded on misconception and excitement? If scheming adventurers can "resolve" in the interest of wrong, why cannot honorable non-"Mormons" remonstrate in the interest of right?

## SHOULD THE MERCHANTS REMONSTRATE.

Editor Deseret News:

A recent issue of your paper contained an anonymous—but editorially sanctioned—suggestion to publish the names of all business men who would and who would not sign a remonstrance to Congress against the passage of the "Edmunds Bill." As one who has less to gain as well as less to lose by an expression of opinion than nine-tenths of our "business men," will you kindly accord me space for a few comments on said "suggestion."

I wish it distinctly understood, however, that the rightfulness or otherwise of polygamy, monogamy or any other form of marriage or relation of the sexes has nothing to do with the subject under consideration, and will not be alluded to here except as may be necessary in a legal point of view. The question is whether it would be right, wise or useful for any or all the "business men" of Utah to sign a remonstrance against the passage of Edmund's Bill. To answer this it will be necessary to consider very briefly what said bill proposes to do, and what its effects would be.

If I understand it correctly it proposes to disorganize the political machinery of the Territory, to be followed by an immediate reorganization. It provides for a commission to supervise elections and virtually govern the Territory until a new election is held, a new set of legislators and other officers are chosen by the people, and then, like Othello, "their occupation will be gone." It also provides that no polygamist or person living in unlawful relations with more than one woman shall vote or hold office.

There are many grave objections to and serious defects in this bill, one of which I have italicized, and it

may well be questioned what sort of men will accept such a thankless position for so short a period at so miserable a pittance provided for the salary of the commissioners, which would almost seem a premium on dishonesty and bribery. But, passing its defects, let us consider the probable results to the people of Utah, should it become a law and is administered justly and impartially. It will simply result in a change of civil officers throughout the Territory. It will substitute monogamists in all civil offices held by the latter. But all will be "Mormons" still, unless the latter choose to vote for a "Gentile." This result is inevitable under the provisions of said bill, and I think the "Mormons" have more reason to ask for its passage and impartial administration just as it is than to urge remonstrances which might result in more harmful legislation. I have no means of knowing what proportion of the "Mormons" are polygamists, but presume—according to your own frequent statements—it must be small. If so, their disfranchisement can make but little difference in the number of votes cast, and it is easy to see how and why—under their iron-clad provisions of this bill—the "Mormons" are certain to retain political control of the Territory. Indeed, it is the most innocently formidable document that the "Mormons" could expect under existing circumstances.

Now let us briefly consider the questions before stated.

First: Would it be right for either "business men" or others—who as conscientiously believe polygamy to be wrong (aside from its legal aspect) as you do that it is right—to sign a remonstrance against a law which works injury only to polygamists and abridges also the civil rights of others who are living in illegal sexual relations. Would it not be considered equal to a request to continue polygamists in office and to recognize the polygamic relation as legal? I ask again, would it and is it reasonable to ask to do this?

Second.—Would it be wise to do so? Let your own judgment answer. The public sentiment of the country is intensely aroused on the "Mormon" question—whether justly or unjustly is immaterial to our question—and Congress feels itself obliged to do something or we may be assured it would not stir. I repeat that if the "Mormons" have any cause for fear it is that the nation will not be satisfied with the "Edmunds bill," but will demand more radical measures. The passage of this bill would probably satisfy the popular cry for a few years, until it proves as futile as other measures when you may be better able to stand another legislative dose. Hence I should regard such remonstrance as unwise, even from your own standpoint—unless you think Congress is like that historically ancient animal which is by all denounced, and yet by all (but our Jewish brethren) devoured, and which is proverbial for his hereditary disposition to travel in any direction but the one you wish.

Third. Would such a remonstrance be useful? In the present state of public sentiment I do not believe a petition signed by every business man of Utah would be of any avail. The country demands some legislation, and of what avail would be the remonstrance of a score or two selfish "business men" against the clamor of millions? Besides, the signing of such a document would not prove a man's friendship for the "Mormons." It would certainly prove that he had a special friendship for their money and their patronage, and perhaps not half as deserving of either as many who while making no hypocritical parade are quietly using their influence on the side of moderation and justice.

For one I would not sign it. Yet there is no one more anxious to see justice, impartiality, kindness and broad and far-seeing statesmanship characterize the treatment of the "Mormon Question," nor one who according to his influence and means, would do more to secure it. Conservative men are generally objects of suspicion and dislike to both parties because they cannot endorse the views of either extreme. But I expect to continue to protest and use my feeble influence against what I deem to be oppressive and unjust on either side or from any quarter, leaving my motives to a higher tribunal than that of mortals at least as erring as myself.

I do not believe there are twenty

"Gentiles" throughout Utah—who of any influence whatever—who desire to see the "Mormons" treated justly and harshly or to obtain illegal possession of their property. On the other hand they desire to see the laws impartially administered, and to promote the prosperity and happiness of its citizens, irrespective of party creed. And while they would refuse to sign a remonstrance against the Edmunds bill, I believe they would almost universally join in a request that the proposed "Commission" should be selected from the able and most upright citizens of Utah of both parties, including two monogamic liberal "Mormons," who would discharge the obligations their position both to the government and to the people, with the strictest fidelity. Such a petition may be of some avail, the other would be worse than useless.

Respectfully,  
W. H. SHEARMAN.

## LEGISLATIVE MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

THE special joint committee of the Legislature appointed to draft a memorial to Congress setting forth reasons why a commission of investigation should be sent to Utah before action is taken by Congress on the affairs of this Territory has prepared the following which was presented in the House by Mr. Pease and unanimously adopted, and sent to the Council where it was also adopted:

## MEMORIAL.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah, respectfully represent that consequence of baseless rumors and monstrous exaggerations the people of Utah have been placed in jeopardy, and are now threatened with the deprivation of the right of local self-government. Persons whose aim is to gain control of this now wealthy and prosperous Territory and manipulate its finances, have succeeded in arousing the ire of the clergy, and through the anger of many people against the large majority of the citizens of Utah, and thus a pressure has been brought to bear upon your Honorable Body which shows its effect in proposed measures containing provisions utterly at variance with the fundamental principles of republican government, and which, while ostensibly aimed at the marriage relations of but small portion of the people will, carried into effect, deprive the whole Territory of the vested rights secured to it by the Organic Act, and the Constitution of the United States.

For many years the people of Utah have patiently endured the misrepresentations and slanders of unscrupulous persons who have acted at different times in the Territory, and who from various unworthy motives, have formed themselves into political and religious cliques, avowedly to represent the liberal and progressive element of the Territory, but really, as the history of their transactions plainly shows, to vex and annoy the majority of the people, and deprive them, if possible, of their civil, religious and political rights.

The executive and judicial power of the Territory being vested in the hands of government appointed and the legislative trammelled by the absolute veto power of the Governor, it is no difficult to realize how comparatively powerless the people have been when attempting to foster the interests of the Territory.

While bearing all the burdens imposed under influences created by officials wholly irresponsible to them, the people of Utah have waited, hoped and prayed for better things, under a government less like the colonial bondage to which their fathers were subjected, and more in harmony with true republican institutions. When accused of exercising undue influences over the female portion of the population, and the idea was advanced that if women in Utah were granted the right to vote, a remedy would once be found, the Territorial Legislature promptly anticipated the proposed action of Congress, and passed an act conferring upon women in Utah, over 21 years of age, and with