

## EDITORIALS.

## A CHINESE CATASTROPHE.

TODAY'S dispatches tell of a terrible catastrophe which occurred in China on July 15th. For two days previous to the awful outburst the Bandai San mountains emitted strange rumbling sounds, and there was a succession of earthquake shocks. Suddenly the sky assumed an inky blackness, and the volcanic disturbance burst forth in terrible fury. The crest of one mountain seemed to be thrown upward from its place and to fall with a deafening noise. These phenomena were followed by showers of red mud and stones, under which villages were buried to a depth varying from seven to twenty feet.

Up to the time the steamer left Hong Kong bearing the advices, tidings had been received from the ill-fated villages that nearly five hundred bodies of the killed had been recovered. They were so chopped, cut and smashed as to be beyond recognition, it being impossible even to ascertain their sex.

The number and extent of calamities of one description and another that have befallen the Chinese Empire during the last few years constitute an appalling catalogue. They appear to be fulfilling the predictions of the ancient Prophets who, directing the prophetic finger to events of the latter times, indicated that there would be destruction and fury upon the heathen such as had not been. The balance of the world has the promise of having, in due time, its proportionate share of trouble and perplexity, preceding the time when the Son of Man shall appear.

## FIXING WAGES BY LAW.

THE leader of the Republican Party, James G. Blaine, at the great ovation when he landed in New York said "the whole plth and mement" of the campaign was the wages question. It was whether the great mass of American citizens who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow shall be seriously reduced in their emolument from day to day."

This outlines the course to be pursued during the struggle for the presidency. It is to be the text from which the protectionists will preach on the advantages of a high tariff, and show how the people are to grow rich by being heavily taxed. We do not propose, now, to discuss this interesting question, but to call attention to a scheme which is designed to settle it.

Congressman White of Indiana figures as the author of a bill which will prevent, as he imagines, the dire calamity foretold by his fellow Republicans as the sure consequences of the Mills bill and referred to by Mr. Blaine as, "The long looked for occasion on which the cheaper labor and cheaper fabrics of the old world expect to invade the new world and lower the wages of American workmen to the European standard."

Mr. White proposes to strike a deadly blow at the low wages terror. Pass his bill and make it successfully operative—which would be much more difficult than getting it through Congress—and there would be no danger of the "European standard" or any other menace to American labor. It fixes the minimum rate of wages for the entire country and makes it uniform in all the States. It provides that:

"Every male citizen or alien over 21 years of age who may be employed as a laborer in any capacity shall be entitled to and shall be paid not less than \$1.50 a day of 10 hours; every woman of over 18 years of age shall be paid not less than \$1; and every minor over 14 and under 18 shall be paid not less than 75 cents a day."

To bring these provisions into practical operation, a million dollars is to be appropriated, and the business is to be put into the hands of that already perplexed and badgered body, the inter-state commerce commission.

Mr. White is a protectionist in the full sense of the term. He perceives the necessity of something more than the protection of the capitalist, which is the chief object and effect of the high tariff system, and so brings out this plan to protect the laborer, who is—for the campaign—the great consideration of anxious Republicans.

Of course there is not the slightest danger, or hope, as the case may be, that such a bill will become law. It would take away the chief issue of the campaign, as presented by the great Maine politician. It will be probably buried in a committee. If it had been brought forward at an early day in the session, it would have been food for the funny men of the House and enlivened some of the dreary hours when jokes were needed to awake a little interest.

It has long ago been settled that the rate of wages is regulated by causes outside of the domain of legislation. The scale will vary with the locality. Prices in the East will not be the same as in the West. Where the labor market is crowded low wages will prevail, and scarcity of workmen will bring up the rates of remuneration in spite of written rules, agreements, or acts of legislatures.

But if Mr. White believes that wages can be fixed by law, on what principle did he decide that the minimum for a laborer must be a dollar and a half a day? Why not make it three dollars while he was about it? And why should a laborer in an old State where living is cheap, be paid the same wages as one in a new Territory where living is dear? Then Mr. White is likely to array against his scheme a very important part of the working population—the women. Why this discrimination between the sexes? Susan B. Anthony and her army of reformers will not sit quietly by and allow the value of a woman's daily labor to be but a dollar, while a man's is placed at a dollar and a half.

The question of "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work," will never be settled by law. Neither will the tariff regulate it. "The law of supply and demand" is more potent than acts of Congress or of Parliament, and while poverty prevails, and capital buys labor, and individual interest and aggrandizement are the motive and object of human effort, there will be a conflict between money and muscle and the weaker will go to the wall. High tariff or low tariff, free trade or protection have really very little to do with the matter. But "the benefit of the laboring man" is a plausible political cry and cunning politicians are slow to take advantage of it. We shall hear a great deal of shallow sophistry on this head during the political struggle of 1888.

## DIVORCE MADE EASY.

LUCKY THOMPSON, a well known actress, was married to Colton Reed in 1884. We learn from Chicago papers that she sued for a divorce on the ground of desertion and her husband's infidelity. He forsook her, she claimed, because she would no longer support him in idleness and luxury. When she informed him to this effect he took all her jewelry and decamped. If he was as bad as she painted him she was rid of him cheaply, no matter what her jewels were worth.

The actress rather dreaded the ordeal she expected to undergo in so serious a piece of business as getting a divorce from her husband. But she was not familiar with that kind of business as conducted in Chicago. When she briefly told her tale in court she was informed by the Judge, "You can take your decree for desertion." Joined in the corridor of the court house by Charles Cooke, an actor, she exclaimed, "My! I nearly took my breath away. Why I wasn't on the stand five minutes." "Oh! Divorces are easy to get in Chicago," said Cooke. He had indulged in the luxury himself and knew all about it. "Well," said the actress, "I didn't know it was so quick as that."

This is how divorce is made easy in Chicago, one of those very moral and religious cities that furnish funds for the regeneration of Utah and lots of cash for missionaries to the heathen. Chicago is a fast city, and in nothing does she manifest her speed on the broad road more than in her five minutes rate in divorces.

## INSANITY OR MALICE?

THIS morning a gentleman informed us that a prominent American lady of national repute had in his presence related a remarkable anti-"Mormon" statement. It was in a nutshell, about as follows:

The lady referred to met three lady teachers, of the party who were here about four weeks ago. They had just come from the Tabernacle grounds. They stated that while there they were approached by a woman who represented herself to be "an emissary of the Mormon Church." She asked them if they would not embrace the "Mormon" faith and take up their residence here, where they would be provided with good husbands from among the Elders. All they needed to do was to signify their wish to be married to one or other of the Elders and the matter would be arranged, as according to the creed of "Mormonism" no man associated with it could refuse to enter the marital relation with any woman who asked him.

The astounding part of this ridiculous affair was that our informant stated that the aforesaid prominent and widely celebrated lady appeared to place some confidence in the story. As she was still in town this morning a reporter of the News was sent to ask her whether such was the case. She verified the relation about the four teachers making the statement to her, but told the reporter that she was of opinion that the woman who approached them must either be an insane person or she was an enemy to the "Mormon" people.

Taking the statement of the three teachers as correct, how could any sensible person adopt any other theory than that of insanity or malice? The idea that the Church should take such a step as that indicated cannot be believed by people of a hairsbreadth removed from idiosyncrasy. In the first place the idea that "Mormonism" and polygamy are synonymous is a flagrant error, and the assertion oft repeated that the "Elders

are more anxious to have members of the female than the male sex converted is totally untrue. That they have an undue anxiety for any people of any class to embrace the faith of the Gospel beyond a desire for the latter's own welfare is a fallacy. And all must come in at the door by having faith in a risen Redeemer, being baptized by immersion, at the hands of one having authority from God, for the remission of sins, and receiving the Holy Ghost through faith and obedience.

Of the two theories suggested by the prominent lady referred to that of malice is the most probable. If a woman of the kind spoken of by the female teachers approached them as they described, she was in line with a certain class of hackmen who are required by those who employ them to stuff tourists with every species of anti-"Mormon" falsehood. She was also a unit with a clique of anti-"Mormon" button holders. It is not improbable that the female fiend, if she is not a myth, was employed by those whose chief occupation is to spread lies and defame the character of the "Mormon" people, that under the popular prejudice thus created they may prey with impunity upon the Latter-day Saints.

We would have given the name of the lady of national repute to whom we have made reference, but from respect to a request from her that we should not, we refrain. Doubtless she knows, if she reflects a moment, what is meant by anti-"Mormon" buttonholing. If we are rightly informed she has been somewhat subjected to attacks from persons who exhibit an over-anxiety to impart anti-"Mormon" information. The wise and just on every question will, however, never base a judgment on a one-sided story.

## JUSTIFYING NOBOCRACY.

WE are pleased to see a general call from prominent newspapers for the suppression of the lawless and brutal White Caps of Indiana. Governor Gray will receive popular support in his efforts to bring to justice the cowardly villains who have perpetrated the outrages that have been common of late in certain portions of his State.

It will be remembered that a band of those night marauders recently whipped nearly to death two men and a woman said to be "Mormons," cutting out one man's eye from its socket. It remained to a very pious journal, published in Chicago and called the *Christian Cynosure*, to apologize for this cruel deed. It speaks of this as "but a single case where their brutality had any justification." The "justification" was that the men were "two Mormon missionaries." And the *Christian Cynosure* indulges in a sneer at Governor Gray's expense by the intimation concerning his effort to "clean out the White Cap lodge" that "perhaps the Mormons had influence with the Democratic party."

This religious journal is published by The National Christian Association, and it is as vehemently opposed to Masonry as to "Mormonism." But we have not seen in its columns any encouragement of anti-Masonic fanaticism to use violence for the suppression of Masonic lodges. Its venom is not so much excited by these secret societies to which it devotes so much of its attention, as by a religious body whose principles and spirit it does not understand, but whose missionaries it would deliver over to the tender mercies of murderous mobocrats.

We are happy in the belief that there are few editors in this wicked world who would attempt to justify the outrages in Indiana because the victims were said to be "Mormons," and we think that if the pious writers for the *Christian (?) Cynosure* desire any support for their sentiment in the next world, they will have to seek for it in the remotest depths of the lowest sheol.

The *Christian Cynosure* also approves of the confiscation of "Mormon" Church property. But it mourns over one defect in the process. It says the "Mormons will have to render an account for these properties and pay the income over to the court for the support of the school fund"—which shows that the pious editor doesn't know what he is writing about—but mourns that: "They may yet have the consolation of knowing that the fund comes thus back into their own hands—and it seems to be a wretched defect in the law that it does so."

What a pity that the *Christian Cynosure* people couldn't make the law and execute it as well. They would soon make "ducks and drakes" of the "Mormon" Church property. What matters that the members of that Church have voluntarily donated the funds held for its use and benefit? They hold a different faith from any endorsed by the National Christian Association and its organ, and therefore are fit subjects for spoliation and plunder.

The *Cynosure* says of Utah: "There is not a more beautiful country in the world, and none would be more profitable if it could be de-Mormonized." Yes, if the very "Christian" souls who lust for the products of "Mormon" industry could succeed in driving out the people who made it possible for

the white race to live in this region, they think no doubt they could make it "profitable." But they need not count on a repetition of former scenes in "Mormon" history. Religious fanatics will not "de-Mormonize" Utah in any such manner. The "Mormons" are here to stay, and no one will find it permanently "profitable" to undertake to drive them out.

The loss of the Church property which the *Cynosure* thinks is gone, would not materially affect the situation nor tend to "de-Mormonize" Utah in the least degree. But the property is not gone yet; nor is there any likelihood of an opening for religious or other spoilers to make a crusade upon Utah profitable. For a people suffering the "sore affliction" which their pious enemies imagine they are enduring, the "Mormons" are doing remarkably well. They do not set so much store upon "valuable" as the *Cynosure* imagine. They are not set upon riches. And they will "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods," should it become necessary, rather than sacrifice their faith or "de-Mormonize" any portion of their Territory. Applauding the confiscation of the property of a Church, is in perfect harmony and sweet accord with the justification of mobocracy against its missionaries.

## LIBELS ON SHERIDAN.

THE whole country has rung with praises of gallant Phil. Sheridan, and the press, without regard to party or creed, has endeavored to do the dead hero justice. But the wretched wood cuts accompanying the eulogies some of them publish, purporting to be pictures of the departed soldier, are most disgusting libels and look like deliberate contradictions of the letter press panegyrics they are intended to embellish. Some of them bear a faint resemblance to Sheridan, while others are worse than caricatures. Patent inside papers come with blotched and blurred and blackened "portraits" that are a disgrace to the "artist" and shameful to the firms that print them. It is time that journals with any claim to respectability cease to patronize these, clumsy, ugly cuts of public men, and either secure something like a decent portrait or drop the pictorial innovation that disfigures so many newspapers, altogether. It is often a burlesque on art and an offence instead of a compliment to the persons supposed to be represented, as well as a gross deception of the public.

## RASCALLY POLITICAL METHODS IN IDAHO.

THE Logan Journal publishes this form of an affidavit, which has been prepared by the anti-"Mormon" obstructionists of Idaho, for the purpose of preventing a certain class of voters from exercising the suffrage at the November election;

TERRITORY OF IDAHO, } ss.  
County of Oneida.

I—being first duly sworn, answers the following questions as follows to-wit:

1st Question. In what year did you come to the United States?

Answer.

2d Question. Of what country are you a native?

Answer.

3d Question. In what State or Territory, Court and year, did you declare your intention to become a citizen?

Answer.

4th Question. In what State or Territory, County, Court and year, were you finally admitted to citizenship?

Answer.

5th Question. Where did you last see your certificate of naturalization?

Answer.

6th Question. Did you vote at the general election held in this Territory in 1886; if so, at what precinct?

Answer.

7th Question. Why did not you vote at the election of 1886?

Answer.

8th Question. Are you a member of the order or organization in this county commonly known as the Mormon Church?

Answer.

9th Question. Does not the Mormon Church or organization practice bigamy or polygamy, or plural or celestial marriage, as a doctrinal rite of such organization?

Answer.

This affidavit is designed for naturalized voters who fail to produce their papers. Of course it is in excess of the law and therefore need not be filled up as required by the framers, who are not working to maintain the purity of elections but to prevent citizens of the United States from voting. No person is required under the law to answer either of the questions in the above form from the sixth to the ninth, inclusive.

Voting at the election of 1886 is not a qualification to vote at a subsequent election. Failing to vote then or at any other previous time does not disqualify a citizen for the election next November. The motive of a citizen for not casting a vote at any election cannot be questioned by law, neither can he be legally required to disclose it. No citizen can be compelled to state what Church he belongs to, or whether he belongs to any Church. Neither can he be required to explain the tenets or views or practices of any

Church, society or organization, whether he belongs to it or not, as a qualification for voting. None of these questions has any bearing on the naturalization of a person desiring to vote at an election.

The best thing for naturalized citizens to do in Idaho is to have their certificates ready for presentation when necessary. In case any citizen has lost or mislaid his papers, he should endeavor to obtain a certificate from the clerk of the court where he was naturalized. If this cannot be done in time, or because of other circumstances, a legal affidavit should be prepared as to the facts of such loss or failure to find the papers, and that should be tendered if a challenge is offered or the voter is refused registration or the privilege of casting his ballot.

In case he is rejected a test should be made of the matter, at once, in the courts, a mandamus should be applied for. Then a suit for damages should be entered against the obstructing official, and the criminal law also should be invoked to punish those who seek to interfere with the free exercise of the elective franchise. No half way measures will suit the situation. Officers should be sustained in just and faithful efforts to execute and enforce the laws. They should also be punished when they wilfully endeavor to exceed or prostitute the laws through partizanship, intolerance, fanaticism or fraud. No illegal voting ought to be permitted, and no legal voter should be deprived of his rights at the polls.

A great deal of noise is heard in the land about the suppression of the negro vote. George W. Cable in the August *Forum* has a vigorous article entitled "What Shall the Negro Do?" He answers his own question in this way:

"Vote! Cast your vote though taxed for it. Cast your vote though defrauded of it, as many a white man is to-day. Cast your vote though you die for it. Let no man cry 'Liberty or blood;' leave that for socialists and Parisian mobs; but when liberty means duty and death means one's own extinction, then the cry of 'Liberty or death,' is a holy cry, and the man who will not make it his own even in freedom is not free. Seek not to buy liberty with the blood either of friends or of enemies; it is only men's own blood at last that counts in the purchase of liberty. Whatever may have been the true philosophy for more ferocious times, this is the true philosophy for ours. Cast your votes, then even though many of you die for it."

Keep your vote alive; better nine free men than ten half freed. In the name of the dead, black and white, of the living, and of your children yet unborn, not as of one party or another, but as American freemen, vote! For in this free land the people that do not vote do not get and do not deserve their rights."

This is just as good for white as for colored citizens. There need be no violent contention. But a freeman who will not struggle, lawfully, for his lawful rights does not deserve liberty. We would not utter a word to induce any man to vote who is not entitled under the law to cast a ballot. But if he is so entitled, we think he would be less than a man if he permitted unscrupulous schemers to cheat him out of his rights, and made no effort to vindicate himself and maintain his franchise.

Any officer, candidate or party that seeks to obtain or retain political power by trampling upon the rights of others, or, seeking for the suffrage of voters, is too cowardly to stand up for the liberties of law-abiding citizens for fear of the taunts of scoundrels and tricksters, is deserving of political damnation and ought to be despised by every lover of his country and supporter of human rights. It is time that brave men and just officials came to the front and put a quietus on the rascally methods invented to rob voters of their rights in Idaho.

## CAUTION AS TO STREET FRANCHISES.

THE City Council of St. Paul, Minnesota, have been wrestling with the question of granting a franchise to an electric railway company through the heart of the city. The company has already a short elevated line in successful operation. But it is doubted whether the same system will answer over a long line and be adapted to the needs of the public. The Council decided to permit the construction of a line for a given distance, but reserved the right of franchise until it can be demonstrated whether the line will be a benefit or a detriment to the public, and how private property will be affected by it along the route.

The *Pioneer Press* makes the annexed comments on the subject, which we think are sensible and timely, and worthy of attention by our home City Council under present circumstances:

"It is not a matter to be decided lightly when a corporation applies for the right of way upon our business streets. Though its route be definitely located, it still obtains an actual monopoly so far as the streets which it traverses are concerned. And, if it should happen to be less satisfactory to the public than its representations