

ELLIS VS. HOLLISTER.

ON June 8th Mr. Charles Ellis devoted the greater portion of an hour and a quarter, in the Federal court room, to the labor of painting a life-like word-portrait of O. J. Hollister. The reason why the lecturer devoted so much time and attention to a subject that ought, under ordinary circumstances, to be beneath notice, was that Mr. Ellis had, in one of his Sunday speeches, stated that a "Mormon" woman was entitled to all the privileges of personal liberty accorded without question to "Christian women." Mr. Hollister, who is a doughty champion of bigotry and intolerance, was enraged at this statement and undertook to make a scurrilous attack upon Mr. Ellis, calling him a Fakir, threatening him with a club and expressing a desire to kill him, and a hope that those who listened to him might be "damned." The gentleman against whom this characteristic Hollisterian logic was directed challenged the "Christian" federal office-holder of twenty years standing to a discussion of the points involved in this low-toned controversy.

By thirty-five minutes past eight, a fair-sized audience had convened. Those who composed it became somewhat impatient at the non-appearance of the lecturer, and some of them expressed the feeling by making a clatter with their feet on the floor. At this juncture Mr. Ellis entered the room and walked quickly to the rostrum. At the same instant a man walked down the aisle carrying a long, ponderous white roll, which he laid on the clerk's desk. It was so adjusted as to present to the audience the initials, in large letters painted upon it, "O. J. H." It was intended to represent Hollister's club, but it had more the form of the leg of a tall porker which had passed successfully through a prolonged famine, so that a person not familiar with the cause of the quarrel might have been led into the erroneous presumption that the lettering signified "old jaundiced hog."

We consider the introduction of this emblematical article as in exceedingly bad taste, and however reprehensible an undignified the course of Mr. Hollister may be deemed in connection with the matter, this act on the part of Mr. Ellis placed him on a plane not appreciably elevated above that of his opponent.

Mr. Ellis—who is a man of medium height, is inclined to rotundity,

has clearly cut features and iron-gray hair—stuck his hands into the pockets of his pants, leaving the thumbs exposed, while he slowly stated the introductory portion of his lecture, which consisted of a rehearsal of the dispute between himself and the objective point of his assault of words. His first attitude was relieved by his using the left hand to rub the side of his nose, and then to run his fingers through his hair, after the most approved fashion of intellectual prodigies. Having turned on a little more physical steam—not enough considering the circumstances—his gestures became more free and his words flowed with greater fluency. He plunged right into a personal portraiture of the gentleman who had assailed him.

It would be useless, and perhaps unprofitable, to give a detailed report of Mr. Ellis' animadversions, which were intended to show that the person who was receiving his attention was a spiteful, cruel, intolerant bigot and hypocrite. The speaker admitted that the free government of the United States permitted Mr. Hollister to bear false witness against, defame and slander him, and even to murder him, as he had expressed a desire to do, if he was willing to take his chances regarding the results. He could libel him with impunity, as he had, in order that he might safely use the weapons of falsehood against those he hates, put every dollar of his property out of his own hands. The utterly unredeemable meanness of this chronic office-holder, who had been sucking at the "long" suffering breast of the government for twenty years, had been shown by his expressed desire that the lecturer's audience, who were not in any way connected with the controversy, should be "damned." This man who hated and maligned the "Mormons" because they did not like him—they had no reason to—had, with the class of which he was a type, by unreasonable abuse and intolerant bigotry, done more to keep polygamy alive than any other agency. They were seeking to unseat one hierarchy and supplant it with another. People could not be forced nor driven to any course, but they could be persuaded and led toward it.

Much more was said by Mr. Ellis in the same line, but the freshness of the whole statement merely consisted in the manner in which it was elucidated. The central facts are understood by the entire community. It is believed that, because of his

senseless hate of a people who never injured him, Mr. Hollister has been on the verge of becoming a maniac, some of his ravings appearing to give good ground for a presumption of that character. So completely has the anti-"Mormon" virus occupied his veins that at times it has seemed as if the whites of his eyes had assumed a yellow tint in consequence. Hence the murderous sentiment that permeates him extends to people who venture to utter a word of sympathy for the objects of his unnatural venom.

POLITICAL DICTATION AND COERCION.

"The News does not deny that in all the past in Utah every officer has been nominated by a little Trinity at the head of the Church. It does not deny, either, that all the votes in Utah have been cast by the direction of that power."

THE DESERET NEWS has denied this and does now deny it, *in toto*. But this will make no difference to the sheet from which the above sentences are copied. There is no need to name it or the writer. There is no other paper or editor in the United States that would continue, year after year, to repeat a fals hood which had been exploded, for which there was no foundation in fact, and to excuse which not the faintest attempt at proof had ever been adduced.

We assert once more, and challenge the production of proof to the contrary, that the voters of Utah are perfectly free in the casting of their ballots, so far as any Church Trinity or power is concerned, and that the officers nominated have been the choice of the majority of delegates in the conventions at which they were selected.

We will refer to the latest election in this city as an example. The delegates to the municipal election were chosen at the primaries by the popular voice. There was no dictation, or direction, or suggestion in regard to them from any Trinity or other Church power. The ticket nominated was the result of many and repeated ballottings and discussions, in which every delegate had full opportunity to express his choice. We challenge proof that any Church influence, dictation or control was exercised over that convention. We appeal to the delegates present as to the truth of this statement. They know that they were left perfectly and entirely free as to their deliberations, and that the men selected were the