

EDITORIALS.

MR. HENDRICKS' SPEECH.

The speech of Vice-President Hendricks, delivered at the pro-Parnell meeting at Indianapolis on Tuesday night is entitled to more than a passing notice.

Its effect "over the water" will be to greatly irritate Great Britain. Had the speaker been an ordinary citizen this result would not be so extensive nor strong. As it is, however, he occupies an exalted official position in this government, and his public utterances will doubtless be taken as voicing in some degree the sentiments of the administration. It will be strange indeed if the "gentleman" is not denounced as an interferer with the affairs of a friendly foreign government. This position appears to be aggravated on account of the nature of the meeting addressed by the Vice-President. It was not convened merely for the purpose of sentimental expression, but to insure financial aid to the cause of Parnellism, which means the detachment from the United Kingdom of the Emerald Isle. It was not a matter of opinion, but of actual and active aid.

When the inwardness of the Irish question is scanned it will be at once seen that in speaking as he did and under such circumstances, Mr. Hendricks could not fail to ruffle the British lion. He not only rubbed his back the wrong way of the fur, but brought down his boot upon the animal's tail.

The retention of Ireland as a part of the United Kingdom is a necessity to the British Empire, whose existence would be imperiled by a severance of the connection. Even if Ireland herself were too weak to materially operate against Great Britain, if she were detached she would be a constant thorn in the side of that government. Long cherished antipathies cannot be obliterated at once. So intense is the general hatred of the Irish toward the British that in the event of a separation the "Green Isle," would be one of the most formidable strategic points from which any powerful enemy of the United Kingdom could operate that could be imagined. Its geographical situation would make it everything that could be desired in that regard. It will therefore be regarded as the antipodes of friendly on the part of the Vice-President of the United States to give not only countenance, but even indirect substantial aid to an object whose attainment could not be viewed otherwise than as disastrous to the British Government and Empire, threatening the very existence of the latter.

In all matters of great moment every little counts for something in one direction or another. In this light it is a question as to whether the position of Mr. Hendricks on this question will be taken as giving color to the half-suppressed accusation of the British that this government has at least winked at the dynamite plots that have been hatched in this country and consummated in England. It is not improbable that Mr. Hendricks, in speaking as he has done, at a meeting of the character of that held at Indianapolis, will give a fresh impetus to the demagogic crew who seek to attain the object advocated by him by violent means. Anyway it will be quite natural in the event of fresh destructive explosions, for the English to point to the utterances of the Vice-President of the United States as oiling the machinery of Irish-American anti-British conspiracy.

One point placed by Mr. Hendricks before his audience may readily be construed into a reflection upon both of the great political parties of Great Britain. He bases an expectation of success for the Parnell movement on the ground that there will be at least eighty members of the next House who are staunch supporters of the firebrand agitator. He expected that each of the parties would aim to obtain the support of this Irish element, that it might wield the balance of power. The Vice-President was reckoning outside of the ingredient of English patriotism in politics. Every intelligent Briton knows that the separation of Ireland would mean the destruction of the Empire, and to insinuate that, for the sake of political prestige he would jeopardize the very existence of his country, is not giving him credit for that patriotic sentiment for which he has heretofore been noted. Even at this point of the controversy on the Irish question both the conservative and liberal parties have expressed a determination, through their leaders, to oppose Parnell's scheme for the disintegration of the Empire. This shows that while British politicians may be gradually drifting away from the genius of true statesmanship, they have not yet gone so far as to place the more vital interests of the country upon the altar of their own personal and selfish objects.

It may well be asked why Mr. Hendricks directs his "eagle eye" beyond the sea to dabble in the politics of a distant friendly nation, when there is so much that might profitably engage his attention nearer home. But was his gaze indeed turned to a far away object, or was it a closer purpose that was in his mind? Not only were his honeyed words directed to the Irish, but he took occasion to allude to the fact that during the Franco-Prussian

war he took part in a German meeting on the relative attitudes of the two powers engaged in the deadly struggle. What relevancy was there in the German matter of many years ago to the question discussed at Indianapolis on Tuesday night? There is probably a lurking suspicion that the connection lies in the fact that if the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States should be fortunate enough to secure the combined Irish and German votes he would be almost certain to be elected.

In his Indianapolis speech Mr. Hendricks enunciated the genuine principle of democratic rule. Said he: "Local self-government, with respect to local affairs, is the true system of government in this world."

That is real, unadulterated democratic doctrine. But it would not be out of place for some of that anxiety manifested to have it established abroad, to be exhibited for its maintenance at home. The Territorial form that obtains in this country is at direct variance with this idea. The people elect their legislators, but their labors in making laws for the government of local affairs is subject to nullification by the Governor, in whose appointment they have no voice. In case the people should have a little of their own way in relation to the control of their local affairs, even under that unrepresentative system all measures passed by their representatives that happened to receive the signature of the Governor, are submitted to Congress, in whose councils they have no voice.

All this is in conflict with the principle laid down by the vice-President. In addition, the general law-making body, responding to an anti-"Mormon" howl, have made for Utah unconstitutional and oppressive laws, not only depriving the people still further by an interference with these local rights, but subjecting them to all the irritation, annoyance and loss entailed by the application of class legislation. If the local self-rule which the people of Indiana are congratulated upon possessing and that is so devoutly desired for Ireland were applied to Utah the democratic statesmen of the United States could extol the beauties of popular government with a better grace. They could also be profitably employed in blocking the ulterior designs of those who are demanding and urging the destruction of all local self-rule in this Territory by the establishment of an autocracy compared with which Ireland would be a political paradise.

MORE OF THE SAME.

The kind of justice administered to Latter-day Saints accused of offenses against the laws, received another striking illustration yesterday in Commissioner McKay's court, in the case of J. W. Witt, of Heber City, under examination for unlawful cohabitation.

Instead of the charge being sustained it was completely disproved by the witnesses for the prosecution. It was shown by the evidence that the defendant and his alleged plural wife had not lived together in the marriage relation for five years, more or less, there being not a scrap of evidence to the contrary.

In the face of this undeniable status of the case, U. S. District Attorney Dickson requested that the defendant be held to answer to the grand jury. Mr. Richards, for the defense, asking, very properly, for his discharge. The "thumbscrew" Commissioner, having long since, in complaints against "Mormons," become a part and parcel of the prosecution, held the defendant.

The character of the case precludes the feasibility of this action being taken on the ground that an indictment and conviction would ensue, unless some new rulings should be manufactured for the purpose.

This pusillanimous official who is under the thumb of an unscrupulous District Attorney could evidently see an opportunity of putting a "Mormon" to inconvenience and annoyance, and the imprisonment of innocent women and babies took advantage of the occasion to satisfy his hateful propensities to the detriment of people who never did him an injury.

The basis upon which an accused person is properly held to answer is a reasonable expectation that an indictment and conviction would ensue. This anticipation must be founded upon the evidence. There being not the slightest proof to sustain the charge against Mr. Witt, to hold him to answer further was a mean and contemptible outrage.

Were it not for an expression made by the Commissioner, one might have been led to suppose that the accused was committed on the ground that an indictment was a foregone conclusion on account of the grand jury being of a piece with himself. There would have been a faint glimmer of consistency in that position because it embodies an ingredient of truth. But if that were the real hypothesis of the torture-inflicting functionary, he sought to hide it under an alleged reason not any more creditable to him. Said he: "I think there is enough in the case to call for an explanation on the part of the defendant."

If that means anything it means that inasmuch as Mr. Witt has been accused of committing an offense it becomes

necessary for him to explain away the complaint. In other words he must prove that he is not guilty of the charge. Consequently this is but another instance illustrating what we have maintained has been the rule throughout in the anti-"Mormon" crusade. In this raid the rule of law that a man is innocent until proved to be guilty has been reversed. If an accusation be planted against a Latter-day Saint he is held to be guilty until he proves his innocence. Instead of it devolving upon his accusers to sustain the position they assume toward him, he is called upon for an "explanation," and to show cause, if any there be, why he should not answer, be indicted, convicted, and sent to prison.

Cause in abundance was shown yesterday why Mr. Witt should not be thus treated. True, he did not give the "explanation" himself, as it was furnished by the prosecution, whose witnesses testified to the effect that the complaint against him was foundationless. Now that the District Attorney has furnished sufficient ground for the discharge of the accused, the Prosecutor and Commissioner contend that this is not sufficient, but that the person himself who is in jeopardy must provide a corroborating "explanation." What a sickening farce these anti-"Mormon" alleged legal proceedings are, to be sure.

THEIR TRUE COLORS.

It is not often that the conspirators who are working with might and main for the overthrow of freedom and human rights in Utah, entirely lay aside the mask of hypocrisy which it suits their purpose to wear, and show themselves in their proper light. Whenever they do, however, the exposure is so complete that it makes up amply for the time spent in simulating virtuous motives which they do not feel, and the consequent lack of more numerous self-unveilings and convictions.

The Latter-day Saints have declared for years, in the face of every doubt and protest to the contrary, that the real object of the loud-mouthed shouters for sexual reform and the separation of Church and State in this Territory, was plunder, oppression, and even wholesale murder if necessary to accomplish their vile purposes. This has been disavowed repeatedly, not only by those who are under the influence of the rule-and-ruin clique who desire that anarchy shall reign and chaos come again, but by the blatant blowers themselves, and we have over and over again been accused of falsehood and fanaticism for reaffirming that such were indeed their intentions. In the organ of the conspirators, yesterday morning, appeared an editorial entitled "The Stalwart Plan," of which the following is an excerpt:

"After Vicksburg was captured General Sherman, by request, wrote a letter to General Halleck giving his views of the situation, some sentences of which would apply to Utah at the present time admirably. Here are some of them."

"None dare admit a friendship for us, though they say freely that they were at the outset opposed to war and disunion. I know we can manage this class but only by action. Argument is exhausted and words have lost their usual meaning. Nothing but the logic of events touches their understanding; but, of late, this has worked a wonderful change. Our officers, marshals and courts must penetrate into the innermost recesses of their land, before we have the natural right to demand their submission. I would banish all minor questions, assert the broad doctrine that as a nation the United States has the right, and also the physical power, to penetrate to every part of our national domain, and that we will do it, * * * that we will remove and destroy every obstacle, if need be, take every life, every acre of land, every particle of property, everything that to us seems proper; that we will not cease till the end is attained; that all who do not aid us are enemies, and that we will not account to them for our acts. * * * The people of this country (the South) have forfeited all right to a voice in the councils of the Nation. They know it and feel it, and in after years they will be the better citizens for the dear-bought experience of the present crisis. Let them learn now, and learn it well, that good citizens must obey as well as command. Obedience to law, absolute—yea, even abject—is the lesson that this war, under Providence, will teach the free and enlightened American citizen."

The anti-"Mormon" sheet continues: "The foregoing was written from the camp on the Big Black, Sept. 17, 1863. It was when eight millions of fighting Americans, by day and by night, swore that they would never surrender to the laws of the United States; never again acknowledge the sovereignty of her flag. In that emergency, the man who led the march to the sea, gave the foregoing opinions. * * * We are not confronted here in Utah with war, but it is only because of the weakness of those who fight the laws. The spirit is quite as bitter as it was in the South and here, as there, words have lost their usual meaning. * * * The same point in one respect is reached that was reached in the South. Only an exhibition of irresistible force will have any effect here."

Then follows a saving clause to the effect that it is only the "force exercised by the courts" that is meant, and others advocating that the Latter-day Saints be stripped of every right and "reduced to mere denizens," if they do not forsake and give up certain features of their religion.

We are not afraid that anyone will be deceived by such plausible second-thoughts as that in relation to the "force exercised by the courts" being the only kind of force hinted at in the foregoing article. The ill-concealed exultation of that paper over the Tennessee massacre, the indirect work of its editors and supporters; the fiendish glee with which it satirized the memorial services of the murdered Elders, and its repeated efforts in the past, notably on the 24th of last July, to precipitate a bloody conflict between a mob of its own making and the "Mormon" citizens of Salt Lake, are too well remembered for such hypocritical make-believes to be credited. It is simply the effort of one who sees that he has uncovered his nakedness a little too far for his own purpose—and the Tribune is an adept at such things—to regain his hold of the cloak which the breeze of his anger has carried away from his grasp, thus exposing what for cunning's sake he fain would have kept hidden. So much for that.

And now, without going into the merits of the cruel conflict between North and South, in the very heat and storm of which General Sherman's letter was written—a fact that pleads in extenuation of its harshest expressions—what possible parallel, we ask, can be drawn between the positions of the people of the South in 1863, and the people of Utah in 1885? Then it was "eight millions of fighting Americans," swearing by day and by night that they would never surrender to the laws of the United States; "never again acknowledge the sovereignty of her flag;" who had fired at Sumter on purpose to provoke the war, and at the time Sherman's letter was written had been fighting in armed rebellion against the government for over two years. Now it is a little handful of farmers and mechanics, 150,000 at most, including women and children, peaceably pursuing their daily avocations, molesting no one, simply worshipping God in the way they believe He has marked out, and who have never faltered in their allegiance to flag, country or government, though goaded and exasperated in that direction by designing knaves who see in a "Mormon" rebellion the opportunity for spoil and murder they have so long sought, to an extent the people of the South never dreamed of. The very idea of the two conditions being analogous is an insult to public reason and intelligence.

And yet these blood-thirsty wretches, for the purpose of reaching and realizing their unhallowed desires, would apply and execute in a time of peace the harshest measures suggested by General Sherman in a time of war, and upon a people who, so far from firing upon the Nation's flag, have ever honored and respected it; and whose only crime against a government which guarantees religious liberty to all its inhabitants, is differing from the vast majority of their fellow citizens in the manner of worshipping God. For this, these would-be robbers and murderers would take every life, seize every acre of land, confiscate every particle of property belonging to the "Mormons," under color of enforcing the law enacted against a feature of their religion. Great God! in what age and country are we living? that creatures wearing the human form and calling themselves American citizens, can advocate such inhuman, let alone un-American, doctrines as these! Why not go a step farther and put all your thoughts into words, and say you would not only take every "Mormon" life, but ravish every Mormon maid, brain every Mormon babe, burn our homes and break us upon the wheel or sell us into slavery? These are the thoughts of your black hearts. Why not give them utterance, that the fifty-five millions of Americans whom you claim to represent, may see as we do and as the world will some day, what delectable creatures assume to voice their sentiments and to speak in their name in relation to Utah and her long-suffering people!

THE WAY THEY WANT IT.

SOME of the U. S. Deputy Marshals in this region are adepts at diplomacy in a small way. Their style is soft, winning and persuasive, under some circumstances. Under other conditions they present a rather repulsive aspect. But—speaking of some, by no means all—when they make an arrest of a Latter-day Saint on the usual charge of "unlawful cohabitation" with his wives, and fail on the outset to secure the necessary witnesses for the prosecution, they expend much suavity upon the accused. They explain to the hapless victim how much better it will be for him if he gives the "government" as little trouble as possible, and how much more straightforward it will be for him to get the witnesses, have them come right along and be subpoenaed. Occasionally in this way they succeed in trapping somebody more than ordinarily susceptible to their persuasive ways, and the person under arrest in the most accommodating man-

ner imaginable brings in the witnesses for the prosecution. Thus the wily officer accomplishes his purpose of securing his fees for service of papers and gaining credit with his superiors for more than ordinary sagacity and efficiency.

Of course it is the right of those who desire to pursue that course to take a prominent part in their own prosecution, and to contribute aid, comfort and success to the diabolical crusade that is going on against the Latter-day Saints. But the wisdom and consistency of such a line of action may well be questioned. If, by thus acting, the person pursued anticipates obtaining any personal advantage by it, in the shape of judicial clemency, it may be appropriately asked upon what is such an expectation based. It is not founded upon any precedent, the full penalty of the law being inflicted in every case in which a conviction by a packed jury has been found, extenuating circumstances of any kind having no apparent weight. Nothing insures a mitigation of penalty, judging from circumstances of the past, except an unqualified renunciation of religion and family, and consequently of manhood. And it should be understood that, no understrapper in the shape of a Deputy Marshal has any authority to hold out hopes of clemency on the ground of any circumstances whatever. He is simply a servant of the court, authorized to serve and return its process. Any inducements he may hold out to persons who are pursued by the law are so much bird-lime, used for the purpose of entrapping the unwary. Besides, it ought not to be necessary to inform any person who may be prosecuted under the law, that he is under no obligation, legal or otherwise, to furnish witnesses or evidence against himself.

The hollow twaddle about people who have reason to believe they are subject to the blows aimed by the Edmunds law being under any moral obligation to come up in droves and say "Here am I. Having entered into my family relationship conscientiously, as a part of my religion, I am ready to receive any penalty you may impose"—is the height of absurdity. How can such a view be taken from the standpoint of the Latter-day Saints? They look upon the statute referred to as an unconstitutional infringement upon their liberties; as not being in the interest of morality, but on the contrary as encouraging the corrupt in their debasing practices. They look forward to the time when it will not only be overthrown but stigmatized as one of the most infamous measures of modern times, when its repulsive character will be universally understood. Taking this view of that oppressive and misery-creating act, under what moral obligation are the Latter-day Saints, against whom it is claimed to be solely aimed, to assist in its enforcement? To render assistance in that direction is to help on the work of tyranny under which an abused and oppressed people now groan.

The Saints do not propose to deny their God, their religion nor their families, neither does it appear to be incumbent upon them to relieve those who are pursuing them under an unrighteous statute from the burden of proof when charges of infringing it are preferred against them. Doubtless a horde of the most vindictive and unscrupulous officials that ever preyed upon a community would like very much to be relieved from the labor of making out cases against people who are accused, that the Saints might be herded into prison like so many sheep. This would enable them to go before the community and exclaim: "Behold what we have done in putting down and crushing the Mormons. Are we not worthy of preferment?"

The ground of personal and general liberty should be contended for inch by inch, and no man by his course should give any acquiescence in a raid whose object is the destruction of human freedom.

[COMMUNICATED,]

A CURIOUS SPEECH.

FIRST impressions on reading the speech made to the Irishmen of Indianapolis by Vice-President Hendricks, are those of surprise, not so much for its matter, but because of the official position of the speaker. As the second man and possible first in the Government, it would appear as if comment on the relations of ruled and rulers of a leading and friendly power were altogether misplaced, and such expressions are very likely to be misapprehended by the people and statesmen of England. Indeed, the telegrams at once indicate that the anticipations of the Vice-President meet with no response, even from Chamberlain, the seeming leader of the Liberal Party, who, in a speech at Warrington the day following, declared that "the granting of Home Rule to Ireland would mean the destruction of the British Empire."

Whatever his form of "domestic government, of free schools, of revised taxation, of game laws and mineral royalties;" whatever his theory as to the "appropriation of land and the rights of property," it is very evident that if things depend upon either the Conservative or the Liberal Party, our sanguine official will live long, before he has "the pleasure