

EDITORIALS.

GOVERNOR STEVENSON AND THE CHINESE.

GOVERNOR STEVENSON of Idaho has taken a proper stand on the Chinese question. The Mongolians who have come to this country, and who obey its laws, are entitled to the protection of the government and should have it to the last extremity, when assailed by those who would curtail their rights or deprive them of life, liberty or property. Governor Stevenson is a staunch Democrat and a fearless official. He is not likely to stand much of the nonsense of the rotary element that delights in tormenting and oppressing the poor pig-tailed subjects of the Flowery Kingdom. People need not employ the Chinese unless they wish to, but they must not inflict violence upon them, nor break the laws in a savage attempt to effect their removal from the country. Governor Stevenson's proclamation is worth copying. It reads as follows:

Whereas, Authentic statements and information from sources I deem reliable having been received at this department from different localities in Idaho that numerous organizations have been formed and are now forming for the purpose of expelling, by force and violence, all Chinese who may be found in said localities on and after the first day of May, 1886, it is hoped that none of our citizens will join in such a movement, nor countenance in any way such violations of the law. The life and property of our citizens, and those of the Chinese as well, who are engaged in our midst in peaceful occupations, are entitled to and must receive the equal protection of the laws of our Territory.

I do, therefore, admonish the people in every portion of Idaho to oppose in every lawful way the institution of such riotous proceedings and mob violence. And I warn those persons, organizations and committees having in view the forcible expulsion of the Chinese or any other persons now pursuing their peaceful labor, against such acts of violence, with the assurance that the law will hold those who may engage in such deeds responsible, individually and collectively, for the results of their acts. And I particularly notify and call on the sheriffs of the counties and the officers of the law to use every precaution to prevent all riotous demonstration for such objects, and if unable to maintain the peace and majesty of the law to call on every male citizen to assist them, recording the name of every man who refuses such assistance, or who is riotous, for future prosecution. [See Section 5519 Revised Statutes United States.]

In witness whereof I have hereunto signed my name and caused the Seal of the Territory of Idaho to be affixed.

Done at Boise City, Idaho Territory, April 27th, A. D., 1886.

EDWARD A. STEVENSON,
Governor.

E. J. CURTIS, Secretary.

THE RIOTS IN THE EAST.

The bloody work in Chicago and Milwaukee illustrates what we recently advanced on the labor question. The Anarchists and Socialists, mingling with the real labor element, are the authors of those diabolical outbreaks that have resulted in the loss of so much life and property. Those ring-leaders who have been captured will no doubt be made examples of. The danger is that in these times of excitement, horror and indignation, suspicion will take the place of proof and men not guilty of overt acts will be made the scapegoats for the crimes of actual assassins. The trial of such persons should be postponed until the public mind has had time to become cool and collected. At present they would be doomed if their lives were placed in jeopardy before the courts.

Mr. Powderly has done a prudent thing in repudiating for the Knights of Labor, the villainous acts of the Anarchists and Socialists. Every other labor organization should promptly place itself on record against crime and violence. And inquiry should be made to discover how far members of such societies have lent themselves to the schemes of the destroyers of society. No sympathy will be entertained by just people for any association that unites with the breeders of discord and advocates of murder in their violence and lawlessness.

Organization and unity are necessary to the workmen who are struggling for fair wages and reasonable hours of labor. They have the right to combine against the encroachments and oppressions of capital and monopoly. But they have no right to destroy property, obstruct business or prevent others from doing the work which they refuse to perform. Freedom cannot be gained or promoted by restraining the liberty of others, and the triumph of human rights cannot be achieved by depriving any one of their benefits, whether capitalists or laborers.

The country is in a terrible condition and the events of the past few weeks

are but precursors of greater troubles yet to come. We are living in perilous times, and the tribulations predicted by ancient and modern Prophets are at the doors of the world. Great changes in society are about to take place and the wise will be looking and preparing for them.

And while the lovers of their race will be pleased to see the workers among men obtain the proper results of their toil, they will set their faces like a flint against the anarchy and revolution which are desired by those human fiends whose object is destruction and whose minds are filled with malice and murder. Order and peace are just as much for the permanent benefit of the laborer as of the employer. The good of society is for the good of the individual.

THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

THE report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on the woman suffrage bill, will be naturally viewed as a great defeat of its advocates. But, in politics as well as in law, a number of defeats often precede and lead up to a grand victory. The minority report, signed by four members, marks the progress of the movement. It is gradually gaining ground. It was not to be reasonably expected that the project for an Amendment to the Constitution making the suffrage equal to men and women throughout the country, would be at once successful. But the fact that so many of the Judiciary Committee favor the measure, is a token of ultimate triumph.

Such a reform as that in contemplation must of necessity be achieved by degrees. Public sentiment requires gradual training for so radical a change. Prejudice is so powerful, and there are so few, comparatively, who go below the surface of the platitudes which are in common use against the movement, that it is not to be expected that the public will perceive at once the groundlessness of all the common objections.

When the question comes to be generally investigated apart from unreasonable antipathies, it will be discovered that there is not a valid and tenable argument in favor of denying to half of the citizens of a republic any voice in the conduct of its affairs. The speeches and essays that have been used to oppose woman suffrage consist chiefly of ridicule and sophistry. Every attempt at argument, when analyzed, will be found incompetent, irrelevant and without a solid basis. As it stands it is a question of might over right, of that possession of power which denies a share in it to others who cannot enforce their just claim to its exercise.

The report of the minority has this great advantage over the majority report: It advances reasons for its conclusions, and those reasons cannot be successfully controverted. The majority report simply recommends that the proposition be laid upon the table. That is as much as to say, no tangible reason can be given for killing the measure, but it ought to die, anyhow.

We are still of the opinion which we expressed years ago on this question. That is, that the ladies make a mistake in trying to force this matter through the National Legislature and by means of a Constitutional Amendment. They attempt too much at once. It is true that negro suffrage was brought about in that manner. But they must remember that the measure was a party necessity, and that from enslaving the colored man there was a sudden rebound to worshipping him. An illiterate and untrained negro was exalted, politically, by a sudden wave of unreasoning enthusiasm, high above every cultivated and gifted white woman in the nation. The elevation of women citizens to their proper place by the side of male citizens, as an essential part of the body politic, will have to be acquired by degrees, unless some revolution in public sentiment should occur through causes at present unforeseen.

We believe that the surest method for success will be a concentration of effort on the part of the chief promoters of the movement, in some State where the conditions are favorable. Victory there, and the example of its beneficial results, would lead to other triumphs, and finally to universal success. What has been accomplished in Territories has no weight compared to that which would be carried by the conversion of some old-established commonwealth. Even the adoption of woman suffrage in a newly organized State would not have so strong an effect as that upon the country.

Let the claim of "inherent right," no matter how much intrinsic worth may be attached to it, be dropped for the time being, because the established doctrine is that the suffrage is not a right inherited, but a privilege conferred. Let the equal claim of the woman with the man, as a citizen and a part of "The People," be urged as simple justice in a government of the people, for the people and by the people, and on the ground of privilege let it be shown that the female citizen has equal political demands and necessities with the male citizen.

The old common law absorption of the identity of the wife into that of the husband, making the unity of marriage

to involve the nonentity of one of its elements, is almost obsolete in the United States and ought to be emphatically a dead letter. A union of parts does not imply the loss of identity in either, and this holds good in the matrimonial compact as much as in the union of States in this great republic.

The defeat of the constitutional amendment measure, which may be considered settled for the present session of Congress, as the majority report is almost certain to be adopted in the House, comes in such a shape that encouragement rather than disappointment will be the effect upon the advocates of the rights of woman. And their cause will still move forward with good prospects of achieving the object to which they have devoted their energies, in the interest of justice, equality and universal liberty.

IN THE TOILS.

The vindictiveness of the Prosecuting Attorney is once more exhibited in the course pursued towards Orson P. Arnold. The sum of his offense is his supposed association with the movement of President George Q. Cannon towards the West. President Cannon was on a mission to which he had been duly appointed, and Mr. Arnold and others were on the train when he was arrested. It was alleged that the latter was assisting the former to escape from the Territory. It was a matter of public comment at the time that an official threat had been made to the effect that, "if Arnold ever showed his face in Utah again things would be made decidedly hot for him." Whenever it was reported that he had returned, similar remarks were repeated and it came to be generally understood that Mr. Arnold was marked down for that vengeance which is easy to execute with a packed jury and a pliable Court.

Mr. Arnold's arrest last night, the extraordinary bonds required for his appearance—\$5,000 when the full penalty if he is convicted is \$300 fine and six months imprisonment—the refusal to take as his bondsmen gentlemen well known to be good and sufficient sureties in every sense of the word, and the hustling off to the Penitentiary of the captured defendant, all indicate the malevolence with which he is to be pursued and the probable result of his prosecution, no matter what may be the facts or however closely he may have "lived within the law," according to the definition of that term announced by the Court when Mr. Arnold made his agreement.

Since that time the Court has turned several complete judicial summersaults, as the Prosecuting Attorney pulled the string. And the words "unlawful cohabitation" have to-day attached to them, by decree of court, a meaning exactly the reverse of that given to them when Mr. Arnold last appeared before that peculiar tribunal.

He may look for the extreme punishment that can be inflicted. Not so much because it will be made to appear that he has not kept the law as at present construed by the court, as that he is understood to have aided President George Q. Cannon when in need of assistance. Well, we believe he can stand it, and he will have the sympathy and support of his friends in the trial that awaits him and the experiences which he may have to undergo.

FAIR'S APACHE SCHEME.

SENATOR FAIR has made a proposition to the Secretary of the Interior for the solution of the Indian question so far as it relates to the Apaches. It is to colonize that tribe of savages on the island of Santa Catalina, which is in the Pacific Ocean about twenty miles southwest of Los Angeles. It has a mild and salubrious climate, the fishing is excellent, and it is far enough from the shore to make it a safe place for the Indians without guards, and a steamer could run between the Island and Wilmington by which needful supplies could be forwarded. The land can be bought at from three to four dollar per acre and the title is sound. If the Apaches can be corralled on that Island it will be a cheap and an easy way to keep them from those assaults upon settlers which now make some parts of Arizona a land of terror.

But the question is, will the Apaches consent to the arrangement? Most of the dealings of this nation with the Indians have been conducted with little or no reference to the wishes of the savages. They are the weaker party to those transactions, and have to submit to the will of the "Superior race." Hence much of the trouble that eventually follows nearly all the treaties and bargains and contracts with the red-skins.

If a fair and square arrangement could be made with the Apaches to move on to the nice little Island and stay there, it would no doubt be a cheap and easy way to settle an important difficulty. But if force is undertaken, in our opinion it will prove an ignominious failure.

THE CAUSE OF THE "TURMOIL."

An anti-"Mormon" paper, after pouring out a tirade of invective against the advocates of equal rights in Utah, asks: "What is there in Mormonism that gives it the right to keep the country in a turmoil year after year?"

As to the "right of Mormonism," it is the same as that belonging to any other religious denomination in the country. It has the right to place its claims before the world, to send its missionaries wherever they can gain an opening, to promulgate its principles, and to organize for their advancement. If it succeeds in making a mark upon the public mind, it shows that it has some force and power. If it were like many of the dying denominations it would make no stir in the land and would not be worth talking about.

The turmoil that is kept up year after year, is made more by such persons and papers that ask the question, than by "Mormonism" or its advocates. It does not assail them, but they attack it. If it did not stand up in its own defense it would be a poor and flabby affair. But as far as right is concerned, it has just as much right in law and in reason, to arouse attention as Methodism, Catholicism or any other ism.

The only right some very "Liberal" people would accord us is to hold our tongues while they misrepresent and revile us; to bow down meekly while they put a yoke upon our necks; to relinquish to them all power, political and otherwise, and simply believe but not promulgate or practice our religion. We do not propose to submit to this, and hence the "turmoil."

"Mormonism" is a true religion. It does not consist merely of something shut up in books. It is a vital and vigorous system, destined to move all mankind and work a change in the affairs of the world. It does not seek or expect to accomplish anything by revolution or violence of any kind. But it proposes to talk and to act. It cannot be muzzled, it cannot be fettered. You may chain up some of its advocates or put them to a cruel death. But "Mormonism" is deathless and unconquered. It has come down out of heaven to live upon the earth. It is a little heaven that is going to leaven the whole lump of society. It is the resistance that is offered to it that makes the yeast turmoil which some folk complain of. All the same it will go on, and it cannot be stopped.

The reason why it is so opposed is because it presents truths that have force and application to-day, and that come in contact with the hoary errors of ages which have been venerated by many generations. Those who will not receive them, but yet recognize their force, become angry because they cannot refute them nor silence those who proclaim them. Then follow that violence which is the fruit of bigotry and that desire to destroy which is prompted by inability to overcome with reason, coupled with unwillingness to acknowledge error.

The turmoil is sure to continue. It will become more general as "Mormonism" grows and advances. We are not unmindful of the likely results. Those who embrace it with all their hearts must expect turmoil and to meet a world in arms. They must not shrink from the conflict that will be forced upon them. If "Mormonism" is not worth everything, it is not worth anything. And he who is not ready to forsake all things for it when needful, is not worthy of its blessings.

As for its opponents, if they do not like it they are at liberty to let it alone. But they seem "unblessed" to do that. They must fight it. Well then, they should not complain if the result is turmoil. "Mormonism" forces itself on no one. It compels no one to embrace or support or stay with it. But when it is attacked, its natural and inherent vigor is manifested, and it presents an attitude of strong defense. It will not succumb, nor fuse with the false systems of the times. It has a mission on the earth and will strive to perform it, lawfully, peaceably but with determination and steady persistence.

And as sure as there is a God in heaven, it will accomplish its work—the regeneration of the world and the establishment of the reign of righteousness and truth; for God is its author and promoter, and the Adversary, who is the creator of turmoil, will have to yield to the rule of heaven and the power of the everlasting King of Peace.

HOW AND WHY CONVICTIONS ARE OBTAINED.

THE trial of Royal B. Young has given one more example of the ease with which a conviction can be secured when there is no evidence against the accused, providing always that he is a "Mormon." The polygamy charge had to be abandoned for obvious reasons. There was nothing in it, and if it had gone to the jury with instructions amounting to a charge to convict, an appeal could be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, where a conviction, under the circumstances, would not have stood the ghost of a chance to be sustained.

The cohabitation count charged that

the defendant had lived with Mary P. Young and Emma Rawlings Young as his wives from June 13th, 1883, and February 1st, 1885. The testimony went to show that he had not lived with Emma Rawlings Young during that period. It was to the effect that she and the defendant had agreed to live apart, and had lived apart, from the 10th of June, 1883, up to the present.

The testimony of the deputies in regard to the occurrence at the time of the arrest of the witness, even if it were true, had no bearing upon the charge for it happened over a year after the last date in the indictment. As a matter of fact, known to other witnesses than those who testified for the defense, Mr. Young really went to the room where the arrest was made simply to inform the lady that the deputies were there. And it was a practical impossibility to see into the room from the window, as testified by the deputy, because of obstructions that prevented observation. And there was not an article of clothing of Mr. Young's in the room except what he had on. He was fully dressed, having come to the barn to arrange for her conveyance to another place, as she testified and as sworn to by the witness Mr. J. O. Young.

That the evidence of alleged facts occurring after the period covered by the indictment ought not to have been admitted, anyhow, need not be argued; we do not suppose that anybody but the Prosecuting Attorney who asked the questions, and the Judge who always allows what that functionary demands, would attempt to claim that such testimony was lawfully admissible. We ask any reasonable and disinterested person to show where there was a single scrap of evidence to sustain the indictment.

The defendant was convicted, of course. What is easier than to obtain a conviction with a court swayed by the prosecutor, and a jury chosen from a man's enemies and with the understanding that that is what they are for? When jurymen who have doubts about convicting in the absence of evidence are given to understand that they are not wanted on cohabitation cases against "Mormons," how can juries fail to comprehend what is expected of them? Scrutinize the proceedings and note the following; repeated with ludicrous frequency and uniformity:

"Objected to by the defense; overruled." "Objected to by the prosecution; sustained."

It is the same in all the trials of this character: "The defense objected; the objection was overruled." "The prosecution objected; the objection was sustained." It does not matter how pertinent the former or invalid the latter, the result is certain and may be surely predicted according to the side interposing the objection.

It is the same in regard to the definitions of the meaning of the law. Not less than half a dozen different and conflicting constructions, in separate cases, have been placed by the Prosecuting Attorney on the term "unlawful cohabitation." They have all been sustained by the Court. With complacent equanimity the Court will announce a ruling completely reversing one given by himself but a short time before. The record shows a mass of glaring and irreconcilable inconsistencies such as have never appeared before in judicial history.

Royal B. Young, like some others of our brethren, will go to prison for an offense that the evidence for the prosecution proves he has not committed. His case is one more going to show that men having plural wives who endeavor to live according to the Edmunds law, fare no better than those who openly acknowledge that they have not attempted to do so, and that it is useless under the present administration of the law for men so situated to endeavor to observe its provisions. This serves to confirm the "Mormons" in the faith and practice of plural marriage. I cannot fail to have that tendency.

We firmly believe that this is what the active pretended opponents of the system desire. It means business to them. It signifies fat pickings for the fee-benders. All engaged in the work of special prosecutions profit financially by their schemes and doings, and would be sorry to see that kind of submission which would rank their occupations with Othello's. They have fixed the matter so that it is an impossibility for a true Latter-day Saint to concede to their demands. If he were to separate himself from all his wives and cohabit with none, and yet acknowledge that they are his wives, according to the law of God which united them, and contributes to their support and looks after their welfare, he would be considered just as guilty of breaking the law as if he lived with them openly as his wives.

Henry W. Naisbitt went to see his wife, from whom he had been actually separated, when her baby was born, and for that was found guilty of unlawful cohabitation, under Judge Zane's special ruling—as prompted by Attorney Dickson. Royal B. Young did not visit his plural wife at all during the time charged in the indictment, but he furnished her support, sending it to her and not seeing her personally, and he is adjudged guilty all the same. A plural marriage is not recognized as a marriage in law. It is a religious obligation celebrated by an ecclesiastical ordinance. There can be therefore no legal divorce even if the parties desired it. A man with plural wives must either