

EDITORIALS

SIGNS OF SOCIAL DECAY.

ACCORDING to the Boston *Traveler*, the marriage rate in the State of Massachusetts has been rapidly diminishing during the past twenty-eight years, and this in spite of the growth and development of the resources of the country and the increased demand for labor. Statistics show that business depression, which occasionally occurs, does not materially affect the marriage tables, and the decrease is found to exist among the wealthy classes and not among the laboring population.

This we regard as a very bad sign. The condition of society cannot be good where aversion to marriage is exhibited among those who are financially able to assume the care and responsibilities of family life. It is frequently offered by young men as an excuse for not entering the matrimonial relation, that they are not able to afford the luxury of a wife, or to support one in the style which the young ladies of the period regard as necessary. Yet they frequently spend more in the indulgence of unwholesome habits than the cost of living would amount to for a companion. And this excuse is not valid, according to Massachusetts facts and figures, for it is not the indigent but the well-to-do who manifest disinclination to matrimony in that State.

This is particularly evil and unfortunate for the New England States, where the females so largely exceed the males in numbers. There are always plenty of marriageable girls and women, even in communities where the census shows that the masculine element exceeds the feminine, except in newly settled districts or mining camps. But in Massachusetts and other places "down east," where the disproportion is so largely on the female side, the army of unmarried women is rendered immense by the aversion of the men to the family condition. A decrease of marriage with an increase of population, is a state of society which is nothing less than deplorable.

When to this condition is added the disposition of many married persons in the New England States to have no more than one or two children, the indications are plain and unmistakable that society is corrupt, and that licentiousness abounds. In a really virtuous community, marriages are frequent and families numerous. Marriage is the legitimate regulator of the natural attraction of the sexes, and family increase the natural result of proper matrimony. The rarity of marriage and the suppression of offspring are both proofs of carnality and unnatural indulgence, and are the certain precursors of social decay.

It will be found on examination that among the people who live in the unnatural—aye, anti-natural condition here pointed out, the strongest opposition and the most malevolent feelings exist in relation to the divine order of family government. It is a natural consequence of perverted appetites and the avoidance of right actions and responsibilities. Massachusetts furnishes many venomous "Mormon" haters, and States smitten with similar social diseases to those mentioned, are equally hostile to the system which opens to all women the glory and honor of wifehood and maternity. But the warfare will not be of long continuance. A few generations will run the class we have named, out of existence, while the people and system they seek to exterminate will, upon natural principles, grow and multiply much faster than the others decrease.

We are sorry for the country's sake to see the disinclination to marriage, which is an increasing evil in the land, and view the growing aversion to offspring and family cares as one of the most certain and prominent signs of impending social ruin, such as overwhelmed ancient republics that fell into the vortex of licentiousness and were swallowed up in the waves of destruction.

PROTECTING THE PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE.

THERE have been many suggestions offered since the villainous attempt upon the life of President Garfield, for laws for the protection of men in high public office. But these are met by the argument, that in this

country all men are equal before the law, and that the life of the humblest citizen is entitled to the same protection as the most important personage in the Republic.

This objection, while stating the truth and affirming a principle that no one is likely to deny, does not fully meet the case. So far as the individual is concerned, the incumbent of the Presidential office is no more than the man who makes his coat or the citizen who brushes his shoes. They claim the protection of the laws with as much right as he does. But should there not be some special safeguards thrown around the chief official in the nation by virtue of his position? Personally he is but a common citizen; officially he is much more. The people elect him to the post and expect of him the performance of its duties. They place him in the most prominent position before the country and expose him to the malevolence of the disaffected. Should they not also guard him as far as possible from attacks to which ordinary persons are not liable for the same causes? We think so. We look at the office, rather than the man. And now that examples have been set by "responsible lunatics" they will likely be followed by imitators of the same stamp of mind. An attempt on the life of the President should in our opinion be regarded as a more heinous crime than an attempt on the life of an ordinary citizen, and ought to be punishable by a far greater penalty than a few years' imprisonment.

Neither do we regard the proposition made to constitute such attempts as the miserable Guiteau's, capital crime, as savoring of monarchism or imperialism, as some appear to consider it. But think it is simple justice to the temporary occupant of the office, and to the people who are the sovereign, and whose representative he is.

The New York *Sun* declares that royal and imperial lives are not made more secure by such means. We doubt this very much. It is probable that if the law was not so stringent in their favor the attempts made upon their lives would be more frequent. And although absolute security cannot be assured by law, yet considerable can be done toward it, and if severe laws against murder are no protection against murder, why enact them or make them severe? If it is treason to make war upon the United States or to give aid and comfort to their enemies, why should not an attempt upon the life of the officer in whom the authority of the United States is embodied, be counted a crime of equal magnitude?

PROFANE SWEARING.

THERE is a municipal ordinance against profane swearing. It is not often enforced. If every infraction of the law was met by its penalty, this city would be in excellent financial condition, and perhaps some check would be put upon those lips too ready to utter the name of Deity prefixed to an oath. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," ought to have weight with all who believe in a Supreme Being. And those who do not, exhibit great inconsistency, to say the least, in using the name of a Being whose existence they doubt or deny, in affirmation of something to which they aim to attach the greatest importance. It is also ungentlemanly to use profane language, in violation of the feelings of others whose regard for Deity should be respected.

As a word in season bearing pointedly on this subject, we reproduce for the consideration of those who have contracted the low and vicious habit of profane swearing, the following from the Father of our Country, whose opinion perhaps may have more weight with some people than either law or religion:

"HEADQUARTERS, MOORE'S HOUSE, WEST POINT, June 29th, 1779.

Many and pointed orders have been issued against that unmeaning and abominable custom of swearing, notwithstanding which, with much regret, the General observes that it prevails, if possible, more than ever; his feelings are continually wounded by the oaths and imprecations of the soldiers whenever he is within hearing of them.

The name of that Being from whose bountiful goodness we are permitted to exist and enjoy the comforts of life, is incessantly im-

preacted and profaned in a manner as wanton as it is shocking. For the sake, therefore, of religion, decency and order, the General hopes and trusts that officers of every rank will use their influence and authority to check a vice which is as unprofitable as it is wicked and shameful.

If officers would make it a rule to reprimand and, if that does not do, punish soldiers for offences of this kind, it could not fail of having the desired effect.

GEORGE WASHINGTON."

JUDGE BLACK AND THE SPRINGFIELD "REPUBLICAN."

THE Springfield *Republican* never misses a chance to say something spiteful about the "Mormons." This time that paper goes out of its way to attack Judge Black for his remarks about the "Mormons" in his reply to Robert Ingersoll, which were copied into our article on the controversy between those able disputants in the North American *Review*. The *Republican* quotes the paragraph and says:

"So this is the whole case against the Mormons! Mr. Black was Mr. Buchanan's attorney-general when Brigham Young issued a proclamation against the United States army as 'a mob,' and when Alfred Cumming only became Governor by the gracious permission of Young, obtained through a disgraceful compromise; he remembers how United States judges in Salt Lake City had fled in fear of their lives just before, and how a previous Governor had been chased out of the city with ox-whips; and he ought to be ashamed to make such a paltry imputation as this."

Now the truth is that Judge Black is not stating any "case against the Mormons," either wholly or in part, in his strong defence of religion against infidelity. He does not defend "Mormonism," the "Mormons," or polygamy. He merely exposes a cute dodge of the smart politician in seeking to enlist the prejudice existing against the "Mormons" on the side of his assault upon the Bible. He does not attempt to present the "Mormon" case, pro or con. The remarks of the *Republican* are therefore based upon its own assumption, and are entirely uncalled for in a review of the discussion upon "The Christian Religion."

Further, the assertion made by the *Republican* that Judge Black remembers certain things set forth in the above paragraph, cannot be correct, because the occurrences related never took place. In the first place, Governor Young was never notified by the Government of the appointment of his successor, nor of the dispatch of troops to Utah, and therefore had no official notice of the approach of any "army." He was privately informed of a howling mob coming over the plains, swearing and blaspheming, and boasting of what they were going to do with the "Mormons" and their wives, and, as in duty bound, he did what he could to stop the progress of that mob.

In the next place, Alfred Cumming was made Governor by the President and Senate of the United States, and was never hindered in the performance of his duties when Governor Young received notice of his appointment. In the third place United States judges did not flee from Utah in fear of their lives, but lie to the authorities at Washington, and the Government, instead of investigating the matter, foolishly jumped at the conclusion that the "Mormons" were in rebellion, and sent an army to subjugate an insurrection that had no existence. The falsehood of the returning judges was fully established and can be proven from public documents, and the subsequent action of the Government was an acknowledgement thereof.

In the last place no Governor was ever chased out of this city with ox-whips, though we freely admit there have been several persons occupying that position who would have been treated to that kind of courtesy if they had been given anything like their just deserts.

But why are all these exploded anti-"Mormon" libels brought in at this juncture, as so much mud to fling at Judge Jere Black? Is it because he has presented an argument which cannot be refuted by infidels, and they respond by assaulting the man? Or is it because the *Republican* found another opening

to cast a clod or two at the "Mormons," and could not resist the inclination to throw them? In either case the motive is as despicable as the language is false and foreign to the subject under review. This is not the "whole case" against the *Republican*, but it is enough for one day.

BATTALION FAMILIES.

FOLLOWING is the list of families accompanying the Mormon Battalion on its unparalleled march to Mexico, to support the army of the United States in the Mexican war, so far as they are known to Judge D. Tyler who is compiling the history of that remarkable expedition. He is very anxious to make the list full and complete, as the work is partly in the hands of the publisher, and it is desired to perfect it without delay. All persons acquainted with the names of other individuals not in the list, who accompanied the Battalion, will do well and confer a favor upon Brother Tyler and the public by sending him the information; also if there are any names incorrectly given or inserted by mistake, corrections, and Christian names where omitted, are earnestly solicited:

Wife of Captain Nelson Higgins, sons, Alpheus, Nelson, Don Carlos, daughters, Almira, Druzilla and one born at Pueblo, name unknown. Mrs. Fanna Mariah, wife of Dimick B. Huntington, sons, Clark Allen. Lot, daughters, Martha, Zina and Betsey Presinda, born at Pueblo. Mrs. Celia Hunt wife of Capt. Jefferson Hunt, sons, Martial, Hyrum, John, Joseph, Parley, Jane, Harriet, Mary. Mrs. Malinda wife of Milton Kelley, daughter, Catharine, born at Pueblo. Mrs. Selint Shelton, sons, Jackson Mayfield, John Mayfield, Sarah Mayfield, daughters, Caroline Shelton, Mariah Shelton. Mrs. James P. Brown, sons, Newman, Robert, daughters, Sarah Jane, Mary Ann. Mrs. Norman Sharp, daughter born at Pueblo name unknown. Miss Caroline Sergeant. Mrs. Montgomery Button, sons, James, Jet or Jutson, daughter Louisa. Mrs. Mary B. Brown, wife of Captain Jas. Brown, son David Black. Mrs. Albina, wife of Sergt. T. S. Williams, son, Ephraim, daughters, Caroline, Phebe, latter born at Pueblo. Mrs. Hanks, wife of Sergt. Ebenezer Hanks. Mrs. Wm. Tuba. Mrs. John Steel. Mrs. Adams, wife of Sergt. Orson B. Adams. Mrs. Jno. Hyrons. Mrs. Eveline, wife of John Hess. Mrs. Rebecca wife of David Smith. Mrs. David Wilkie. Mrs. Luddingtons, two wives of Lieut. Elam Luddington.

Bro. Tyler has labored hard for more than three years to prepare an account that will be worthy of the event and of those who figured in this episode of "Mormon" history, and feels proud of the success which has so far attended his perseverance in the collection of facts and incidents and names. We hope his work will reach speedy completion, and that it will be patronized sufficiently to compensate him in some degree for his steady efforts and public spirit.

SUPPRESSING THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

THE traffic in intoxicants gives more trouble to legislators and officers of the law than any other branch of business in which people engage. The necessity for its regulation where permitted is recognized by all thinking minds and admitted by all candid persons. That the world would be the better in a short time if no alcoholic drinks were manufactured and sold, few sober folks we think would attempt to deny.

But the subject of controlling the traffic and preventing as far as possible the evil results which are its consequences, is one that requires more than ordinary consideration. There are many very good and practical men who think that the whole business should be prohibited. A more numerous class of men, just as good and practical as the other, believe prohibition to be impracticable. Our opinion, previously expressed, is that in rural districts, where public opinion is largely in favor of the suppression of the liquor traffic, prohibition can be made effectual; but that in populous cities and towns where in habitual indulgers most do congregate, prohibition will not prohibit.

In some of the cities of Utah, power is vested by charter from the Legislature to prohibit and suppress as well as regulate the sale of intoxicants. Among these is Tooele City, which by section fifteen of its charter is empowered,

"To license, regulate, prohibit or restrain the manufacturing, selling or giving away of spirituous, vinous or fermented liquors."

Last winter, in response to a large public sentiment there, the Tooele City Council enacted a prohibitory ordinance, not to take effect, however, until the licenses previously issued should expire. The license of a saloon keeper named Moses B. Beau, who has the reputation of a quiet, sober and peaceable citizen, expired on the fourth of July. He closed up his premises, but coming to this city he obtained what we consider bad advice, and on his return re-opened his saloon. He was arrested and fined \$25. Following noted examples here, he took an appeal and continued to sell liquor in defiance of the law. He was re-arrested on Monday, July 18th, but on request was given until Wednesday, the 20th, to get legal advice, on condition that he closed his saloon. He did so, and on Tuesday evening a writ of habeas corpus was sued out in the Third District Court and granted, and the case set for next September; meanwhile he has voluntarily agreed to close his saloon till that time.

There can be no question that the Tooele City Council has the right to prohibit the selling of liquor within its corporate limits, providing the Legislature had the power to grant the authority conveyed by the charter. This it seems to us is the only question in the case that remains to be decided. Not having space to-day to discuss this subject, we must leave it for further consideration, congratulating the people of Tooele, however, for the stand they have taken for the suppression of intemperance in their pleasant city, and hoping that the courts will stand by the municipal authorities in the exercise of all lawful jurisdiction. In this case, J. L. Rawlins, Esq., will appear for Tooele City and Arthur Brown, Esq., for the liquor dealer.

"AN OFFICER AND A GENTLEMAN."

THE Army and Navy Club, one of the most select social organizations in England, has recently shown how much value is placed by upper-tendom on the principles of virtue and morality. Col. Valentine Baker, who is principally famous—or rather infamous—as the ravisher of a virtuous young girl in a railway carriage, has been restored to membership in that club, which professes to admit no one who is not "an officer and a gentleman."

Baker's case was so outrageous that the whole civilized world was shocked and indignant. It was brutal in the very extreme. The deed was inexcusable and the details were revolting. Something had to be done, notwithstanding the personal friendship of the Prince of Wales towards the accused. He was fined heavily, imprisoned for one year and dismissed from the army. He subsequently turned up in the service of the Sultan and gained some notice as an efficient officer.

No reasonable person will object to giving the man a chance to redeem his character as far as possible and to show by his future career regret for the past and permanent reformation. But the restoration of his standing in the club, which said to have been effected on the suggestion of the Prince of Wales, is something altogether different and under the excuse given, in our opinion, brands the club with shame and disgrace. The ground offered that the offence for which he was expelled "did not affect his character as a gentleman."

The world will know now what estimate is placed on the title "gentleman" by one of the most aristocratic societies of Great Britain, and by the heir apparent to the British crown. We think his act not only thoroughly ruin to his character as a gentleman, one that should cover with shame and ignominy the most ignominious person from the lowest class society. Baker the brute, is a specimen of the British elite, acknowledged by the Prince and his peers, to be "an officer and a gentleman."