

## EDITORIALS.

ONCE more, in all probability, the people of this Territory will shortly be invited to elect delegates to a convention to adopt a constitution for a State government for Utah. An unexceptionable constitution has heretofore been adopted and presented to Congress, in furtherance of the same end, and if Utah had been then admitted the expense of another convention now would not have been necessary.

It is within the constitutional power of Congress to admit a new State, or to refuse to admit it. If admitted, it is the constitutional duty of the Federal Government to guarantee such new State, in common with all the elder States, a republican form of government. It is useless, therefore, constitutionally speaking, for a Territory to ask admission as a State, unless upon the basis of a State constitution republican in form, anything unrepugnant being inadmissible.

A "republic" is defined to be, "a commonwealth, a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in the representatives elected by the people." A "republican form of government" is a government "consonant to the principles of a republic," a government guaranteeing the exercise of the sovereign power by representatives elected by the people. A Territory has not a republican form of government, the sovereign power in this Territory is not "lodged in the representatives elected by the people." According to prevailing laws and customs, the only way for the people of a Territory to enjoy a republican form of government is by the admission of the Territory as a State in Congress.

Certain portions of the old "north-west Territory" were to be admitted "whenever any of the said states shall have sixty thousand free inhabitants therein, such state shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States, on an equal footing with the original states, in all respects whatever; and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and state government: Provided, the constitution and government so to be formed, shall be republican, and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and so far as it can be consistent with the general interests of the confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the state than sixty thousand."

Hitherto the custom has been to admit Territories as States, with 20,000 or more inhabitants. Utah has more than 20,000 inhabitants. She has more than the old number of 60,000, many more. Attempts have recently been made in Congress to increase to more than double the last mentioned figures the number of inhabitants considered requisite in a Territory for admission as a State. Such has never been the custom, and such is not the law at present. Nor have we ever seen any sufficient argument why it should become either custom or law, especially when we consider that the Territories, though controlled by a republican Federation, have not even the name of a republican government for themselves, and that the proposition named, if it should become law and custom, would be likely to deprive thousands of citizens of this republican Federation from enjoying the advantages of a local republican form of government, deprive them of the privilege of the franchise for the greater part if not the whole of their natural lives, thus keeping them politically below the level of negroes and upon the same level as idiots in the States, a thing most unrepugnant in itself, and which no republican Federal government could commit itself to without losing all credit for consistency and for a due regard to its own professed principles.

In this view of the case, although it is constitutionally provided that Congress may admit new States, when a Territory presents a constitution republican in form, possesses a sufficient number of inhabitants to pay its way, and manifests that it is capable of self-government, the claim of a Territory to admission as a State rises to the dignity of a right, which, in tardy justice to its long semi-disfranchised, unrepresented, and, in the case of Utah, much misrepresented, inhabitants, should not be withheld a moment longer than absolutely necessary.

All the above conditions Utah has presented for years, but upon some frivolous pretext or other the privilege and rights of republican Statehood, and

of republican local government altogether, have been persistently though inconsistently withheld.

All the arguments which we have ever seen against Utah's becoming a State are extremely unrepugnant, indeed destructive of republicanism, resolving themselves into this selfish form—"We, the pitiful minority, want to rule Utah. If she become a republican State, the majority will rule and will have a voice in choosing the representatives in whom the sovereign power must be lodged. Consequently, the chances for the realization of our ambitious dreams of power will grow smaller by degrees and beautifully less. However, as we are determined to either rule or ruin, we will oppose with all our powers the attainment by Utah of a republican form of government, her only apparent way of doing which is by becoming a State." This is what the opposition amounts to, and it should be treated accordingly.

It would be abasing themselves and insulting Congress if the people of Utah were to present a State Constitution containing any degrading provisions, and we are satisfied that such will not be the case. A Constitution modelled after and in conformity with that of any one of the States already admitted, could not be rejected by Congress with any show of reason, and we are sure that the people of this Territory will not be satisfied with a Constitution that, in adherence to the Federal Constitution, in the expression of republican principles, or in the manifestation of the true spirit of republicanism, freedom, and civil and religious liberty, shall be one whit inferior to the Constitution of any other State in the Union. Personally, we should feel a pride in the well-founded thought that Utah claimed admission into the Union, presenting a Constitution overflowing with admirable characteristics, the peer and indeed the superior of any and every other constitution covered by the protectingegis of this great Federal Union of States. The Constitution that we desire is one that is broad and generous enough to guarantee liberty to all, underneath whose ample folds all men and women may rejoice in that glorious liberty which makes a people free indeed, free to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, free to do all the good they can, and in their own way, provided that they do not infringe upon the enjoyment of the same freedom by others.

In speaking of the proposed admission of Utah as a State into the Union, the New York Herald very piously says, "They cannot be admitted as a State with the present immoral and unchristian social institution of polygamy." We do not reproduce this sentence because it is in the Herald particularly, but because the sentiment is a common one amongst prejudiced people. In this instance it is a very apt illustration of Satan rebuking what he considers sin.

We object to the sentiment because it is absolutely false, and to the conclusion antagonistic to Utah because based upon the falsehood.

If Utah be kept out of the Union for practising alleged immorality and unchristian conduct, it will be the first time such a thing has been done in the history of the country. It will be a policy which will effectually keep out every other Territory indefinitely. It will be a policy that, had it been always acted upon, would have prevented the establishment of any such federation as the United States of America.

New York and the Herald must have been seized with a new spasm of virtue, to induce the resolution that hereafter nothing immoral or unchristian shall enter the Union. New York itself is such a very moral and Christian place. Washington is such a very moral and Christian place. Other cities in other States, likewise.

But lest we be considered sarcastic, we will ask why this new rule to exclude everything immoral and unchristian from the Union? Is it because the States at present in the Union are so exceedingly moral and Christian that they cannot endure the least immorality or unchristian conduct in a Territory applying for admission? Or is it that they are already themselves so exceedingly immoral and unchristian that they are really afraid to admit another State with any immorality or unchristian conduct in its inhabitants, lest the increasing weight of a-bomination sink the whole Union? Which is the reason? We should very well like to know, because the proposed basis of opposition to the admission of Utah is so very singular, so very

peculiar, indeed it is altogether unprecedented. When Nevada was applying for admission, we never heard of any such scruples, nor in the case of Nebraska, Kansas, California, or any other State in the Union. It is a new thing under the sun, so far as it relates to this nation. Then wherefore is it brought to the surface now, and in this particular connection? There must be some occult reason. If it is a strong reason, why not bring it forth, that it may have its due weight? Why hide it up from the public gaze? Why this sudden fit of virtue, this prudish indignation at unchristian things, just at the juncture when the admission of Utah, a long delayed act of simple justice, is once more proposed and discussed? It is very singular, very singular indeed. There must be a reason, latent or open, worthy or unworthy. Such extraordinary scruples, such an unprecedented policy, could not spring from nothing. The motive, the animus, must be peculiar, as peculiar as the policy which it urges to the view. Let all be made clear, so that the world may know the real cause of this extraordinary antagonism to the admission of Utah. The idea of refusing a Territory because some of its people are charged with being immoral or unchristian! Why, who ever heard of such a thing before? Scores of Congressmen, and hundreds of thousands of citizens in the States now in the Union would laugh, openly or in their sleeves, if any one seriously charged them with being either Christian or moral. The Herald itself would receive such a charge with a sardonic leer.

We are at the defiance of the whole world to prove that plural marriage is either immoral or unchristian. We assert, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that marriage, whether singular or plural, is essentially highly moral and altogether Christian, and therefore "honorable in all," as the Bible says. It is a false notion that when a man marries a wife he commits an immoral and an unchristian act. No one can prove that he does. If a man take a woman without marriage, then he is immoral and unchristian. But no priest, no judge, no lawyer, no divine upon the face of the earth can prove marriage, of either one or more wives, to be immoral or unchristian. All the human laws that ever were made, or that ever could be made, against marriage, cannot prove it immoral or unchristian. Rome and Greece were the nations whence sprang this notion of plural marriage being immoral and unchristian, two as immoral, unchristian, and corrupt nations as ever existed on this planet, and upon whom the curse of God and the damning weight of their own corruptions have rested for ages.

This policy of keeping Utah out in the cold because of alleged immorality and unchristian conduct, is the sheerest hypocrisy, the flimsiest sophistry, the most transparent casuistry. Everybody knows that Utah is the most moral, Christian, and industrious Territory in the Union. Everybody knows that nowhere in this great republic is there a community more free from degrading vices than this is, or was previous to the advent of certain parties who have no sympathy with the community. Everybody knows that nowhere under the broad folds of the stripes and stars is there a community with less drunkenness, less whoredom, less seduction, less crime, less immorality, less unchristian conduct, than this manifests. Even the Herald itself sustains this view of Utah, for it says:

We think, however, that there is no danger of the admission of Utah as a State while Mormon polygamy continues there to flourish. General Grant has undertaken to put it down in the Territory, and Congress will rather assist him than do anything to embarrass him in the good work. Meantime it appears that robbers, garroters and desperadoes of all sorts abound and make night hideous in the sacred city of the Saints; all of which signifies that by the Pacific Railroad the border ruffians, the advanced guard of the Gentiles, are crowding the Mormons.

The Herald and all others antagonistic to Utah are welcome to this view of their side of the situation. Their allies in what the Herald calls "the good work," according to their own showing, are so excessively moral and Christian. Pity that anybody should be embarrassed in such a highly moral and undoubtedly Christian labor of love.

AMONG our telegraphic dispatches today will be found the following paragraph—

Washington, 17.—At a regular meeting, this forenoon, the following was unanimously adopted in the Senate: Resolved, that in making Federal appointments within the Territories, the President is respectfully requested to apply the same rule, by selecting citizens thereof, as is adopted in making appointments in the States.

This is a long needed step in the right direction, but it is not the only step that should be taken in that direction. The common usage in Territorial appointments has been to choose strangers to the Territory and to the community to fill certain offices, the parallels of which in the States are chosen by the people. This policy of choosing strangers who know not the people, who have no particular sympathy with them, who understand not their wants, their wishes, their manners, their customs, and who can hardly be expected to appreciate or act in harmony with the prevailing sentiments of the community, is not only at decided variance with the fundamental principles of the government of the United States and of the several integral States, but is one fruitful cause of numerous local disturbances and quarrels, and of the marked hindrance of the progress of the community in material prosperity and in general good order and obedience to wholesome law.

A resident citizen and a neighbor, who knows the people and understands and is known and understood by them, is naturally a more fit and proper person to be appointed to office than a person an utter stranger to the people, of whom they know nothing, who knows as little of them, who, there is generally reason to suppose, is a political partizan, a political adventurer, and who, there may be plenty of cause to apprehend, will be more intent upon the success of his party's purposes or the gratification of his own personal ambition, political or merely lucry, than upon promoting the true interests and welfare and prosperity of the community.

This reported resolution, then, of the Senate to adopt the policy of appointing officials for the Territories from among the people of the Territories respectively appointed for, is a resolution which every American, every republican must hail as in consonance with true republicanism, with the true principles of American government.

But there is another important step which should be taken in this connection, and which can not be reasonably abstained from by a republican Federal government, and that step is, for the nominating and confirming powers to appoint candidates from among those who are chosen by the people themselves. Neither the justice nor the wisdom of this policy could be fairly questioned. If the people are not allowed to have a choice in their rulers, the government is not republican; but dictatorial, which is contrary to American principles, and should not be indulged in by American people, unless they wish to lose all credit for fairness and consistency, and to lay themselves open to the damaging charge of "craw-fishing," going back upon their own boasted and most dearly cherished principles.

In the nature of things it will hardly be that the people would choose for their rulers men in whom they do not repose a large amount of confidence, whereas when strangers are appointed to rule over them, such rulers may or may not secure the confidence of the people. In the history of Utah, rulers appointed from among strangers have far oftener proved unacceptable than acceptable to the people, and the consequence has been that little or no mutual confidence has existed between the rulers and the people, but a great lack of good understanding and of harmony and co-operation for the public good. We therefore cannot do other than conclude that the prevalent appointing policy is not a good one, and that the policy of appointing resident citizens, and in the appointment honoring the republican principle of recognizing the voice of the people, would be an immense improvement upon the present policy. If such a policy had been acted upon in the past, the present dilemma in which the government and the Federal officials find themselves would have been avoided, and there is no question that the people of this Territory would have been infinitely better satisfied than they are with the existing state of things.

That Nashville cow who got drunk on brandy peaches, the Mobile Register thinks, will probably give milk punch the rest of her life.