



GEORGE Q. CANNON.....EDITOR

Wednesday,Feb. 19, 1868.

THE PRESS AND POLITICS.

The great preponderance of politics above everything else, in nearly every paper which reaches us, is very distinct. The subject is not confined to what might be termed political papers. Newspapers of every kind, periodicals and religious journals devote a large portion of their space to the fruitful theme. But, seldom does a paper come to hand which professes to take an independent position on politics. Party and party interests are all absorbing; and it seems as if the belief very generally exists that a newspaper can not live and flourish without being a political hack. The great questions of the hour, some of which affect the national vitality, are viewed from a partisan stand point and dealt with in a partisan spirit. And the character, motives, opinions and actions of political opponents are dragged through the mire of vituperative controversy, while leaders and members of the party in whose interests the paper acts, are lauded beyond all bounds, their very vices being tortured into apparent virtues.

This condition of the press throughout the entire republic is highly suggestive. It marks the tone of public feeling, to a great extent. For though the press may sway the popular will, it must travel at least partially in harmony with that will, or its power for good or evil is greatly limited.

It is but a few years since this supremacy of politics, as a subject of great public interest, was confined to the eve of election contests. Then, in the heat of excited feelings, utterance was given to many things which in calmer moods would have been unsaid, and which were willingly forgotten by all parties as the excitement died away. Now, this is of daily and continued occurrence. The bitterest epithets are hurled with recklessness from either side of contending parties, against those from whom they differ; and the wounds thus made are kept rankling by repeated thrusts of envenomed darts. In a republican form of government such as ours, the acts of every public servant are open to criticism, and the higher his position, the greater the trust reposed in him, the closer is he watched that he occupies with honor and dignity the position in which he is placed. This is according to the spirit of our national institutions. But to seize upon every trivial saying or act of public servants, with the eagerness of a vulture fastening on a morsel of carrion, simply because they hold other views and act upon other opinions, is, or ought to be, beneath a great people represented through its press.

That politics has become reduced almost to a science is well known; and that men make it a profession which they follow for a livelihood, is a fact too well substantiated to be controverted. And in the pursuit of that profession, every lever is used that can be, and every means are employed, no matter how unscrupulous or dishonorable, to "make it pay," and secure the triumph of party. The times when "loyalty" meant devotion to country and constitution, and not to a party, and when "patriot" did not mean partisan, are looked upon as antediluvian, slow and a long way behind the spirit of the present. The press teems with personal and public abuse; its wide-spread influence attacks the fine sensibilities of the young, who are becoming so accustomed to the liberal use of foul epithets that refined language and true gentlemanly politeness cannot but suffer from it. The people are constantly called upon to watch the politicians; and the politicians are incessantly laboring to prove how disinterested and honest they, and the members of the party to which they belong, are, and that those to whom they are opposed must of necessity be corrupt, venal, and unworthy of public confidence. Thus, like a huge cauldron fill-

ed with ingredients that will not unite and mix freely, the politics of the nation are kept seething and boiling, with the press as chief cook and fire-tender.

When the influence of the press is exerted to honor labor and degrade fashionable and corrupt indolence; when men are sustained for office because they are fully qualified and will labor for the public good; when virtue in a public servant is lauded, and dishonor, corruption and dishonesty reprobated without respect to party or opinion; when men who claim the suffrages of their fellow-citizens are endorsed because they seek their country's, not a party's good; then the press will be engaged in a nobler labor, and will challenge, in an infinitely higher degree, the admiration and support of the intelligent and patriotic throughout the land.

MARRY AND BE HAPPY.

There are a few young men of our acquaintance who seem to be incorrigible bachelors. They have been reasoned with, joked with, and almost threatened with fine, to urge them to marry; but, so far, in vain. Reason, eloquence, wit and threats are all alike unavailing; they do not marry. Should they still continue to persist in their celibacy, we would be inclined to favor the revival of the Spartan custom of treating bachelors. It is said that at a certain festival at Sparta, the women were enjoined to flog old bachelors around an altar, that they might be constrained to take wives! The publicity of such a proceeding might, possibly, have the effect to shame our bachelors into compliance with the first law given to man. If the fear of the first flogging would not do it, probably the dread of a repetition might cure their obstinacy.

There is too great a feeling of indifference manifested by many of our young men in relation to this duty. In many instances they are doubtless deterred from marriage by the apprehension that they cannot provide the young ladies with such comfortable homes and surroundings as they have been accustomed to enjoy under the paternal wing. But there is not a young man of good habits in the community, no matter how poor he may be, who is not as well provided with worldly gear as ninety-nine out of every hundred of the parents here have been at some period or other in their lives. Every man who has clung to "Mormonism" through the changing scenes through which it has passed, knows very well what it is to be poor. And our girls, if they do not know what it is to be poor by actual experience themselves, ought to have a very good understanding of it by what they have gleaned from the recitals of their parents.

We have too high an opinion of our young ladies, and the training their mothers have given them, to think that any of them would reject the addresses of an honorable, industrious young man, because he happened to be poor. The girls are here; they should not be permitted to become old maids. They do not want to marry outside of their faith, and what are they to do, unless our young men give them the opportunity of entering into wedlock? We have a great country—a country of "magnificent distances"—the desolate places of which are crying for population to gladden and beautify them by the fertilizing hand of industry. There is a certain class of persons East, however, who say population shall not be increased in Utah by plural marriages. They would rather put us all in the Penitentiary, or have all our ladies die old maids, than have population increased by that method. As we must have population, it is, of course, the more necessary then that our young, unmarried men should take partners.

Old writers say that there was an ancient constitution among the Romans by which all persons of mature age were obliged to marry. It is certain that in later days a law was enacted among that people by which various prerogatives were given to persons who had many children. Such a law would meet with considerable favor in this country! We recommend it to the consideration of our Legislators. If they were to pass such a law, they might surely count on a re-election. The same Roman law imposed penalties upon those who lived a single life. Those old Romans had some very sensible ideas. They learned to place a higher value upon a citizen who was a married man, especially if he had a numerous progeny, than upon one who was single. Such men have a heavier interest at stake, they share more deeply in the prosperity of the

community in which they live, than a single man; and they have more inducements to be loyal to it.

Seriously, we advise our young men to marry. "Marriage, is the mother of the world, and preserves kingdoms, and fills cities and churches, and Heaven itself. Marriage, like the useful bee, builds a house, and gathers sweetness from every flower, and labors, and unites into societies and republics, and sends out colonies, and feeds the world with delicacies, and obeys their king, and keeps order, and exercises many virtues, and promotes the interest of mankind, and is that state of good to which God has designed the present constitution of the world."

SANDWICH ISLANDS' TREATY.

For some time back Congress has had under consideration a treaty with the Sandwich Islands Government. This treaty is strongly recommended to Congress by the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, and it is probable, from the last advices respecting it, that it will be ratified. This treaty will allow the Islanders to get a number of commodities of United States' manufacture free, or at a reduced tariff, and permit their commercial staple, sugar, to come to California on similar terms. By the treaty the Hawaiian government takes off the duty from articles which last year yielded its revenue to the amount of \$64,000. The revenue of this country from those articles, which under the treaty will be admitted duty free, was last year \$145,000. Before the war the duty on raw sugar of low grades was about three-quarters of a cent per pound. It is now three cents per pound. On the better qualities of refinery sugars the duty averages eighty per cent. of the export value.

By the operation of this treaty the production of raw staples, particularly sugar, will be increased in the Islands, and as these will be admitted into California duty free, there will be a direct loss to the revenue. But, on the other hand, to counterbalance this, lumber, manufactures, various articles of food, and every thing that can be profitably exported from the Pacific ports of California and Oregon, will be admitted duty free into the Islands. The annual importations of the Islands from this country amount to \$2,000,000, and it is hoped that these importations will increase.

The opponents of the treaty say it would be cheaper to buy the Islands at once, than to have such a treaty ratified. But Kamehameha V. is unwilling to sell them. He would rather live and die a king, though the kingdom were not so prosperous, than to have it said he bartered away his inheritance, his *one hanau*, to *na haole*, the foreigners. The general opinion is that the ratification of the treaty will be followed by a movement of immigrants into the Islands. The friends of the treaty assert that this movement will be mainly from the United States. In that case the real property of the Islands will gradually fall into American hands. Already the American interest predominates over every other on the Islands. Americans direct eighth-tenths of the skilled industry, own twenty of the twenty-six large sugar plantations, and keep, in whole or part, ninety out of the one hundred and four principal stores and shops. There are about 3,000 white men there, of whom much the larger portion is American.

The Hawaiians are a dwindling people. In 1832 they numbered 130,313. Now the population, excluding the whites, is 55,000. Their decrease has been steady and rapid. The causes which have produced this decrease are to be found in the "civilizing institutions" which were introduced into their peaceful Islands by Captain Cook and those who followed him. It is estimated that unless this decrease be arrested, the native population will be nearly or quite extinct within the century. But there are no grounds to hope that this decrease will be arrested. Before the discovery of the Islands by the whites, a more healthy, robust race, could scarcely be found than dwelt there. Their country did not have an extensive supply of animals; the hog, the common barn yard fowls and the dog, comprised the animals; neither did they have snakes, fleas, mosquitoes, &c., to be a dread and an annoyance to them. Disease was almost unknown. But following the white man came a train of evils. He introduced the most dreadful form of disease, from the effects of which the race is surely, and swiftly perishing. Every man familiar

with the Islands is aware that the race cannot last long, and it is desirable that steps should be taken to maintain there the American supremacy.

The Islands are the commercial centre of the North Pacific ocean. They lie in the track of the trade between California, Japan, China and the East Indian Archipelago, as also of that between Panama and China; and a little off the direct routes between South America, Australasia, and the northern and north western Pacific coast. Their position gives them strategically the command of the commerce of the Pacific ocean. In the opinion of persons competent to judge, they can be made "self-sustaining fortresses and home stations, of the first class." They should not be allowed to fall into the hands of any foreign power; but the bonds which bind the Islands to American interests should, in every way, be strengthened. A little ocean State might yet be formed out of those Islands.

THE FENCE LAW.

Laws in relation to fencing land must materially affect the interests of any people whose chief pursuit is that of agriculture. In our Territory they have given rise to considerable discussion at various times since its settlement, some strongly advocating the necessity of a fence law, while others take the opposite view of the case. On the Territorial Statute book there is at present a law, which we believe gives the power to the settlers in any settlement or precinct to make the owners of stock responsible for any damage that may be done by them, whether the land where the damage is done be fenced or not, as the majority of the people shall determine.

This subject is just now being discussed, pro and con, with considerable interest in California, and definite action in relation to it is being urged upon the attention of the State Legislature.

Some time ago a committee was appointed by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to consider a proposition to repeal the fence law. A few evenings since they made their report which is strongly in favor of repealing all or nearly all the fence laws on the statute book, believing that it would greatly promote the agricultural, commercial and general prosperity of the State.

This report is said to be grounded on the fact that there are hundreds and thousands of acres of the best grain raising land in the State, or in the United States, which cannot be cultivated for the reason that the cost of fencing amounts to far more than the cash price of the land itself, and thus farmers of limited means are driven into other lines of business or into other States and Territories where their interests are more protected.

The ranching system of California it is said by the advocates of the "no fence law" system, has proved a signal failure. The ranchmen with his five or ten thousand head of cattle, roaming over a hundred thousand acres of good land is worth less as a producer of wealth, a supporter of schools or a patron of manufactures and commerce than a few small farmers cultivating yearly their hundred or two hundred acres of land; and the former, like the Indians on the plains, having barred the progress of civilization, must be pushed aside to make room for, and to secure protection to small farmers.

The sole wealth of the ranchman consists in the increase of his stock, and if this, as is not uncommonly the case, fails or is swept away through flood or drouth, the inconvenience caused by the scarcity and high price of meat is felt by all classes; but the abolition of the ranching system would increase the number of small farmers, improve the quality of stock and lead to their more general distribution, greatly add to the wealth of the State generally by the increase of its exports, and would be quickly followed by great improvements in rural life.

The advocates of the fence law, on the other hand, contend that the repeal of that law would be inimical to the best interests of the people of the State. It would enable land speculators and capitalists, who now possess immense tracts of land, valueless for grain raising, to enrich themselves at the expense of unsophisticated, would-be farmers by selling land to them at high figures, for grain growing experiments.

To the small farmer it would also work very disadvantageously. Now, in case of the failure or partial failure of his crops, he has his hogs and cattle, raised at comparatively small cost