

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - AUG. 24, 1881.

SELLING INTOXICANTS TO
INDIANS.

THE scene described by our correspondent in Kanosh, whose letter will be found in another column, is revolting in the extreme. The practice of furnishing intoxicants to Indians cannot be too strongly condemned. All the worst features of the Indian character are aroused into action by alcoholic stimulants. It is a sin and a crime to cause the intoxication of an Indian. For it will transform the partially civilized and kindly disposed red man into a wild and bloodthirsty savage. The lives and property of citizens are in danger when intoxicated Indians are in the neighborhood, and the public peace and safety are rendered insecure.

Everybody in Utah ought to know that, license or no license, prohibition or full liberty on the liquor question, it is unlawful to sell, or give, or cause to be furnished any intoxicating drink to an Indian. There is no need to hunt far for a law touching the condition of affairs described by our correspondent. Section 221 of the penal code provides that,

"Every person who sells or furnishes, or causes to be sold or furnished, intoxicating liquors to any Indian, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

This law applies to every part of the Territory. We presume that there is not an incorporated city in Utah which has not a municipal ordinance embodying this provision of the territorial statutes. The law is plain. The penalty is severe. Every misdemeanor when the penalty is not specially fixed, is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding three hundred dollars, or by both. Seeing that the law has placed the power of self-protection within the reach of the people, they ought in common sense to avail themselves of it. If any one knows of an infraction of this law let him proceed to the conviction of the offender. The plea that he would be looked upon as an informer is a childish one. He has little moral courage if he permits that to stand in his way. He has a duty towards society to perform and ought to have stamina enough to undertake it.

This is no common offence. It is something more than a mere violation of the revenue or liquor laws. It involves the safety of the community. It not only degrades and brutalizes the already low type of humanity that imbibes the liquid in which lurks the fires of hell, but renders insecure the people and their homes where the drunken and reckless savage riots in his orgies.

White men who will thus demoralize the red man and expose their neighbors to his diabolism ought to be punished with rigor. "Mormon" or "Gentile" rich or poor, of influence or not, they should be complained against by those who know of the crime, and every right-minded citizen will sustain the prosecutor and support the magistrate who vindicates the majesty of this just and necessary law.

MEASURES AGAINST THE
"MORMONS."

UNDER the above caption a German paper has the following, which was sent by Elder Goethe to Prest. W. Budge, of Bear Lake Stake, and a translation of which he furnished to the *Democrat*:

"The government of Sleswick has lately made the following proclamation: The reports we hear concerning the practice of Mormon emissaries in this province gives us to understand that this sect here, as in Germany, is on the point of organizing and spreading their im-

mal and general pernicious doctrines in a designed and comprehensive manner. A large number of so-called Zion's Brethren have already arrived or are on the road here, for the purpose of obtaining every class of proselytes, to swell their emigration and some to labor locally to assist in uniting the different branches in a conference, which is presided over by one president, the whole being under the direction of a central post in Denmark.

It cannot be doubted that in their endeavors, inducements must be offered, which, as presumptive matter of fact, often conflict with section 144 of the penal code, and on this account there is cause to oppose this corruptible practice of Mormon missionaries with all lawful means.

It is therefore the duty of the local police to notice the respective persons, to watch their actions and inform each other of their movements. If they attempt to hold public meetings for such propagandist purposes, they are not to be allowed to do so, and the leaders must eventually be dealt with according to law. Private meetings of the same nature also give sufficient cause to examine the leaders and participants, establish their nationality, and to find out if there is any occasion for lawful proceedings against them. (Besides sec. 144 event. secs. 183, 171, 360 and 11 of the penal code, also secs. 43 and 148, statutory law for the trade.) If the respective persons prove to belong to other nations, banishment is to be motioned. We have these measures already adopted against the Mormon missionaries, L. Suhrke, from Mechenburg, at one time Lubeck, and Elder P. C. B. Hammer, from Faaborg, and A. Fuhnen, both of which came from America and are in the service of the mission."

It will be seen by a careful reading of the proclamation that the government of Schleswig is compelled to presume a great deal in order to make out a case against the "Mormon" missionaries. This is the case in every land and with every person who seeks to condemn them. No definite charge is or can be brought against them. It is a "presumptive matter of fact" that "inducements must be offered" contrary to the penal code. And on that presumption they must be prevented from holding meetings in public or in private, and if the law can be so construed as to meet the "presumptive matter of fact," they are to be banished from the country.

Elder Suhrke, as our readers will remember, was imprisoned two or three times for preaching the gospel in that land, and Elder Paul Hammer has received similar treatment; but they are now at liberty, such "liberty" as is accorded in that part of the European continent.

The same cry is raised in Germany that has been uttered in America. It is alleged that our missionaries are "recruiting agents," offering material "inducements" to people of the lower orders to swell the ranks of settlers in Utah and reinforce polygamy. It would be very easy for the American and European opposers of our missionaries to find out the facts in the case. But this would not sustain their position. It would be found that our Elders are sent out to preach the gospel to all people of every class. That the only "inducements" they have to offer are the blessings of the gospel, remission of sins, the power of the Holy Ghost, the gifts of the spirit and the fellowship of the Saints in heaven and on earth. Emigration to Utah is an after consideration. It follows by the desire of the converts, and as a consequence of their own exertions and savings, with, sometimes, the help of relatives who have gone before. And it would also be discovered that the extremely aged as well as the young, the fathers and mothers of families as well as the boys and girls, compose the companies which cross the sea on their way to Zion, and that polygamy has no bearing on the question of their change of country.

But these investigations are not made. It suits the brawlers to go upon presumption, and take that for matter of fact. In these despotic European countries, this is made the pretext for preventing public or private meetings for the worship of God, in republican America to endeavor to stop the immigration of converts seeking a spot where they can serve God according to the dictates of their own consciences. In either case the attempt will be a failure. These "measures against the Mormons" will come to naught. This gospel—

which some people call "Mormonism"—will be preached to all nations in spite of bonds, prisons, intolerance, misrepresentation, banishment or death. And the elect of God will be gathered from all parts of the earth, no matter what laws or regulations may be framed to prevent the work.

The reason is that God has set his hand to fulfill the words of His prophets concerning the latter times, and He will accomplish his purposes in His own way. And as sure as He lives, those nations which by oppressive measures, or unrighteous wrestlings of law seek to impede the progress of this work, will be rent in twain and broken in pieces, while truth goes forth and liberty prevails, and His kingdom grows in the earth to stand supreme for ever.

ARIZONA FRUIT.

THOSE who imagine that Arizona produces nothing but the cactus and lizard should read the following, which we take from the *Pinal Drill*:

"Deacon Daniel W. Jones, of Jonesville, the first Mormon settler and pioneer of Salt River, has brought a wagon load of most delicious grapes into Pinal. These are raised on his own ranch in the settlement three miles from Mesa City. The original settlement was founded by him in 1857. There are now twenty families, all farming. Grain, fruit and produce are the products. They raise some sixteen varieties of red and white grapes, the Mission, Black Cluster, Flaming Toque, etc. The first cuttings were brought by the deacon from southern Utah. The quality is unsurpassed. The ground is peculiarly fitted for grape, being coarse sand and gravel. The grapes ripen here about and before the 4th of July. Every year immense numbers of cuttings are planted, and this industry promises to increase to a very great importance. There are already over 200 acres of fine land under grape culture in the Mormon settlements on Salt River. Pinal is now regularly supplied with vegetables, fruit and hay from those settlements."

BARROWS-FULL OF ANTI-
"MORMONISM."

BARROWS the bald, lately of Salt Lake City, the tender-hearted "Christian" preacher, who wanted the "Mormon" problem solved by the sword, has been enlightening the people of San Francisco on the subject of "The Mormons and the Work of the New West among them!" A synopsis of his remarks is published in the *Chronicle*. From this we learn that Barrows finds "nothing very heretical in the Book of Mormon," and considers "it is not the 'Mormon' theology that Christians quarrel with so much, as the social institutions, most objectionable of which is polygamy." This is quite a change in the sentiments of the "Christians" who "quarrel with Mormonism, for as Mr. Barrows said further on in his lecture;

"Polygamy was not originally a part of the system contained in the Book of Mormon published in 1830, but was grafted on it by Joseph Smith in 1843. It is not the taproot, but a branch of Mormonism. Mormonism flourished before polygamy was a part of it."

Just so. And these same "Christians" who now pretend that polygamy is the great objection, in the times between 1830 and 1843 when polygamy was not "a part of the system," pursued the Latter-day Saints with fire and sword, with rifle and cannon; and the heaviest and most horrible and fatal persecutions our people have ever endured, was before polygamy was "grafted on to Mormonism."

For the removal of this alleged evil, Barrows, like other professed preachers of the gospel of Jesus, can see no method but the power of the civil law. He wants "a better jury law," "freer rules of evidence," women to testify against their husbands, and the offense to be made continuous. Not a word about gospel methods. No. But "a better jury law," which means the packing of juries with the avowed enemies of the accused; "freer rules of evidence," that is the acceptance of rumor, common fame and neighborhood gossip in lieu of proof of a marriage. Very nice recommenda-

tions from a "Reverend" and an American, are they not?

But Barrows goes down to what he considers is "the taproot." Says he:

"The vital principle of the whole system is the doctrine of the infallibility of the priesthood, supported by the tithing system and the most complete system of espionage ever devised by man."

Now that "taproot" is all in his eye. There is no such doctrine in our Church, taught by its leaders or believed by its members, as "the infallibility of the priesthood." Neither is there in it any system of espionage whatever. The tithing system is a regulation of the Church that applies to the priesthood equally with the people, to the highest authorities as much as to "the weakest of those who are or may be called Saints," and when paid it is not the property of certain individuals to be used at pleasure, as some people imagine and such men as Barrows try to make others believe. Out of his three "systems," which he says constitute the "taproot," two of them have no existence, and the other is an ancient, ecclesiastical and Biblical rule for the raising of funds for Church purposes, which is eminently preferable to the everlasting plate, contribution box and subscription list system, with the continual begging whine of the orthodox preacher.

But Barrows reached, at last, the real object of his harangue. It is couched in the final paragraph of the account of the lecture:

"The speaker stated in detail what had already been done in these directions in Utah, and closed with an appeal for aid to carry on the work."

That is the outcome of all these hypocritical and lying attempts to arouse popular indignation against the "Mormons." "Give us money to carry on our work!" That is the end and aim of the whole business. "The 'Mormons' are an awful people, therefore pass around the plate, fill up the contribution box, put your names down for a fat subscription, and we'll pitch into the 'Mormons' hot and heavy, and use all our influence to prevail on the Government 'not to reason' with their religion, but to 'stamp it out.'"

We have doubtless given Barrows more notice than he is worthy of. He will probably go East and repeat his effort. He will do as others of his cloth have done—prevail upon tender-hearted people who believe his untruths to hand him money for the cause he represents. But he will accomplish nothing against the system he pretends to fight. And if he doesn't show out yet in his true character to the cost of those on whom he imposes, it will be because he doesn't live long enough, that's all.

A CRAZY IDEA.

THE Scanton (Pa.) *Republican* which, by the by, has been very liberal with our Elders traveling in Pennsylvania, publishing several of their replies to anti-"Mormon" attacks, has the following in its issue of August 11th:

"Mormon emissaries operating in this section of Pennsylvania will not relish the recommendation of the *North American* that they be arrested for practicing customs at variance with the laws of the United States. Our contemporary says if there is no law for such purpose it is high time one was made and put in force."

If Congress were to take notice of all the suggestions, recommendations and demands for legislation against the "Mormon" that body would have no time left for anything else. The *North American*, like the rest of the papers, loses its head directly it tries to tackle the "Mormon" question. Just think of arresting preachers of the gospel on the assumption that they "practice customs at variance with the laws." The German method would have to be adopted in the United States, and the guilt of the Elders assumed, "as a presumptive matter of fact."

Our eastern contemporaries will find on investigation that the lives, customs and example of the "Mormon emissaries" will suffer nothing by comparison with the doings of any of the orthodox clergymen of the States. And when Congress passes a law for the arrest of peaceable men on the presumption that "their customs are contrary to law," simply because they are preachers of an un-

popular creed, it will be because the law-makers of the nation have turned as crazy as the editors when they fly all to pieces on the "Mormon" question.

AN IMPORTANT LIQUOR
DECISION.

THE courts in Nebraska take a different view of the liquor license question from that which is held by the Third District Court of Utah. The Legislature of that State recently passed a law, which is known as the Slocumb law, based on the principle that a high license fee is the best method of regulating traffic. It was regarded as a stepping stone to prohibition. It provided for licenses of from \$500 to \$1,000, covering the sale of beer as well as ardent spirits, and the dealers were required to give bonds in the sum of \$5,000, render themselves liable to suits for civil damages, and to take down all screens, so as to make their saloons public and open to the public eye.

Of course the saloon-keepers resisted the law. Omaha has one hundred and forty of them, who would have to pay the \$1,000 license fee or shut up. A case was tried under the new law as a test. Andrew Pleuler was the defendant, and the constitutionality of the law being denied, it was tried in the District Court before Judge Savage, who decided that the law was sound and binding. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, and that tribunal has ruled that the law is constitutional. Arguments requiring weeks of hard labor in preparation were made by able counsel on both sides. The decision was unanimous. It was telegraphed from Lincoln, the capital, to Omaha and made quite a sensation among the liquor men, over half of them declaring that they would close up and go out of the business, and that a similar effect would be produced throughout the State.

This, no doubt, was one of the objects held in view by the framers of the law. A high license fee, by closing up the low and disreputable drinking dens and limiting the business to responsible persons, does away with many of the evils connected with the liquor traffic and keeps it within more respectable bounds. The bonds required by the Nebraska law form a further guaranty for order and decency, and the measure to secure publicity will be the means no doubt of keeping many people out of the saloons.

Judge Lake who delivered the opinion of the Court—which will not be filed until the 17th of October, to which day the Court adjourned—on being interviewed by a reporter of the *Omaha Herald* said:

"We decided that the law was a police regulation entirely, and that the imposition of the money for license is in no sense a tax, as the word is used in the constitution."

It will be remembered that one of the main objections offered by Judge Hunter to the \$1,000 license fee of this city was, that its high figure was such as to amount to a tax. The Supreme Court of Nebraska takes a totally different view of this point, agreeing exactly with that advanced by this paper.

Some comment having been made upon the haste with which the decision was arrived at—only twenty-four hours elapsing between the close of the arguments and the rendering of the ruling—Judge Lake explained:

"We took the case up as soon as submitted yesterday and did nothing else and looked up every authority that was cited, making it our business until this morning—that is working yesterday afternoon and up to noon to-day; we examined the case then and the court was united in the opinion."

It appears that one of the points made in the case of Pleuler was, that though the law might be valid and binding on general principles, yet it would not operate in his case, because he held an unexpired license from the City Council. The Judge remarked:

"We held in this as Judge Savage did, that the law disregards all licenses issued under the former statute repealed by the new statute, which went into effect on the first day of June (the Slocumb law). We sustained Judge Savage's decision in all particulars and the court was a unit."

This decision will have great weight in other places besides the