DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE

DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - JULY 20, 1887.

PEOPLE'S TICKET.

GENERAL ELECTION,

Monday, August 1st, 1887.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

COUNCIL.

First District.....JOHN E. CARLISLE, Logan.
Second District.....C. F. OLSEN, Hyrum.
Third District.....L. W. SHURTLIFF, Ogden.
Fifth District.....JOHN R. WINDER, Salt Lake City.
Sixth District.....ELIAS A. SMITH, Salt Lake City.
Seventh District.....RICHARD HOWE, South Cottonwood.
Eighth District.....A. O. SMOOT, JR., Provo.
Ninth District.....J. P. WIMMER, Huntington.
Tenth District.....WM. A. C. BRYAN, Nephi.
Eleventh District....LUTHER T. TUTTLE, Manti.
Twelfth District.....E. G. WOOLLEY, St. George.

HOUSE.

First District.....ELIAS S. KIMBALL, Meadowville.
Second District.....JOSEPH HOWELL, Wellsville.
Third District.....RICY H. JONES, Brigham City.
Fourth District.....CHAS. C. RICHARDS, Ogden.
Fifth District....NATH'L MONTGOMERY, North Ogden.
Sixth District.....THOS. F. ROUECHE, Kaysville.
Seventh District.....JOHN BOYDEN, Coalville.
Eighth District.....DANIEL D. HOUTZ, Tooele.
Ninth District.....WILLIAM W. RITER, Salt Lake City.
Tenth District.....JOHN CLARK, Salt Lake City.
Eleventh District.....JAS. H. MOYLE, Salt Lake City.
Twelfth District.....THOS. V. WILLIAMS, Salt Lake City.
Thirteenth District.....GEO. M. SPENCER, Taylorsville.
Fourteenth District.....LEVI P. HELM, Mill Creek.
Fifteenth District.....WILLIAM CREER, Spanish Fork.
Sixteenth District.....S. R. THURMAN, Provo.
Seventeenth District.....LYMAN S. WOOD, Springville.
Eighteenth District.....ABRAM HATCH, Heber City.
Nineteenth District.....WM. H. KING, Fillmore.
Twenty-Second District P. T. FARNSWORTH, Beaver.
Twenty-fourth District..WM. F. STEWART, Kanab.

SALT LAKE COUNTY.

Selectman.....E. M. WEILER
Collector.....L. G. HARDY
Treasurer.....M. E. CUMMINGS
Superintendent of Schools.WM. M. STEWART

A "LIBERAL" TRICK.

We learn that at the school meetings held on Monday, the 11th inst., a trick was resorted to by the so-called "Liberals" which ought to be exposed and in future provided against. Persons who reside in one school district voted in another, shifting their votes to a district where there was likelihood of a "Liberal" victory. This was wrong in principle and clearly illegal in practice. We have the names of individuals who it is said committed this offence, and among them are those of men as conspicuous for their pretended devotion to the law as they are notorious for their unscrupulous animosity to the "Mormons."

The law on this subject provides that,

"Sec. 2. At a school meeting to be held in each school district in the year eighteen hundred and eighty, there shall be elected *by the registered voters of the district*, three school trustees for each school district, one for the term of one year, one for the term of two years, and one for the term of three years. And annually thereafter at the school meeting provided for in section 3 of this act there shall be one trustee elected *by said registered voters* in each school district whose term of office shall be for three years and until his successor is elected and qualified."

No one is entitled to vote, then, in any school district unless he is a registered voter of that district. A citizen who resides in the Fourth District can only vote, legally, in the Fourth District. If he votes in the Thirteenth District, for example, his vote is illegal. Instances of this kind could be named. The object of the trick was to strengthen the "Liberal" vote in the Thirteenth District, where there was prospect of a "Liberal" victory, by the ballots of men residing in another district where the People's Party was sure of carrying the school election. It is claimed, we are informed, that some who perpetrated this "Liberal" trick excused themselves by saying they did business in the Thirteenth District though they lived in another. No one knows better than they that this is no excuse at all. Their residence determines their voting district as it does their voting precinct. No proposition can be clearer than that "a poor excuse is better than none." But this pretense is far worse than silence, for it adds sophistry to subterfuge and folly to unfairness.

The remedy for wrongs of this kind is vigilance on the part of those who are intrusted with the duty of watching over the public interest. In some instances the school trustees were a little behind the times. They should have been ready with lists of the registered voters of their districts. Every improper vote should have been challenged. Persons living in a certain district should not have been permitted to vote in another district. In future this must be seen to. The experience of the past should be profitable in time to come.

If tricks of this kind can be used with effect in school elections, what is to hinder them or similar tricks at the general election? Nothing but prompt action by the committees of the People's Party in the several precincts, and by such judges of election as are disposed to act fairly instead of as "offensive partisans." In certain precincts especially, advantage will be taken of every possible dodge and scheme to gain the election for "Liberal" candidates. In addition to measures to secure the attendance at the polls of every registered voter of the People's Party, steps must be taken to purge the registration lists of all names of unqualified persons—transients and others—who may have been induced to sign their names to the oath.

We should think that respectable non-"Mormons" who consistently rallied to the support of their own nominees on Monday night, would be ashamed of such illegal acts as that we have referred to, and would openly deprecate anything that has the taint of illegality and the color of unfairness. At any rate it is necessary that those who act for the People should take precautions with a view to preventing illegal voting on Monday, the 1st of August, 1887.

DON'T MARRY A DRUNKARD.

Tender-hearted and sanguine ladies who think thy can reform vicious and intemperate men by marrying them, are not likely to be cured of their delusion except by the heroic treatment of violent and sorrowful experience. Examples of the folly and danger of this mistaken notion have been multiplied in vain. If a woman makes up her mind to marry a rake or an inebriate or a fool, she can very rarely be reasoned out of her rashness and temerity.

But a recent case of rude awakening from a dream of this kind may serve as a warning to some gushing and unsophisticated damsel, anxious to sacrifice herself in the work of reform, so we relate it with the hope that it may not prove altogether in vain:

At Hartford, Connecticut, a year ago, Kitty McCann was secretly wedded to John Swift. She was twenty years old, he was twenty-two. She was of respectable parents, who strongly opposed the marriage. He was also well connected, but shiftless, violent and intemperate. She felt sure that her fond affection would lead to his reform, and so she took chances on it. On the 7th inst. he shot her in the back and she died in an hour.

After the marriage Swift soon fell into his old mode of life, and his wife was compelled to leave him and she went to work in a harness factory. She offered to return to him if he would give up his dissolute ways, but he would not. Then she applied for a divorce. This enraged him and he swore he would kill her if she persisted. He frequented the lowest resorts and earned his drink by playing on the piano. On the evening of the 7th inst. as she was returning from work he followed her and shot her in the back with a revolver, the ball passing through her body. The blood spurted from the wound, she sank upon the pavement, Swift tried to escape but was soon arrested, and she soon bled to death. He admitted she was innocent of anything to cause jealousy or justify his murderous deed.

A drunkard is a dangerous person to entrust with anything. A woman who places her life and future in his keeping takes one chance out of a hundred. If reform is not effected before marriage it is very improbable that it can be brought about afterward. The demon of drink is a relentless tyrant and one under his dominion has a terrible struggle to break away from his alluring but unyielding fetters. Kitty McCann's fate should prove a warning to her sex, but it is doubtful if it deters many from following her foolish example.

THE FALL OF THE BASTILE.

As early as midnight last evening, the people of France began their customary demonstrations when this day of the year (July 14) comes around. It is the anniversary of the fall of the Bastile, this being the ninety-eighth year succeeding that occurrence. The structure was originally intended as a fortress, a means of defense against the English, and with that object in view was commenced by Charles V in 1370 and finished in 1383, being called when completed the Castle of Paris. As a defensive structure it enjoyed a long period of idleness, and was finally converted into a prison for the incarceration of political offenders of the higher ranks. Its capacity was less than 100, but, like the Utah Penitentiary, it was nearly always filled and very often by means not at all dissimilar to those that have been practiced here. It was a convenient method of disposing of those who differed with the government as to its method of procedure in any particular class of cases and were led by lucid explanations and analyses of their position to cause others to understand; and if a person or party who stood in favor with the King or his ministry happened to have an objectionable opponent, such offender was speedily disposed of by means of a *lettre de cachet*; these missives were merely forms to which the great seal of the reigning power had been attached, and thus only required a signature and the insertion of the name of the person who was to be disposed of to make them an order of State for his immediate incarceration, without complaint, arraignment, or trial, within the cavernous maw of the Bastile. Those to whom these special favors were given used them with reasonable frequency, often enough at least to keep the prison filled as stated above until a very late period; and once immured behind its iron gates, death was the only liberator. A feeling gradually grew upon the Frenchmen that this was tyranny, inhumanity and murder; it was spoken inaudibly at first, and when caution slowly gave way to expression, not a few of those who were determined upon the overthrow of this engine of oppression, were overthrown by it; but this was attempting to extinguish a blazing fire with oil. The sentiment spread and grew apace, until it was useless to attempt to suppress it by means of persecution, and at last, in 1789, it culminated in an armed uprising of men determined not only upon abolishing the system but destroying the monument that had become a mausoleum wherein, unattended and through sheer decay, the innocent representatives of a dozen generations had yielded up their lives, their friends and relatives not only powerless but in absolute ignorance of where they were or what their fate was. On this day of that year the uprising appeared in full force before the moats, took possession of the drawbridges, swarmed past the frowning abattis and up against the hoary bastions, beating back the guard, captured the governor of the prison and putting him to death, then tearing down the walls by means of explosives and other available appliances, and on the following day the task was completed; there was not one stone left upon another. Some ten persons were all that the liberators found, owing perhaps to the check put upon the reckless use of the *lettres* in the later years, because of the growing agitation; one of these had been imprisoned thirty years, did not know his own name, could not give his age nor the place of his birth; he had almost forgotten the use of language, and his redemption was only to render more exquisitely infernal the close of his earthly career. But the bastile was no more, and the condition of things which made it a necessity passed away with it.

It is safe to say that there were grand doings and some very foolish ones going on throughout the land of the Gauls to-day. Frenchmen may be, as they generally are, attracted by tinsel and pedigree; but this is only the superficial element in their composition, for beneath it and thoroughly incorporated with every nerve and fibre is a patriotic feeling which bursts forth into clamors and violent demonstrations at the very mention of the word France; and they are tyrant-haters by heredity. Flagrant outrages and malicious maladministration will arouse French ire to such a point of desperation that it is hard to control, but with a trusted leader is easy to direct. This makes them all splendid soldiers, and when educated, shrewd politicians. With such an element and such an occasion to give it impulse, the reader need not be surprised if our dispatches contain accounts of wild and giddy turbulence amounting in places to riot, even if not to actual bloodshed. It would not be safe for a German flag or emblem of any kind to be shown there to-day; nor would it be the part of wisdom for any one to even speak the word Germany in an audible tone; for the Frenchman's day to celebrate without restraint—not his Fourth but his Fourteenth of July—is his own by right of every precedent and principle by means of which human affairs are regulated.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PHASE OF THE UTAH QUESTION.

The clause in the proposed Constitution of the State of Utah, providing that no amendment of the section prohibiting bigamy and polygamy shall be in force until approved by Congress and proclaimed by the President, has caused some discussion in prominent newspapers. A question has been raised as to its constitutionality. It is very properly argued that States should be admitted into the Union on a perfect footing of equality as to rights and privileges. There should be no conditions imposed upon one that is not required of all others. And it is affirmed that anything of that character imposed by Congress would be an abridgment of the constitutional rights of States and would therefore be inoperative.

It is amusing to see how editors of intelligence will stultify themselves and blow hot and cold almost with the same breath on the "Mormon" question. One day they will protest that Congress must require special conditions of Utah before admitting her into the Union; the next day they declare that any such special conditions would be unconstitutional and inoperative. In one issue they will announce that if the people of Utah will insert clauses in their State Constitution prohibiting polygamy, there will be nothing to prevent her admission. In the next issue they publish the fact that such prohibitions have been inserted, but the objection is, the people can change the clauses by amending their Constitution as soon as admitted. Then when it appears that this objection is met by rendering any such change inoperative without the consent of Congress and the President, they pretend to believe that such action is unconstitutional. Thus they manifest their insincerity on this question, and their determination not to be satisfied with anything that the people of Utah may do, even if it is the very thing demanded of them as the only condition necessary.

Let us examine this question a little. Is it a fact that Congress cannot require special conditions of any State preparatory to its admission into the Union? By a strict construction of the Constitution of the United States the Congress, in our opinion, can not do so. But as a matter of history this has been done in a number of instances. Missouri, Michigan, Nebraska and other States were admitted on special conditions. In the "reconstruction" of the South certain pledges were required of States that had participated in the rebellion, as conditions precedent to their re-admission into the Union. These were special obligations not required of other States. Thus there are anundant precedents for that which is considered objectionable in the case of Utah.

But whether such conditions are unconstitutional or not; whether they are expedient or not, in this case Congress has imposed no special condition. This should be distinctly understood. It really takes away the foundation of the whole argument of the opponents to Utah's Statehood on this ground. It is not Congress that has required unusual conditions, but the people who form their own Constitution that voluntarily concede to the national authorities this power over their affairs. That alters the case materially. And it must be further understood that the State of Utah does not attempt to impose upon Congress and the President any duties beyond their constitutional authority. It is not so presumptuous and assuming. Neither Congress nor the President is thereby required to do anything. If they do not voluntarily act in the matter the prohibitory clauses will remain perpetual. That is all there is of the provision.

Will it be claimed by these sudden sticklers for strict constructions of an instrument that for other purposes they make very elastic, that the People who hold reserved powers not conceded in the national Constitution cannot use these powers? Or will it be argued that they cannot concede some of those powers if they choose to do so by popular vote? If of their own volition they choose to limit the amending power in reference to a special provision, because of special circumstances, have they not the inherent and constitutional right to do so? Or are the provisions of Articles Nine and Ten of the Amendments of the Constitution of the United States merely a dead letter?

On the broad grounds of constitutional freedom and equality, no special requirements should be imposed upon any State as a condition precedent to its admission into the Union. They should all enter on an equal footing, and the sole requirements should be that with the necessary population they have "a republican form of government." We have taken this position many times when the cry has been raised that Utah could not become a State without some special provisions on the polygamy question. We do not swerve from that position now. We do not think any other conditions should be imposed upon Utah than have been required of other States. But the public seem to think otherwise. The leading journals, supposed to voice public sentiment, have vociferously demanded special provisions prohibiting polygamy in Utah's State Constitution. Members of Congress, shouting themselves hoarse over the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker bill, declared that Utah should never come into the Union without a prohibition of polygamy. In this condition of affairs, the majority of Utah's voting population have taken the matter in hand—the polygamists having been disfranchised—and have framed a Constitution with provisions meeting all the objections, essential and incidental, that have been advanced on this question; and now what more can be reasonably demanded?

It puts this nation to the test. It leaves them without excuse if they reject the action of the voting citizens of Utah. It shows that many persons and papers in making the demand which has now been met, did not mean what they required. It proves that they have neither mercy, justice nor consistency. It will carry the questions before the high courts of heaven, and demonstrate to the world that continued war upon Utah is without reason and without excuse. There is more in this movement than the simple quibbles raised by its adversaries, and the God of Nations will judge the motives and acts of all who fight against common right and common justice.

THE AMERICAN FORK FIGHT.

The good people of American Fork, through their duly constituted local authorities, are conducting a lively fight against illicit liquor dealers. We join with all the lovers of law and good morals in this section of the country in wishing them success in the contest. They are in the right as well as the overwhelming majority, and are therefore clearly entitled to victory, which we believe they will achieve.

It is not to be presumed that the higher courts will sustain the lawbreakers, who, if they consider their best interests, should succumb at an early stage to what appears to be inevitable. It is not supposable that the unlicensed liquor dealers will profit by an appeal of their cases. The probable result will be that their unrighteous and illegal course will suffer the more by the taking of that step.

Notwithstanding the many occasions we have had to differ with Chief Justice Zane in regard to much of his judicial procedure there have in other respects, been much in his course that has been entitled to respect. He has, for instance, so far as we can recollect on that score, invariably sustained the local liquor laws against the encroachments of those who have sought to override them, and his decisions in such cases have been characterized not only by a disposition to uphold the local government, but by evidences of lawyer-like ability. In the same direction Associate Justice Henderson has, as a rule, also taken the right view and acted accordingly in his judicial capacity.

With these facts before them, together with the knowledge of the fact that they have been guilty of breaches of wholesome laws for the preservation of peace and order, it is difficult to see what benefit some of the American Fork unlicensed liquor dealers expect to derive from the appealing of their cases to the higher courts.

DAKOTA KNOCKING AT THE DOOR.

Dakota is again making herself heard in the matter of Statehood, and this time is taking the case systematically, methodically, and with the air of a person bent upon the accomplishment of his task, no matter if there be here and there a few intervening obstacles. This is commendable, but the Territories can't admit themselves, otherwise Utah would have been where she belongs in the consellation of States long ago.

The proposition on the part of our eastern neighbor is to go into the Union not with her present geographical lines, but to cut off the portion north of the seventh standard of parallel and leave it as a Territory under some other name, the southern portion receiving the investiture of Statehood without changing its present designation. This would seem to be proper enough, considered from a practical standpoint, since the extreme northern portion of Dakota is almost if not entirely uninhabitable during the cold and stormy seasons of the year, comprising much the greater part of it, although the State line will run some miles south of the Northern Pacific Railroad. The line would be about 4,760 miles from the equator, commencing at or near the northern line of Bowman County on the west side, cutting Emmons County in two at the Missouri River or the central part of the Territory, thence proceeding due east to Richland County on the Minnesota line, which county it would bisect far enough north to bring the town of Wahpeton, on the eastern border into the State. This line may not be entirely correct, but it does not vary very far from it. The portion which it is proposed to invest with sovereignty would still contain some 90,000 square miles, or about two-thirds of the area of the present Territory, and