

THE DESERET WEEKLY,

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, . . . \$2.50
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

Saturday, . . . June 20, 1891.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION.

THROUGH the courtesy of Hon. F. S. Richards we are able to print today the full text of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the suits for the escheat of the property of the Church. The Supreme Court of the Territory will now have to modify its decree so as to conform to this decision, and also to appoint a Master in Chancery. He will have to take testimony in regard to the charitable uses for which the personal property of the Church was originally intended, and determine as to which of them, or to what purposes nearest akin to them, this property may be devoted conformable to the law and not repugnant to public morality. The decision also defines the duties of the future Receiver and inferentially limits his official acts to the performance thereof. It is to be hoped and expected that the court will appoint a man not only learned in the law, but disposed to justice and fitted by ability and good judgment to perform the duties of a Master in this important case.

"A NASTY QUESTION."

COMMISSIONER NORRELL is be congratulated. He has incurred the displeasure of the Salt Lake Tribune. He is treated to about a column and a half of vile abuse, because he has attached himself to the Democratic organization in this city, and has openly expressed his dissent from "Liberal" ring methods and the disfranchisement policy of its organ.

The gentleman's chief offense, however, appears to be, that during the delegate election campaign he asked "a nasty question" of the "Liberal" candidate, who was also editor of the Tribune. That "nasty question" was, "How do you stand on the Force bill?"

No doubt this was a "nasty question" to the candidate. An advocate of the Force bill when trying to get the votes of Democrats and others who considered that measure one of the most infamous things ever devised by any

party in the United States, would naturally feel that such a question at such a time was a very "nasty" one to answer.

But is there anything really nasty in the interrogation? If so, in what does the nastiness consist? If the force bill was a measure that could be defended and that was framed for the good of the country, why was there anything nasty in asking a candidate for election to Congress how he stood in relation to the bill? The pretended objection of the candidate to being interrogated about it is, that a Delegate from a Territory would have nothing to do with the Force bill. But even if that is true it does not make the query about it "a nasty question."

A Delegate from a Territory, however, might have something to do with a measure of that kind. He might speak in favor of it and use his influence for its passage, even if it did not directly affect his constituents. And voters opposed to the measure might consistently inquire as to the attitude of a candidate upon it, before deciding as to whether they would support him at the polls.

It could only be "a nasty question" because the candidate found it a difficult one to answer, when demanding the suffrages of people who saw in the bill a plan eminently fitted to harmonize with his own scheme for the disfranchisement of thousands of law-obeying citizens because they did not see through his distorted optics.

We are not acquainted with Mr. Norrell, but it appears he has not been a member of the "Liberal" party, and does not now propose to be whipped into its ranks by the scourge which, as he showed in his speech, has been such a terror to "free and independent" American citizens. He is not a "Liberal" officeholder, neither, and therefore need not pay any attention to the "Liberal" demand that such office-holders who are declaring themselves to be either Democrats or Republicans, shall at once resign their places.

It is refreshing to see that there are both Republicans and Democrats who have trained with the "Liberal" party, but are now taking their proper places, who do not intend to be lashed back into line, and who are indifferent as to the curses and libels of the "Liberal" organ. It shows they have some manhood and independence, and it will be duly appreciated by the majority of the people.

As to "nastiness," one has only to read the diatribe of the "Liberal" organ upon Commissioner Norrell to decide that, while the term does not and can not properly apply to his timely

question about the Force bill, it is a very appropriate word to designate the attack made upon him, in the ordinary language of the ring organ when it attempts to make an "argument." It is quite probable that the organ will have to face several more "nasty questions" before its cruel war of hate is over.

OWNS EVERYTHING IN SIGHT.

THE last purchase of the Chicago whisky trust amounts to something over a million. It includes Shufeldt's and the Calumet distilleries. Both concerns close out everything in the business. The monster swallows the real estate and outside appurtenances and belongings, and along with the balance will pass to the new proprietor the "good will" in the business. This snug little concern is now the absolute owner of every distillery in Chicago. According to a recent estimate of the output of the various establishments, the Shufeldt has a capacity of 51,000 bushels, producing 25,000 gallons of whisky per day, proof goods. The Calumet's capacity is 35,000 bushels, or 17,000 gallons a day. Before these last purchases the trust produced about 200,000 gallons a day. The other Chicago distilleries owned by the trust are the Phoenix, with a capacity of 3500 bushels, the United States, 2000; the Chicago, 2500; the Empire, 2000; the Riverdale, 2000; and the National, 2000. These do not represent half the property of the trust, although if necessary the Chicago plants could produce about one-third of the total product.

These last purchases put the trust in possession of about "everything in sight" in the whisky line, round about the great centre of vice, and like the rest of the big money absorbants of the republic, they are making this effort to be large for the sole purpose of "cheapening" the product of the manufacture with which they are concerned. For this assurance the public will be grateful, perhaps. But when along with this promise of cheap monopoly whisky they perceive the prospect of monopoly politics quite as cheap and nasty, their gratitude will be unspeakable.

Probably of all the corruption enterprises in the Union this whisky monster is the chief by many odds. It now practically runs Chicago, and the difference between running Chicago and running the United States is the difference between owning all the whisky of Chicago and owning all the whisky of the United States.

William Cullen Bryant, the American poet, died June 12, 1878.