

EDITORIALS.

THE DEBATE.

The Congressional Record of the 21st Inst. contains the debate that took place in the Senate the day previous, on Senator Call's resolution to print in the Record the memorial of the Utah constitutional convention, and accompanying documents. Senator Edmunds moved the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Territories, and urged that the contents of the memorial and accompanying documents should be examined into before they were ordered to be printed in the Record, intimating that language, disrespectful to Congress, might be contained in the papers. He so objected to the insertion of papers in the Record on account of the expense attending it.

Senator Call urged in reply, that the memorial contained nothing objectionable, that it related to a public matter, the admission of Utah, and gave a statement of the facts as they are regarded by the petitioners, who claimed to speak in behalf of 200,000 citizens of the United States. He said that it would be unjust to say in advance that what those citizens stated or wished was disrespectful to Congress, and to practically deny their right of petition. The objection was made, he declared, in the spirit of persecution, and he referred to intelligent men of both parties, who had visited Utah, as stating that not three per cent of the people of the Territory were guilty of the practices, upon the assumption of which the Senator from Vermont had based his objection.

Senator Paddock, by way of objection, urged that the resolution covered not only the memorial, but all the accompanying papers. Senator Call replied that it was not desired to encumber the Record with any voluminous publication, and that the constitution need not be included. To show that there was nothing objectionable in the memorial, he read it, and then remarked:

"Mr. President, I have read this memorial to show the insincerity of the objection which has been made by the Senator from Vermont to the printing of this memorial from 200,000 American citizens in the Record, as requested by them, to the end that they may have a hearing before the Congress and before the people of the United States.

The Senator from Vermont knew that there was nothing in this memorial disrespectful to Congress, and he knew that there was no reason in right or justice why the Senate of the United States should refuse to hear the petition of either one citizen, however poor or however erring, or of two hundred thousand citizens who have a right to be heard here, as much right as the Senator from Vermont or I have—a constitutional right to be heard in this body and before the American people. A solemnly guaranteed right not only to be heard, but to have secured to them, and to each of them, all of the rights, immunities and privileges which the Senator from Vermont has or which any other citizen of the United States has. A right of equality in all respects before the law, which the Senator, myself, and every other Senator have taken an oath to respect and defend and secure to them.

For one, I propose to respect and obey that oath, and not violate it either directly, or by evasion, or indirectly.

Mr. Edmunds.—Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much for his gratifying and complimentary allusions to me. They are worthy of him, and I trust I can bear them.

I certainly do not question the sincerity of the Senator from Florida, for he has stood behind this polygamous hierarchy every time they have had any interest to advance or any wholesome legislation to resist, so far as I now remember, at all times and with great ability and considerable zeal. So I can with equal sincerity give him the praise to which he is justly entitled of being absolutely sincere in standing by this body of persons through thick and thin, come good, come ill. I expect that he will continue to do so, and if in the process of time that Territory should become a State, and we could change the Constitution so that one person might be Senator from two States, I have no doubt that the Senator from Florida would be the first Senator that the Mormon hierarchy would select, as they ought to.

I am for the first time advised of the contents of this memorial.

There are a great many other papers, there are a great many answers to them in other papers that might be read, if I chose to evade the just rules of the Senate by spending the morning in reading counter statements, which would show the utter hypocrisy and gammon of this performance, a mere trick to get out from under the hand Congress and the laws of the United States, on a promise that when they become a sovereign and independent State, standing, as the Constitution requires when they come in that they shall stand, on an equal footing with every other State in the Union, and having the right, whatever may be in their constitution about changing it, to change it any time they please without the consent of Congress, and

not being bound by any compact that they may make in regard to their social institutions, as the Supreme Court in another case, or in more than one, perhaps, has long ago decided, respecting the equality of all new states admitted into the Union. I understand all that, and I trust everybody does; and, for one, I do not propose to be a party to spending the money of the people of the United States in printing in the Record for circulation among the people this sort of things.

Mr. Call.—Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is equally insincere, incorrect, and even frivolous in his statement that he has heard me stand behind the Mormon hierarchy and defend it. The Senator from Vermont has heard me stand behind human rights—the rights of women and children whom he was seeking to brand with a lifetime of sorrow and disgrace; he has heard me defend a patient and suffering anti-polygamous people when with the most exquisite cruelty he has sought to punish the poor innocent women and children in Utah by legislation which I regard as unconstitutional, unfeeling, inhuman, and subversive of the religion and precepts of the divine Teacher. But I am as far from sustaining the Mormon or any other hierarchy as is the Senator from Vermont; indeed, I am much farther, for I am in favor of religious tolerance. I am a believer in the power of Christ's religion and His preachers, and the Senator from Vermont does not seem to be so. A Senator may be a defender of religious liberty, in favor of tolerance, without being a persecutor and without being inhuman towards women and children.

That much the Senator from Vermont has heard from me, but he has never heard, and he never will hear me stand in this chamber to deny the rights of 200,000 citizens of the United States to whom he has sworn to give their constitutional rights. He has never heard me seek to prevent them from having a hearing, and he has never heard me advocate corrupt judicial tribunals or packed juries of the prostitution of the courts of justice and the laws of the land for the conviction even of criminals, much less of men and women who formed relations under peculiar religious beliefs of their own at a time when the right to make their own laws and regulate their own institutions had been guaranteed to them by treaty and expressly conferred upon them by act of Congress. He has never heard me advocate branding a whole generation of young men and women, native-born and adopted citizens, with a stigma by law, and to declare them unworthy of trust and confidence as citizens because their fathers and mothers are charged with what we regard as objectionable relations and heterodox and unsound religious opinions. The Senator from Vermont has not heard me advocate the seizure of the places of worship and the property of citizens of the United States because they call themselves the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and because a small number of them have been guilty of polygamy.

I have not expressed an opinion even as to how I should vote on this proposition, nor as to whether these people are or are not sincere. That is a question for future consideration and for evidence. I have, however, been informed by persons, Democrats and Republicans, as good as the Senator from Vermont or I, as fair in standing, as respectable in character, that the majority of these people, all but about 5 per cent, have never been polygamists; that more than a hundred thousand young women and men growing up, many of them now of age, who were educated in the public schools of that country, are opposed to polygamy and that the prevailing sentiment of the young population of Utah who have been educated as American citizens, who have the rights that I have and that the Senator from Vermont has, is opposed almost unanimously to the institution of polygamy, and that they have consented conscientiously to the legislation of Congress and have done all that they could to enforce it, and propose to make it, so far as they can do so, perpetual and irrevocable. By what right does the Senator from Vermont say here that this is a "sham and a pretense?" On what assumption of truth or reason does he pronounce the protestations of the young men and women of Utah that they are innocent and chaste and desirous of an anti-polygamy society and government a false pretense, sham, and a fraud.

How vain and idle the objection which the Senator from Vermont seeks to make here, and impose upon the people of this country, that by the law these men cannot trammel the state in its future legislation. Suppose that to be so, does that show that they are not sincere? Does that import that the very cruel legislation he himself has constantly forced on these people has had no effect? Why, Mr. President, these attempts to condemn these people in advance, to prejudice them in the public opinion, without a hearing, are idle and unworthy of the Senator from Vermont. They are not reasonable as a matter of logic and not true as a matter of fact.

Senator Stewart, of Nevada, here took part in the debate. He was opposed to printing the memorial in the Record. He charged that Utah was governed by a hierarchy, that neither freedom nor free schools existed in the Territory, and that "It is impossible for citizens of the United States to live

in any part of Utah outside of the towns where there is military protection." In a similar strain he continued to urge the unfitness of Utah for admission. His remarks were particularly conspicuous on account of the utter incorrectness of his statements.

Senator Call rejoined:

Mr. President, I deprecate any discussion in regard to what Utah is or is not. These people deny the statement of the Senator from Nevada. They have a right to be heard. They ask that proof be taken as to whether or not they are loyal people and sincere, as to whether they are hostile to the people of the United States or not. They ask the poor privilege of being heard and allowed to prove their true status, and not to be condemned in advance, without evidence, upon prejudice. That is the question upon which I have been speaking. That is the motion which I have made. I am defending, sir, the right of an American citizen to a fair trial and to a fair hearing, and that he shall not be condemned in the Congress of the United States without a hearing and without proof.

They deny all the statements of the Senator from Nevada, and I have heard them denied, as I said before, by republicans of the highest intelligence and by democrats within the last few days. In regard to these facts I have not expressed any opinion of my own. If the Senator from Nevada is right, then it becomes simply a question whether we have the constitutional power and right to deny the principles of the government and the great position upon which all our institutions rest, whether public opinion under our institutions and our government is the true and safe basis of local self-government, or whether a central and concentrated authority in the hands of a small number of persons shall prescribe the domestic institutions and the religion of a people—an anti-Mormon hierarchy of which the Senator from Vermont shall be the high priest and apostle, to make war upon and suppress the Mormon hierarchy with fire and sword—or whether we shall rely on the principles of our government and the presumed power of Christ's religion and His ministers to accomplish the result.

I have not expressed an opinion even on this subject. I will agree with the Senator that, as a matter of expediency, if what he says is true these people are not like other American citizens; but if what they say is true, and what other citizens of the United States of character and consideration say, and what people from Europe who have testified on this subject say is true, then the Senator from Nevada is wrong. He is condemning these people upon facts which do not exist, and denying to them virtues and qualities which they possess. This he denies to them without a hearing and without proof, and he asks that they shall not have the rights of American citizens on this judgment in advance.

Senator Platt, of Connecticut, here took part in the debate, objecting to the publication in the Record of the documents under discussion, upon technical grounds. He made no remarks bearing on the merits of Utah's claim for admission.

In reply to a question from Senator Harris, the presiding officer stated that the pending question now was the reference of Senator Call's resolution to the Committee on Territories. Senator Harris observed that the memorial would necessarily appear in the Record, having been read.

Senator Paddock, of Nebraska, now joined in the debate, by observing:

Mr. President, I do not propose at this stage of the session to embark in any discussion of this question of the application of Utah for admission into the Union. I desire simply to correct a statement or two made by the Senator from Florida.

The Senator said that this memorial comes from 200,000 people of the Territory of Utah. That is a mistake. The whole population of the Territory of Utah is 200,000. The Mormons of all kinds are about 140,000. The remainder are what are known as Gentiles. They are not Mormons at all; nor did any of them in any way participate in the concoction or presentation here of this State scheme.

Then, as to the Mormons of all kinds, my friend says that only 3 per cent of the gentlemen who present this memorial here are polygamists. I assert that there are not 3 per cent who are not polygamists so far as the endorsement of the doctrine of polygamy is concerned. There are a good many who, under the circumstances of their situation, have not gone into polygamy; but there are not, in my opinion, and I speak with the confidence of an intimate knowledge of the situation in Utah, 3 per cent of all those who stand behind this petition for the admission of Utah as a State into the Union who do not believe that polygamy is the result of a divine revelation and that it is their duty to maintain it. While they may not have gone into polygamy themselves, they have aided and abetted others who have gone into it, and aided and abetted in maintaining the institution itself against the law and the prosecution of offenses under the law. Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read a passage from the last annual report of the Utah Commission, which I send to the desk.

The Secretary read the excerpt, in which the Utah Commission predicted the results that would, as they put it, follow the admission of Utah, and re-

ferred to the address adopted by the mass meeting held in this city May 3d, 1885, protesting against the assault then lately inaugurated, upon the rights and religion of the people of Utah and neighboring territories. Senator Paddock followed the reading of this extract by some remarks in which he declared, in effect, that the move to secure the admission of Utah was instigated by the leaders of the "Mormon" people, in the hope that the latter might escape from the control of the Federal government, and, with the sovereign power of a state in their own hands, circumvent the national authority and nullify the laws relating to polygamy, to the end that the latter might be perpetuated.

Senator Blair moved that the resolution lie on the table, but withdrew the motion long enough to allow Senator Call to say:

The Senator from Nebraska said that I had stated there were only 3 per cent of Mormons who were practically polygamists. I wish to say that I said nothing of that kind. I have stated anything or any opinion on this subject. I do not know anything about the facts. I have stated what these people state, and what other credible persons state, and I have asked permission for them to prove this before the Senate. They say that there is not over 3 per cent in the Territory of the whole population who have ever been polygamists, and they ask permission to prove that fact. I will not say whether that is the same or a greater proportion than may be found among other communities—Vermont or Nebraska, or other states. I have no doubt that our people in all the states are very much alike, and that there is, perhaps, as large a proportion of immorality in this respect as three per cent in many of our communities.

I am opposed to polygamy. I am opposed to all forms of superstition, whether it be called religion or not. I believe in the old evangelic churches, the Baptists, Methodists, Catholics, Presbyterians, and others. I do venerate their teachings and respect and honor their ministers. I do not profess to know anything about the condition of things in Utah of my own knowledge. I have made no statement of it, and I make none here. I stated what was the opinion and statement of men of character and intelligence upon this subject. I do not think any one believes that if 200,000 men and women of Connecticut were to ask that any petition of theirs should be printed in the Record that we should hear the Senator from Connecticut arguing that they were not a sect, and that there was no rule of the Senate for it. This is hair-splitting of the worst kind.

Now, Mr. President, this memorial having been read, and not desiring to provoke any further contention of the matter, I will withdraw the resolution.

The following proposition.—The resolution will be considered as withdrawn if there be no objection.

The proposition being withdrawn, the debate which it occasioned closed.

THE GREAT STRIKE.

This time it is the Reading Railroad of Pennsylvania that is made to feel the pressure which dissatisfied men working for their living sometimes precipitate upon their employers. A great force employed by that company, with a large number who are tributary to it in various ways, have left their posts and left the company in that uncomfortable situation known as a tie-up. Those who read the details will be apt to say that the strikers are nearer right than the employers are, and that there is little if anything that is unreasonable or unjustifiable in their demands—a position which does not always exist in such cases. It remains to be seen, however, whether they will keep the right on their side, a line of conduct which is only secured by fully observing the law and observing the rights of the company with respect to its property. Already it has begun filling the strikers' places, and the announcement is made of one or two trains having started out; it is the duty of the strikers to let them run without let or hindrance, or assistance either, on their own part, and to contribute in no way toward the annoyance, embarrassments, shortcomings, and perhaps disasters, to which the road will be subjected through the absence of their experienced and superior help and the substitution of raw and undisciplined labor. To refrain from anything that savors of lawlessness will command for the strikers the respect of all and perhaps the substantial support of many, but in any event, they will be doing right and the consequences for whatever takes place that is wrong can not be laid at their doors.

This incident gives fresh impetus to the labor agitation, and will cause a great many whose trend of thought is occasionally in the direction of social economy to wonder why it is that the great bulk of our population and the most useful part of it, reasonably educated and fairly intelligent, is on so many occasions defeated in a skirmish with capital, the holders of which stand as about one to twenty against those who draw it from them in salaries. Herein is the chief difficulty: The agitations

are simply agitations, having no organized laceration, direct movement or attainable object. They amount to no more than the disturbance of the bottom of a pond; the water is opaque for a while, but the sediment soon settles when the disturbance ceases, and the natural state of things resumes its wonted sway. The capitalists are more systematic in their methods and united in their purposes, and as a result they are more successful in their workings. Occasionally those who revolt against the rules established by them prevail, but not often; such an instance is a very rare exception to the rule.

The contest of money against muscle should cease to be a contest and be a co-operative movement. To be continually associated with those whom we distrust and are suspicious of and taking advantage of every opportunity to cause them annoyance, injury and loss, is to weaken energy and effectiveness on one side and cause immeasurable outlay that ought to be doing service to those who need it; yet that is about the situation as it stands all along the line. Statesmanship has been appealed to and has in a feeble sort of way applied weak and uncertain remedies now and then; but even if it had done its best, we question if things would have been brought to a proper condition, so that employers would not grind down and oppress and employees would render a dollar's worth of service for a dollar and be ever on the alert for the preservation and furtherance of their employer's interest as well as their own. It takes a better understanding and more determined good will on both sides to bring about with certainty such a semi-Utopia as that condition of things would constitute.

Since the foregoing was in type, the announcement comes that the road has consented to submit the questions at issue to arbitration, which is very fortunate. In consideration of this, all trials will be run as usual and all hands, except a few who expressly disavowed the company's orders, will be retained. As this is all the employees asked for, the result amounts to mutual satisfaction without sacrificing the interests of either.

SCHOOL MATTERS.

We are in receipt of the following communication from Edward J. Arthur, dated St. John, Tooele County, Dec. 19th, 1887:

"In your last issue of the SEMI-WEEKLY NEWS, I notice some very valuable answers to some pertinent questions in relation to school matters. Such information is a great help in country places from time to time, to keep voters as well as school trustees straight.

Please answer the following questions; your replies may be of some use to others as well as myself:

1. Would it be legal for registered voters to elect an unregistered person for school trustee, when said person had a chance to register but refused?
2. A special school tax for repairing and seating a school house, and for other incidental expenses, is being levied. In the district in which this is being done, resides the owner of a flock of sheep, which have been assessed in another county for county and territorial taxes, but not for a special school tax. Is the owner of the sheep exempt from paying the special school tax on them in the district in which he resides, and in which the sheep remain most of the time?"

In answer to the first query, we will state that a school trustee must be a registered voter. In his second question our correspondent has touched upon a subject of considerable importance, in which many taxpayers are interested, and concerning which erroneous views are liable to be entertained. An act of the legislature approved February 10th, 1880 provides:

"Sec. 1. That where bands of horses or mules, or both, and herds of cattle, or sheep, are wintered in one county, and taken into another county to summer, the taxes on said stock shall be assessable in either county, and the county court of the county where such assessment and collection may have been made, shall cause to be remitted to the county treasurer of such other county one-half of the county taxes so collected, after deducting therefrom the percentage allowed in such county for assessing and collecting said taxes, upon application therefor by the county court of such other county so interested."

This Act repeals the former law relative to taxes on transitory stock, and is the law at the present time. It will be noticed, however, that it relates to county and territorial, and not to school taxes, except incidentally, as will be shown further on.

Territorial School Commissioner Williams has caused to be prepared and extensively circulated, a compilation of the school law of 1884, and the amendments thereto, adopted in 1886, numbering consecutively the sections of the law as thus compiled. The result shows incongruities in the statute which can be reconciled only on the principle that the latest legislation will be held to apply.

The first part of section 4 is as follows:

"Whenever it shall be necessary to raise funds to purchase, build, repair or furnish schoolhouses, or for other