

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - JULY 27, 1887.

## PEOPLE'S TICKET.

## GENERAL ELECTION,

Monday, August 1st, 1887.

## TERRITORIAL OFFICERS.

For Commissioners to Locate University  
Lands:FREDERICK A. MITCHELL,  
ISAAC M. WADDELL,  
RICHARD A. BALLANTYNE.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

## COUNCIL.

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

## HOUSE.

First District.....ELIAS S. KIMBALL,  
Meadowville.  
Second District.....JOSEPH HOWELL,  
Webbville.  
Third District.....NICHOLAS JONES,  
Bridgman City.  
Fourth District.....CHAS. C. RICHARDS,  
Ogden.  
Fifth District.....NATHL MONTGOMERY,  
North Ogden.  
Sixth District.....THOS. F. ROUCHE,  
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,  
Muir Creek.  
Fifteenth District.....WILLIAM GREENE,  
Spanish Fork.  
Sixteenth District.....S. H. THURMAN,  
Provo.  
Seventeenth District.....LYMAN S. WOOD,  
Springville.  
Eighteenth District.....ABRAM HATCH,  
Heber City.  
Nineteenth District.....WM. H. KING,  
Fillmore.  
Twentieth District.....A. H. LUND,  
Mount Pleasant.  
Twenty-first District.....WM. H. SEEGMILLER,  
Richfield.  
Twenty-second District.....P. T. FARNSWORTH,  
Beaver.  
Twenty-third District.....R. W. HEYBOURNE,  
Cedar City.  
Twenty-fourth District.....WM. F. STEWART,  
Kanab.

## SALT LAKE COUNTY.

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

## THE PREVAILING QUESTION.

THE letter of George Ticknor Curtis to the New York Evening Post, which we copy in full to-day, squarely meets the most prominent objections to the admission of Utah as a State in the Union which have been made by journals of reputation and influence in the country. One of these objections is that the promoters of the Statehood movement are not sincere, and another is that unless the "Mormon" Church takes ecclesiastical action in the matter and renounces an obnoxious tenet, Utah cannot be admitted as a State. These points Mr. Curtis meets frankly and fully and turns them aside with arguments that are irrefutable.

All the presumptions are legally and substantially against the conjecture that the framers of the Utah Constitution are not sincere. The Congress of the United States, which is the body to receive or reject that instrument, cannot set up the groundless assumption

that the people of Utah who have undertaken this work do not mean what they say. Such conjecture is not warranted by any facts. It is not consistent with the theory of law in reference to presumptions but is in complete opposition to it.

These people are those who have not violated any law of Congress in reference to bigamy and polygamy. They have, moreover, taken the oath prescribed by Congress concerning their future conduct. They are the majority of the voting citizens. They have formulated provisions in the Constitution which fully meet the demands that have been made by the press and by the statesmen who have rationally discussed the question, and have surrounded those provisions with safeguards which could be urged as to their permanence and perpetuity. What more could they do? Will the New York Post or some of those eastern editors who take similar ground to that of the Post answer that simple question?

It must be admitted that the people who have taken this work in hand have done all that any reasonable person could ask. But the Post and other papers say "the Mormon Church must renounce polygamy." What has that to do with the action of the legal voters of Utah Territory? The Constitutional Convention had no power over the Church. The Congress of the United States has no right or power to dictate terms to the Church. This is not a Church question. And those editors who attempt to make it such, simply try to dodge the direct issue. They cannot ask more of the citizens who have framed the Constitution, and so they turn to another and different question and assail the "Mormon" Church which is not in the present controversy.

Here are the majority of the registered voters of Utah, as citizens of the United States, asking for their political rights and privileges and making such arrangements as fully meet the public demand that has been made as a special condition to Statehood. That is the situation. No one has the right to ask what Church they belong to, and there is no reason in assuming what any Church will or will not do in reference to the matter. Congress can only in reason, on precedent, in fairness and consistency determine whether the Constitution which has been framed is republican in form and meets the special political requirement that special conditions have seemed to demand. It cannot impose conditions upon a Church, nor raise objections as to the belief or disbelief of citizens asking simply for political rights and privileges under the national Constitution.

The Post, attempting to reply to Mr. Curtis, thus evades the question: "His instance of a Territory full of Roman Catholics who should not be admitted to the Union unless their church should first by some formal act condemn the practice of privately confessing sins to a priest, is strangely out of line. Rather should he suppose a Territory full of Roman Catholics who affirmed that they had a Divine law commanding them to kill heretics, and who, in consequence of belief in that law, did freely murder Protestants."

The argument of Mr. Curtis put in the strong words and striking manner peculiar to his legal mind and cultured style, was in substance this: Auricular confession is denounced by Protestants as immoral and pernicious. If a Territory composed chiefly of Catholics was denied admission into the Union until confessing to priests was abolished, there would be "thunder in the political sky." The Post sees the pertinence of the comparison and hastens to hide it by substituting something that has no parallel with the main question. The argument of Mr. Curtis is not "out of line." Mormon polygamy is objected to as immoral, so is Catholic "confession." Whether viewed as doctrines or practices Mr. Curtis' comparison of the two for the purposes of the argument is complete. But there is no similarity between polygamy and murder. One produces and promotes life, the other destroys it. One invades no natural or acquired rights, the other, crushes out both. One is not forbidden by natural or divine law, the other is condemned by both. One is *namus prohibitus* in certain sections of human society, the other is *namus in se* universal and everlasting. It is the reasoning of the Post that is altogether "out of line."

The argument of the Post is disingenuousness, too, in assuming a condition of affairs that does not exist. It ignores the fact that the voters of Utah who are agitating the Statehood question are law-abiding citizens in every sense of the word, and reasons on the false basis that they are polygamists who are to be judges of their own offences and executors of the law against themselves. This distortion of the facts is in itself strong witness of the weakness of the cause which the Post is vainly attempting to hold up.

Finally the Post meets the provision that the anti-polygamy section of the Constitution shall not be amended without the consent of Congress, with the tremendous objection, "we do not believe any such bargain will stand." Prodigious! What the Post may believe or assume on that point has nothing to do with the rights of the people, nor the duty of Congress. The people may place restrictions on themselves, in

their own volition, that Congress would have no power to impose. That is the strength of the Utah position on that question.

And there is no "bargain" in the transaction. The Post is begging the question again. It takes at least two parties to make a "bargain." This is a simple provision made by the people themselves, and there is no equivalent offered or required by way of a bargain. The Post elegantly calls it a "bargain," we do not think the argument, if such it may be called, will "carry." Mr. Curtis has given the Post more than it can hold up under and much more than it can cover with its sophistical shadow.

## CONVENTION DOINGS AND "MORMON" PROSELYTING.

WE notice that a number of papers, in discussing the question of Utah's admission into the Union as a State, compare the action of the Constitutional Convention on the subject of polygamy with the missionary work now going on in the Southern States and other places. What relation these totally different things have to each other is not perceptible to the common mind. It takes the warped imagination of an anti-"Mormon" editor to bring them into any kind of connection.

The Elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have a mission to perform which reaches to every part of the world. It is to preach "the Gospel of the kingdom as a witness to all nations" before "the end" comes. They expect to fill the obligations of this mission, no matter what happens. And they have an indisputable right to proclaim the truth as they understand it wherever people are willing to listen to them. They do not propose to use compulsion in any form, nor will any degree of force prevent them from doing what they conceive to be their duty.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention met in a political capacity to perform a political duty for which they had been selected by the citizens. Their religious views had nothing to do with their work. It does not matter whether they were "Mormons," Methodists, Catholics, Episcopalians, Quakers, Jews or Infidels. Neither the government nor the nation has any right to raise questions as to their faith. It is no business of the press. The Constitution they have framed must be criticised, if at all, solely on its merits.

But it will be said, the Convention made provisions against bigamy and polygamy, and it will be asked, do not "Mormon" missionaries preach polygamy? The statement is correct, the question is based on a fallacy. The Elders of this Church are not abroad in the world preaching polygamy. They are not sent for that purpose. As a matter of fact they do not attempt to make proselytes on that ground. "Mormonism," in the mind of the average newspaper man, means polygamy and vice versa. This is a mark of ignorance on the subject so profound that it seems useless to try to reach it by fact or reason.

Let it be repeated, until the idea penetrates the fog with which the press is enveloped on the "Mormon" question, that the people of Utah who have this Statehood movement in hand are men who have not broken the laws in regard to polygamy, and have all taken the oath to obey in future the laws that they have kept in the past. They hold the political power. The polygamists are all disfranchised. The men who framed the Constitution and those who will vote upon it are citizens of the United States who have the right to struggle for their full liberties under the Constitution and the laws which they have observed, and they are endeavoring to do so in the way that has been pointed out as their only path to Statehood.

What the Elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are doing abroad or in the States has nothing to do with this movement. It has no relationship to it. But if any connection could be made out, the truth is that the Elders are not engaged in any such work as is alleged, but are preaching faith in Christ, repentance of evil, baptism for the remission of sins, the laying on of hands to impart the Holy Ghost, and the gathering of the Saints preparatory to the second advent of the Savior.

And it may as well be understood, first as last, that no matter what political, social or religious changes may take place in Utah or elsewhere, the warning voice of the Elders of this Church will be raised until all nations have heard it and all people have had an opportunity of learning the glad tidings of the latter-day gospel revealed from heaven anew. But the question that is now agitating the country, consequent upon the action of the Constitutional Convention of Utah, has no essential bearing upon that missionary work and will not affect it one way or another. One is a political, the other a religious movement, and neither will affect the other in the least degree.

Those editors who have been charging the "Mormons" with mingling religion and politics till they could not be distinguished, are involving themselves in their own muddle, and doing that of which they have continually accused their neighbors. A great many "beams" will have to be taken from the eyes of some members of the

press before they will be able to see straight enough to take a square look at the supposed motives in the eyes of the "Mormons."

## THE PRANKS OF THE "LIBERALS."

THE permanent residents of Utah who have resided here for any length of time, must be highly amused at the pranks played by the motley crowd who elect the "Liberals." Never was a title so grotesquely and inaptly adopted by any organization under the sun. The object of its members is the oppression and political destruction of the large majority of their fellow citizens. Bogus Democrats and oleomargarine Republicans mingle in an attempt to crush out both democratic and republican principles and institutions in the locality where they live, for no other reason than that they are in the minority and therefore cannot rule.

Every person who, though part of that minority and desirous of a change in local management, does not bow to the dictates of "Liberal" leaders, jump into line at the crack of the "Liberal" whip, and promptly hand out cash at the "Liberal" demand, is booted and spit upon, and cursed and derided, until coerced into abject submission or cast out for "Liberal" assault under the fearful title of "Jack Mormon." One of the chief "Liberal" charges against the majority is that they are united in politics, and yet anything that savors of independence in "Liberal" ranks, or tends to the slightest division, is howled down with insensate fury, and the most virulent abuse is heaped upon those who suggest anything counter to the plans of the dominant members. If workmen refuse to pay up the half-dollar monthly tax imposed by the "Liberal" League, schemes are devised to prevent their employment and deprive them and their families of daily bread. It is a very "Liberal" organization indeed.

Some time ago a coaxing call was issued to the young men of Utah to come out from the majority and be independent, form a party of their own and "assert their manhood." This took effect in a small degree, and some persons calling themselves the "Young Democracy" foolishly imagined that the "Liberal" inducement meant what it said. They have found out to their chagrin that it really meant repudiation of the advice of the People's Party and the decisions of its majorities, for the grinding tyranny and absolute dominion of professed "Liberal" leaders, and the compulsory endorsement by Democrats of the utterances of a radical Republican organ. They dropped the substance of liberty and hid at the shadow, with the natural result. They are now out and injured and disgusted both with their pretended deliverers and their own fatuity.

Young men of "Mormon" parentage who were deluded by the invitations of this bogus "Liberal" concern, and who expected that encouragement and preferment which were held out as baits for their deception, have learned to their sorrow that they have been caught like gudgeons upon "Liberal" hooks, and their defection from the stream of the principles of their fathers has been taken advantage of to abuse and deride them. "Young Utah," so often appealed to by these "Liberal" cunning and cruel anglers and betrayers, ought to jump at their baits and be blind to their snares, should they not?

Of course this "Liberal" cabal is opposed to Utah's admission into the Union as a State. Political freedom is the last thing that they would approve. Their idea of liberty is the complete enslavement of the majority by the minority—because they are the minority. If Utah could go into the Union with their control of the affairs of State, with their hands ready to dip into the treasury, with their henchmen to occupy the offices, no Territory would have such powerful claims on the Congress for favorable consideration. But now, Statehood under the terms proposed would signify the rule of the majority which would be the defeat of their kind of "Liberalism."

What the State would be under their control was foreshadowed by the fate of Tooele County, which once was unfortunate enough to succumb to their dominion. Plunder and corruption rode rampant over the people, and fraud permeated the local government. The county scrip which was at par when the Liberals gained possession, was refused at fifteen cents on the dollar when they were ousted by a determined and united popular uprising. One taste of "Liberal" medicine is caution enough for the whole Territory for a lifetime. Only by chicanery and fraud was Tooele captured; only by similar "Liberal" methods can Utah be overthrown. They know that; but thank heaven, so do the people.

For years these "Liberals" have invited the monogamous portion of the "Mormon" people to take a stand similar to that which has been taken by the Constitutional Convention. Now they are vehemently opposed to it. Why? Because their invitation was a sham and a pretence, and their cry against polygamy was a mockery. It was their great hobby. Without it they would have nothing upon which to predicate their howlings for place and power. Let it once be seen and known that the "Mormons" are not

what they have been represented to be; let the majority of the citizens, who have never violated the law, gain the political rights to which they are entitled and the occupation of their defamers will be gone.

"Liberal" opposition to Statehood means a last desperate grasp at rule for the minority and a vicious spurt to prevent rule by the majority. It is to be conducted abroad on the "Liberal" tactics of falsehood and vituperation, by press and telegraph and hirelings at the seat of government. At home all "Liberals" are to be ordered not to vote for or against the Constitution. Every Democrat who claims the right to act like a Democrat, and every Republican who wants to stand as a Republican, is to be whipped into line or blackguarded out of the ranks. He must be a "Liberal" with the most ultra illiberal motives, designs and deeds, or he is to be treated as a traitor and an outcast.

The effect of this will be, we have no doubt, that many who would have voted the so-called "Liberal" ticket will refrain from doing so because of "Liberal" tyranny and abuse, and if they do not vote for the People's candidates will at least support the Constitution, as a means for obtaining that political liberty for Utah's citizens which they ought of right to enjoy, and which it is the aim of these coercive, vindictive, false and tyrannical "Liberals" if possible to prevent. At any rate the masses of the voters will see what they ought to do by learning what these precious "Liberals" are so terribly afraid of. "Liberal" hostility should be a sign to the People.

## A BRIGHT MORNING LUMINARY.

THE people of the Junction City are to be congratulated upon the publication in their interests of a live, vigorous and well conducted morning newspaper. The Ogden Herald has for some time past exhibited considerable talent in its editorial columns and general make up, and now that it has walked up to "the top of the morning" it is still further improved in its appearance and contents. The forcible and pungent articles which have lately appeared in its columns, and which lose none of their brightness by coming out in the morning instead of the evening, it appears are from the pen of Frank J. Cannon, whose name now appears as editor.

Very wisely and consistently the Ogden Herald devotes its main strength and ability to matters of local interest, giving them the precedence while not neglecting general news. We notice that the business men of the city, of all classes, are availing themselves of the opportunities afforded them of advertising their claims to public patronage, thus sustaining a journal which can do them incalculable good while they place themselves before the public in the best possible manner. They are wise in their generation. It is sound commercial policy to build up and encourage home journalism.

We wish our Ogden contemporary increased usefulness and prosperity. If the people of Weber County do not fully sustain a paper devoted to their interests which shows so much talent and enterprise, they will not exhibit a very high regard for their own welfare or appreciation of native talent and energy.

Success to you, friend Herald, and as you are of necessity the advocate of the material interests of all sections of the community where your light chiefly shines, may they all unite, in mutual forbearance of minor differences, to supply the oil which is necessary to your permanent and increasing illumination!

## DISGRACEFUL DOINGS.

BECAUSE the United States obtained its common law, its criminal procedure and its parliamentary tactics from England, it can scarcely be said that it borrowed one feature of legislative conduct from the mother country—the practice of resorting to blackmail and the most low-lived behavior over personal disputes in public positions. The upper branch of the legislative department of almost any nation is measurably free from such exhibitions, they finding favor among those who are nearest the people and freshest from them; so that the British House of Lords and our Senate are nearly always pretty respectable bodies; but the House of Commons at times seems desirous of throwing an anarchist picnic very much in the shade. In our House of Representatives there are occasionally personal tilts and debates more or less flavored with acrimony; but there is a line beyond which these are not permitted to be carried, and when that is crossed the offender is hustled back to where he belongs accompanied by a very sharp rebuke from the chair, sometimes a formal censure when it is too aggravated, and this ends it; but the Commons—well, such things as have been said and such