DESERET NEWS
WEEKLY.
TRUTH AND LIBERTY.
WEDNESDAY, - Nov. 1, 1876.

People's Ticket!

FOR DELEGATE
TO
CONGRESS,
GEO. Q. CANNON.

THEIR UTTER LACK OF PRINCIPLE.

In all the movements of those who compose or sustain the narrow ring of persons who are opposed to the interests of the people of this Territory, one thing is ever conspicuously patent—their utter lack of principle. They are absolutely recreant to the fundamental principles of American government, statesmanship, or politics. Perhaps we ought to except the latter, if understood in its very modern meaning in this country, which is, struggle for the spoils. It does not matter a bit to these ring people what they are known as, so long as there is hope of their obtaining their nefarious ends. They are everything by turns, and nothing long, except the same unscrupulous characters as they always were, at least since their connection with the ring. They will be republican or democratic, Grant or anti-Grant, conservative or radical, liberal or anti-liberal, anything or nothing, but they are recreant to all, with the proviso that they are always "loyal," intensely "loyal," which, in the peculiar ring vocabulary, means *dead set after* the money. O they are stupendously "loyal," they are! They monopolize the "loyalty," they do indeed! By hook or by crook they mean to have all the "loyalty" possible, that is, all the money getatable. The taxes they are particularly hungry for, and even rave about stealing them before they are paid. O what "loyal" people they are, to be sure!

One fundamental American principle is that all men are created equal. This the ringites trample in the mire.

Another fundamental American principle is that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. This the ringites trample in the mire.

Another fundamental American principle is that to secure these just rights governments are instituted among men. This the ringites trample in the mire.

Another fundamental American principle is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This the ringites trample in the mire.

Another fundamental American principle is that the majority shall rule in accordance with the above principles. This the ringites trample doubly in the mire. They are opposed to the majority ruling, when they, the ringites, are not in the majority, and they are opposed to the above principles when not favoring their ambitious schemes.

In doing despite to all these acknowledged fundamental principles of American government, the ringites prove that they are neither republican nor democratic. They are not liberal, but exceedingly illiberal. They are not so liberal as monarchists, but are extremely despotic, more despotic than the accepted despots of the old world.

They are notably in the minority, yet would they rule, and rule arbitrarily, over the majority.

They would have a delegate sent to Congress to represent the unscrupulous minority, and misrepresent the respectable and overwhelming majority.

They would have all officials, local and Federal, chosen from the minority, to rule over the majority.

They would deny the majority the rights of naturalization.

They would deny the majority the rights of citizenship.

They would have the majority tried before juries composed exclusively of persons from the minority.

They would have the majority pay all the taxes, and the minority steal and spend them.

They would have the minority vote early and often, and the majority be deprived of the right to vote at all.

They would have the majority exemplarily punished, by law if it could conveniently be, but without law if it could not be done with.

They would have the majority sent to the penitentiary and their property sequestrated and confiscated for the benefit of the minority, "assessed for campaign purposes."

They would do all this and much more, always and in each, every, and all cases providing that they, the ringites themselves, were the minority, which they are notoriously at present, and are likely to be, thank heaven.

That the ringites do or would do all these vile things is plainly manifest by their constant proceedings, their misrepresentations and lies, their slanders and libels, their browbeatings of officials, their shameful abuse of respected citizens and of all who do not aid and abet the ringite conspiracies, their continual attempts to violently twist the law and influence the courts to swerve from the line of impartiality and right, their ceaseless attempts to obtain from Congress special and proscriptive legislation, their corrupt actions of divers kinds, and their unscrupulous and rascally conduct in general.

What competent term can be applied to these ringite characters? They are certainly not American in any true sense of the word. They are an abnormal growth, that should be judiciously pruned from the body politic, an unsightly wen, defying all laws of symmetrical contour, a loathsome ulcer, eating its sickening and corrupting way into the political corporeality.

Such are the ringites beyond controversy, as demonstrated by their own outrageous record. They are the enemies of God and man incontestably. Who would vote for them, or for their candidate? Nobody who has the slightest love for his country, for his fellowman. Nobody who possesses the faintest scintilla of self-respect.

WHO ARE LEGAL VOTERS IN UTAH?

MALE citizens of the United States, above the age of 21 years, who have resided in the Territory six months previous to the election, and who are tax-payers in the Territory.

Female citizens who are above the age of 21 years, and have resided in the Territory six months next preceding any general or special election. They are not required by law to be tax-payers.

Persons in the United States navy, whose permanent domiciles for six months have been in the Territory, who have been constant residents of the Territory during six months next preceding the election, and who are tax-payers in the Territory.

Persons in or subject to the United States army, whose homes and places of residence were in the Territory at the time they engaged in the service, who have been constant residents in the Territory durthe six months next preceding the election, and who are tax-payers in the Territory.

Thus all voters, male and female, must be citizens of the United States, over 21 years of age, resident in the Territory six months next preceding the election.

All male voters must be tax-payers in the Territory.

The following persons are citizens, unless they have forfeited their citizenship for cause—

All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, Indians not taxed excluded.

Children, born out of the United States, whose fathers were citizens at the time of the birth of the children, unless the fathers never resided in the United States.

Women married to citizens, which women themselves might lawfully be naturalized.

Alien men and women who have been naturalized.

Local and Other Matters.

FROM THURSDAY'S DAILY, OCT. 26.

Sequestration.—This is a word which, to the studious mind, involuntarily calls up the customs and usuages of the medieval periods of the world's history, when, under the feudal laws then prevailing, titled nobles of means took possession and devasted, for no other reasons, frequently, than their caprice so moving them and that they could do so without interference. Many things, in fact a majority of the prevailing customs of the legal world to-day, have descended from this period; some are objectionable, and some pernicious; but, as they have been handed down in gross and the process of separating the good from the bad is necessarily slow, some time may elapse before the common law becomes purged of all its obnoxious features with nothing but what is best calculated for the equalizing and regulating of social conditions left behind. Each succeeding age obliterates some distinctively erroneous idea of former ages, and curtails the mischievous effects of others; while again, some measures are comparatively unchanged because they answer a certain purpose in certain emergencies, and the enlightenment and advancement of the humanity of this period have not discovered or invented anything in the nature of a substitute to apply to such exigencies, and this is doubtless the case with the process of sequestration. That it is an extraordinary remedy, must certainly be admitted by all; that it should never be invoked so long as other means can by any possibility be adopted, is a natural sequence of the foregoing proposition; and that when a resort to it is inevitable, it should be handled carefully and surrounded with every available safeguard, is the only logical and rational conclusion.

The definition of the word in law and in common lauguage are about the same. Bouvier defines it as being "a writ of commission, sometimes directed to the sheriff, but most usually to four or more commissioners of the complainant's own nomination, authorizing them to enter upon the real or personal estate of the defendant, and to take the rents, issues and profits into their own hands, and keep possession of, or pay the same, as the Court shall order and direct, until the party who is in contempt shall do that which he is enjoined to do," &c. But this is not to be construed as a recommendation or support of the proposition that in *every* case wherein a supposed contempt is committed, this is to be the remedy even as a last resort; for the author, being a Frenchman, bases the most of his definitions and conclusions upon the French practice, which is so hedged in by safeguards in the *Code Napoleon* that it requires the pressure of a great and urgent extremity to justify a plaintiff in making use of it. For instance, a bond must be executed, in such sum as the Court may determine, in all cases ample to cover any possible or consequential damages which the defendant may sustain, and by which he may be made whole, should the writ subsequently be vacated; the plaintiff also agrees not to remove the property sequestrated out of the jurisdiction of the Court; and the officer in charge is required to see that no other use or disposition is made of the property than such as is ordered by the Court—all of which tends to show that, so far from being a means of ready redress, sequestration is a very remote remedy, and should never be resorted to or allowed except ample preparations be made for such full and prompt reparation as its abuse may demand.

Having reference to the recent order of sequestration issued by Judge Schaeffer against the property of President Young, wherein his Honor adjudged that an officer, *without giving bonds*, should seize upon and sell the property of the defendant to satisfy a previous rule of court, we are decidedly of the opinion that, to put it in the mildest form, a glaring error has been made and that many of the recognized rules pertaining to this equitable remedy have been palpably ignored. If the court found itself in such a position in the case referred to as required the exercise of this extra-judicial measure, the same equity which authorizes its use prescribes the manner in which it shall be executed. A writ of sequestration "does not *change the title or create any lien upon the property* (and yet Judge Schaefer orders it sold), its purpose in this respect being rather like that of an injunction *pendente lite*, to preserve the subject matter until the rights of all parties can be judicially determined."—High on Receivers, p. 6. In President Young's case, however, there is no such provision made; nothing that is seized upon is to abide a judicial determination; instead, the property must be peremptorily disposed of and without, so far as the court issuing the order is concerned, the possibility of redemption or recovery of damages.

Further on the same author says—"It follows, therefore, from the peculiar nature of the remedy as thus shown, as well as from the fact that the Court must often act before the merits of the controversy have been fully developed, and when the parties in interest are not all before the Court, that it proceeds with extreme caution, in order to avoid any unnecessary disturbance of legal rights or equitable priorities." Had the merits of this controversy been "fully developed?" Evidently the defendant's attorneys thought not; for they announced to the Court that an appeal had been perfected, in order that the Supreme Court might determine the merits by review.

All the recent proceedings in the case of Young *vs.* Young have hinged upon the alleged contempt of the defendant, in not paying over the temporary alimony awarded. An execution was issued and the defendant's property levied upon; this being contrary to all law and practice, it was quietly smothered; the next proceeding was to cite the defendant to appear and to show cause why he should not be punished as for contempt, in disobeying the Court's order; he gave as his cause that an appeal from the order had been made, which his Honor rather testily refused to consider, and ordered that the defendant's property be sequestered *and sold*, to satisfy not the contempt, evidently, but the award of alimony, which has a great tendency to deprive the whole matter of an appearance on the part of the Court to uphold its dignity, and partakes largely of the coloring of an assistance rendered the "bleeding process" movers; furthermore, the officer serving the writ is relieved of all liability, and thus virtually ordered to "go in" and get that money by hook or by crook—by law, if it should afterwards appear that the law supports the proceeding; but, anyway, to get it!

It seems to be a rather remarkable proceeding to collect alimony *pendente lite* by means of sequestration and sale of the defendant's property.

Again: "Unless, therefore, a party can be proceeded against *under the statute* concerning contempts to enforce civil remedies, there does not seem to be any remedy for their collection, unless it can be found in the power of the court to sequester the property, *which is doubtful.*" "So far as the power of the court to punish contempts is derived from the statute, such power can be exercised *only in the manner prescribed in the statute.*"—41 Howard, pp. 547-548. The "statute," in Utah, prescribes no such remedy as sequestration, and if a judge finds that such proceeding is imperative and that his legal remedies are exhausted, he may make resort to it as an equitable measure; but in doing so, he should be governed by those rules of equity which have obtained in the highest courts of civilized nations, since his authority so to act is derived therefrom, and not disregard fixed boundaries and settled principles to achieve immediate results.

——Sussie Steffera, a little girl, died in Hoboken the other week, from the effects of an over-dose of Mrs. Winslow's soothing syrup.

——The King of Fiji has forwarded, as a token of esteem, to the President of the London Missionary Society, seven handsome young women as wives.

——A letter from H. B. Bates, in the Dubuque *Herald*, who has been travelling through Iowa and Nebraska, says, "There never was as many hogs in the north-west as there is now, but most of them are light and small. They are largely Berkshire or a high cross of that desirable breed. In Nebraska all agree that they have twice as many as they had one year ago."

LAWS CONCERNING ELECTIONS.

UNITED STATES LAWS.

SEC. 25. The Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in the year eighteen hundred and seventy-six, is established as the day, in each of the States and Territories of the United States, for the election of Representatives and Delegates to the Forty-fifth Congress; and the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every second year thereafter, is established as the day for the election in each of said States and Territories, of Representatives and Delegates to the Congress commencing on the fourth day of March next thereafter.

SEC. 26. The time for holding elections in any State, district, or Territory for a Representative or Delegate to fill a vacancy, whether such vacancy is caused by a failure to elect at the time prescribed by law, or by the death, resignation, or incapacity of a person elected, may be prescribed by the laws of the several States and Territories respectively.

SEC. 27. All votes for Representatives in Congress must be by written or printed ballot; and all votes received or recorded contrary to this section shall be of no effect. But this section shall not apply to any State voting otherwise whose election for Representative occurs previous to the regular meeting of its legislature next after the twenty-eighth day of February, eighteen hundred and seventy-one.

SEC. 1860. At all subsequent elections [after the first], however, in any Territory hereafter organized by Congress, as well as at all elections in Territories already organized, the qualifications of voters and of holding office shall be such as may be prescribed by the legislative assembly of each Territory; subject, nevertheless, to the following restrictions on the power of the legislative assembly, namely:

First. The right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States above the age of twenty-one years, and by those above that age who have declared on oath, before a competent court of record, their intention to become such, and have taken an oath to support the Constitution and Government of the United States.

Second. There shall be no denial of the elective franchise or of holding office to a citizen on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Third. No officer, soldier, seamen, mariner, or other person in the Army or Navy, or attached to troops in the service of the United States, shall be allowed to vote in any Territory, by reason of being on service therein, unless such Territory is, and has been for the period of six months, his permanent domicile.

Fourth. No person belonging to the Army or Navy shall be elected to or hold any civil office or appointment in any Territory.

SEC. 2004. All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, Territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such elections, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or Territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding.—*Revised Statutes.*

SEC. 6. That section 25 of the Revised Statutes, prescribing the time for holding elections for Representatives to Congress, is hereby modified so as not to apply to any State that has not yet changed its day of election, and whose constitution must be amended in order to effect a change in the day of the election of State officers in said State.

Approved March 3, 1875.

[The States thus excepted are Vermont, Maine, Ohio and Indiana.]

SEC. 5. And be it further enacted: That every free white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of said Territory at the time of the passage of this act, shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said Terrritory; but the qualifications of voters and of holding office at all subsequent