DESERET NEWS:
WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - JANUARY 13, 1886

THE DELEGATE'S SECOND LETTER.

THE second letter of Hon. John T. Caine to President Grover Cleveland, which we published on New Year's eve, is a manly and pointed presentation of the gross imposition perpetrated upon the President of the United States by certain Federal officials. Although they have never had the courage to publish the dispatches they sent for the purpose of inducing the forwarding of troops to this city, enough is known of their contents to satisfy the public of their falsity. And however the friends of those officials may attempt to belittle the investigation by the City Council into the alleged reasons for the call for troops, that inquiry demonstrated beyond doubt that the rumors to which those Federal officials gave support, if they did not personally invent them, were utterly baseless and manufactured with evil intent.

Delegate Caine brings the matter sharply and clearly to the notice of the President, and at the same time indicates the unworthiness of those who deceive him to hold office or retain the President's confidence. He also repeats an old suggestion to the Government, that competent and reliable men be sent to Utah to investigate and report on the real condition of affairs here. That is only a reasonable request, and, we believe, would have been granted to any other people of the country but a body belonging to an unpopular religious system.

The blunder of sending troops to awe into submission a peaceable people, upon the false and uncorroborated statement of Federal officials, has been twice committed under a Democratic administration. It seems that the lessons of the past have had no effect upon the present, in this instance.

The troops which were sent here in 1857 at immense cost to the country, were forwarded without investigation into the alleged necessity for their presence in Utah. The stories of the debauched Judge Drummond, which were afterwards proven false, induced President Buchanan to authorize the transportation of an army to this Territory. Subsequent official inquiry demonstrated that there was no necessity whatever for the presence of soldiers in this Territory, and they were withdrawn after the needless expenditure of millions of dollars. Investigation before instead of after the fiasco would have been worth a great deal of cash to the country and considerable reputation to the Buchanan administration.

The small body of troops sent here in 1885 were ordered on the representations of Federal officials as groundless as the Drummond falsehoods. There was no foundation for the stupid rumors that occasioned that hurried dispatch to the supposed scene of tumult. The error was not so great, or so important, or so expensive as the big blunder of 1857, but it was committed on the same principle.

As Mr. Caine intimates, the people of Utah do not object to the location of soldiers here if the Government considers it necessary. But they do object to being misrepresented. They object to having troops sent to quell disturbances that never existed except in the minds of untruthful persons, bent on working mischief at the people's expense. That we have a right and a reason for objecting to, and it would be only a matter of duty and of justice, if the President expressed his disapprobation of such unworthy conduct by promptly removing from office those who deceived him to effect their own evil purposes.

Investigation into Utah affairs ought to be had for the benefit of the Government, if not for that of the citizens of Utah. But it should be thorough. And it ought to be entrusted to gentlemen who would not be entrapped into a one-sided view of the situation. If it was undertaken in secret it would be more likely to be impartial. As soon as such a Commission was publicly known to have been appointed, the enemies of the "Mormons" would move earth and Hades to bring a pressure to bear unfavorable to a fair and unbiased inquiry.

The Delegate's letter is creditable to him as the representative of this Territory, and while his facts are indisputable, his deductions and recommendations are sound and logical, and are in the interests of the whole people of these mountain valleys.

SENATE DISCUSSION OF THE EDMUNDS BILL.

FROM our Washington dispatches we learn that Mr. Edmunds brought up his latest anti-"Mormon" production in the Senate on Tuesday. The only portion of the bill that then met with serious opposition was the section abolishing woman suffrage in Utah. This was vigorously opposed by Messrs. Hoar and Blair on general principles, and Mr. Blair, with good logic, argued that if the women were to be deprived of the voting power on the ground that they supported polygamy, the men ought to be deprived of it for the same reason. Mr. Edmunds replied that the plural wives were under the influence of the hierarchy of Utah, and that their condition went near to a state of serfdom.

As we have proven heretofore, Mr. Edmunds does not understand the Utah question at all. He does not seem to understand even his own bill which is now a law. By that measure plural wives are already deprived of the suffrage. He is also under the impression that the ballots in Utah are numbered and marked so that it can be ascertained how citizens vote, and his new bill contains a clause abolishing a system that does not exist. This is all wrong. Mr. Edmunds is fumbling and floundering in the dark, and appears not to wish to be enlightened. He is so blinded by anti-"Mormon" prejudice that he is impervious to reason on that question.

Mr. Hoar springs another question, which ought to be understood and urged by the friends of woman suffrage and of the general rights of citizens. That is, that when the elective franchise has been acquired it becomes the property of the holder and cannot be taken away without due process of law. That signifies a judicial trial. The franchise, which is a privilege when conferred, becomes a right by possession and usage, and deprivation of that right without legal trial and as a punishment for guilt, is usurpation and robbery.

The bill is to be further argued, but will very likely pass the Senate intact. Its fate in the House has yet to be determined. But it will not slide through as smoothly as some people anticipate.

"MARKED BALLOTS" AGAIN.

IT is useless to expect that editors any more than preachers will try to inform themselves on the "Mormon" question before attempting to enlighten the public on that subject. There are papers east and west endorsing the new Edmunds monstrosity, because it abolishes the system of marked ballots by which it is asserted that "Mormon" leaders find out how people vote. And as near a neighbor as the Sacramento *Record-Union* approves of the measure for robbing the women of Utah of the elective franchise, although it favors woman suffrage on general principles, and bases its approval on its opposition to those same "marked ballots."

We will explain once more to our misguided contemporaries that there are no such things as marked ballots in the Utah system of voting. They may ask why a man as well-informed as Senator Edmunds is supposed to be, would introduce a bill containing a provision to abolish the marked ballot system, if no such system exists. The answer is, Senator Edmunds is really as ignorant of Utah affairs as the average editor or preacher who has acquired a *penchant* for pitching into the "Mormons," and that his new bill contains provisions to annul several Utah laws that are not upon our statute books.

But to make this matter clear to the dullest or most skeptical anti-"Mormon," we quote as follows from the laws of Utah:

"The County Court shall furnish the Judges of Elections in every precinct with a sufficient number of plain envelopes for election purposes. Said envelopes shall be uniform in color and size, without any marks, writing, or printing, or device upon them; and no other kind shall be used at any given election."

"Every voter shall designate on a single ballot, written or printed, the name of the person voted for, with a pertinent designation of the office to be filled. And when any question is to be decided, in the affirmative or negative, he shall state the proposition at the bottom of the ballot, and write thereunder 'yes' or 'no,' as he may desire to vote thereon; which ballot shall be neatly folded and placed in one of the envelopes hereinbefore provided for, and delivered to the presiding judge of election, who shall, in the presence of the voter, on the name of the proposed voter being found on the registry list, and on all challenges to such vote being decided in favor of such voter, deposit it in the ballot box without any mark whatever placed on such envelope; otherwise the ballot shall be rejected." (Laws of 1878, p. 32.

These provisions render the ballot absolutely secret. What nonsense then to talk about "Mormon" leaders coercing citizens at the polls! There is another thing which we would like our contemporaries to consider. That is, the provision of the Edmunds law, now in force, which puts the control of election affairs in the hands of persons appointed by five Commissioners who are appointed by the President and Senate of the United States. Since 1882 the elections in Utah have been so conducted.

Will the Sacramento *Record-Union* or any other paper, east or west, inform us how the "Mormon" leaders, under these conditions, compel voters, male or female, to vote for or against any one or anything contrary to their own free will and choice? And how many editors who have endorsed Senator Edmunds' catapult against vacancy will rectify their error when they read these proofs of their own and his misinformation?

ONE MORE TESTIMONIAL.

The Philadelphia *News* has the following crisp little article on a subject that will be interesting to some creatures who infest this Territory:

It is hard sometimes for fair men who have any special knowledge of facts to refrain from what would be denounced as a defense of the Mormons, so many base creatures join in the hue and cry and go out to Utah to fill their pockets at the expense of the Saints they abhor. It is not therefore surprising that Editor Eugene Field should write thus in the Chicago *News*:

Says the Salt Lake *Tribune*: "What an infamous hound old Miller, of the Omaha *Herald* must be." We beg to inform our gentle contemporary that Dr. George L. Miller is no hound; if he were he would probably be editing a daily paper in Salt Lake, lying about a certain religious sect, and doing everything in his power to promote discord and bloodshed in a Territory that as much belongs to the Mormons as Plymouth rock belongs to the Pilgrim fathers. We think that one of the first steps toward the decent suppression of polygamy would be the suppression of the Salt Lake *Tribune*.

It is a fact that "Mormon outrages" are often manufactured for private gain by adventurers who go to Utah, in some cases as Federal officials."

Now it is in order for the *Tribune* to call the Philadelphia *News* by some of the pet blackguard names with which it welcomed the paragraph in the Chicago *News*.

THE DEBATE ON THE BILL.

THE debate in the Senate over the new Edmunds bill, as reported in our dispatches, is quite interesting. It shows up the good sense of some members and the ignorance of the Utah question under which Mr. Edmunds labors.

The proposal to abolish the Utah Commission, was probably prompted by Senator Van Wyck's personal animosity to ex-Senator Paddock. The motive was doubtless bad, but the object was good, for the Commission is of no earthly benefit to any one but those who draw salaries from its continuance.

The idea that forcibly misappropriating property which religious people have donated for Church uses is not interference with religion, is one that no person but an anti-"Mormon" bigot would ever entertain. It remained for Mr. Edmunds to advance it, and it is certainly novel if not convincing.

Mr. Teller put the matter in a true and forcible light before the Senate. His testimony to the condition of Utah previous to the introduction of "Christian civilization" is true. It is also a fact that the crusade against the Saints has done more to confirm the faith of monogamist "Mormons" in the rightfulness of plural marriage than a thousand sermons in its favor. And the rough handling of the matter, which Mr. Teller deprecates, will never drive out conviction from the "Mormon" heart, or solve the "problem" which troubles the nation. It will only tend to perpetuate and complicate it.

Mr. Edmunds' statement that his bill is designed to "cut off the one-man power in Utah,," is truly laughable. The only "one-man power" now existing here is Federal. A Governor holds the one-man power of veto over the acts of the people's elected representatives. The President of the United States, in whose election the people here have no voice, nominates the Governor and all the chief officials of the Territory. And now Mr. Edmunds wants to make the President the appointing power in the Church as well as in the State, to give fourteen trustees authority, without the consent of the people whose property they handle, to control their Church funds and devote them to other purposes than those for which they were appropriated. What is that but elevating a "one man power," and depriving the people of their votes upon their own ecclesiastical affairs?

The more the bill is canvassed, the greater the folly and villainy of its projectors are made manifest to God and and the world.

THE DIFFERENCE.

OUT of two-thirds of a column of balderdash, pettifogging and abuse in this morning's *Tribune*, we extract one question which is decent, relevant to the subject and worthy of a reply. It is this in reference to the Snow case:

"We beg to ask the NEWS what difference there was according to his own showing between his case and that of Angus Cannon."

The difference is this: In the Cannon case it was shown that the defendant had lived in the same house with two women whom he acknowledged were his wives. He offered to prove that cohabitation in its generally accepted sense had ceased with the passage of the Edmunds Act. The Court ruled that living with and holding out two or more women as wives, constituted unlawful cohabitation, and that sexual intercourse need not be proved nor disproved. The Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that ruling, taking Webster and civil jurisprudence for authorities, and ignoring the established meaning of the term in criminal jurisprudence. Although, according to Justices Miller and Field, this was the first time such an interpretation was ever given to the term in criminal law, that definition now stands as the legal meaning of "unlawful cohabitation." In the Snow case it was proven by the prosecution's own witnesses that the defendant had *not* lived with two or more women, either in the same house or in separate houses, but that he had only lived with one, in a house that had no connection with the houses in which his other wives resided. And further, that during the time mentioned in the indictment, he had not visited them, or either of them, except for a very few minutes, to inquire after the health of children, or transact some financial business, and that in the day time. The evidence was positive that he had not lived with them as a husband lives with a wife. But the Court ruled that it was not necessary, in order to convict, to show that the defendant had lived under the same roof with these women, or either of them.

Now, if the *Tribune* cannot see the difference between these two cases, it must be either very dense or wilfully blind. The difference is essential. The court of last resort has ruled that to constitute the offense of unlawful cohabitation a man must live with, as well as hold out as wives, two or more women. Judge Powers has ruled that a man is guilty of that offense if he holds out more than one woman as wives if he does not live with them at all. Mr. Cannon lived with two women in the same house, Mr. Snow only lived with one woman. If living with two or more women as wives is the essential ingredient of the offense, how can a man be guilty who only lives with one woman as a wife?

The *Tribune* adds the following to the question we have answered:

"Both were known to be polygamists; neither had given any public notice that he had dissolved his polygamous relations; both held out to the world that they were polygamists and taught their flocks to live up to their religion, but both declared that in point of fact they had not violated the Edmunds law. But Angus Cannon went to the Pen, and the Supreme Court affirmed the ruling which sent him there. When we cite that fact the NEWS says "Fudge!" That is, the legal talent of the NEWS cries "Fudge!" to the Supreme Court of the United States. Still, the Court survives."

The *Tribune* here comes down to its usual level. It was never known to quote correctly the argument of an adversary or to state his position fairly. We did not say "Fudge," to the Supreme Court of the United States, but to the nonsense of the *Tribune*. And we did not say it to any "fact" that the *Tribune* cited. Here is what we said:

"The *Tribune* asks: 'Had any Mormon heard that he had given up those relations?' It does not matter whether any 'Mormon' or any one else has heard anything about it. Is a man to be tried for what somebody has heard or has not heard? Fudge!"

What is there in this about the Supreme Court, or about any fact cited by the *Tribune*? It is because that paper continually falsifies both facts and arguments that it so often places itself beneath contempt.

But to the point in dispute. It may be true that persons are known to be polygamists, that they teach polygamy as a religious doctrine, that they hold out to the world more than one woman as wives, and yet they may be, "in point of fact," not guilty of violating the Edmunds law. For that law does not forbid men to acknowledge their wives, nor punish them, except by disfranchisement, for being in the status of polygamy, nor for preaching or teaching the doctrine which they believe and practice. A man may be a polygamist and not subject to prosecution under the Edmunds law, if he has not married a plural wife or lived with more than one woman in the marriage relation since the passage of that law. And any pretense to the contrary is so much nonsense, fitly met with the expressive word "Fudge!"

If the *Tribune* would use a little more reason and a little less misrepresentation, with some decent language instead of such torrents of abuse, it would not be so much of a degradation for respectable journals to notice its effusions.

THE EDMUNDS BILL PASSES THE SENATE.

THE new Edmunds bill has passed the Senate by a vote of thirty-eight to seven. Several Senators who could not swallow such a monstrous and dishonest measure, but had not the courage to face the popular feeling that might have followed their vote against it, quietly abstained from voting on either side. The names of the heroic seven who dared to do their part like men in stemming the tide of wrong, should be written with indelible ink upon the page of history. And the noble six who valliantly placed their names on the record without qualification or excuse, as opposed to a scheme to despoil an unpopular religious body, should be remembered by the sons and daughters of those who struggle for truth and liberty through all succeeding generations. All honor to Senator Blair of New Hampshire, Call of Florida, Gibson of Louisiana, Hampton of South Carolina, Morgan of Alabama and Vance of North Carolina!

Senator Hoar of Massachusetts voted against the bill because it proposes to rob the women of Utah of a vested right. So far, so good. But with that provision expunged, he would have voted to rob the whole people of the "Mormon" Church of their vested rights in the property they have put together by their own voluntary donations for religious uses. He argued that the suffrage when it becomes a vested right is property, and therefore could not be lawfully taken away by legislation. By what system of logic could he approve of the forcible taking away by legislation from a body of people that which nobody disputes is property? Senator Hoar is an advocate of woman suffrage, therefore he was consistent in his opposition to a measure abolishing it in Utah; but he was most sadly inconsistent in that little spurt of consistency.

Senator Morgan, though desirous of tearing up the "Mormon" Church, root and branch, did not want to endorse an attempt to loot it, nor to sanction such loose legislation as provided for certain officers without fixing their compensation. Edmunds promised to answer his question as to the salaries of the trustees, but failed to do so. Neither could he show that the funds of the "Mormon" Church are used illegally, when requested to do so by Senator Teller. He said he "believed" they were, but when pressed to explain, remarked they were used for the purpose of "inducing and securing immigration." What there is illegal in the use of funds for inducing and securing immigration, he did not pretend to show. His reply proved the weakness of his position. If the Church chooses to use a portion of its funds for emigration purposes it has a perfect right to do so, but how Senator Edmunds acquired his belief that its funds had been so appropriated he did not pretend to explain.

Senator Call made the most sensible speech in the closing debate, and touched the marrow of the question when he argued that the bill assailed *that freedom of speech and worship* to which the nation owes its liberties, and that a "Mormon" has as much right to proclaim his faith as an infidel has to proclaim his unbelief. Senator Morgan exposed the determination of the promoters of the measure to rush it through without giving its opponents a proper chance to study it. That was the method by which the first Edmunds act of oppression was hustled through Congress, and the same tactics will be resorted to, no doubt, when the bill comes up in the House. And considering the rash and unreasoning mood of the public on the "Mormon" question, it will not be surprising if a measure to take private property for public uses in direct hostility to a constitutional restriction, with a number of provisions in the nature of wholesale robbery and a lot of sections repealing laws that have no existence, will be hurriedly passed without deliberation in the spirit of passionate haste to join in the sectarian hue and cry against an unorthodox religious system.

But mark this: "Mormonism" will live on, all the same, and the shameful measures adopted for its suppression will rekindle and keep alive the fires of zeal and faith in the hearts of its adherents, and win for it such sympathy and influence among thinking people, everywhere, as will aid in its spread and hasten the day of its triumph over bigotry, oppression and the false traditions of many centuries.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION.

WE publish to-day the full text of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of President Angus M. Cannon, omitting only the documents to which reference is made, which have already been published in this paper and which are not necessary to a correct understanding of the rulings of the Court.

The most important portion of the Opinion is that which defines the offense of unlawful cohabitation under the Edmunds law. The Court adopts the dictionary definition of the word "cohabit," that is, "to dwell or live together as husband and wife." The question naturally arises, how do persons live together as husband and wife? The answer that will come to every person's mind who does not wish to put a special construction upon it, will be similar to that expressed by Justices Miller and Field in their dissenting opinion. Those intimate relations which are sanctioned only by the marriage state have ceased, cohabitation, or living together as man and wife, may be reasonably stated to have ceased. If a man and woman live in the same house