

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - FEBRUARY 24, 1893

RESTRICTIONS ON IMMIGRATION.

In view of the bread riots and other disturbances in England which are evidences of widespread distress, some of the leading papers are urging that "Government shall immediately organize an emigration scheme." This would perhaps give some little relief to the overcrowded ranks of the working classes who cannot find employment. But it would not strike at the root of the trouble, it would only trim off a few of its branches. Yet there is no doubt that in the British colonies there is ample room for thousands of laboring people, who might work their way to comparative independence but who are now existing in a state of semi-starvation in over populated towns and dwelling in packed and swarming tenements.

There is some danger to the United States in the project. It is notorious that the efforts of this Government to prevent the landing of pauper immigrants have been almost a failure. With but one or two exceptions, the European Governments have taken no official action of moment to carry out the suggestions and desires of the United States on this matter. The laws enacted to prevent the landing of persons likely to become chargeable to the authorities have been evaded, the strong competition between rival companies engaged in the passenger traffic has stimulated invention, and methods more or less ingenious have been devised to dodge around the law's restrictions. The port authorities, too, have been willing to wink at the doings of the ship companies, for considerations best known between themselves, and since the agitation on the subject has subsided, there has been little difficulty experienced in landing any kind of immigrants from any part of the world except China.

If the emigration plan should be adopted to aid in relieving the widespread distress in England, we may look for a revival of the agitation in regard to pauper immigration. Connected with this subject in the public mind—although there is no similarity between the two—is the question of "Mormon" immigration. The suppression of the latter would be found much more difficult than the prevention of the former. And the notion entertained by some folks who pass for persons of intelligence, that the "Mormon" arrivals could be excluded, under the provisions of the act against criminal and pauper immigration, is exceedingly shallow and far-fetched.

The "Mormons" who land in this country from the old world are not from the pauper or criminal classes. They do not become chargeable to the local or Federal authorities. They do not fill the jails, poorhouses or asylums. They are of the productive classes. They help to build up the country wherever they go. Their intentions are to become permanent citizens. They have no intention to violate law. Their belief is their own property, with which the Government has nothing to do and into which it has no right to inquire. Governments can only regulate actions, they cannot encroach upon the domain of faith. If the laws against pauper immigration have not been made effective, it is likely that a law against "Mormon" immigration would be still less effective. Ways and means could be devised by which so foolish and needless a scheme would be rendered completely abortive. And the idea of preventing families from landing whose only objection was a religious one, seems too absurd for contemplation in a country and an age like this.

It is quite amusing to note the sage remarks of popular journals on the supposed cessation of the influx of "Mormons." The Castle Garden authorities are quoted as affirming the statement that no "Mormons" have arrived for some time. This is snapped up by those wise people who say so much and know so little on the question, and interpreted to signify a collapse in "Mormonism." One brilliant editor attributes it to the lectures of Kate Field. He might just as well have said that the skittish old damsel was responsible for the bread riots in London.

The last company of the season sailed from Liverpool in October, and there will be no more until spring. From April to October is the usual season for "Mormon" emigration, and the same story as that told by the Castle Garden people to the newspaper men, might have been heard every winter if they had taken the same trouble to inquire.

The gathering of the Latter-day Saints will not be impeded by the ex-

temely unfavorable sentiment, evoked by itinerant lecturers, malevolent preachers and a misleading press, by the difficulties that the people of Utah are placed in because of their religion, nor by existing laws about pauper immigration or any illiberal and ill-advised measures that may be concocted by fanatical politicians.

THE SOLDIERS, THE PRISONER AND THE PEOPLE.

ANOTHER attempt at an anti-"Mormon" sensation was made on Tuesday evening, in sending a number of soldiers by train to the Promontory to aid in conveying President Geo. Q. Cannon to this city. That there was not the slightest necessity for such a movement is well known to all men. That it was done for effect at a distance is thoroughly understood. It was a cheap and nasty bit of clap-trap, worthy only of the gang of conspirators that are engaged in brewing trouble for Utah to effect their own selfish ends.

Marshal Ireland disclaims having anything to do with the call for troops. If he saw no need for such help, why was the demand made except for the purpose of creating a sensation? Is it to be supposed that the miscreants who are continually trying to work up a conflict here intended this movement for the purpose of peace? Not at all. It was a menace, and the object was to irritate and anger the people so as to precipitate a row. If the people here had intended to rescue Geo. Q. Cannon from the officers, that band of soldiers would not have been a mouthful for them. But they had no such intention. None was expressed or hinted at. No prisoner has been rescued by the "Mormons" through all the persecutions and convictions that have taken place, nor was there the slightest excuse for supposing that any such thing would be attempted in this case.

The rumors of trouble in Ogden were also without foundation. It is said that they were worked up or reported by one Orlando W. Powers. The object of all this is easily perceived. It is disgraceful to its projectors. It may be said that it is harmless to the people who are thus maligned by implication. But this is not correct. The harm is done to their reputation abroad. The idea that troops were necessary to protect the civil officers from "Mormon" mobocracy is injurious to the people. It helps to swell the tide of popular animosity. It has its effect at Washington for the time being. The public are willing to believe anything against the "Mormons," and the national authorities seem to possess as little cool and impartial judgment as the mob, when the "Mormons" are in question.

In view of all this, the sending of those soldiers was a paltry and devilish trick for a mean and sinister purpose. But the people here know better than to allow themselves to be provoked into a collision. They do not resist legal process. Everybody that knows their history understands this. They will meet legal wrongs with legal rights. They do not oppose lawful execution of the process of courts with violence. They have submitted to too many indignities when sanctioned by the forms of law to begin now to fight law by physical force. It requires no bravery to serve papers or make arrests in "Mormonism," for there is no resistance. If officers only keep within legal limits they are as safe in taking prisoners as in badgering some defenseless woman and torturing her with shameful questions before a court or a grand jury.

The high-handed proceedings at the Promontory, when, according to the information furnished us, soldiers assumed command, surrounded the prisoner, ejected his friends and forced his removal against the pledged word of the Marshal, prompt the question, has the civil power in this Territory become subject to the military? Marshal Ireland appears to have given up his authority to the officer in command of the soldiers.

By what right was this outrage committed? If those troops were there by any legal authority it was as a posse to assist the United States Marshal. There was no need whatever for their employment. But even if it was considered prudent to have them with the Marshal for fear of a rescue—which was the only pretext for their presence—they were under direction of the Marshal, not his dictators. And they had no legal right whatever to assume the position which they are said to have usurped. The officer in charge of the soldiers seems to have stepped a long way outside of the bounds of his authority, and the Marshal to have played the poltroon in submitting to the indignity put upon him and upon his prisoner. He also broke faith with President Cannon or permitting his removal in his weak and wounded condition before the time he had agreed to allow him to remain at rest had expired.

We think this matter worthy of further inquiry. If the military are to supersede the civil authorities in executing civil process, it ought to be known and understood. If the course of the officer in charge of the soldiers was authorized by his superiors, the public ought to know it. If that officer exceeded his instructions, he should be properly

reprimanded for his presumption. Marshal Ireland is in duty bound to show why he knuckled down to military dictation and rendered up his prisoner to soldiers for whom he had not sent and whose presence he acknowledged to be needless.

If the military are in future to run proceedings against individuals accused of offenses against the criminal law, it is only fair to the public that it should be so proclaimed, lest resistance may be offered against such aggression, under the established understanding that the civil power is paramount and the military have no authority except in martial affairs.

The entire proceedings in this case are extraordinary. The reward, the heavy bonds put upon the family, the employment of the soldiery, and the unprecedented amount required for bail, all for a simple case of misdemeanor, are such as, in our opinion, were never known before in the history of criminal law, either in this country or in Europe.

President Cannon has the deep sympathy as well as the profound esteem and affection of many thousands of true hearts in Utah. But they know that he would not desire any lawless exhibition of that regard and that he would be the first to rebuke it if it was manifested. But there are wretches here who would like to see a tumult, because it would work in with their designs to obtain martial law or a Legislative Commission. We do not think the "Mormons" are going to gratify them. But if such an event should take place, we are of the opinion that they would not draw much lasting comfort from the effects of their provocation.

President Cannon is now under legal restraint. He must have a fair and legal trial, if such a thing is possible in Utah with prejudiced courts, packed juries and a malignant special, personal feeling against him, prompt all who take part in his prosecution. All other considerations than those tending to prove or indicate that he has committed an offense against the law should be banished from his case. He is not to be tried as one of the First Presidency, as an Apostle, as a prominent "Mormon" leader, as an able defender of doctrines held by the Latter-day Saints, nor in any other capacity than as a citizen charged with infraction of the Edmunds law. The inflammatory remarks of unprincipled journalists and the special measures against him, official or otherwise, are in the nature of persecution and spite, and are in conflict with the spirit of law and the requirements of justice.

The Latter-day Saints are required to still cultivate that forbearance and calmness which have governed them all through the present crusade. They have borne a great deal, they may have to bear a great deal more. But let the wrong come from their enemies. They should be careful to be in the right. It is only in the right that they can conquer. Their victory, which is as certain as the revolutions of the earth, will come on that ground. Truth only can vanquish error, righteousness only can subdue iniquity, and evil will have to be overcome with good. It is by righteousness that they will ultimately prevail.

While Satanic schemes and fiendish plots are being concocted by the wretched creatures who thirst for the blood and lust for the property of the Saints, and while cruel and unusual measures are adopted and encouraged, for the injury of men and women whose chief motive is to obey the will of God, it is gratifying to see the order, peace and patience of the people; and we hope that they will prove to God and angels and the world, that for the truth's sake they are able to endure all things that they may be worthy to inherit all things.

A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

In the Third District Court to-day, Henry Dinwoodey withdrew his plea of "not guilty" and plead "guilty" to the charge of unlawful cohabitation. The attorney stated that he had been keeping the law for a year and a half or more. The Prosecuting Attorney recommended that sentence be suspended during good behavior, on the ground that he had reason to believe the defendant would obey the law in future.

We understand that Mr. Dinwoodey claims he has made no such promise. But any man with a brain will decide that there is no difference in principle between making a promise personally, and doing it through an attorney. It may be argued that Mr. Dinwoodey made no agreement in court. But we fail to see any difference in principle between making an agreement in open court and permitting the prosecuting officer to convey the idea to the Court.

We do not want to see any of our people caught upon so palpable a plunk. It may be represented to them that they can escape punishment by making a private or evasive arrangement without compromising themselves in public. Such sophistry may be very cunning, but it is also very transparent to any one with eyes. Such a course is just exactly the same surrender of principle as going into court and making public submission.

In other words, whether in public or in private, any person who takes such a course virtually and thoroughly acknowledges that in his mind the law of man, as interpreted by the courts, which vary with the changes of the wind, is superior to the law of God and His sacred covenants, which are as eternal as the throne of Jehovah. There is no getting away from this conclusion, and everybody ought to know it and let their actions be governed accordingly.

OFFICIAL ACTIONS THAT DE-SIROY RESPECT.

The object of bail is to secure, without injustice, the attendance of a person accused of crime, and whose guilt has not been finally determined judicially. The Constitution of the United States provides that "excessive bail shall not be required." The equity of this provision is self-evident. The very purpose of granting bail may be frustrated if excessive bail is demanded. And so long as the attendance of the defendant is assured beyond all reasonable doubt, no good purpose can be served by harassing and perplexing him to furnish bail beyond the amount necessary for that purpose. Anything more than that is oppressive, vindictive and unconstitutional.

The bail required of President George Q. Cannon to secure his attendance for trial, in a case of misdemeanor the full penalty for which is a fine of \$300 and six months' imprisonment, was \$25,000. And by trebling the charge—one indictment being found and two cases pending for the same charge, under the anti-"Mormon" scheme called segregation, by which an offender can be punished any number of times for the same offense according to the whim or the spite of the Prosecuting officer—the bail required aggregated the enormous sum of \$75,000!

This demand was resisted by Messrs. Richards and Rawlins of the attorneys for the defense, who showed that it was excessive and unprecedented. But District Attorney Dickson insisted upon the amount, and Judge Zane, of course, granted what that attorney demanded. Did Zane ever fail to dance to Dickson's piping? Is it not popularly understood that Zane's rulings are Dickson's dictates?

But the question is, was the bail required excessive? Outside of the court officials and the clique who bound them on to extremities, we do not think there is a man who will not answer that question in the affirmative. To decide it, if any one is in doubt, let the amount be compared with the full penalty of the law. Let usage and precedent be called into the controversy. If there was ever an instance in the jurisprudence of this country that can be cited as a parallel, let it be produced. It cannot be done. If the demand was not vindictive in its spirit, oppressive in its nature and harassing in its purpose, then those adjectives have lost their settled meaning.

It may be argued that the amount of the bail does not signify, because the friends of the resented defendant would have furnished bonds in any sum that might have been named. The fact is true, but the reasoning is wrong. It does signify a great deal. It is the principle of the thing that we are after, and it is against that we object. It is wrong and is another proof that in proceeding against "Mormons" neither constitutional restrictions nor common justice is permitted to stand in the way of harsh and unprecedented measures to annoy and perplex and punish without reason.

We have not the slightest doubt that if the law had not given President Cannon the absolute right to bail, it would have been refused altogether. We are satisfied from what we know of the proceedings, that, if the defendant had not stood upon his rights, the trial would have been hurried on in the most indecent manner considering his injuries and general condition of bodily health. Against such animosity and spite, which should never enter into a prosecution for any purpose, and particularly in such a paltry offense as charged against this defendant, we feel it our duty to protest.

The paltry attempt of the District Attorney to prejudice the court and the public against the defendant, by repeating a rumor as though it was a fact known to the Attorney, that the defendant had attempted to bribe an officer to release him, was all of a piece with the rest of the proceedings. It was highly improper and unprofessional, and no one knows that better than the official who let himself down to it, in his excessive zeal to please the enemies of the defendant. If the statement was true it had no place in the argument about bail, and being something the Attorney could not vouch for, was a piece of pettifoggery unworthy of a government officer.

The "Mormons" are continually taunted about their want of respect for the law and the courts. The slur is undeserved, for, as a rule there are no people who are more submissive to the law than the Latter-day Saints. But in the administration of the law which some of them are accused of violating, has there been anything to win that respect which is so loudly called for? Spite, vindictiveness, shallow sophistry, rulings diametrically opposed to each other, shiftings of argument to suit different cases under the same law, an evident and un concealed animus against the victims of

the law, because of their faith in a creed obnoxious to the Court and its officers, trouble indictments, extreme penalties, excessive bail, pure man-imprisoned and filthy lechers set free, and other proofs of special action against one class of the community, render it impossible for the "Mormons" to feel that respect for this law and the officers who administer it, which some people rave about so loudly.

Show us something to command respect. Exhibit some dignity, consistency and fairness. Let us know what the law means, definitely, that we are required to obey. Give some evidence that virtue and decency are valued and that vice is not encouraged. Act so that we can see that desire for the public good and not religious bigotry and hatred of a powerful faith and a devoted people, animates the persons whom we are requested to honor, and perhaps there may be some change of sentiment among the masses of the "Mormons." But while they see such exhibitions of spleen, such excess of authority, such personal animosity, such disregard of legal meaning and established precedents, such shifting, unstable, illogical and unparalleled proceedings as this whole crusade has developed, disgust will be mingled with just resentment, and scorn and indignation will drive out the last vestige of respect.

NO HANGING ON THE FENCE.

The case of Henry Dinwoodey has caused considerable comment. The gentleman occupies a very peculiar position. In all probability it will have to be defined beyond question. The District Attorney claims that he has virtually agreed to observe the Edmunds law in future. Mr. Dinwoodey says he has made no such promise. It is due to the court, to the public and to the gentleman himself that the truth be plainly declared. We are informed that he will have an opportunity given to him to openly express his intentions or to take the consequences of refusing to do so. This we consider quite proper. If he has made up his mind to give the required promise and so escape the penalties of the law, it is fair that he should openly declare it. If not, his position should be known to his friends that they may see where he stands. Every man is free to act or refrain from acting, to stand or fall; to live by his principles or relinquish them as he sees fit, and there is no power to coerce him in either direction. All that is wanted is square dealing, "yes" or "no," without equivocation or pretense. We await the result.

THE MILITARY USURPATION.

This disreputable organ of Marshal Ireland makes a weak effort to poor passy his surrender of authority to the military power, in the conveyance of President George Q. Cannon to this city. But the fact remains that an outrage was committed, which, if perpetrated upon anybody but a "Mormon," would have aroused general indignation and called for a full investigation.

It is not denied that a number of soldiers, in charge of a captain and lieutenant, took the control of a prisoner who made no resistance, out of the hands of the United States Marshal, who quietly submitted and also broke faith with the prisoner, after promising that he should not be removed until a given time. If we are under martial law the fact ought to be proclaimed that the people may know it. If not, the action of Captain Penny was usurpation and a contempt of civil law, or the submission of Marshal Ireland to improper authority was both unlawful and contemptible.

If the officials here want the "Mormons" to respect the law, they must respect it themselves. Marshal Ireland not only declared that he did not call for the aid of troops, but that he considered their presence unnecessary. Who then is responsible for their employment? Report, pretty well authenticated, charges Orlando W. Powers with sending the word which occasioned the senseless military display. The only individual that appears in sight as calling for their help is the smirched deputy, whose single chance of escape from punishment for a filthy crime of the most bestial character, which witnesses claim he was seen to commit, was a legal quirk of which he was given the advantage. He is a sweet-scented dignitary to strut around and obtain the services of the soldiery, in a case where they were not needed, and were only a menace in one sense and a burlesque in the other!

The theatrical display of the military is discreditable to its projectors whoever they may be. One thing seems clear. It is not likely that troops would have been furnished without a requisition from the Governor. It would be strange if he interfered without a request from the Marshal. If the Marshal made the demand, then he lied when he denied it. If he made none, then the requisition was without reason and the responsibility falls on the Executive. From what has happened before, the public can reasonably conclude as to the present sensation. It is a disgrace to everybody engaged in it except the soldiers who had to act under orders.