

law, and often have plead guilty simply to save their families the humiliation of being dragged into court and questioned upon private relations of the most delicate character.

His Honor may not have meant all that his language implies. But, as it stands in his charge, as reported to the press, it is an open invitation to throw aside the safeguards and limitations which are placed around persons accused of other offenses, and expose suspects under the Edmunds law to prosecution and punishment which would not be permitted in other cases. And this, we respectfully submit, is not "executing the laws as in other parts of the United States," which has been demanded by the public and declared to be the policy of the National Government.

Zeal may be proper, under the circumstances, in this particular direction. But such discrimination as this implies does not comport with that unswerving impartiality which is considered to be the glory of both English and American jurisprudence.

#### FALSE AND UNGRATEFUL.

IN THE examination before Commissioner Norrell on Thursday, Mrs. Cornelia H. Paddock complained of the newspapers of this city, with one exception, stating that they had been opposed to her family because of her writings. This is evidence that the witness is as little influenced by gratitude as truth. The criminalities of her boy, now committed for two plain cases of burglary, are notorious in the community, and have been borne with patiently and forbearingly. At the father's request the papers referred to have, in times past, suppressed the publication of damaging facts which actually appeared in the sheet excepted.

We have refrained from mentioning many things that have been called to our attention concerning the author of the anti-"Mormon" slush which a too-confiding publisher has issued from the press. We have kept quiet upon many damaging facts concerning the family that might have been given to the public in the regular course of news. It is not true that, for any cause, the Paddocks have been singled out for attack, either by the press or the officers. Instead, they have been

treated with a forbearance that has almost "ceased to be a virtue."

The utmost leniency possible has been shown to the boy who was hidden from the officers, and a portion of whose plunder was received into the house of his parents. His utterly vile and depraved conduct was condoned by sending him to the insane asylum, because there was then no reformatory in which he could be placed. And out of kindness to the parents who now seek to shield him and ungratefully spit out venom against the forbearing, he has been dealt with gently and mercifully.

The course pursued by the Paddocks in the latest development of natural depravity in their wayward son, will neither help him nor create for them any respect in this community. Their own testimony proves that they were shielding him from the officers and that this was attempted by violence. When an officer with a warrant is assailed with a loaded cane, and movements are made to impress him with the idea that firearms will be used in addition, he is justified in law and by the instinct of self-preservation in using force to defend his own person. The idea that a policeman may be abused, threatened and assaulted with impunity is absurd. The officers were in the rightful exercise of their calling when obstructed by Paddock, and if this had been another kind of case and the officer had been a deputy-marshal, in all probability there would have been a death instead of a knock-down.

It must be remembered that when burglaries repeatedly occur, blame is at once attached to the police, if they do not discover the criminals. Young Paddock was known to have recently committed two. A portion of the booty was found in his parents' house. They endeavored to conceal him and then his father tried to forcibly prevent his arrest. Is this persecution? Has it anything to do with the rubbish written by the woman to make money and pander to ignorant prejudice?

Common prudence and common decency would have suggested silence instead of self-exposure. Sympathy may be felt for persons who have ungovernable and lawless children, but such feelings will be obliterated by furious attempts to divert attention from crime with false attacks on the merciful. The Paddocks should court as little publicity as possible.

#### SELF-CONVICTED.

WE clip the following from a late edition of daily slander. The two items follow each other under a general heading:

"The News lies in its claim that both elements amalgamate commercially."

"The latest First South Street bank is what will probably be called the Merchants' National and Savings Bank."

"Capital to the amount of \$150,000 has been subscribed, which will be increased to \$200,000. The prime movers in the scheme are Francis Armstrong and P. W. Madsen; and Messrs. Auerbach, Clasbey, Auer, Levy and other prominent merchants are interested."

Two of the gentlemen named as thus "amalgamating commercially" are "Mormons," the other four are "Gentiles." We could give the names of numerous firms and corporations composed of similar combinations of the two "elements," but we leave the miserable creature who wrote the foregoing to refute his own falsehood.

#### NO CAUSE TO COMPLAIN.

IT APPEARS that Judge Judd thinks he has been dealt with unfairly by the press of this city, particularly in the Nielsen case. If he will point out in what particular, if any, the DESERET NEWS has been unfair to him, we will endeavor to do him full justice. Our understanding of the matter is that the finding of double indictments which the Supreme Court of the United States has decided to be unlawful was consequent upon Judge Judd's own rulings at Provo. If he had doubts as to the constitutionality of the proceeding and the course of the District Attorney, why did he not give the accused "the benefit of the doubt" and prevent the wrongs that have grown out of the erroneous rendering of the law?

We took occasion last fall to point out the illegality of the proceedings and warn the Judge as to the consequences. We have not commented severely on this matter, although the opening for it was wide and tempting. If Judge Judd did not believe the law justified these double indictments and penalties would it not have been better to have acted on that belief in time, and thus saved himself from the mortification of having his ruling reversed and a number of defendants from needless suffering and expense?

There are several men now in the