

bed and sleep, awakening in the morning refreshed and strong.

There is no such happy lot, however, for the man of business and wealth. He works with his brain, and when he lies down upon his soft and downy couch the active mind keeps on thinking and sleep refuses to come with its restorative assistance. As a consequence, according to the assumption of our peculiar cotemporary, the man who is harrassed by the possession of capital and participation in business schemes, becomes wan, his "eye becomes brighter," and the "lines of the mouth become more tightly drawn." He is really the workingman.

The "Liberal" organ after drawing this gloomy picture of the woes of the rich, insists that the latter are entitled to the sympathy of the men who perform the manual labor of the world. It can be reasonably inferred from the article in question that the writer of it is pickled in the impression that laboring men do not think, but, like the animals, merely work, eat and sleep, repeating the process every twenty-four hours without shadow of turning. There is no brightness in their eyes, but a dull fishy expression, while the muscles around their mouths are in a perpetual state of relaxation, having none of the cares of life to deepen the facial lines. This is all wrong.

Thought and sorrow are both well known to the performers of manual labor, while the burdens of the capitalist are lightened by the possession of wealth, which, as the world wags, gives prestige and power.

If the writer in the chief anti-"Mormon" organ had a wasted human spectre in his mind as an example of the wan and worn sorrow-laden capitalist, it may probably have been "Hank" Barnes, the candidate for sheriff on the "Liberal" ticket. That spare and pitiable victim of *Tribune* insomnia does not weigh more than about 195 pounds, while his gleaming eye and tightly drawn mouth testify to his being one of the "Liberal" laboring capitalists who are the real working men. Or may it not have been the emaciated form and melancholy countenance of the manager of the chief anti-"Mormon" organ that loomed before the gaze of the person who penned the plea for the overburthened capitalist, as his Faber rushed over the paper in the hope of attracting the sympathy of the masses for the downtrodden men of wealth?

Pity the sorrows of a rich old man
Whose trembling limbs have brought him
to your door.

HE ARRANGED EVERYTHING.

"Richard Croton, the registrar of Granite precinct, is in the city helping his old friends in Salt Lake. He has arranged everything up his way and has a little time to spare."

The foregoing appeared in this morning's "Liberal" organ. Yes. "He arranged everything up his way." He issued notices of objection to People's Party voters, and required them to appear in Salt Lake City. Of course the Registrar here had nothing to do with the matter, and they "had their labor for their pains." He is one of the Registrars whom the Utah Commission should investigate, and how he "arranged everything up there" ought to be fully explained. Let the Granite folks report.

ONCE A POLYGAMIST NOT ALWAYS A POLYGAMIST.

Registrars and other election officers should take notice that they have no authority, in law or in any instructions from the Utah Commission from whom they received their appointment, to deny to a present monogamist or widower the right to be registered and to vote, on the ground that he was once a polygamist. Also that they are liable under the laws of Congress and of the Territory of Utah to criminal prosecution and a suit for damages if they do so.

"Once a polygamist always a polygamist," is untrue in fact and in law. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled on this question and decided that the assumption is wrong.

In the case of *Murphy vs. Ramsey et al.*, the Court ruled as follows:

"It is not, therefore, because the person has committed the offense of bigamy or polygamy, at some previous time, in violation of some existing statute, and as an additional punishment for its commission, that he is disfranchised by the act of Congress of March 22, 1882; nor because he is guilty of the offense as defined and punished by the terms of that act; but because, having at some time entered into a bigamous or polygamous relation by a marriage with a second or third wife while the first was living, he still maintains it and has not dissolved it, although for the time being he restricts actual cohabitation to but one. He might in fact abstain from actual cohabitation with all, and be still as much as ever a bigamist or polygamist. He can only cease to be such when he has finally and fully dissolved in some effectual manner, which we are not called on here to point out, the very relation of husband to several wives, which constitutes the forbidden status he has previously assumed.

The disfranchisement operates upon the existing state and condition

of the person and not upon a past offense.

It is, therefore, not retrospective. He alone is deprived of his vote who, when he offers to register, is then in the state and condition of a bigamist or polygamist, or is then actually cohabiting with more than one woman."

In addition to the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, by which all courts and judicial officers are bound to be governed, the Utah Commission have issued a ruling which has been and now is in force as regards all the officers appointed by the Commission. It is as follows:

"The disfranchisement operates upon the existing state and condition of the person, and not upon a past offense. It is, therefore, not retrospective. He alone is deprived of his vote, who, when he offers to register, is then in the state and condition of a bigamist or polygamist, or is then actually cohabiting with more than one woman. But a bigamist or polygamist is such a person as is described in paragraph two above."

"Paragraph 2, referred to above, was as follows:

"A bigamist (or polygamist) in the sense of the 8th section of the Edmunds law, is a man who has entered into the state of plural marriage at any time in the past and still maintains that relation—it not having been dissolved by death, divorce, or other effectual manner—and he is still a polygamist, even though he restricts his cohabitation to but one woman."

So that no registration or election officer can plead justification in law, or in the proper discharge of duty, or in directions from his superiors in office, for the deprivation of the right to vote which many People's Party citizens have suffered.

In addition to all this, Chief Justice Zane has ruled further upon the matter. Wm. B. Bennett, of West Jordan, was tried October 28, 1889, in the Third District Court for illegal voting. The ground of the charge was that he was a polygamist, because his former plural wife was still living and that, though he had separated from her, he could be nothing else than a polygamist, unless the President pardoned him. This was urged by the strongest counsel the "Liberals" could engage.

Judge Zane reviewed the proposition and said:

"The question is, what is the meaning of the term polygamist, as used in the statute, and what is necessary to terminate that relationship? In a general sense a man is a polygamist who practices polygamy, or maintains that it is right, but that is probably too general a definition for this statute. In the case of *Murphy vs. Ramsey*, the United States Supreme Court said the law did not apply to those who went into polygamy before there was a law against it, but to those who were actually in the relationship; a man