

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - FEB. 9, 1887

TO THE PRESS OF THE  
COUNTRY.

The press of the United States should, in common justice and common honesty, investigate the Utah question now before the Congress and the country. We have often had to reflect upon the lack of understanding exhibited in most of the editorial remarks made on this subject. It is truly deplorable. And there is little excuse for it. The means of information are within easy reach. There is no need to rest in ignorance. If the "Mormon" question is of sufficient public interest to require comment, it is of sufficient importance to demand investigation. Yet influential journals frequently dilate upon it in a manner that proves to both "Mormon" and "Gentile," that they have not taken the trouble even to master the most salient points relating to it.

We ask of our contemporaries that they will examine the principal provisions of the bill introduced by Mr. Edmunds in the Senate and almost entirely remodeled by Mr. Tucker in the House, and see how wrong it is in principle and how thoroughly un-American it would be in practice. The common idea is that as it proposes to suppress polygamy it must be a good bill, and that with that end in view, some departure from strictly constitutional and even humane principles may be considered allowable.

But a careful examination of the measure will show that its main design is not the suppression of polygamy. This Tucker-Edmunds craft is sailing under false colors. The press and the public are deceived by the flag flying at the fore. It is a bill to deprive monogamists in Utah of the commonest political rights. It is chiefly a political scheme. And in that respect it does not touch polygamy nor deprive polygamists of any power or position. Their disfranchisement was effected by the Act of March 23, 1882. No bigamist, polygamist or person guilty of unlawful cohabitation can now vote or hold any office under the United States or either of the Territories. No person who believes in the rightfulness of either of the offenses named in that bill can sit on a jury in a prosecution therefor. The present measure is not aimed, politically, against any person living in polygamous relations.

It takes the franchise away from all women voters without distinction. Remember, only monogamists and unmarried women now hold the elective franchise in Utah. The new bill does not propose, then to take it away from anyone on the pretext that she is a polygamist or the wife of a polygamist. Perhaps some of the thoughtless endorsers of the bill will show us how polygamy is to be suppressed by the disfranchisement of monogamists. And whether they believe in the propriety of woman suffrage or not, perhaps they will think a little as to the justice and political morality of forcibly depriving a whole class of citizens who have exercised the franchise for seventeen years, of this vested right, without process of law.

The bill further takes away from monogamous and unmarried male citizens of the Territory, the right to vote for any territorial, district, county and precinct officer, except members of the lower House of the Legislature and the Delegate to Congress. It vests in the President of the United States and the Governor of the Territory the right of appointment of all the local officers down to a constable and a policeman. The people who pay the taxes are to have no voice in the manner of their collection or disbursement. The citizens who are affected by purely local arrangements within their respective counties, are to have no hand whatever in their management.

For directing the election of one Delegate to Congress, and twenty-six Representatives to the local Legislature occurring only once in two years—as clearly explained by the Delegate in a letter to the New York Post—five Commissioners appointed by the President and Senate are to be paid out of the United States Treasury, with their assistants, amounts aggregating \$65,000 a year! Their office was created by a bill which recognized the election by the people of all the local officials, but the proposed bill does away with nearly all the Commissioners' duties and confines their office with its enormous emoluments. The Utah Commission was almost entirely useless from the first, but under the new bill its existence will be a burlesque on free government and a scandalous squandering of public money, so obvious as to need no denunciation of ours.

The bill further proposes to disincorporate two corporations, organized for legitimate business purposes connected with an establishment of religion, and open the way for robbery and spoliation under color of law. The incorporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was simply an act to give that religious body a legal status, for the transaction of its business, the holding and disposition of property belonging to the society, and the gathering of its members from distant places. Its disincorporation by legislative act is a gross violation of right as well as of long recognized principles of jurisprudence. Every religious establishment has the right to incorporate under the laws of this Territory, and Congress has no more legitimate authority to disincorporate one Church than another. If this is not interfering with religious liberty, then the words are without meaning.

The bill proposes to make the husband and wife competent witnesses against each other in certain instances; to give authority for the issuance of attachments for witnesses without a previous subpoena; to give United States Marshals and their deputies power to act as Sheriffs, constables, etc., and thus intrude into the proper sphere of the local officials. And it proposes, by a test oath, to exclude "Mormons," who believe in but do not practice plural marriage from voting and jury service and office holding. The words "Mormon" and "believer" are not inserted in the oath, but it is so worded as to have this effect without stating it in terms.

In short, the bill intends, and was framed with the purpose, to establish an oligarchy in Utah, in such a way that a small minority, controlled by a few cunning and greedy adventurers, shall be put into the offices which they could never obtain by the republican means of choice at the polls; and to clear the way to the property of the "Mormon" Church, the value of which has been enormously exaggerated; and all for place and plunder on the part of the local intriguers and for popularity on the part of the congressional tools and manipulators.

As for polygamy it simply re-enacts the old penalty that has been prescribed for twenty-five years, while it puts a premium upon adultery. The old and new imprisonment for polygamy is five years, for adultery the new bill prescribes three months! It is a very moral bill is it not? It creates a new offense called "polygamous association," but no mortal can tell what it means or how it will be construed by the courts; but as it is likely to be worked in Utah, it would put a man in the penitentiary for five years and make him forfeit five hundred dollars for shaking hands with a plural wife and the mother of his children, even if he had ceased to live with her, and puts the very extreme punishment of the vilest adulterer at three months imprisonment and one hundred dollars fine.

No wonder the promoters of the bill forced it through the House under the gag rule of the previous question. Let it be once critically examined and the press will see why no amendments were allowed or discussion of the details of the bill permitted. It will be understood why it was not inquired into, section by section, but huddled into passage, mob fashion.

A scheme that cannot bear ventilation and calm deliberation in a legislative body ought to be viewed with suspicion. If it had not been aimed against the unpopular "Mormons," the very manner of its pressure would have caused doubts as to its propriety. Let the press of this nation look into the bill and discover its infamies, and then let those editors who have moral courage enough to defend the right and expose the wrong in face of public ignorance and prejudice, come out like men and denounce the villainous un-American, anti-republican, anti-democratic scheme for place and plunder with the rigorous condemnation that it so richly deserves.

## THE PRIESTHOOD IN POLITICS.

The advocates of repressive and coercive legislation for Utah have two special pleas, which they use alternately as occasion requires. One is that polygamy must be put down at any cost and that unconstitutional measures are justifiable with this end in view. When it is shown that the legislation proposed gives no assurance of accomplishing this purpose, but is rather a political expedient for the disfranchisement of the monogamous majority, the other plea is brought into use: it is that polygamy is not the chief trouble in Utah but the influence of the prevailing religion in politics.

Thinking people who take the trouble to inform themselves on the Utah question instead of joining in the general clamor which precludes investigation, very soon perceive the fact that the polygamy cry is but popular humbug. It is raised to shut off discussion and justify wrong. They see that a bill to disfranchise monogamists is a singular method of suppressing polygamy. They look then for some other reason for the extraordinary, and, at least, questionable methods resorted to for the political subjugation of an entire community. And they are gravely informed that the danger is in the Church controlling the State. If they examine this spec-

ious plea and enquire into the facts, they find that in Utah, political affairs are managed as in other parts of the country, with the exceptions that among the great majority the office seeks the man and not the man the office, and that ruffian and rowdism, inseparable with popular politics, are entirely excluded from the Utah organization embodying eight-tenths of the population and known as the People's Party.

Primaries are held, delegates to a convention are there selected by the citizens, a ticket is formulated and discussed and settled upon by the convention, and on election days the legal voters—all polygamists being excluded—go to the polls quietly and deposit completely secret ballots in sealed, uniform envelopes furnished by the election judges, and thus vote for those whom they desire to be placed in office. These facts being beyond dispute, the inquiries naturally want to know why these people should be deprived of the right to choose their own local officials to attend to their own local business, and why all this power, belonging or right to the people, should be vested in one man who is to them wholly irresponsible.

They are told by the conspirators against the peace of the Territory that, to tell the truth, polygamy really cuts no figure in this matter, but these "Mormons" vote as they are commanded by the heads of the Church. Investigation, if further pursued, discloses the fact that this is simply an unproved, and as far as can be ascertained an entirely groundless assertion. The people who deposit the ballots are not aware of receiving any such command, and all they know about it is what they hear their enemies say on the subject. They can vote just as they choose, they do vote as they choose, and nobody can tell how they vote or for whom they vote unless they choose to tell it, and, further, no one asks them how they voted or makes any fuss about it except the few malignants who cannot control affairs through the ballot and therefore clamor to have it abolished.

What ground, then, remains for the complaint that the great, overpowering and radical grievance that calls for drastic remedies is the dominance of the Church in local politics? It is simply and only this: Men who have influence in the Church, in some instances take an active part in politics. It is natural that if they are respected in one capacity they will be in the other, because the great majority of voters are members of the Church. And in the so-called "Mormon" Church religion is viewed as something more than sentiment. It is looked upon as combining faith with practice. It contains rules of living as well as tenets for believing. And a true Latter-day Saint considers that his whole life and its acts should be governed and directed by the precepts and influence of the religion which he professes. Thus, then, a man whose experience, stability and standing in the Church entitle his opinions to respect, is likely to have considerable influence with his neighbors if he is permitted to take part in local politics.

The question, then, and the only real question left to be considered, is the right of leading men in the Church to take an active practical interest in the affairs of State. The coercion part of the objection may be dismissed at once, as undemonstrable and contrary to the evidence; and we will add, here, that it is entirely untrue, and simply absurd because impossible under the circumstances.

To decide on this matter intelligently, it must be understood that the "Mormon Priesthood," about which so many foolish things are said, includes nearly all the adult male members of the Church. The power of the Priesthood, then, actually means the power of the people. But of course there are presiding authorities and men who are leading spirits in this body of Churchmen. But even they are usually gentlemen who are engaged in some business or occupation of a secular character by which they make their living, and are not exclusively clergymen like the priests and preachers of most religious societies. They are of the people and with the people, and their interests are as closely identified with the public interest as those of any lay member or non-"Mormon."

On these grounds we maintain that the leading men in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have just as much right to a voice in local political affairs as other men. And if, without using any unlawful or coercive measures, they can induce others to vote as they vote, to adopt their views, to sustain the ticket which they consider best at any local election, they are justly, fairly and lawfully entitled to use that influence, and no one can rationally deny their right to do so. Why should a Methodist preacher be permitted to use his influence in politics, and a "Mormon" Elder be excluded? Why should a Catholic priest be allowed to advise Catholics in regard to men and candidates, and a "Mormon" priest be muzzled? Why should religion be shut out of politics and every citizen but one who teaches the highest truths be given full liberty, while the latter is to be tongue-tied and manacled on matters that vitally affect him and his hearers?

On this important subject the Catholic World says:

"If law should be based upon the principles of justice, the authorized exponents of these principles must not be denied a voice in legislation. If the civil code is intended *pro bono publico* in its construction, you cannot ignore those whose lives are devoted to the same grand cause. If at no time are passions so turbulent as in the political campaign, the minister of Him who calmed the winds and the waves must not be outlawed from the scene. The civil state, like every other good gift, comes from God. Its principles are divine, and though their application may be human, still its exalted force must not be forgotten. It is, then, a false maxim that shuts out the minister of religion—presuming his religion to be the true one—from the arena of politics. And the clergyman who resigns his right to a voice in the government of his country is false to his profession."

If this is true in regard to professional ministers of religion, how much more pertinent is it to the case of men who live by other pursuits, but are leaders and preachers among their co-religionists? We claim that a citizen loses no political right by being ordained an Apostle, nor by an appointment to preside in any ecclesiastical capacity. He has just as much right to vote and to gain votes, to express his opinions and influence others to see as he sees. As any lawyer, doctor, editor, or merchant, and may be listened to and heeded on political questions, almost, if not quite as closely, as a bar-room bummer, a professional stump-orator, a chronic office-hunter or a "Liberal" and infidel freedom-shrieker.

But the infamous theory is unblushingly advanced that all the local political power must be wrested from the hands of the "Mormons," because they are supposed to follow the advice of men whom they believe to be their best friends and are competent to guide them in an emergency, in preference to the conspirators against their liberties whom they utterly despise. In other words, the minority, including the worst elements of society, the habitués of the prisons and jails, the frequenters of the lowest and vilest haunts, the habitual law-breakers and the non-taxpaying ingesters against taxation, cannot gain control of the Territory nor any part of it because of paucity of numbers, and so they are working with all their might to deprive the majority of all political power whatsoever. And clergymen and congressmen are falling into their trap and aiding them in bringing about this infamy.

This is the situation exactly; this is the present "Mormon" question in a nutshell. Let the fair and candid press and people of the country consider and then decide, and let their voice be heard on the side of reason and right, no matter how much the mob may declaim against the influence of religion in politics.

## THE "TEREDO NAVATIS."

SAN FRANCISCO is unquestionably the most magnificent city of the Pacific Coast, whose bankers and merchant princes, clad in purple and fine linen, fare sumptuously every day, and vie with each other in the splendor of their establishments, while through her Golden Gate pours the wealth of two hemispheres. Yet she is not happy. There is a worm gnawing at her vitals which defies all the efforts of her great medicine men. She has been persecuted at various times with Chinese cheap labor, with sand-lotters, hoodlums, strikers and similar afflictions, and now she is troubled with worms. It would seem time enough under ordinary circumstances to wait until her demise before making the attack, but this is a fast age and the worms are taking time by the forelock. The name of the particular worm referred to is the Tereido. It is a well known fact that considerable of the property of San Francisco, including the wharves, is built on piles driven into the mud of the harbor. It seems that these are being gradually, yet surely eaten away by the Tereido, involving a loss estimated at \$2,000,000. Every conceivable device has been employed in order to prevent these ravages. Piles have been coated with asphalt and asbestos, Portland cement impregnated with poisonous chemicals, red lead naphtha, covered with vermilion paint, etc.; and still the Tereido continues to bore them so full of holes that they can be knocked to pieces with an ordinary boat hook. This formidable destroyer is described by Marden Manson, engineer of the State harbor commission of San Francisco, as a headless mollusk with a nearly cylindrical body ranging from a few inches to thirty-six inches in length, and from one quarter to three quarters of an inch in diameter. The body is nearly gelatinous and traversed by several tubes serving as an intestinal canal for transmitting the excavated wood, for introducing water and perhaps air. The anterior end is encased in a pair of calcareous semi-spherical cutters, which are hinged and firmly connected and operated by a tough reddish-brown muscle. It attacks the grain but bores longitudinally. It enters just above the mud and works up to above low water mark. In color it is a dingy white and in smell utterly revolting.

## DESPOTISM IN A REPUBLIC.

The Boston Herald commenting editorially on "The Mormon Bill," calls it "an exceedingly stringent measure, admits that it may" be said to deprive the people of the Territory of those personal rights which all American citizens are supposed to possess," but adds: "There seems to be no means by which an undesirable social and religious system can be eradicated by government except by despotic methods and the 'Mormon' bill unquestionably comes under such classification." And the only justification the Herald can offer for this "despotic," stringent "special legislation against an" undesirable social and religious system, is that the Constitution "expressly reserves republican government to the States, and gives Congress a right—a right that it has hitherto cautiously exercised—to govern the Territories in such a manner as it sees fit."

It is strange that the absurdity involved in the last sentence quoted from the Herald should receive any countenance from thinking men. To begin with, it is not true. The Constitution confers no such power upon Congress, either in terms or by implication. It says nothing about Territories. No such form of government is alluded to in that instrument for the perpetuation of republican institutions. It has been repeatedly shown that the clause respecting "the territory and other property of the United States" for the disposal of which Congress is authorized to "make all needful rules and regulations," means United States land. It contains not the slightest allusion to political government. It relates to the disposition of the public domain. It bears upon that "property of the United States" wherever it may be located. That includes the public lands in the States as well as outside their boundaries. The powers granted in that clause, then, are no different as regards "the territory and other property of the United States" in an organized State of the Union, than their "territory and other property," where no State government is organized, whether that territory is inhabited or uninhabited. It relates to land and not to people, for the citizens of the United States are not the "property" of the United States.

If, then, under the clause of the Constitution so often quoted as conferring the extraordinary powers claimed for Congress, that body is authorized to legislate directly for the people as well as the land, it can legislate directly for the inhabitants of a State who dwell on the public lands, and that would be in direct violation of many express provisions of the Constitution and would destroy one of its chief ends and designs. In the clause cited there is nothing more provided in regard to the citizens outside of a State than to those inside of a State, nor to land in a State, a Territory, or the public domain without an organized government.

To seek for those absolute powers over human beings assumed by Congress, we must look to some other part of the Constitution than the clause so often relied upon to justify despotism and apologize for tyranny. The only grant to Congress of the right to "exclusive legislation" in all cases whatsoever, is in regard to the District of Columbia and the arsenals, dockyards and similar public works belonging to the Government. There is nothing else of the kind in the whole document defining and limiting the authority of Congress.

Mr. Tucker, in defending the infamous measure which bears his name, quoted the Constitution as conferring these wonderful powers in a republic, in the clause which gives Congress the right "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department thereof." He then proceeded to argue that "the power of Congress to govern the Territories clearly springs from these clauses of the Constitution by irresistible deduction."

What law, and what logic! Examine this language microscopically and analytically and see if you can discover a single addition of power in it except to pass laws to carry into effect authority previously specified. The Constitution, having defined the powers of the General Government and declared that they were to be confined to the limits marked out, simply authorizes the passage of laws for the execution of those powers. If, then, there is no such authority as that claimed in the body of the instrument, there certainly is none in this clause. If the advocates of absolutism have to rush to this executive provision for support to their cause, they have to rest upon vacancy.

But suppose that by a species of deduction violating all rules of reasoning, and by assuming something that does not exist on the ground that it ought to be there, it is established in practice that Congress has the right under the Constitution to legislate directly for the Territories. Is there anything in that instrument authorizing Congress to govern them "in such manner as it sees fit"? If so, where is it? The Herald says the Constitution "expressly reserves republican government to the States." We can find no such reservation, express or implied. It says "the United States shall guar-