

## RAMPANT "LIBERALS" DISGUISED AS DEMOCRATS.

A self-constituted committee calling itself the Democratic Territorial Committee has issued a call for a Territorial Convention to appoint delegates to the Democratic Convention to be held at Chicago, and has accompanied the call with a platform of principles which the so-called committee lays down as the only standing ground on which it will recognize any person in Utah as a member of that party.

The Salt Lake Herald of this morning clearly points out the facts that there is now no Democratic organization in Utah; that for the last six or eight years the individuals now claiming to dictate to Democrats what they shall adopt as a test of their standing, have not only suffered the organization to go into decay, but have acted with other parties opposed to the Democracy, and that this call is only a trick in the interest of the "Liberal" party.

The facts are irrefutable, and if there is any Democratic party in Utah, the persons now claiming to be its Territorial Committee are not recognized by that party. The only chairman of any committee of the party that we know of is Hadley D. Johnson. But the organization as the Herald states, has gone to decay, and if the Democrats of Utah intend to take any part in national politics, they should reorganize on a basis broad enough to include all citizens who stand by general Democratic principles, and with limits so well defined that those who reject any of those principles may not be numbered in its membership.

The self-constituted committee speaks entirely without authority. But this is not all. In its attempt to dictate what shall form the political creed of Utah Democrats, it goes widely astray from Democratic doctrine and demonstrates its object to be not the promotion of the Democracy, but the subjugation of the majority of the people of Utah. The very first "principle" laid down in the address of the committee, and adherence to which they make binding on all who participate in primaries or county meetings, is subversive of true Democratic doctrine. Here it is:

1. That all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed; and in all cases where these powers are ascertained and determined by decisions of courts of last resort, their judgments are conclusive of all questions of power decided, and binding on every citizen, and all attempts to call in question or defeat them are factious and revolutionary.

The first part of it is all right. But the attempt in the latter part to deny the right of the people to call in question the official doings of one branch of that government which derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed, is rank political heresy, and savors of despotism rather than Democracy. We need only to refer to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the legal tender case. It is meeting with general denunciation from the Democratic press. It is shown to be subversive of the true interests of the country, and hostile to the Constitution. We will make just one quotation. It is from the *American Register*, published at Washington, D. C., and not excelled in the country as an able and vigorous exponent of Jeffersonian Democracy:

Every department of the Government has deteriorated and become corrupted by the long continuance of the party in power. Even the Supreme Court of the United States has become so far partisanized as to declare in a recent decision that the standard of value of the commercial world is not by our Constitution made the basis of our money system. This sweeps away at once the foundation of our financial system, and of the credit and character of our Government at home and abroad, and subjects the country hereafter to the deplorable evils of an irredeemable paper money system."

Judge Field's dissenting opinion on this decision expresses true Democratic ideas and shows up the fallacy of the reasoning of the Court. But the Democrats of Utah are to be deprived of the right of calling that decision in question, and of the right to make any attempt of any kind in opposition to it. And the men who thus attempt to tie up American citizens in this way, call themselves Democrats and assume to dictate what Democrats shall believe and act upon.

By what logic will they justify the change of ruling on this question by the Supreme Court? In 1870 the court decided to the exact reverse of its latest ruling. On the rule laid down above it was "factious and revolutionary" to call the first decision in question. And if any Democrat thinks the first decision right and as a consequence the last decision wrong, and should call it in question in any way, he would be thrust out of the party by this wonderful "Territorial Committee."

We pass to the consideration of a Resolution embodied in the "committee's" declaration of principles, which is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the solemn duty of the Government to provide a suitable law for suppressing the practice of polygamy in the Territories, and proper officials to enforce it, that this

gigantic evil which has so long flourished in spite of the zeal of Republican conventions and the apathy of Republican administrations, shall cease.

This is the root of the whole matter, and shows the movement to be nothing but a dodge of the "Liberal" party, to which all of the "committee" really belong and of which they are active members, to force upon the Democratic party an issue which does not belong to it. According to true Democratic doctrine—one principle of which is announced at the opening of the precious address from which we quote—the Government has no authority to legislate directly for the Territories nor to govern any people without the consent of that people. And this resolution would commit Democrats to "anti-Democratic doctrine and constitute the party a mere anti-"Mormon" organization, pledged to do violence to the principles which are vital to Democratic government. Congress has no right to legislate on the subject of Marriage in any way, nor to make laws for any Territory without giving the people a voice in the selection of those who make those laws. And any one who denies that proposition denies simple Democratic fundamentals.

But the persons figuring as the head and front of this pretended Democratic organization are not Democrats, either in principle or act. They have helped to sustain radical Republican candidates for office. They are hand and glove with the blackest kind of black Republicans in all their political schemes for the enthrallment of this community. They seek to obliterate every particle of Democratic government in this Territory. They want to destroy the elective franchise in Utah. They encourage and applaud a measure to set up a despotism here more binding and galling than Russian autocracy. They are striving to reduce scores of thousands of American citizens to a condition worse than any kind of serfdom that exists in any part of the civilized world.

Democrats! They have no Democratic spirit or principles among them. Such as they have put forth in their address are merely used as a blind, and are contradicted in the very same breath with which they are uttered. No true Democrat will submit to their assumed leadership or be bound by their anti-Democratic dicta. There are many persons in Utah who entertain the true principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, and if they want to organize, they should do so independent of men who have prostituted their influence to the support of those who are open enemies of the Democracy as they are of popular government in Utah. Let the "committee" whistle against the wind and pose as dictators if they choose, but let them play their "Liberal" antics, disguised or in their naked deformity, alone and despised in their fallen glory.

### "I AM PASTOR NOW."

LAST Saturday we published some details of curious proceedings in Madison Avenue, N. Y., Congregational Church, of which J. P. Newman is pastor. The meeting of Tuesday the 8th inst., was still more peculiar, and justified the statement of Dr. Ranney, of the anti-Newman faction, that the pastor would tender his resignation with the full understanding that it would not be accepted. A prominent exchange gives this description of the singular scene, more characteristic of a gathering of blatant political log-rollers than an assemblage of Christians:

"Stalwart policemen, with night clubs swinging at their sides, guarded every aisle of the Madison Avenue Church as the loyal Newmans swarmed through the big entrance doors to-night and massed, to the number of 300 odd, about the pulpit. Silken cords were drawn across the aisles, and Newman sentries stood near to prevent strangers from passing inside the lines. A handful of the Ranney phalanx gathered in a bunch in lonely seclusion at the extreme north of the church, and waited for the beginning of what they called the 'Newman farce.' At 8 o'clock Dea. Finch offered prayer and Dea. Cummings rose on the north in his war paint and flourished a protest, which he read and asked to have entered, on the minutes. The protest was signed by J. W. Ranney, T. F. Hopkins, Wm. Leggett, H. M. Cummings, G. A. Palmer and A. E. Barnes. It recited that on behalf of themselves and 437 members of the church, these gentlemen protested against the meeting, on the ground that it was neither a meeting of the church society nor of the church members, but a mixed assembly of members and pewholders, such as the advisory council, Bro. Sherman and Lawyer Abbott, had expressly discountenanced as illegal, and that it was not properly called and had no authority to do anything about the church affairs. Chairman Breen had his war paint on, too, and pulling his grey beard, he invited the meeting to table the protest, and 331 loyal Newmans promptly and vociferously obliged. The vote reached Dea. Cummings just as his hat disappeared through the church door. Dea. Peter Dewitt invited all those opposed to Dr. Newman to retire. Four men and two women arose and swept past the policemen amid a storm of hisses and derisive laughter.

Dea. Dewitt wheeled round in the doorway, with his eyes blazing, and cried: 'I thought this was a Christian assembly, but I should judge now that it was a den of vipers.' He shot out of the door amid a fresh outburst of laughter. Sunday School Superintendent Brush ascended the pulpit steps and read a letter from Parson Newman offering his resignation. When the reading ceased, they all stood up in a body, while Teller's Wright and Anderson counted just 333 heads in favor of keeping the parson. There wasn't a solitary negative voter left, and the loyal Newman ladies and their loyal husbands applauded till the gas jets danced. Parson Newman appeared opportunely at the vestry door in his spring overcoat, with his black beaver in his hand, and cheers mingled with the hand-clapping. At length the parson walked to the reading stand, and, resting on the big Bible, stated that he had tendered his resignation in profound sincerity, but, as it had not been accepted, he would devote his talents henceforth to the eternal welfare of those who had stood so firmly by the church and by him. He forgave all his opponents, and asked his friends to do the same. Then the women crowded around until the parson could not move, and shook hands with him for 15 minutes without stopping. 'What's the next move?' was asked of the anti-Newman cabinet. 'We'll meet Dr. Newman in the courts,' replied Dea. Ranney.

'Everything is peaceful and settled,' said Parson Newman, as he got ready to go home. 'I am pastor now.'

The description of such a scene is liable to create in the peruser a feeling of mingled amusement and disgust. The participants were professed followers of Christ, yet their conduct showed an utter destitution of the characteristics of the Great Master. The few who held opposite views from those entertained by the majority were indecently, almost violently, expelled and treated to "hisses and derisive laughter." A merited rebuke was met by another dose of the same medicine. Pastor Newman, who never intended to resign, as the whole affair shows, evidently not only stretched the truth but deliberately resorted to its opposite when he said his resignation was tendered in sincerity. Probably but few if any will believe that a man of his caliber will devote his talents to any body's eternal welfare, his interests being too much swallowed up in looking after his own worldly advantage, as exhibited in the exultant exclamation, "I am pastor now." Not only was the meeting, as described by the Ranney faction, a "Newman farce," but a travesty of religion.

### IMPROVEMENT AMONG INDIANS.

THE Indian agent of the Pima Agency, Arizona, Dr. Jackson, is credited by the *Star*, as being one of the most successful among that class of officials. He is among the Papago, Pima and Maricopa Indians. The Phoenix, Arizona, *Gazette* recently had an interview with Dr. Jackson, who gives a very good account of the Indians under his jurisdiction. It appears from the statement that there are about 13,000. These Indians are self-sustaining and farm extensively. The appropriation for school purposes and farming implements is only \$17,000, or about \$1.25 a head. There are no rations issued to them. It is his opinion that there would be less trouble with the Apache Indians if they were required to work for their own sustenance. There are about 7,000 Apaches and they receive \$250,000. Mr. Jackson says the school at his agency is doing well. There are about seventy-five pupils, and they learn to read and write rapidly. They have recently completed a nine mile ditch to the agency, and will this year cultivate 150 acres of land at the agency. He has made a requisition for thirty-five wagons, which he will receive, and he says that in less than six months every wagon will be taken and paid for by the Indians—paid in work. He will establish a school on the Papago reservation in a short time. He has succeeded in making arrangements with the railroad company to prevent the Indians from riding at will on the cars, and since the order has been in force there has been but little drunkenness among the Indians. In the past three months 150 Indians have died with the smallpox, though the scourge has been almost entirely checked.

### PECULIARITIES IN SPEAKERS.

IN speaking of the peculiarities of men when addressing audiences, the London *Truth* says Gladstone generally scratches the back of his head with his thumb. Sir Stafford Northcote flaps his hands like a talking fish. Lord Randolph Churchill worries his moustache. It is interesting to note the singularities exhibited by some local rhetoricians. A favorite movement of a certain rather boisterous anti-"Mormon" stump speech maker is to persist in boring the air overhead with his index finger, besides doing the same thing to his audience with his speech. Another of the same stripe stands limply, as if his tall form required a brace, while his hand is held loosely forward as if the gall was

dripping from his fingers as well as his cold and expressionless lips. A criminal lawyer of this city gesticulates fiercely with the whole of his spare figure in play, and gives the spectators an impression that providing the decision be unfavorable to him it is his undoubted intention to cuff the ears of the Court.

### SCHOOLS IN UTAH.

THE pious frauds who are continually deceiving the people of the United States in regard to education in Utah, for the purpose of getting money from the benevolent, should notice the remarks recently made in Congress in relation to schools in this Territory. Representative C. H. Morgan, of Missouri, while the bill providing for aid to common schools was being discussed in Congress, made a fitting tribute to the excellent standard of Utah in educational matters by saying:

"It will be found by an examination of the table submitted to us that the Territory of Utah has a less proportion of illiteracy to-day than several of the older States in the Union. Utah is not very celebrated for its good morals, but they have a very fine school system in Utah. I have been there; I have examined it. A very large proportion of the children of Utah are in school every day that they can spare from work upon the farms of their fathers, and as to Sunday schools, there never was such a country for Sunday schools as Salt Lake City and the surrounding region."

### POWERS OF THE GOVERNMENT—SCHOOLS IN UTAH.

WE publish to-day another communication from Mr. T. W. Curtis to the Boston *Index*. The writer is a thorough skeptic on revealed religion, but appears to be strictly impartial and honest in his treatment of believers. He is familiar with Utah affairs, and speaks largely from personal knowledge and the rest from information derived from reliable sources. In response to his letter on education in Utah Mr. W. J. Potter, editor of the *Index*, comes out with a long article in which he lays down the proposition that it does not matter how moral, well educated or liberal the people of Utah may be, it is still the duty of the National Government to "reform Utah" by legislation and its enforcement against polygamy. We quote as follows:

The question, therefore, before Congress with regard to Utah and any of the Territories (for Mormonism is spreading into the Territories adjacent to Utah), is this: Shall the nation now ignore its own marriage laws and permit the plea of religious faith to nullify its authority in respect to marriage customs, and allow the current of civilization in this important matter of the home and family to be turned backward, or shall it continue to treat any other than monogamic marriage as a crime? Our opinion is, that the national government must adhere to the latter alternative, and thus protect the integrity of the home, the equality of woman with man, and the rights of children; and that the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom gives no ground for countenancing the crime of polygamy more than it does for countenancing homicide or theft, should they be set up as religious rites."

It is strange that such a clear-headed writer as Mr. Potter shows himself to be, does not perceive the wide difference between essential crime and an offence made criminal by law, and also the lack of constitutional authority in Congress to legislate on the subject of marriage. He asks: "Shall the nation ignore its own marriage laws and permit the plea of religious faith to nullify its authority in respect to marriage customs," etc.? Will Mr. Potter, through the columns of the *Index*, please quote for our benefit and the enlightenment of its readers, one of the marriage laws of Congress, and that clause of the Constitution which gives to that body "authority in respect to marriage customs," etc.? We do not know of any marriage law of the United States, and we deny that Congress has any constitutional power to pass a law of that kind or to regulate "marriage customs," and ask the gentleman to be kind enough to bring forth his proofs for the position he has taken.

He speaks of the protecting power of Congress in regard to "the equality of woman with man." If that body has any power of this kind it is merely to protect women as well as men in their rights. Let us suppose a case: If two women chose to unite themselves to the same man, he being agreeable, and the sentiment and usage of the society in which they move sanction the alliance, what need is there for any "protecting power of Congress" to secure woman's equality with man? Would not a power exercised to prevent these parties from acting on their own will and choice under these circumstances, be a curtailment of their liberty instead of a "protection," and thus an infringement of two natural rights—those of liberty and the pursuit of happiness? No such pretended "protecting power" is needed, and

it is not vested in the Government of the United States.

Mr. Potter falls into the common error of classing polygamy with homicide, theft and other essential crimes against which laws are of right enacted. And yet there is nothing whatever in common between them. "Mormon" plural marriage is contracted by the consent and with the understanding of all the parties. It violates no human rights. It is a mutual agreement. Homicide and theft are crimes of themselves, because they are invasions of the rights of the individual and would be criminal if no laws were passed against them. Plural marriage has to be defined and constituted a crime by law or it would not be criminal. And Congress has no more right to make it a crime or provide for its punishment, than it has to make celibacy a crime, and enact penalties against that condition. If Congress has the right to say a man shall have but one wife, it has the right to limit by law the number of his children. Mr. Potter talks about Congress protecting "the rights of children." Does he think that if parents are considered too poor to provide properly for more than one or two children, Congress should provide penalties against the parents for producing a greater number? And if not why not, when he claims such extraordinary powers for the National Legislature?

It is certain that no such authority as is claimed for the Federal Government by Mr. Potter and others can be found in the Constitution of the United States. But some people appear to think that such authority may be conferred by implication. This is a dangerous doctrine. Once admit this undefined and general power, and the whole system of our government, that of a Union of independent States, could be overthrown and a Nation evolved from the debris which would be but little removed from a monarchy. There is nothing clearer to the impartial student of constitutional law than the principle that the Government of the United States is one of delegated and limited powers, and that these are strictly defined in the Constitution. It has therefore no authority other than that which is derived from that instrument and expressly named therein. All other powers are reserved to the respective States or the people.

On this important point we will make a few quotations from the opinion of Judge Field of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the recent legal tender case, an able exposition of the law, which is endorsed by the leading minds of the country and cannot be refuted. He says:

"When the Constitution came before the convention of the several States for adoption, apprehension existed that other powers than those designated might be claimed, and it led to the first ten amendments. When these were presented to the States they were preceded by a preamble stating that the conventions of a number of the States had, at the time of adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, 'in order to prevent misconception or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added.' One of them is found in the tenth amendment, which declares that 'the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'"

There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the Government of the United States. It is a government of delegated powers, supreme within its prescribed sphere, but powerless outside of it. In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution, entrusted to it; all else is withheld."

"The doctrine that a power not expressly forbidden may be exercised, as I have observed, change the character of our Government. If I have read the Constitution aright, if there is any weight to be given to the uniform teachings of our great jurists and of commentators previous to the civil war, the true doctrine is the very opposite of this. If the power is not in terms granted, and is not necessary and proper for the exercise of a power which is thus granted, it does not exist."

The doctrine laid down by Judge Field is that held by the great jurists and statesmen of the country from the beginning. And the idea which is taking hold of certain radical members of the Republican party, of establishing what they call a "strong government," is the old heresy of the Federalists, and means the centralization of political power and the consolidation of the several States into one amalgamated autonomy or Empire. In other words it is revolution, the entire destruction of the system of government established by the fathers of our country. Against this every lover of his race and supporter of popular sovereignty should use all the influence at his command. And the admission of the right to exercise these implied powers over the Territories, is but the entering wedge to its domination of the States, resulting in the overthrow of true republicanism and the utter downfall of true democracy.

Mr. Potter, in another part of his article, casts some slight doubt on the statements and statistics of Mr. Curtis in regard to education in Utah, and