

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - Dec. 20, 1882.

THE PITEOUS PLEA OF THE "LIBERAL" EIGHTEEN.

We publish to-day the petition to Congress of the "Liberal" central committee, which was noticed some days ago in the press dispatches as the petition of "the Gentiles of Utah." We expressed our doubts then of the alleged paternity, and the signatures justify our remarks. It is the petition of eighteen persons—if all the persons named signed the memorial, which we have good reason to doubt—who represent the views of a few others as reckless, radical and untruthful as themselves, but not the majority of the non-"Mormons" of Utah. The object of the petition is to subvert republicanism in this Territory and, to use one of their own expressions, set up "a government without a vote." They ask—in the event that the Territory is not turned over to the rule of the minority—for the abolition of all local self-government and the appointment of a Commission to make the laws by which the Territory shall be governed.

What are the grounds on which they base this extraordinary demand? Simply that the party which they claim to represent—its numbers when greatly exaggerated by "Liberal" claims, reaching only 30,000 out of 150,000,—cannot gain control of local affairs by the only legitimate means, namely, votes at the ballot box. That is the whole ground in view when the rubbish is cleared away. The table of votes cast from 1870 to 1882, which accompanies the document, shows the same position and nothing more. The fact is exhibited that the party for which the petitioners claim to speak has but a sixth of the voting strength of the population. All their pretended arguments, sophistical reasonings and unwarrantable deductions make no difference to this fact, the small minority of Utah's citizens want either to rule over the large majority or procure the entire destruction of all local self-government.

The great grievance of these eighteen petitioners is thus set forth to Congress: "The loyal element," that is their own party, of course, have failed, "after years of active, earnest endeavor, to make inroads upon the Mormon vote." What a plea to make to the Legislature of the nation! Imagine eighteen Republicans claiming to speak for one sixth of the voters of a Territory, arguing that because the Democrats, numbering the other five-sixths of the voters, persist in voting for members of their own party, and the few "loyal" citizens, after "years of active, earnest endeavor," cannot make inroads upon the "disloyal" Democratic vote, therefore all local rule should be abolished and a commission of nine, or eleven, or thirteen, "loyal" Republicans should be appointed to make laws to govern the majority. Would not the proposition be received with shouts of laughter by members of every party in the land? Yet that is the position exactly, substituting the word "Liberals" for "Republicans" and the People's Party or the "Mormons," whichever you please, for "Democrats."

These very "Liberal" but very silly petitioners try to have it appear that their failure "to make inroads upon the Mormon vote" is due to "the control of the Mormon priests over their followers." But it will strike candid minds as much more probable that the "Mormon" vote is cast for the "Mormons" friends by the free will and choice of the voters, particularly when it is understood that the "Liberals" have had ample opportunity to address the "Mormons" and use "active, earnest endeavors for years" to win them over, and that the ballot in Utah is

secret. Such minds will conclude that the "Mormons" show good sense in voting for their friends and not voting for their enemies; and that these so called "Liberals" are their enemies is clearly proven by the present "active, earnest endeavor" to deprive these people who will not vote for them, of all power to vote for anybody.

The quotations made from the "Liberal" platform contain a collection of most impudent and transparent falsehoods, the villainy of which is susceptible of easy proof. Reference need only be made to the statutes of Utah to demonstrate this. It will be a matter of no difficulty for a person acquainted with the facts to point out the laws of this Territory which put to utter rout the mendacious statements set forth in the petition.

There is one assumption in the document now considered which will be apparent to every Congressman who pays any attention to it. It is this: "The Edmunds bill indicates an intention to strike at the vital point, the political power of the Mormon Church." The law referred to does not contemplate any blow at the "Mormon" Church, or the political power of people known as "Mormons." Its intention is shown in its title and its provisions. It is aimed at polygamy. Its object is to deprive practical polygamists of the right to vote and hold office. That being effected the political intent of the law would be accomplished. The criminal part of the law is also directed against the practice of polygamy. There is nothing in the law pretending to disfranchise "Mormons" who are not polygamists or to strike at "the Mormon Church."

But this is what the petitioners are striking at. For years they raised a howl about polygamy and pretended that all they wanted was its elimination from the politics of Utah. But now polygamy is by legal enactment excluded from any active part in the local government, these disingenuous persons are more rampant and dissatisfied than ever. They now want to destroy the "Mormon" vote altogether. And they ask with the utmost assurance that Congress shall "take all political power from the Mormon people." The "vexed problem" is no longer "polygamy in Utah," but the right of the "Mormons," that is those "Mormons" who are not polygamists, to have any voice in their local affairs. They poll over twenty-three thousand votes against less than five thousand of the "Liberals," and yet Congress is advised that it would be "eminently proper" to "turn over the government of the Territory to the minority of its people," and failing to act upon such a monstrous proposition, that body is asked to deprive the whole Territory of the voting power and reduce them to political slavery.

What for? Just because the "Mormons" will not vote for the "Liberals." That is all there is to it. The whole petition is based upon that. And Congress is advised that unless one of these two things is done these "Liberals" will have "reached a point where discouragement must ensue." This is simply terrible! It should provoke another rush for legislation without debate, like the passionate exhibition of unstatesmanship that preceded the passage of the Edmunds law. Just think of it! "Discouragement will ensue" to eighteen prominent "Liberals" in Utah, with their associates and hangers on, if Congress does not strike down all political liberty and strangle republicanism in this Territory, and either turn over the local government to a few scheming tricksters, or give it into the hands of nine persons irresponsible to the people!

Instant relief for the eighteen is demanded. If it is not afforded they will certainly become discouraged. They have found out that they can't make inroads on the "Mormon" vote, for the "Mormons" are so different from other citizens that they will vote for their friends. So let the Constitution, republican institutions and common sense be discarded, and the prayers of the eighteen be granted, for if they were to become discouraged what would be the fate of the nation?

THE SEAT IN THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

ACCORDING to dispatches from Washington, "a nice legal question" is involved in the application of Hon. John T. Caine for a seat as Delegate from Utah in the present

session of the Forty-Seventh Congress. It is true that there was no proclamation of the Governor for the election at which Mr. Caine was chosen for that position, because the Governor was such a strong stickler for law that he would not act upon implied authority, but required specific statutory powers in order to act in the premises. But the election was regularly called and conducted as the law provides. No provision was violated, no technicality neglected.

The returns were properly made, but they were not canvassed by the Board specially appointed to canvass and certify to the returns of the election of Delegate to the Forty-Eighth Congress, and it is not denied that the votes for Delegate to the unexpired term of the Forty-Seventh Congress were duly cast, or that the count made by the Judges of Election was incorrect; neither is there any other candidate claiming to be entitled to the seat.

The only nice legal point involved is, had the people, from whom all power is supposed to emanate, the right to express at the polls at a regular election, their will on an important matter connected with the main object of the election but not essentially involved therein, and shall the House of Representatives, which is the sole judge of the election as well as qualifications of its members, take cognizance of the will of the people when there is no doubt as to its expression at the ballot box.

The refusal of the Governor to issue a proclamation for the election of Delegate to fill the unexpired term, would have looked more consistent if he had not acted upon assumed implied authority in the case of the former Delegate. In this case he would have done no harm to any one, and the law would not have condemned him; in the other he did an intended wrong to the injury of the Delegate-elect, and contrary to his own official oath as well as in neglect to perform a duty positively required of him. When an officer pretends to be such a stickler for positive authority in one case he ought to be equally particular in another. When it suited him he could assume extreme authority, when it did not suit him he could ignore implied authority. However we hope to see Mr. Caine seated, for Utah is clearly entitled to the representation of which she has been deprived.

AN UNLAWFUL ACT CONDEMNED.

THE Philadelphia *American*, in an article commenting on the Louisiana certificate case, makes the annexed remark:

"The Constitution of the United States says that each House of Congress shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own members. Two years ago the Governor of Utah thought he would be a better judge than the House, so he gave the certificate to Mr. Campbell and refused it to Mr. Cannon, who had the majority of votes. A Territorial delegate is not strictly a member of the House, yet it was voted that the Governor of Utah had trampled on the House's prerogatives."

The *American* is correct. The action of the House of Representatives, as well as the reports of the majority and the minority of the Committee on Elections, was as heavy a condemnation of the course of the Governor of Utah as could be expressed. The refusal to admit the Delegate from this Territory was grounded on the polygamy objection and on that alone. The certificate given to the Governor was treated as a fraudulent document and of no force or value in law or equity. The assumption of the Governor in presuming to sit upon the qualifications of a Delegate-elect was placed at its proper value, and the statement set forth in the certificate that Allen G. Campbell was the person, being a citizen of the United States, who had the greatest number of votes was proven to be a falsehood.

Not only was the position taken by the Governor shown to be a false one, a position that he had no right whatever to assume, but Mr. Cannon was declared to be a citizen of the United States and to have received 18,568 votes against Mr. Campbell's 1,857, so that the certificate was false in language as well as in intent, and was a vain and foolish fraud in every respect.

The apologists for the Governor, who try to palliate his crime by pretending that he did a service to his country, by giving a pretext to the House of Representatives to exclude Mr. Cannon on account of his marital relations, cannot cover up the fact that the certificate was a falsehood and the action of the Governor was an assumption of authority for which he had no shadow of justification in the law.

The *American* is right in its charges against the Governor, and they cannot be disproved. And that the offending official is still occupying the position for which he proved himself unfit, is not the fault of Congress, but of the Administration. If the gentleman's friends do not want the unpleasant facts to be alluded to they had better not seek to make them subjects of remark by eulogizing his act, directly or indirectly, for that will only provoke explanations of the truth, which are deeply damaging to all his professions of "loyalty" and other similar buncombe.

"MIXED MARRIAGES."

THE Coast papers note that, "the archbishop and bishops of California of the Catholic church have issued a pastoral letter to their flocks, denouncing mixed marriages (Catholic and Protestant), and urging their people not to marry in haste, but to give timely notice to pastors, that the banns may be duly published. They order that no priest shall preside at a marriage except on three days' notice, and after publication of banns (where both parties are Catholics), and lastly, that 'in no case whatever can a Catholic be married by any other than a priest without subjecting himself to excommunication.'"

We hear no condemnation of this by the press. But suppose the word "Mormon" were substituted for "Catholic" in this connection, what a storm it would raise in the West, and spread forth even unto the East, arousing the whole country to indignation! Congress would be called upon for immediate action to crush out the "Mormon hierarchy" and sweep away the priests who dared thus "to infringe upon the liberties of citizens." But the country is used to such proclamations from the Catholic dignitaries, and there is nothing said about this, although the number of people whom it affects is so immensely greater than the whole membership of the "Mormon" Church in every part of the world.

Now, we have no fault to find with the pastoral letter to the Catholic clergy. We think it is quite consistent, and within the bounds of the prerogatives of the ecclesiastical authority which issued it. The Catholic has the right to prescribe as one of its rules that its members shall not marry outside of its pale and still retain the privileges of membership. So with any religious denomination. If persons do not wish to subscribe to its regulations they can sever their connection with the body. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has not proceeded to this extremity. It gives strong advice to its members against "mixed marriages," that is of "Mormons" with "Gentiles," but does not excommunicate them for disregarding that counsel, and yet there are good and sufficient reasons why such unions should be strictly forbidden.

True marriage, according to the doctrine of this Church, is ordained of God. Its celebration is a religious ordinance. It cannot be properly administered except by a man holding divine authority. It is of far higher importance than a mere civil contract. It should be solemnized as an eternal covenant. Not until death only, but for this world and the world to come. Divorce is wrong, and only permitted because of the sins, weaknesses and follies of men and women. A marriage administered by any one but an authorized representative of Deity is not the marriage ordained of God. It is binding between the parties like any other contract under the civil law that does not partake of the divine, but is not recognized in heaven and will not have any force in the world to come. Neither will the offspring of the union be regarded as under the direction of the parents in the eternal world. The relation will end with the decease of the parties. But a true marriage, in which God's authority as the

Father of the race and the Supreme Ruler of all is recognized, and by which loving hearts are united in a holy compact forever, is acknowledged in the heavens above as well as on the earth beneath, and the family formed under its divine direction and benediction is a perpetual organization, in which the relations of husband and wife, of parents and children are never sundered, and the increase of which never ceases while the cycles of eternity succeed each other or the throne of Jehovah endures.

"Mormon" boys and girls are advised not to marry with "Outsiders," for excellent reasons. There is an abiding antagonism of spirit and sentiment between what is called "Mormonism" and the systems of the world, similar to that which ever exists between truth and error, light and darkness. In the home there should be perfect unity. If the parties continue to belong to the adverse divisions there cannot possibly be true harmony in the home. After the novelty of the new position wears away discord will be sure to ensue; unless one of the parties gives way to the views of the other, and then either the former Saint becomes an apostate or the "Gentile" becomes a "Mormon." The member of the Church, by placing himself or herself in a false position, is liable to turn away from the truth and lose that standing which is of more value than all the earth and its riches. All religious bodies of any force or power in society have recognized the impropriety of the marriage of its members with persons of an antagonistic creed.

The effect of unions in which the parties are of opposite faiths is generally evil upon the offspring, and quarrels frequently ensue as to the child's religious training. The seeds of discord are sown in the child's being by reason of the inharmonious relations of the parents, and disunion is increased and perpetuated, often leading to the destruction of the household.

But the eternal consequences are the most serious. Death separates the husband and wife, the parents and children; and the contract of marriage, with its results, not being recognized in the heavens, where "they neither marry nor are given in marriage," the husband has no wife, the wife no husband, the children no parents, the parents no children. The former husband and wife are separate and single without increase or its possibility. They cannot reach the higher glories of the celestial kingdom, in which are involved family associations and government, and which reach out to the multiplication and peopling of worlds, under the law and dominion of the Eternal Father, and for the never ending exaltation of those who are joined by the eternal compact of celestial marriage.

There are principles connected with this subject which cannot be comprehended by minds unilluminated by the Spirit of Him who has garnished the heavens and studded the firmament with His creations. But they are known to "the wise" and are counted of priceless value. The Saints should teach these things to their children, and explain, as far as possible, the stupendous folly and irreparable loss of unions with those who know not God and are outside the blessings and privileges of the everlasting covenant. And while the Church does not proceed to the extremity of excommunicating those of its members who disregard its admonitions respecting marriage, it is, none the less certain to the true Saint and servant of the Lord that no marriage but that solemnized in the way and by the authority ordained of the Almighty, can bring true matrimonial felicity in this world or that exaltation for which the Saints are striving in the world that is to come. Israel should wed Israel, and they who disregard this admonition will see sorrow, and lose riches and glory beyond human computation.

LOCAL AND OTHER MATTERS.

FROM FRIDAY'S DAILY, DEC. 15.

Married.—Yesterday, December 14th, Mr. Leo Grow and Miss Lizale Jenkins, both of this city, were united in marriage. The groom is the son of our respected townsman Brother Henry Grow, and is a promising young man, while the bride is an estimable young lady. They have our best wishes.