

EDITORIALS.

SETTLEMENT OF "MORMON" TROUBLES.

"BRICK" POMEROY, in his lively and vigorous paper, *Pomeroy's Democrat*, frequently takes a lunge at the fanatics who foam out rage and fury against the "Mormons." And he always has something sensible to urge either in opposition to injustice or in favor of rational treatment of a people and a question which everybody talks about but so few understand. In a recent issue of that interesting journal, the editor recommends the removal of the "Mormon" question from legislation and the courts and its reference to arbitration. He proposes a committee of three, one named by the President of the United States, one by the "Mormons" and the third, a competent jurist, to be chosen by the other two. We do not expect, in the present condition of the public mind and the official disposition, that any such project will meet with extensive favor. But there may come a time when arbitration may be extended to something besides labor disputes and the conflict between corporations and their employees. At any rate, Pomeroy's proposal is made in good faith and with a desire for justice and equity. He offers the following reasons for his proposition:

Under our Constitution, we believe the Mormon Church or form of religion, to be as sacred as any other, and that punishment for a plural marriage relationship entered into before the enactment of a law forbidding it, is in and of itself, a far greater offense than would be the disregard of law by individuals, as the law cannot with impunity turn to attack, read and weaken itself. The right to life, to liberty, to freedom of belief, to happiness, are among the most sacred guarantees of the Constitution. The questions of marriage and divorce are settled not by national or general, but by local laws, and it is a part of the declarations of the Constitution, that the laws of one State or locality must be respected in all other States and localities within the United States.

The assertion that the government of this country is in danger at the hands of Mormons is as false and absurd as would be one that it was in danger from Methodists, Baptists, or others, who enjoy their rights under the Constitution. The idea that any one has a right to interfere against the harmonious family and religious relations of others, is of itself an insult to human rights and manly intelligence.

We would like to see all forms of religion and all known forms and conditions of marriage, and consequent conditions and results tried in this country, side by side, believing that the people would adopt, as they should adopt, that which produced the best results, the same being peace, happiness, prosperity and enjoyment of home and its surroundings.

The Mormons are greatly misunderstood, maligned and persecuted, yet they increase, and will increase, never to be wiped out till God, Himself, so wills. That day will never come till liberty dies. No matter how long or expensive the contest, all wars, quarrels, etc., end in arbitration. Then why not prevent quarrels by arbitration so soon as there arises a matter of difference?

EDMUNDS LOSING HIS LEADERSHIP.

THERE seems to be a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction over the general course of Senator Edmunds. His anti-"Mormon" mania is, of course not noted in the animadversions that are so often passed upon his senatorial actions. But there are so many things about the dictatorial sage from the Green Mountains that jar upon his associates, and also upon the public mind, that his popularity is rapidly on the decline. He will, sometime, certainly meet the fate of all the prominent ultra opponents of the work of God which people commonly call "Mormonism." They never prosper for long. They may flourish for awhile like the "green bay tree," but in a little while, behold "they are not" and their works perish with them. From a number of disparaging articles we have lately seen in the public prints, we select the following from the *Omaha Herald* which, under the above heading, tersely puts the objections more diffusely expressed in other papers:

"It has leaked out that in executive session the partisan resolutions adopted as the outcome of Senator Edmunds' warfare upon the president, are totally disregarded. Instead of rejecting the nominations of every man named in the place of a suspended republican the democratic nominees are being confirmed right along. In fact the republican senators on the quiet are displacing Edmunds from his self-assumed leadership. Nor is the overthrow of the Vermonter an undesired or regrettable occurrence. He has proven himself to be pretty small potatoes as a leader. As a republican he has been selfish, domineering and unworthy. As a senator he has done ill-service to good government and tried

to drag it down when he thought he might rise individually thereby. As the hero of the self-styled reformers or independents, his action and attitude have been laughably incongruous. He has been insincere, sophistical and indecently partisan. His talents have been only a veneer to his personal interests, and there has been just enough virtue in him to barb his personal antipathies. He has been honest enough to keep out of jail, but the honesty which protects principle from policy he does not possess. There will be no tears in republican eyes over his humiliation."

ANTIQUATED AND EXPLODED STORIES.

KATE FIELD is quite rampageous over the removal of her admired and admiring friend, Eli H. Murray, from the Governorship of Utah. In a contribution to *Harper's Weekly* of April 10th, she fairly boils over in a frothy attack on the Presidency of the "Mormon" Church. The female Bohemian probably attributes the downfall of her crony to the influence of those gentlemen, and so they are made the special objects of the venom of her tongue.

The article, like her anti-"Mormon" lectures, is made up of stale gossip with barely enough of the salt of truth in it to save it from corruption. The nub of the whole thing is an affidavit printed years ago in the *Deseret News* and thoroughly refuted, and now brought forward as though it was something newly discovered to do duty against President George Q. Cannon. It is the affidavit of the Jew Razin, which was manufactured for the purpose of helping a contest against Delegate Cannon for his seat in Congress. It alleges that on or about the first day of March, 1855, Brother Cannon taught Razin that it was the duty of every "Mormon" to shed the blood of his neighbor for salvation's sake, and that Razin ought to kill Almon W. Babbitt, who was going East, and was in 1855 killed by the Indians on his way home from Washington. The whole story was bought and paid for and is so absurd and self-refuting as to need no denial to those acquainted with the circumstances related.

Brother Cannon at the time mentioned was not prominent in the Church and early in the spring of 1855 went to California, where he published the *Western Standard*. The affidavit was not concocted till March, 1874, and yet the lively Kate tries to make out that Razin disappeared as the consequence of refusing to do as he was told in 1855. She ought to be a little more particular in examining dates before dishing up such an old and exploded story as Razin's.

To supplement that falsehood she presents, in a deceptive manner, the reply of Delegate Cannon, when Geo. R. Maxwell accused him, in a contest for the Delegateship, of "living with four wives in defiance and wilful violation of the laws of the United States." His answer was simply a legal response, similar to a plea of not guilty, in order to put the accuser to the proof. And as a matter of fact he was not living with any one in defiance or wilful violation of law.

Kate tries to whitewash Murray's attempted usurpation and violation of his oath of office, in giving the certificate of election to a person who was not elected, and says that George Q. Cannon was an alien. Unfortunately for her veracity, Mr. Cannon's citizenship was conceded by the House committee which investigated the matter, and Murray was just as much of a violator of the law and of his oath of office whether Mr. Cannon was an alien or a citizen.

All this is awfully stale, and the grounds she presents in *Harper's Weekly*, as though they were new to the country, have been gone over so many times, that they are to be numbered among the old and weather-beaten paths of ancient history. Whether in lecture or screed, in written or spoken diatribes against the "Mormons," Kate simply repeats a lot of stories that were told to her while in Utah, and that have become so superannuated that the term "chestnut" does not begin to describe their antiquity. They are mouldy with age and ready to fall to pieces with inherent weakness. But the ancient though frisky damsel manages to make a little money by them, and she is welcome to all the good she can get out of their repetition. All the same, however, she must despise herself as much as she does her dupes, when she reflects upon the falsehoods she is helping to circulate through the country.

PROHIBITION IN RHODE ISLAND.

RHODE ISLAND has moved to the front as a prohibition State. An amendment to its Constitution was adopted by a popular vote on the first Wednesday of the present month, forbidding the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. This movement was not inaugurated by the prohibitionists as a party. It was effected outside of party lines, and a victory was achieved in consequence. If it had been made a party question it would have been defeated. But men of

all parties united in sustaining it, and the result is a great surprise to the liquor dealers and their supporters.

This constitutional change has not been accomplished by any sudden wave of popular enthusiasm. It has taken time and deliberation to bring it about. The amendment was proposed a year ago, at the annual town and ward meetings, when it was adopted by the majority of the voters present. It was afterwards presented to the General Assembly of the State and approved by a majority of all the members elected to each house, and was then submitted to the electors, being published officially in the papers for two weeks preceding the election, and in the notices issued by the town and city clerks in the warrants for the election, and finally read by the town, ward and district clerks to the electors on election day, and fifty thousand copies were printed, half with the word "approve" and the other half with the word "reject" and circulated on the day previous to the election. Three-fifths of the votes were in favor of the amendment in order to make it a part of the Constitution of the State. More than the requisite number of votes were cast for it, so it was duly adopted as follows:

ARTICLE V.

"The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage shall be prohibited. The general assembly shall provide by law for carrying this article into effect."

The chief cause for the adoption of this measure was the lax execution of the liquor law throughout the State. It was notorious that intoxicants were sold in many instances without any license. The courts were lax in the enforcement of penalties for infraction of the license system. The police winked at the illegal business. While the revenue collectors looked after the government tax, the local officers failed in their duties. Liquor was sold on Sundays and after midnight in defiance of the law, and the whole license business was recognized as a sham. When arrests were made the parties were allowed to go free on payment of costs, and when bonds were given and forfeited no effort was made to collect the amounts or pursue the evaders of the law. This aroused the friends of order without regard to party, and the result is—prohibition.

The question for Rhode Island now will be, shall prohibition be enforced any better than the license regulations? Laws must be enacted by the General Assembly to give effect to the constitutional provision. Intoxicants are not to be made or sold, to be used as a beverage. This will not prevent their manufacture and sale for other purposes. Unless the legislators who make enactments in pursuance of the amendment are really in earnest in suppressing the liquor traffic, loopholes will be left in the law, through which both distillers and liquor dealers can creep without danger. And whatever the legislators may do, if the people place in office men who will not enforce the law, how much better will the State be under prohibition than under the license system?

So far as it has been tried, prohibition in the United States has been very much of a failure. The law is evaded, the objectionable traffic goes on under various pretexts and subterfuges, and the States where license laws are in force gain the financial benefit of the illegal business in the prohibition States. Of course placing the business under a ban and divesting it of the protection of the law, must to some extent tend to keep down the drinking habit. But it promotes deception and does not accomplish the desired object, unless in localities where the large majority of the people are opposed to tipping. In general practice, in mixed communities, the high license system, reasonably and honestly enforced, has been found to work better results to the community at large than that kind of prohibition which usually exists chiefly in name.

While so many people will have intoxicants at whatever risk or cost, there will be a supply to meet the demand. And how to regulate this supply for the best interests of society without infringing upon personal rights and individual liberty, is one of the most important problems of the age in which we live.

MICE AS A PLAGUE.

CONSIDERABLE speculation has been indulged in of late as to the cause of the marvelous increase in field mice within the past few months in this Territory, and especially in this country. Of course these and other kinds of rodents have been known to exist in the Territory to a limited extent since it was settled; in fact, field mice were observed to be quite numerous on the site of Salt Lake City during the first year that a crop was raised here. They attracted but little attention, however, at that time or since, until quite recently from the fact that their destructive propensity was not specially manifested. And possibly their evident increase of late would not have been particularly noticeable had it not been for their destructive onslaught upon trees and lucern patches. As it is, farmers and nurserymen have been aroused to activity by the ravages

of the pest, and many are busy devising means for the destruction of the same or adopting some of the several remedies which have been recommended as having proved effectual elsewhere. We were told a few days since of one of the most thorough-going of the farmers in this vicinity, being engaged with a force of boys in flooding his land with water and drowning the rodents in their holes, or killing them as they appeared on the surface, and that they were very successful in their operations. Others are baiting the mice with poisoned grain.

Without pretending to be able to explain why these animals should be more numerous or destructive in this region at the present time than in the past, or believing for a moment that it is due to other than natural causes, or taking much stock in the slight feeling of alarm they have occasioned, we may remark that such visitations are by no means unprecedented in the history of the world though they may be unusual in this Territory.

The following account of plagues of this nature is copied from a late issue of *Science*:

"In the colony of Lourenco, Brazil, in the months of May and June, 1876, mice suddenly appeared in enormous numbers. They invaded the maize-fields in such great numbers that the corn seemed literally alive with them, destroying in a few days everything that was edible; and where, but a short time before, bushels of grain might have been harvested, not an ear remained, and the noise produced by their nibbling and climbing was audible for a considerable distance. After the corn-fields were devastated the potatoes next received their attention. Only the largest were eaten in the ground; such as were transportable were carried away and hidden in hollow trees, or other retreats for future use. Gourds and pumpkins, even the hardest, were gnawed through and eaten. Of green food, such as clover, oats, barley, not a leaf was left standing; even weeds were cut down and the inner parts eaten out.

"In the house the struggle for existence of these long-tailed invaders was truly amazing. In many of the dwellings hundreds were killed in a single day. The cats could contribute but little aid fighting such a plague, for not only were many of the mice so large that it would have been an unequal contest, but by their great number they drove the cats actually from the houses, not to return until the plague was past. Nothing except what was composed of iron, stone or glass was spared from their destructiveness; furniture, clothes, hats, books—everything bore the traces of their teeth. They gnawed the hoofs of the cows and horses in the stables, literally ate up fatted hogs, and often bit away the hair of persons during sleep. They penetrated all apartments and gnawed their way through boards and walls of houses. Ditches that were dug about granaries did not suffice; the mice would climb over each other in some corner or other, and thus reach the top.

"The foregoing account of one occurrence in Lourenco will suffice to show to what an extent the plague reaches. The same province had suffered similarly in 1843 and 1863, and in all probability will again in 1889.

"Similar plagues, though far less in extent, have occurred in Europe, in which the field mice unaccountably appeared in greatly increased numbers. One may well think what would be the result were these little, almost insignificant creatures everywhere in such wise to take the ascendancy. When one considers that on an average of every one or two months from five to eight young are born, and that these young become mature in a few months themselves, he will not be surprised to know that a single pair of field mice, in the course of a single summer, would increase to 23,000 individuals. Could all the conditions which now keep them in check be removed, every living thing upon the earth would be consumed in half a dozen years."

DANGEROUS LEGISLATION.

THE elation manifested by the *Volkszeitung*, in its recent article on the Edmunds bill, over the proposed confiscation of the "Mormon" Church property, has brought several papers throughout the country to a sense of the real danger to be apprehended from such legislation. The *Daily Intelligence*, published at Lancaster, Pa., gives a translation of the article referred to, and says:

"The crusaders against the Mormons, the political adventurers whose greedy eyes see years of good stealing in Utah, and the bloody bigots who would sequester church property for righteousness' sake, have found an ally in a new quarter. The German newspaper, the *New York Volkszeitung*, an organ of the 'Socialists' in this country, shows with what view of the future that element regards the Edmunds bill recently passed by the Senate, which is intended to confiscate the property of the Mormon Church.

No doubt its sentiments will find responsive echo in many minds. There is an increasing growth of feeling against ecclesiasticism. It will eagerly avail itself of any attempt, however unconstitutional, to intermeddle with

the religious beliefs of any part of the people, and especially to seize the property of a religious denomination. The proscription of the Mormon today will be the overturn of the Jew's synagogue to-morrow, and the torch and sword for Catholic and Lutheran Methodist and Episcopal temple of worship and temporal possession."

The *Daily Patriot*, published at Harrisburg, Pa., also comments on the bill and the article in question as follows:

"The bill passed by the United States Senate providing practically for the confiscation of the property of the Mormon Church was a measure of extremely questionable policy, notwithstanding the desirableness of suppressing the vice of polygamy. It has already borne fruit in the approval it receives from the Socialist organ of New York, which regards the act of the Senate as preliminary to and a justification of a general confiscation of church property.

"The position of the atheistical Socialist organ is entirely logical. There is legislative power to invade the proprietary rights of the Mormon Church, what is to prevent the exercise of the same power with respect to other churches? Who is to draw, and where is to be drawn, the line beyond which confiscation of church property would not be admissible?

"Religious liberty is not only a prominent feature of our governmental theory, but its practice is secured by constitutional provision. But while the suppression of a vice like polygamy is warranted by law, confiscation would be a violation of the rights both of property and religious belief guaranteed to the Mormons by the Constitution, and in which the people of other churches are equally interested."

POWDERLY AND GOULD—LABOR AND CAPITAL.

IN the conflict between Jay Gould and the Knights of Labor, the shrewd capitalist has come out ahead. But though Powderly has been checkmated, he stands high in the estimation of the public, while his more crafty opponent has gained nothing in reputation by the contest. That the chief of the Knights was deceived by the railway king is very clear to those who have watched the progress of the dispute, and have read the correspondence between the parties which has been furnished to the press. Jay Gould does not look well in the light which Powderly has turned upon him, but practically he has the advantage both in the issue of the struggle and in verbal controversy.

What can be understood from the letter which the Master Workman has addressed to the Master Capitalist, but that the Knights will combine against the latter personally? And if they do, is not the rich man entitled to the protection of the law? Is he not clearly right in declaring that in such an onslaught the contest will not be between the Knights and himself but between them and the laws of the land?

We have no great admiration for the scheming plutocrat who has scraped up so much wealth by taking advantage of others, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that in this controversy there is a "powerful weakness" in the midst of so much numerical strength, and a solidity of ground under the little great Wall Street speculator that makes him well nigh impregnable.

The strike was very wrong to begin with. Even Powderly has to admit that. It was a reckless and unjustifiable movement. All that has grown out of it, although there may have been breaches of good faith on the part of the railroad magnates since the beginning of the outbreak, is fairly chargeable to the needless strike. The violence that has ensued is unjustifiable. The brutal attack of the deputies and the loss of life that followed, form an incident that is deplorable and for which the individuals engaged in the tragedy must and will be held personally responsible. But the beginning of lawlessness was on the side of the Knights. They commenced the violence, and the shameful conduct of the shooting deputies, though not justified by anything that occurred, was incited by the overt act of the strikers in the first place. Mobs had not endeavored to prevent the regular conduct of business on the railroads, the unfortunate occurrences that have resulted in death and misery would not have taken place. Here is the weak point in the controversy on the side of the Knights of Labor.

In the correspondence and proclamations of the Knights there is a great deal of striking rhetoric, but a lack of practical policy that is quite painful. Take Powderly's letter to Gould, and it will be seen that while it abounds in covert threats and references to the power of the organization, it does not state in any definite manner what Gould is expected to do or abstain from doing. He is required to end the strike, but how? He is threatened with some terrible retribution if he does not, but what? So in the document denouncing him that was previously mentioned. It was a piece of fine phrezy, of florid rhetoric, but it contained not a sentence of practical advice or information. In Jay Gould's reply to Powderly's letter there is a defined position. And it is strong and consistent in reference to the situation. In this respect it puts Powderly's manifesto quite in the shade.