

to office, knowing his propensity, to ask him to so stultify his self-respect? These are conundrums which the people should begin to think about very seriously.

### NOT "A NAKED ASSERTION."

THE temperate and unanswerable speech of Chief Justice Zane, as we expected when we read it, is doing good work among the people. "Mormon" and "Gentile" alike applaud the sentiments it contains, and only the bigoted sectarian and the "Mormon"-hating "Liberal" find fault with any part of it.

Of course the *Tribune* is very much put out about it and sneers at the gentleman whom it sloshed over with gushing and garrulous adulation, when he was stretching the law to the utmost for the punishment of men whom it hated and pursued with tigerish ferocity.

The only attempt at reply to the speech which can be called an approach to an argument is this, in the *Tribune* of Thursday:

"When he says, 'we cannot believe just what we want to, and to punish a man because he does not believe just as we do is tyranny and oppression,' so far as he seeks to make that apply to the Liberal party he outrages the good sense of the community, for there is no possible application that he or any other man can make to his naked assertion."

That is to say, if Judge Zane meant to imply that the "Liberals" want to punish men for not believing as they do, it is "a naked assertion" and an outrage upon the community. Let us see about that:

The editor of the "Liberal" organ recently placed himself before the public as a candidate for office on the basis of disfranchisement for "Mormon" voters. This was formally endorsed by the so-called "Liberal" party, which advocated the measure in its platform. Under the laws no "Mormon" could vote who did not take the test oath, as proof that he was not a polygamist and would obey the laws in relation to polygamy. It was not for actions, then, that "Mormon" voters were to be disfranchised, but for their belief, or alleged belief, that polygamy was right. If that is not punishment for belief what is it?

If Judge Zane had flatly charged—which he did not—that the "Liberal" faction were endeavoring to punish men for their belief, it would not have been "a naked assertion" but one abundantly supported by irrefragable proof. And it would have been no "outrage" upon anybody unless telling the patent and simple truth is outrageous.

The "Mormon" people, in the only

effectual manner possible as members of the Church, have set themselves in harmony with the laws against polygamy. They have also disbanded the People's party which was called by their opponents the Church party. They are rapidly uniting with the two national party organizations. Thus they have met the only two objections urged against them by their enemies. But this makes no difference to "Liberal" hostility and *Tribune* hatred. It is urged they have not changed their belief. This is the charge that the *Tribune* has been making, day after day, in reply to the *Times* and other advocates of recognizing the "Mormon" movement and meeting it in the spirit of fairness and conciliation. We will cite one or two *Tribune* utterances as samples:

"We say there has been no surrender of polygamy, not one word of surrender. There is not a word in all that has been said and written where any Mormon has in the least been made to say that he believes polygamy to be wrong, that he believes the command of God has been revoked in one word."

What is the *Tribune's* grievance as here expressed? Why, that "no Mormon has been made to say that he believes polygamy to be wrong." Now take the annexed specimen of *Tribune* reasoning and composition:

"Again, Liberals believe that men who believe, and who have subscribed to that belief, that certain other mortals, not a bit superior intellectually or morally or any other way, have the power to receive daily revelations from Almighty God, and after they have subscribed to their belief, to obey those men, they are not good citizens; they are not citizens at all of the Republic. They believe that men who have subscribed to the belief that polygamy is a divine institution, and when the wives and daughters of a people believe that in order to insure exaltation in the presence of God and the Lamb, they should be married or sealed to an upright and faithful man; when this belief is coupled with the other belief that they are bound to obey those men, and when they have agreed to implicitly obey the men who they believe receive daily revelations in all things temporal as well as spiritual, they cannot be good citizens, they cannot be citizens at all."

If there is any meaning at all in the foregoing exhibition of *Tribune* bigotry and befuddlement, it is that "Liberals" want to deny citizenship to "Mormons" because of their alleged belief. We say "alleged" belief, because much of the stuff which the muddled writer attempted to set forth is not believed by the "Mormons" or anybody else, so far as we know, although he added:

"This is the firm belief of all Liberals and will continue to be their belief," etc.

The only issue before the public in the "Liberal" assault against Republicanism and Democracy, is the purported belief of the "Mormons" and their imagined intentions. What they have recently done and are now doing is beyond censure from their bitterest

foes. And it is because of this that the ghouls of the *Tribune* are so exasperated. They can get no real nourishment out of the carcass of dead issues. They flourished for years on the polygamy and Church party matters, and now both are gone they are wild with wrath. Nothing is left but to wage a warfare on what they pretend is the belief of "Mormons," and on the motives of those prominent Republicans and Democrats who favor liberty to the "Mormons" within the lines of the law.

What people believe or do not believe is none of their business, when it comes to political rights and privileges. We are ashamed of men who, through fear of the venom of the *Tribune* fiends, dare not come out as Democrats or Republicans and stand for American freedom and equal rights. As to the gentlemen who have taken this position, we are pleased to see and record the fact that in doing what is right, they are utterly indifferent to the abuse of the mal-odorous organ of the decaying "Liberal" faction.

### A HUGE SWINDLING SCHEME.

THE discovery of a scheme by which the United States Government was swindled out of thousands of dollars is making a sensation in the commercial world. The whole matter has been made clear to the collector of the port of New York. The swindling was effected by the undervaluation of goods passing through the custom house, but not by the aid or connivance of any of the government officials.

Lehmair & Co. of New York City were importers of dry goods and woollens. They did an extensive business. On January 16th last, they made a trade statement which showed that their house was in a sound condition. This statement was accepted by the commercial agencies and the firm was able to secure extensive credits for the spring trade. In March, however, the house assigned to Mr. Meyers, a Wall Street lawyer. The schedule issued stated that the assets almost covered the liabilities. The firm endeavored to compromise with its creditors at 35 cents on the dollar. It succeeded with all except two. These two secured judgment, and began proceedings to enforce the judgment.

The proceedings are now in progress, and enough has transpired to show how the government was swindled, and that the assignment was fraudulent. The statement of last January which showed a surplus of \$127,000 should have been \$84,000 less. It was also shown that the branch house in