

EDITORIALS.

DESPOILING THE MORMONS.

THIRTY-FIVE HUNDRED OFFICERS UNDER THE NEW LAW FOR VIRTUOUS GENTILES.

UNDER the above headings the New York Herald of Jan. 23, publishes the following report of an interview with Hon. F. S. Richards in Washington, whither he has been to argue the Snow habeas corpus case involving the question of segregation. Of course the correspondent has in some places used his own language in reporting Mr. Richards, as professional interviewers generally do. But the points presented are so true and striking that everybody who thinks can see the magnitude of the wrongs which the legislation treated of is designed to perpetrate upon the people of Utah. Mr. Richards has returned, and speaks confidently as to a favorable decision from the court of last resort:

[From our regular correspondent.]

HERALD BUREAU, Corner of Fifteenth and G Sts., N.W. WASHINGTON, Jan. 22, 1887.

Franklin S. Richards, of Salt Lake City, who is the leading lawyer for the Mormon Church, is in the city and appears before the Supreme Court this week to argue a case growing out of the Edmunds act of 1882. He expresses his opinion very frankly and strongly in regard to the new anti-Mormon bill that passed the House last week.

UN-AMERICAN.

"It is the most un-American measure that ever was presented to Congress," he said. "It is the most brutal legislation that ever was proposed in this country. The situation is this—The Edmunds act of 1882 has been most vigorously enforced for the last two years. If any legislation can suppress polygamy that act surely will, and the Utah Commission in their last official report state that very few polygamous marriages occurred in the more enlightened portions of the Territory within the last year; yet in the face of these results of the Edmunds act of 1882 this bill is proposed, which is the most despotical measure that could be framed. I do not believe that the people of this country know what the effect of this new bill will be; for if they did even their aversion for the Mormon people because of polygamy, which has been made stronger by misrepresentation and calumny would not prevent them from protesting against it."

OUTLAWING THE BEST CITIZENS.

"In the first place it is ex post facto in its operation. It declares that the polygamous status or relation is criminal, and it provides no way by which that relation can be dissolved. It makes every man in Utah who has contracted a polygamous relation, it may have been thirty years ago, whose wives are now living, a criminal and subject to imprisonment for five years in the penitentiary. It is a rule of law that a marriage is void if either party has a husband or wife living. Any man who takes a second wife or a third wife cannot have that second or third marriage dissolved in a court, because it is not regarded as a marriage at all. That is the position that the men in Utah are in who have taken more than one wife. There is no way pointed out by which that polygamous relation can be dissolved, and this new law declares that the man who sustains such a relation—that is, who has contracted it in the past and two or more of whose wives are now living—shall be deemed guilty of a felony and be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary. The man may not see his wife or contribute a dollar to her support after the passage of this bill, yet he would still be held guilty. That is such an open violation of justice that I do not believe the people of this country will approve of it. The men in any community who are most respected are the men of years, of character and of means. Many of this class in our Territory have assumed this polygamous relation in the past. This new bill makes all such felons. The measure will railroad the best men in our Territory, men of family and property, into prison."

A REWARD TO CORRUPTION.

"There is still another serious aspect to this bill. It deprives us of the last vestige of local self-government. It places our lives, property and persons in the hands of men who are to be appointed either by the President or the Governor of the Territory. The Judges of the county courts, the clerks of such courts, the sheriffs of the counties, the assessors and tax collectors, the justices of the peace and constables and many others are all to be appointed. The bill makes more than thirty-five hundred offices appointive in the Territory. More than that, many of these officers, under the present laws of the Territory, will fix their own salaries. The salary of a county judge in Utah is fixed by the Judge himself and the three selectmen of the county sitting as a board. The salaries of all the county officers are fixed the same way. You can see into what a helpless state this throws the Mormons. Suppose some of the men appointed to these places are venal, and such a supposition is not preposter-

ous, there would be absolutely no check on them in committing any rapacity that they might determine upon. Governor West says that four-fifths of the population in Utah are Mormons, so that it is practically the lives, liberties and property of the Mormons that will be thrown into the hands of the officers whom the President and the Governor of the Territory will appoint. I cannot believe that the people of the United States are willing to consent to such a slavery being inflicted upon any people.

A ZEALOUS GOVERNOR.

"I noticed Governor West on the floor of the House when this new bill was being considered last week, and he undoubtedly gave all the aid he could to its passage. I could not help thinking that he was showing a little too much zeal in the enactment of a law that will give him the appointment of more than two thousand officers, but I presume that his participation in this legislation must be borne by us among all the other things that the new measure inflicts upon us."

"There is still another great evil that this measure will impose upon us. I have no doubt that the bill is entirely unconstitutional, and that the Supreme Court will so declare it. But it will take several years before it can be brought before that tribunal, and in the meantime it will be rigidly enforced in Utah. The men convicted under its provisions will be sent to prison, and will have to lie there, for the local courts will have the right to refuse bail till the appeal is decided, as the courts have uniformly refused to accept bail while such cases are being appealed."

A SERIOUS MATTER.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND was right when he said, in response to the appeal of the Woman Suffrage Association against the Tucker bill, that it is a serious matter to deprive any class of citizens of the franchise. That such a course by legislation is unjustifiable, any reader of the Constitution can readily determine for himself. The franchise once possessed and exercised becomes a vested right, and cannot be legally taken away from the possessor without "due process of law." That means a judicial proceeding, not an act of the Legislature.

If it were not so serious a matter, the remarks made by lawmakers and editors in its justification would be very amusing. The stock arguments against woman suffrage have all a vein of absurdity, and are refuted by applying them to the sterner sex. For, all that is urged against the ballot in the hands of women, can be applied with equal force to the cases of a great many men. But all such objections to giving the elective franchise to women, are entirely out of place in reference to the question of taking it away from women who have lawfully held and exercised it for seventeen years. Conferring the franchise upon an excluded class is one thing, depriving voters of that right is another and different thing. Yet a great many persons who ought to know better, attempt to reason upon the latter as though it was just the same in principle as the former.

The Tucker-Edmunds bill proposes to deprive a class of voters of the franchise without any process of law, and this for no assigned reason. If Congress has the power which is claimed for it to arbitrarily repeal an enactment of a territorial legislature, it could thereby prevent any more women from being endowed with the suffrage, but that would not take it away from those who hold it as their property. If it was a privilege when conferred, it became a right by possession and usage and cannot be lawfully wrested from the holders by legislation.

In endeavors to excuse the wholesale injustice and political robbery contemplated in the bill, its supporters advance no tenable grounds for their position. Mr. Tucker, in his closing speech before the House on the passage of the bill said, "When we exclude the whole of womankind as a class, gentlemen might as well say that they are condemned without conviction to disfranchisement by the provisions of this bill, and that they are condemned for the crime of being women. Now there is nothing in that position, as I shall show when I come to discuss that point in the argument." This was a very convenient way to get rid of a formidable objection. The gentleman did not once allude to it again. He never came to "that point in the argument." He shirked it entirely and avoided it altogether. It was too true to attempt to controvert. It was easier to say there was "nothing in it" than to prove the assertion.

But the press apologists for the wrong, assert that the measure "strikes a staggering blow at polygamy." When asked how the disfranchisement of non-polygamists is an assault upon polygamy, they claim that the "Mormon" men who are not polygamists believe in polygamy, and that the women are completely under the control of the men and compelled to vote as they command them. This is a pure assumption unsupported by a single fact. It is very unreasonable, too, and contrary to what is known of the nature of womankind. An attempt to coerce women holding the ballot would

be more likely to provoke them into contrariety than urge them to compliance. And we have to repeat once more, for the enlightenment of our contemporaries at a distance, that the ballot in Utah is strictly secret. If a woman wants to vote any kind of a ticket, the power is in her own hands to do so without the slightest probability of detection. Where, then, does the coercion come in?

It may be asked what does the Sixth Section of the bill mean which repeals the Utah laws "providing for the numbering or identifying of the votes of the electors?" We answer it means that either Mr. Tucker and his associates were deplorably ignorant of the truth, or they have perpetrated a shameful piece of deception upon Congress and the country. For there are no such laws in existence in Utah, but on the contrary, the local election laws forbid any such numbering and identification. There are other sections of the bill, also, for the repeal of assumed Utah laws that are not upon the statute books. And if the implied falsehood of Section Six were a fact, would not the repeal of the alleged laws for the identification of votes do away with the power to learn how any woman voted, and thus destroy the pretended objection to her possession of the ballot?

But even if women voters were influenced to cast their ballots as desired by others, why should it be worse for them to do this than for men voters to do the same thing? How is it in New York, and in Boston, and in St. Louis, and in Chicago? Do men ever vote there as influenced by political leaders and bosses? We refrain from any comment upon votes bought, or the coercion said to be used by employers upon their employes. But why should it be worse for men to be induced to vote in any given direction in Utah than to do so in any other part of the Union; and, to come back to the central point, why is it worse for women to be so influenced than for men?

Then as to the bearing of the question upon polygamy. Neither men nor women have ever voted at the polls in Utah on that question at all. It has never cut any figure in territorial politics, except that by congressional law all polygamists, male and female, are already deprived of the elective franchise. No candidate is a polygamist, no voter is a polygamist, no polygamous question or issue is voted on or presented at our elections. Therefore, it is the veriest bosh and nonsense to talk about taking the ballot from women in Utah because they use it in favor of polygamy. Why, the advocates of this abolition actually claim that "it will free the women from the toils of polygamy," while they claim that the women themselves "vote to sustain polygamy." Is not this a striking instance of complete self-contradiction.

"Polygamy" has been dinned so much in the ears of the country, and held up before the eyes of the public to frighten people into doing something desperate, that anything pertaining to Utah takes on a fancied polygamic coloring. Neither editors nor the public seem to understand that this disfranchisement of women bears entirely upon non-polygamous voters, both "Mormon" and "Gentile," and is simply political robbery. There is not an argument in favor of taking the ballot from Utah women that does not equally apply to Utah men.

But what is the real object in view of the real promoters of this measure? It is a movement on the part of a small minority to lessen the number of votes of the majority. There is nothing more in the whole conspiracy than an attempt to put this Territory into the political control of a very few of its inhabitants. To dispossess the people who opened this region to settlement, built up the country, established institutions and regulations for the protection of life and property, and made the Territory what it is to-day, of those political and personal rights to which they are entitled by their good works and honorable course.

Every editor who advocates the passage of the Tucker bill urges an outrage upon women and champions the cause of adventurers and scoundrels without character and without conscience; and when he imagines he is helping to suppress polygamy he is deceiving himself and his readers, and is helping to consummate a piece of political infamy that has no excuse in law or in religion, in social exigency or in any public necessity. It is indeed as President Cleveland has said, "a very serious matter."

A RUFFIAN WITH A RIFLE.

THE doctrine of Assistant District Attorney Varian, advanced to screen the dastardly and cowardly murderer of Edward M. Dalton, and taken up and advocated by the organ of the lowest elements of Utah society, is making, it appears, some little headway. A ruffian by the name of McLennan, who has signalized his possession of the extraordinary powers of a petty deputy by more than one act of public lawlessness, has been endeavoring to carry that doctrine into practice.

In arresting Mr. Hunsacker in Box Elder County, he fired at him twice with a rifle. The offence charged against the hunted gentleman is unlawful cohabitation, a misdemeanor

under the law. As we have proven conclusively, no officer has the right to shoot at a person charged with a misdemeanor when endeavoring to effect his arrest. That is an excess of duty for which there is no justification in law. Those who have attempted to justify it, whether on the bench, or at the bar, or wielding the pen have had to falsify the law in order to make out the semblance of a case.

The ruffian with the rifle who fired at Mr. Hunsacker has shown himself to be a bully and a brute on other occasions; and he is not a fit person to be entrusted with the authority which the office of deputy marshal confers. His proper place is behind prison bars. There is where he is likely to gravitate, if he does not find a career cut short before he reaches that level.

There are active men on Marshal Dyer's force who are just as keen after accused persons as any law or necessity can require, but who can perform their duties without laying themselves liable to just censure. But such desperadoes as McLennan have no business as any official position in civilized society, and no good purpose will be served in his retention in the position which he has disgraced by his ruffianism.

A SIGNIFICANT SIGN.

WHAT the exchange is to America and England, the bourse is to France, Germany and Belgium. In either case, it means a place where men who do not work for a living in the manual sense of work, use their native talent and business sagacity in the direction of getting gains by means of temporary investments. For instance, in this country, a mine or a railroad becomes incorporated into so many shares and so much capital stock—for the sake of illustration the former are 1,000 and the latter \$100,000; this would make the par value of the stock \$100; but as these corporations always come into existence in debt, that is with a bigger bill against the shares than the capital actually on hand can liquidate, it commences from the advent to be a rambling game, the stock coming nearer to its nominal value when something substantial and profitable occurs in the workings which it represents, and receding further from that point in accordance with its losses or slight profits. These stocks are always on the market, and that class referred to who toll not and spin nothing but yarns have, by the very force of native sharpness and cultivated shrewdness, become such excellent financial barometers that they hardly ever lose; they scent in the air, it would seem, a coming advance or decline in any particular stock or certificate of exchange that is prominent and likely to be bought or sold under a pressure or a rule. Hence it is that these men's operations are in reality the financial pulse of the nation, in which they are acting. They seldom make mistakes, because to do so frequently would be to show their disqualification for this peculiar line of gambling.

The reader can thus see how pregnant with interest are the dispatches concerning the market price of those French incorporeal salables denominated rentes; when they are low, purchasers have received a snuff in the atmosphere of disaster (presumably war, in this instance) ahead, and act so cautiously in their transactions that a shrinkage results. A dispatch dated 3:30 this afternoon shows them to be lower than ever, and this means that the war spirit is rising in an inverse ratio.

SUPPRESS THE NUISANCE.

WE have had frequent occasion to inveigh against personal interviewers of a certain class. They are a public nuisance and ought to be suppressed. We do not wish to be understood as intimating that they should be summarily dispatched to the place reserved for them that love and make a lie. But we think that if the law does not fit their case legislation should supply the defect, and any person who invents an "interview," that is, who manufactures remarks as coming from prominent individuals which they never uttered, should, on conviction, be severely punished.

But the practice, which has become common, of reporting bogus interviews, can be stopped effectually if editors and publishers so determine. A newspaper scribe who, when unable to make a man speak as he desires, invents an interview and misrepresents and thus injures his victim and deceives the public, ought not to be employed on any journal claiming to be respectable. And the fact that bogus interviews are published in any given newspaper, ought to be a signal to the public that the misleading paper is a lying sheet only fit for the flames. Reporters who resort to this infamous trick should be tabooed by newspaperdom, and such prints as encourage the low-lived vagabonds by publishing their inventions should be boycotted by the public.

Comments have been made in local and other journals on a reported inter-

view with Hon. John Sharp, who, a short time ago, went to the East on railroad business. The alleged interview appeared in the Pittsburg Press and Chronicle-Telegraph and contained sensational statements, to the effect that the gentleman said he was going to Washington to meet Delegate Cairne and confer with him in regard to pending legislation against polygamy. The Pittsburg Leader people, knowing that the two papers named were in the habit of publishing bogus interviews with prominent men, telegraphed to Salt Lake and then to New York, and learned by authentic replies that Vice-President Sharp, of the Utah Central Railroad, who is also a Director of the Union Pacific Company, was in New York, not Washington, on business connected with railroads, and that on his way he had seen two reporters at Pittsburg but told them he had no information for the press. It is the rule with the gentleman named, when away from home, to decline "interviews" with representatives of the press because he has been repeatedly the victim of their misrepresentations. The petty of the two Pittsburg papers has thus been established, and they and their methods ought to be denounced by reputable journalists everywhere.

About as unfair and despicable as the manufacture of bogus interviews, is the conduct of editors who, understanding the views of public men with whom they are acquainted, and thus being able to detect the falsehood of statements alleged to have been made by them, yet take up those manufactured utterances and comment upon them as authentic, to the disadvantage of the absent victims. It is a mean and contemptible way to slander a man behind his back and take advantage of his inability to refute the falsehood. It is a common practice with a certain anti-"Mormon" sheet in this city, which is known to be utterly without honor and entirely destitute of scruples about truth.

It does not matter a great deal whether Hon. John Sharp went to New York and Boston on railroad business, or to Washington on "Mormon" business. He had a perfect right to do either, if necessary or desirable to him or his friends. It is the principle, or rather lack of principle, we are after and which we most emphatically condemn, and we shall be pleased to learn that the leading journals of the country set their faces against this common evil, and thus preserve their own character for reliability, and relieve public men from the outrage of appearing, on their pages, to say things which are foreign to their sentiments, dissimilar to their language and misleading as to their position upon important questions. The bogus interviewer must go.

WEEK NIGHT MEETINGS.

IN most of the wards of this city week-night meetings have of late been held in the houses of the Saints. They have been productive of good, causing a more lively interest among the people in their religious duties, and a closer performance of them. They have been specially beneficial to those of the inmates of the houses where they have been held who are, owing to circumstances they cannot control, unable to attend the regular public services.

Unless care is taken in the conduct of those gat herings, however, they are liable to drift into insipidity and the interest in them, when such is the case, soon begins to flag. A chief cause leading to that condition is a tendency to sameness, which can be readily avoided by seeking to be governed in conducting them by the Spirit of the Lord in place of falling into a regular routine until habit makes it appear like a sinful innovation to get out of the well worn rut.

It may well be questioned whether it is productive of good to invariably throw the meeting open for any who choose to do so to speak. This is good in its place, as an occasional proceeding. When made a continuous service the results are the reverse of beneficial. The reason for this is obvious to the observer. It will be found that, when long continued, the same persons, as a rule, take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded. If this were all, there would be no great detriment, but it is a fact that many of them not only monopolize a share of the time entirely out of proportion with what the privileges of others should admit of, but they also, in a great measure, repeat over and over again the same statements. This is not edifying, because non-progressive; "whatever is not edifying is not of God."

Further than this, in the same connection, there are some people who are never happier than when speaking in public. Unfortunately for the hearers, the enjoyment by no means always extends to them. When the patience of an audience is put upon the strain, the spirit of the meeting is not one of freedom. Some of those persons specially noted for loquacity are somewhat curtailed in their own words, where it has been necessary to place a species of embargo upon their prominent proclivity. As a consequence they seek out fresh fields in which to air their eloquence, and they scatter themselves over the city, bobbing up serenely in the block