

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE

DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 24, 1888.

## PEOPLE'S TICKET.

TERRITORIAL ELECTION, NOV. 6, 1888.

FOR DELEGATE TO CONGRESS,

JOHN T. CAINE.

## THE PROTEST UNANSWERED.

THE discussion of the sewerage question by the DESERET NEWS has brought out a great deal of information which would not have been obtained, if the idea which we opposed from the beginning had been permitted to prevail; that is, that all the taxpayers of District No. One had to do was to shut their eyes, and voting only as to the laterals, "go it blind" as to the main sewer and the reception and disposition of the sewage. Some particulars as to the probable intentions of the City Council on these points have been brought forth, and the plan for emptying the fifth of the city into the Jordan or the Lake has been effectually demolished.

The present scheme is yet under consideration, so its discussion is still pertinent. In answer to the protest of Elias Morris and others who give intelligent and specific reasons for their objections, we have some statements that ought to be examined, as they are set forth as "puncturing the air bubbles blown in opposition." Very few people of thought will characterize Mr. Morris' potent and respectful remarks as "air bubbles." At any rate they have not yet been "punctured," but only blown upon, and some of them have not been touched in any way or by any means.

The argument that District No. One is too large and the reasons why it should be diminished, have not been "punctured" or even replied to. It has not been shown why people within the limits of District No. One who do not want sewerage should be compelled to pay for something which they are not likely to use, when they do not wish to deprive the property owners of using and paying for it in that portion of the District where it is really needed. Neither has the proposition been touched that, before citizens as a body shall be taxed for the special benefit of a few, their permission should be held as necessary. And the call for a guaranty that the sum named as the cost of the scheme will cover the expenses has not been answered or alluded to. Indeed when we come to examine the reply to the protest, we find that it is not an answer at all to the arguments and propositions it contains. Let us see.

First, we are told that "no improvement could be made that all did not obtain some benefit from, either near or remote." That is quite true as a general proposition. If all the taxes of the city were spent, without the consent of the majority, for the particular benefit of one part of town, incidental good would come no doubt in some degree to every part, but it would not be either satisfactory or right. And this utterance is but a "glittering generality" that does not touch any proposition in the protest, let alone "puncturing" it. We might as well say that no man can build a fine house without the community, "either near or remote," being benefited; but that consolation is mighty small to folks compelled to live in a dug-out, particularly if they are compelled to furnish some of the bricks for the fine house for nothing. And people in the outer districts, forced against their will to help pay for an expensive system of sewerage for the special benefit of a very limited portion of the city, from which they can never derive any "direct" good will not feel very well satisfied with a possible "remote" good which is about as tangible as an "air bubble."

Next, an attempt is made to draw a parallel between this sewerage scheme and its benefits to but a few, with the Jordan canal project and its alleged benefits to some more than others. It is most surprising that a reflecting mind should conceive such a fallacy. Was not the whole city directly benefited by that canal? Did it not increase the water supply for the common good? The right to the use of City Creek water was not confined to District No. One, it was held in a very large part of the city, and an increase was absolutely necessary, all over town. And there has been no water scheme adopted but for the direct benefit of the whole in some degree, because the increase in the volume of water means

more water for the whole city. We have not enough now, as the dried up orchards testify, and as thirsty people, with City Creek water rights, who have to buy water to drink, most certainly understand. But to compare a scheme from which only a portion of the city can ever derive direct benefit, with a plan designed and carried out for the direct good of all, is to force a contrast that serves to expose the wrong of the former more clearly than ever.

Then, this fact knocks out the fallacious reply with one blow: The Jordan canal project was voted on by all the taxpayers. If District No. One did not receive equal benefits with other parts of town, its property owners had a voice in the adoption of the plan. In the sewer scheme the taxes of the whole city are to be used for the special benefit of a small area and the general taxpayers are not consulted at all! Any comparison or parallel in that?

And here is another consideration: All this attempt to stand up for District No. One, is in opposition to the protests of taxpayers in District No. One. Examine it in this light and see how funny it looks. Poor District No. One, how it has been abused! "It has never had its just dues in the past." Indeed? Never had street work, or public lighting, or police service, or any improvements above other parts of town, eh? Has no water service perhaps, either running in ditches or flooded over lawns or furnished in pipes, or sprinkled over special streets. Dreadful! And since when has that District "abandoned the use of water for irrigation"? Does any one mean to say that no lot owner irrigates in District No. One?

The error of the whole attempt at reply to the protest lies in changing the question at issue. It is assumed that the objection is to "the irregularity of benefit." That is not the ground of the protest at all. It is not the "irregularity of benefit," but the utter absence of direct benefit to taxpayers who are to be compelled to help pay for it, that is complained of. Here is the language used:

"The proposition is entirely unjust, as it compels the great bulk of citizens who will never derive any benefit from sewerage to pay for putting in the mains and for the maintenance of this system, also for the water for flushing."

It is easy to build up an argument against an opponent, when you change entirely the ground of his opposition, and substitute a proposition of your own for that which he presents.

As to the water for flushing, the quantity named, 8,000 or 10,000 gallons daily, does not include the much greater amount which will be poured through sinks and closets, at various times every day, and which will be absolutely necessary to use if service is established in nearly every house in the Sewer District. And the facts as to the present totally inadequate water supply for the other parts of town have not been met and cannot be disputed.

The propositions remain, that the only part of the city where sewerage can be said to be urgently needed is contained within the "three centre streets;" that people in the District outside of that part, and who do not need sewerage, should not be compelled to have it or pay for it; that citizens outside the District who can never be benefited by this scheme, should not be compelled to pay for the main and other expenses that will be inevitable, and that a scheme of such magnitude, so far as it affects the general taxpayers, should be submitted to their vote. These have not been replied to at all, and what has been said in the shape of an attempted "puncture," does not in any way affect the questions to be considered by the City Council.

## "VERY ROUGH BUSINESS."

THE New York Sun has the following brief and sensible paragraph on the news of the decision of court for the confiscation of "Mormon" Church property:

"Much as Mormonism is disliked by everybody except the Mormons, no one can fail to think that it is sharp practice and hard lines to take from them, on a legal technicality, all the property of their Church and turn it over to uses which they do not wish for. They worked for it, made it, saved it, and nobody else has a right to it. Confiscation is a very rough business here in the United States."

Legalized robbery, is the fit term for the process by which property belonging to an association of people who voluntarily donated it for specific purposes, is taken by force and diverted to uses for which it was not intended, and for the benefit of people who never contributed a dime of the money and have no equitable interest therein.

The fault is not in the administrators of the law so much as in the framers of the law. It was passed in the spirit of persecution and religious hatred. The House of Representatives was more like a bear garden, than a deliberative body, when the bill was passed. Scores and scores of members were more like shouting inebriates than sober legislators, and thought, consideration, amendment and debate were drowned in a torrent of passionate intolerance. It was a scene that reflected no credit upon the body that yielded itself to the clamors and demands of sectarian preachers and silly women,

and, in private and candid conversation, no conscientious Congressman will now pretend to defend it.

There is no other community, in our opinion, that would have submitted to this outrage with the equanimity with which the Latter-day Saints have met this assault upon their property and their liberties. They are an essentially law-abiding people, and have never resisted a fair interpretation and enforcement of any law, no matter how much it may have intrenched upon their faith and principles and property. They now submit to the highest legal tribunal in the country the arbitrament of this dispute, and whatever may be the issue, they will still endeavor to pursue their way with serenity, uninfluenced as to their religion by any injustice or shameful "spoiling of their goods."

## STAND BY THE PEOPLE'S PARTY.

THE address of the Territorial Central Committee of the People's Party, which has been published in the DESERET NEWS, should be well considered by the voters of this Territory. It is plain, simple and easy to be understood. It indicates the best policy for the people to pursue. That is, to stand by the organization which has heretofore saved Utah from the chief political calamities designed to come upon her. If the majority here had not been organized and united, they would long ago have been under the heels of as desperate and determined a set of political adventurers as ever plotted for place and plunder.

There is no need for any other organization at present than the People's Party. Its principles are such that they can be endorsed and adopted by the most pronounced advocate of the great national party now in control. Its chief aim is to maintain what local self-government is permitted in a Territory of the United States, and contend for the full rights of American citizens under the national Constitution. It interferes with no one in regard to the great questions before the country, and offers no restriction as to the views and attitude of its members toward national politics. It desires the election to local office, of such men as will represent the great majority of the voting citizens and the general interests, in all respects of this Territory.

It is not ecclesiastical in its aims or constitution, as has been falsely pretended by its enemies. It is secular and political. It is opposed to no church, nor does it exclude persons from its membership because of any religious or non-religious opinions or connections. Its methods are republican in form and democratic in spirit. It is composed of the majority and is controlled by the will of the majority of its own members. It is a lawful organization and is governed by lawful regulations. It is open to all who will join in the laudable work of striving for the full expression of the voice of the people in all matters that affect their political well-being. It is broad and liberal in principle and prompt and vigorous in action. It is indeed the Party of the People.

Of what profit would it be to divide on national party grounds? Can anybody point out any possible good that could arise from such division? Anything that could be done outside of the People's Party for the welfare of the inhabitants of this Territory, can be done equally well, and we believe much better, inside the party.

If Utah were clothed with the habiliments and authority of Statehood, there might be some show of reason for the People to take their places in such national parties as their opinions would lead them to join. They would then have a voice in national affairs. Now they have none. No matter how much they may pose as Republicans or Democrats, Greenbackers or Prohibitionists, they have not a vote on any national question. And so far as their local influence goes, it can be of some service inside the People's Party which is a local party, while it would have no more outside than inside on national affairs.

There never was a stronger instance of losing the substance while jumping after the shadow, as illustrated by the dog in the celebrated fable, than attempting to organize a party here on national grounds, and dropping the local party wherein alone any influence can be wielded for the majority, or any political power can be gained, official or otherwise. It is casting away a reality in order to grasp at a bare illusion.

It must be clear to everyone who thinks that situated as we are in Utah, division in our ranks would be impolitic, in fact suicidal. The great body of the voters are likely to go together, so those who break off for a side issue will accomplish nothing, either for themselves or anybody else with whom they are in sympathy on general principles. But they do by such an excursion give aid and comfort to the political enemy, for they weaken somewhat the forces of their friends and encourage and stimulate their foes.

We think every prudent person acquainted with the situation must see that anything which tends to divide and thus weaken the People's Party, when its opponents of every faction combine against it, is in reality, if not intentionally, hostile to its interests. And no one who engages in an attempt to split or splinter the party, can be

regarded as its true friend, whatever they may think or profess.

The candidate of the People's Party is Hon. John T. Caine, who has served the people of this Territory earnestly and well. We do not know of anyone, no matter what may be his creed or politics, who has sought his aid where it could be legitimately given, and has sought for it in vain. The only thing that his opponents can urge against him is that in matters where the inhabitants of Utah are divided, he has not seconded the malignant efforts of a small minority to oppress and injure the great majority. Any attempt to draw off a portion of the voters of the People's Party to any other candidate, is antagonistic to the interests of the people and the Territory, no matter under what name or pretext it may be attempted.

Mistakes are common in this world of mingled truth and error. Nobody should be blamed for a blunder, unless he persists in it to the injury of himself or others. But a movement to divide the People's Party when union is more than ever a necessity, becomes more than a blunder and will surely cover those who continue in such folly with mortification and defeat.

## VISITING NAUVOO.

THE Independent, published at Nauvoo, Illinois, in its issue of October 12, has the following pleasant notice of a visit from the brethren, who have been furnishing to the DESERET NEWS correspondence of special interest to the Latter-day Saints concerning the waste places of Zion, over which they have been recently traveling:

"Bishop J. S. Black, of Deseret, Utah, and Andrew Jensen and Edward Stevenson, of Salt Lake City, arrived in the city Saturday evening last for a visit of several days. The gentlemen have been traveling during the past few weeks, and have visited all the historic places of interest connected with the Mormon Church. Bishop Black left the city 43 years ago, when but a lad of nine years. Last Sunday he wandered out to discover the grave of a sister who had been under the sod these long years. The scene of the grave and the surroundings were still fresh in his memory and as he went east on Parley Street, the surroundings in the vicinity of Mr. Leppert's residence looked familiar. He enquired of Mr. Leppert in regard to old land marks, and they soon found where the house had been, the old well and the grave of his sister, from which Mr. Black, with tears in his eyes, plucked a few wild flowers to take home to his mother, who is now 86 years of age. After this the gentlemen wandered alone over the hills, and through the grove to the river to again look on the scenes of his boyhood days. No one but himself can better appreciate the situation, the pleasant emotions experienced, and the thoughts of the happy hours he passed in that neighborhood in his youthful days. No wonder he said last Sunday was the happiest day he ever spent in his life. Mr. Stevenson is at present a Mormon Elder, and was a resident of this city until the expulsion of the Mormons. He informed us that he owned several town lots in the city, and before his departure he traded them off for an old clock and a coat. Mr. Jensen is publishing a historical record and is also publisher of a magazine in Salt Lake City. The gentlemen went to Carthage Monday to visit the old jail, returning in the evening and during the next day visited all the historic and noted points of interest in the city. They gathered much valuable information which they intend to use in publishing a history of Mormon events in which our city plays quite a part. The Independent acknowledges a pleasant call from the gentlemen Tuesday."

## THE EFFECTS OF CONFISCATION.

THE decision of the Supreme Court of this Territory in relation to the Church property is variously commented upon by eastern papers. Quite a number of them regard it as "a severe blow to Mormonism;" others say it is "very radical treatment," and neither endorse nor denounce it, some think it "seriously cripples the theocratic administration in Utah," and a few condemn the law and the course pursued to deprive a religious body of its property. Among these the Washington Star is prominent in its dissent, which is uttered in the following pertinent language:

"The decree of the Supreme Court of Utah Territory, confiscating the property of the Mormon Church corporation, may have plenty of law to support it, but, measured by the standards of every day life, it wears the appearance of petty tyranny. The Mormon Church as a religious institution, deserves the same consideration as any other church. If some of its followers practice polygamy, the punishment of their law-breaking should be visited upon them, and not upon a great body of men and women perfectly innocent of offense against either law or morals. It is difficult to see moreover, how such a forfeiture as is wrought by the present decree of court can effect any good in the way of breaking up a per-

nicious domestic custom. On the old theory that might makes right, many harsh and extreme measures are excused in the conduct of one government toward another, whose interests are antagonistic to it; but a policy founded on its mere superiority of strength has never been found a wise one for a government to pursue toward its own citizens or subjects. A large body of the Mormon people are decent, law-abiding and thrifty. They may not be highly cultured, and to the trained eye of the critic the book on which they pin their faith may be full of absurdities; but that is no reason why they should lose the property which they have helped to gather because certain trustees in charge of it have violated the laws of the United States, not in an official but in a strictly private capacity. Let the government use every practicable means to break up polygamy by the enactment of laws against it and the enforcement of the prescribed penalties upon the persons of offenders; but let it be equally zealous in avoiding anything which, by its sweeping and ill-measured consequences, favors of persecution, and is likely to cause a revulsion of sentiment among fair-minded men."

The Star goes to the root of the matter in this sentence: "It is difficult to see, moreover, how such a forfeiture as is wrought by the present decree of court can effect any good in the way of breaking up a pernicious domestic custom." The truth is, confiscating any amount of property belonging to the Latter-day Saints, or to the "Mormon Church" if that term is better liked, can have no effect whatever in changing the opinion or faith of any person who believes in the doctrines of "Mormonism." Neither can it affect their manner of life. It may serve to drive the roots of conviction deeper down into the hearts of those who consider they are oppressed for religion's sake. That is the only result that can be rationally anticipated.

Everybody knows that justly, rightfully and on any principle of equity, the Government of the United States does not own one cent of this property. It was originally the property of the members of the Church. They donated it, severally, for the purposes of the Church. No matter what may be alleged or argued about those purposes, it is clear to every person with a normal brain that the property does not belong to anybody but the Church as an organization, or the individual members who compose the body. Whether it is taken from them by law or by physical force the process is robbery in fact. A thousand enactments will not change wrong into right, or justify the seizure and appropriation of goods by an individual or government to whom they do not actually belong.

If the Church has acquired and held more property than is right, that wrong cannot be rectified by another. There is no forfeiture to the crown, in these United States, as in the old monarchies which have been left behind in the march of human progress. The property of a defunct corporation goes to the individual members thereof, it is not escheat to the Government. Even if the United States do not self-appropriate the property seized by force of law from the actual owners, it is wrong and indefensible to use it for the benefit of people who never owned any part of it, as provided in the act of Congress, which seeks to divert the property of the Church to the support of schools which are open as much to the children of non-members as of members of that Church.

The Latter-day Saints know that other churches possess much larger sums of money and a great deal more real estate than has ever been acquired by the Church to which they belong, and are well satisfied that their Church is singled out for spoliation because it is unorthodox. All the sophistry that may be employed, in court or out of court, will not alter that fact nor change their understanding of it. Neither will this discrimination against them weaken their faith or change its effects upon them. But, as history teaches, oppression, injustice and a sense of injury will confirm them in the assurance that they are in the right and that it is because of that they are persecuted under the forms of law.

It is strange that men with the education and experience of most of our national legislators, should imagine that wresting from the "Mormons" their Church property would have any effect upon a single feature of their religion. If the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints were stripped of every vestige of wealth, if all its places of worship were destroyed, if it were left without a dollar of money or a roof under which to assemble, it would remain just as strong and united and full of force as before these suits were planted against it. Perhaps it would be stronger, more compact, more vigorous than now. The united faith, energies and devotion of its members are more than money, and mightier than earthly possessions.

"Mormonism" made its great strides and achieved its splendid victories before even it possessed fine, public tabernacles and houses of worship, or any corporate powers for legal self-protection. It can endure and survive any number of such "severe and terrible blows" as this despoiling of its goods. All the mobbings and drillings and expatriations to which it has been subjected, have never deprived it of the spiritual forces which are its