

THE DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

ALBERT CARRINGTON.....EDITOR

Wednesday,..... July 10, 1867.

NOTICE!

To commodiously provide for convening large parties for recreation and for innocent relaxation and enjoyment, the Theatre in this city has been expressly prepared and decorated. This arrangement affords superior opportunities for social re-unions; and the brethren who formerly resided in Jackson County, Missouri, the members of Zion's Camp and of the Mormon Battalion and the Pioneers of 1847, with their many friends, can now have ample room in which to assemble in parties and enjoy themselves in contrasting the present with reminiscences of the past.

For the Battalion Party, on the 16th, and the Pioneer Party, on the 24th inst., the Bishops will please ascertain who in their several Wards would like to attend, and forward their names immediately.

TICKETS, \$5.00 per couple, and \$1.00 for each Additional Lady.

BRIGHAM YOUNG,
HEBER C. KIMBALL,
DANIEL H. WELLS.

CELEBRATION OF THE FOURTH.

The 91st anniversary of the national birth-day was duly celebrated in this city, according to the programme arranged by the Committee, and published in the last number of the NEWS. In recording the civil dignitaries who were invited to take part in the proceedings, however, we accidentally omitted the County and City officers, after Territorial Officers; but the gentlemen, though omitted in type, were present in person, and participated in the enjoyment of the exercises.

At dawn, artillery gave the signal for raising the national flag, and the bands soon made inspiring music. About half past nine o'clock the ward processions began to appear near the Temple Block, and were conducted to their places in the Bowery. The display of flags, banners, bannerets, and other species of bunting, was unusually large, even for a celebration including a great number of "Mormon" children, who seem to have a strong predilection for such showy emblems.

To describe the flags, &c., and record the mottoes on them, would require more space than we can command, so we will have to be content with a passing mention. Many of the banners were very tastefully designed and executed, but the most artistic one that we noticed was the Sunday School banner of the 20th Ward, which bore two pretty little childish faces intently gazing on an open page, with the motto "Study the best books."

The 12th Ward had for one of its mottoes "God and our Country: We worship the first and defend the last." Another one, from the same ward, "Love at Home" was very suggestive. One of the banners of the 15th Ward bore the arms of the United States, with the word "Peace" inscribed, and the mottoes "One Country" over the arms and "No North, no South" underneath. The 4th Ward had in its procession thirteen young ladies dressed in white, with blue sashes, and floral wreaths, led by a young lady similarly costumed, bearing with them a banner having the inscription "The gals of '67." Seeing

that the celebration was in commemoration of '76, with its thirteen colonies, the transposition was very happy, and the "gals" were sufficiently interesting looking to make more than one of the "boys" wish to have them pass from separate colonies to be members of the "united state."

All the wards appeared to much advantage, emulating each other in celebrating the day and carrying out the suggestions of the committee. Capt. Croxall's brass band, Capt. Eardly's brass band, the Tenth Ward brass band; Major Huntingdon's martial band and the 15th Ward martial band made the air musical with sweet sounds while the processions were passing to and being seated in the Bowery.

When all were seated, the First Presidency and the officials who participated on the occasion arrived in carriages from the City Hall, accompanied by the Committee, and took their seats on the stand, when the exercises commenced. After the opening song by the choir, written for the occasion by H. W. Naisbitt, Esq., prayer by Elder George A. Smith, the Chaplain, and music by Croxall's band, the Declaration of Independence was read by Hon. Geo. Q. Cannon; followed by one gun, and "Yankee Doodle" by the martial band. The Hon. John Taylor then delivered the following

ORATION:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

We are met here to commemorate, in common with the citizens of these United States, the return of the Fourth of July, the Anniversary of American Independence, a day esteemed as a day of jubilee by every American patriot since the Fourth of July, 1776.

It is customary, on such occasions, to read the Declaration of Independence, setting forth the accumulated wrongs endured by the first settlers of this country, at the hands of Great Britain; and proclaiming to that Government, and to the world, their determination to endure them no longer;—pledging their lives, their fortunes and sacred honor in defense of the "free and independent States of America."

It is also usual to give toasts eulogizing the Constitution of the United States. If any body of men in the United States feel interested in the principles enunciated in these documents, we ought to. We do not wish to treat them with levity or carelessness; but to value them at their intrinsic worth, to abide by them ourselves, and to teach our children, and children's children, to maintain them inviolate.

Joseph Smith said "The Constitution of the United States was given by inspiration of God;" and therefore it ought by us, as every other inspiration, to be held sacred. It may be said we are met here to have a political jubilee; and why introduce religious subjects? I answer that my religion, and politics, are so blended and intermingled, that it is extremely difficult to separate the one from the other. The honorable signers of the Declaration of Independence were not ashamed, in their day, in support of said declaration, to profess, "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence;" and why should we feel ashamed to acknowledge that those patriots and statesmen, who framed the Constitution of the United States, were led by inspiration? It is an honor to any man or set of men to seek the inspiration of the Almighty. It is a greater honor to obtain it.

Was it nothing that kingcraft or priestcraft had ruled with an iron hand throughout Europe, Asia and Africa; and that liberty, as Stephen says of Abraham, concerning Palestine, "could find no inheritance in it; no not so much as to set her foot?" Was it nothing that freedom had been hunted from nation to nation; and that the victims of tyranny fleeing from England and other nations, in hopes of finding an asylum here, were pursued by their relentless persecutors; and that the sacred germ of liberty, just springing into life, was in danger of being crushed, by the iron heel of despotism? Was it nothing that the fate of a mighty continent;—a new world—was at stake; and the destinies of unborn millions in their

hands, for weal or for woe, for bondage or freedom? Was it strange that men of keen perceptions, enlarged minds and philanthropic hearts, should sensibly feel the heavy responsibilities resting upon them and seek for,—and obtain, Divine assistance? And shall we, of all others, fail to recognize the dispensation of Providence in this great national revolution, and acknowledge the hand of Almighty God? Let us rather reverently thank His name for the benefits of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," derived therefrom, which we now enjoy.

Let me here remark that in no part of the political world could a government like ours have been established. In no part of the natural world could so good a place have been found; and in no part of the world could we, as a people, have enjoyed the amount of liberty and freedom from oppression that we enjoy here. This may seem strange to the ears of those who have not reflected upon the subject: it is nevertheless true. We talk sometimes of mob violence, of persecution, of official and governmental corruption and depravity. What of that? While the Constitution is acknowledged it places the wrong doer in the wrong, condemns their practices and reveals the right; and whether mobs or Congress violate it they come alike under its reprobation. In other nations the laws would be against us; in this the Constitution and Constitutional laws sustain us.

I do not agree with a certain writer who says, "If there be a country in the world where concord, according to common calculation, would be least expected, it is America; made up as it is of people from different nations, accustomed to different forms and habits of government; speaking different languages and more different in their forms of worship: it would appear that the union of such a people was impracticable." Coming from different nations, yet all of whom though different in manner were oppressors, they would naturally combine to guard against all kinds of oppression; and institute the largest amount of freedom, consistent with the general welfare. Being of different religious persuasions they would all feel interested in protecting their own from aggression; and in so doing, must of course accord the same liberty to others, and many of them, having been used as so many machines in arms for the oppression of themselves and others, they would necessarily guard against too great power of a military character; and having seen nearly all powers assumed by Government, they would necessarily be careful what powers they granted to the general Government, to the several States, and what they reserved to themselves. These principles are all clearly indicated in the Constitution, and they were evidently well matured in the minds of its framers.

A question frequently propounds itself to the minds of reflecting men, What is government? In scanning the history of many nations one would conclude it to be a machine for the manufacture of armies and implements of destruction, to slay and plunder, subjugate and destroy. Such at least is the history of the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, Carthaginian, Roman, the Turkish, the French, particularly under Napoleon the First and the British. How did these nations obtain their power and possessions? By conquest. It is said of Alexander the Great that after he had conquered the then known world, he sat down and wept because he had not another world to conquer. What is implied in conquering? What I said before, mustering armies for the purpose of fighting, plundering, ravaging and destruction. And how were the possessions of the afore-mentioned nations obtained? They were acquired by conquest; subjugated by that "inhumanity to man which," the poet tells us, "makes countless thousands mourn." What has become of Poland, lately; and portions of Denmark and Austria; not to mention the "sick man of Europe;" the "cutting up of the Turkey;" and the complications of Mexico? These are fair samples of Governments. The question naturally arises, are these governments thus constituted and organized competent to legislate for the benefit of suffering humanity? We should not among civilians appoint such men to places of trust and profit. One would think from the acts of others that governments were instituted in order to furnish offices, sinecures, pensions and positions of honor and profit for certain classes of men, and their connections,—

in the civil lists, the army, navy, and Church; and that governments were instituted for them and their benefit. Such ideas, however, contrast strangely with the welfare of society and the common rights of humanity. We will take England; it was against her that our fathers rebelled. We will not refer to her East Indian conquests; to her treatment of the Chinese; her European conflicts; to her boast, that "the sun never sets on her possessions," for, we might be tempted to ask, Did she originally hold these possessions? Did she purchase them? If not, how did she obtain them? And we are not disposed to enter into a discussion of this nature at present. Neither do we wish to trace the order of her kings. The antecedents, and acts, of William the Conqueror would not be pleasant to trace a line of kingly authority from, nor is the importation of William and Mary from Holland much more creditable. What are we to think of a Parliament who would convey the authority to govern a country to their heirs in the following terms: "We, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do, in the name of the people of England, most humbly and faithfully submit ourselves, our heirs and posterities, to William and Mary their heirs and posterities for ever." What have the people to do with such a government, in its inception or organization? and I might ask, what has God to do with it?

The English government consists of three powers,—the king, or queen; the Lords, and Commons. Now what have the people to do with electing or making choice of king? Simply nothing. He was an imported power which the "lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons," bound themselves and heirs, in behalf of the people of England, to submit to forever. Next we have the lords spiritual and temporal; what have the people to do with appointing them? Nothing whatever. They hold their position either by hereditary right, or by appointment. Two branches of government are therefore entirely out of their reach. The one they are bound by their superiors to submit to. The other claims to govern as a matter of right. Their only resource is the commons. They have one word out of three, and that restricted by a very limited franchise. Was it any wonder that the king of England, "refused his assent to laws wholesome and necessary to the public good." He was king, and acting in consonance with the power and policy of kings; and not professedly for the public good.

They complain that he "dissolved representative houses for opposing his invasions on the rights of the people." What had the people to do with opposing him. They were bound by their representatives to obey; not oppose him, "with manly firmness," and all the catalogue of ills and oppressions complained of, came within the purview of his power. It was really not him, then, but the form of government, of which he was the ostensible representative. They had to combat with the powers conferred on the king and that of the lords spiritual and temporal. They were living on a large continent; their ideas expanded commensurately with its magnitude. They were panting for freedom and could ill brook the clanking of their old manacles. It was not a struggle between the king and colonists; but between monarchical government, backed by lords spiritual and temporal, and the rights of man. And let me here remark that this was then, and is to-day, one of the most liberal governments in Europe. I would further remark that many of the English and other European monarchs have been humane, high-minded, liberal men; but what has this to do with their governments? The present Queen of England is a very intelligent, humane, amiable and honorable lady, and has won the admiration and respect of not only her own nation, but that of others; but that does not alter the form of government; and it is that of which we speak.

Here, then, were a body of men gathered from the various nations, desirous to form a government to meet the wants and exigencies of common humanity. The experience gained in those nations had taught them their evils. It was for them to avoid the rocks and shoals on which many of them had foundered, and to produce a strong, a just and equitable government, "deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed." They stood upon an elevated platform; they were the pioneers of a new world; they