

EDITORIALS.

METHODIST vs. "MORMON."

THE current announced Indian policy of the Federal Government is one of peace, the employment of moral and even religious influence rather than physical force. In pursuance of this policy the Government has appointed Indian agents from members of various religious denominations, and endeavors have been made to induce the Indians to cultivate the earth instead of relying wholly on the chase, and to gradually adopt the industrial habits of civilized people.

This is a good policy, a noble endeavor. It was the very policy which was being pursued, and with a surprising measure of success, with the Indians near the Malad and Bear Rivers, a few miles from scare-crowned Corinne. But, in consequence of a most nonsensical hullabaloo from that poor, self-cowed village, raised for the special purpose of endeavoring to create difficulties and bloodshed between the "Mormons" and the Federal Government, these peaceful, industrious, moral, and religious Indians must be suddenly driven away from their farm lands by U. S. soldiery, forced back to their nomadic, vagabond life, with the loss of the ripening crops they had toiled so faithfully and hopefully to raise. These Indians had not been sought after and brought together by the "Mormons," but had come to them voluntarily, of their own unfettered option, asking of them the administration of the ordinances of Christ's Church, and instruction in the industrial arts of civilization. These Indians had been thus turned from their wild and vagrant ways to the Lord and to the habits of civilized people by means of dreams and visions which they firmly believed to be of heavenly origin and divine influence. Yet, forsooth, because they sought and obtained instruction and ministrations from "Mormon" Elders, the good work must be stopped, and the reforming Indians dispersed and driven back to their old ways and habits of living.

Suppose, under similar influences and desires, these Indians had sought instruction and religious and industrial aid and direction of Methodist preachers instead of "Mormon" Elders, would the Corinnites ever have got frightened out of their wits about it? Would they have imagined the Indians were upon them by legions? Would they have frantically fled to Brigham City for safety and protection and telegraphed to Salt Lake City for troops? Would they have requested the immediate dispersion or extermination of the Indians? Would the Indians have been peremptorily driven off from their maturing crops, on threat of extermination? No, these things would not have occurred.

They why should they under the existing circumstances—that the Indians had sought and obtained instruction and counsel from the "Mormons"? Is not the "Mormon" religion quite as good as the Methodist religion, quite as Scriptural, quite as rational, quite as potent in its salutary influences over the actions of men? Yea, is it not far more so? Is not a "Mormon" Elder quite as good as a Methodist preacher, quite as honest, quite as sincere, quite as faithful, quite as consistent, quite as self-sacrificing, quite as devoted to his religion and what he believes to be the will of heaven to himward? Verily he is, beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Then wherefore the difference in official and popular treatment? There is no justifiable reason for such a difference, such a contrast. It is the height of inconsistency, and can not be successfully vindicated. Inconsistency is often but another name for hypocrisy, injustice, and malice prepense.

MORE THAN A MILLION IN FEES.

A CORRESPONDENT of the New York Sun says that Governor Chamberlain, of South Carolina, is a member of the firm of "Melton,

Chamberlain & Wingate, attorneys at law," Charleston, Melton being also Attorney-General of the State. After detailing considerable sharp practice connected with the firm, or with Mr. Chamberlain, the correspondent gives the following as the best calculation he can make of Mr. Chamberlain's forensic profits for the first eight years of his professional life, "without reference to other large fees which now glide from memory," and "many smaller fees, more than enough to keep his Excellency's household expenses on the safe side"—

As attorney for Continental Telegraph Company, about.....	\$22,000
As attorney for Greenville and Columbia Railroad copartnership, about.....	40,000
As attorney for Greenville and Columbia Railroad Company, about.....	10,000
As attorney for South Carolina Railroad Company, about.....	20,000
As attorney for Laurens Railroad Company, about.....	10,000
As attorney for Union and Spartanburg Railroad Company, about.....	15,000
As attorney for Blue Ridge Railroad Company, about.....	25,000
As attorney for Blue Ridge Railroad Company scrip, about.....	25,000
As attorney for Kilmington & Co. (financial agents), about.....	200,000
As attorney for Morton, Bliss & Co. (conversion bonds), about.....	50,000
As attorney for Parsons & Co., State Bank bills, about.....	50,000
As attorney for Harvey Terry South Carolina Bank bills, about.....	25,000
As attorney for Bank of the State, about.....	50,000
As attorney for Carolina Printing Company, old, about.....	100,000
As attorney for Republican Printing Company, new, about.....	100,000
As attorney for Hardy Solomon's Bank, about.....	75,000
As attorney for Land Commission, about.....	75,000
As attorney for Treasurer Parker, and other matters, about.....	50,000
As attorney for State of South Carolina, with contingent account, and solicitor First Circuit, about.....	60,500
As attorney for United States in Klux cases, about.....	10,000
Total.....	\$1,215,000

COME, YE DISCONSOLATE.

THERE comes a wail from all the watering places toward the Atlantic, the burden of which is the abundance of young ladies and the extraordinary scarcity of young gentlemen. An exchange says—

"There are six girls to one young man at Niagara Falls and Saratoga. Young men do not go to such places any longer, or if they do, they never marry anybody they see there."

We are better off hereabout. There is no lack of either sex at Salt Lake, and, better still, the men walk right up to the law and the testimony, like true heroes, on the marriage question.

A BASELESS STATEMENT.

SPEAKING of the recent trial of Lee at Beaver, the St. Louis Globe Democrat says—

"Should the case reach the Supreme Court of Utah, the majority of its bench are men under the control of the Mormon Church."

The above will be considered by the members of the Supreme Court of this Territory as a baseless libel on them. Is the editor of the *Globe-Democrat* so grossly ignorant of men and things as to imagine for a moment that President Grant would appoint, as judges for Utah, "men who are under the control of the Mormon Church?" Will the *G. D.* please to point out the slightest evidence that President Grant ever had the first particle of affection for the "Mormon" Church? Then it will be time to ask for evidence that he so loved the Church as to appoint, as judges for Utah, men who are "under the control" of the Church. So far as we have learned, President Grant is rather inclined to identify himself with the Methodist church, and among the Methodists may be found some of the most bitter and malignant enemies that the "Mormon" Church has.

The *G. D.* further says—

"It is well known that very few 'Saints' have ever been brought to justice under the laws of the United States Courts."

This may be considered as highly

complimentary to the Saints, demonstrating that they are a remarkably law-abiding people.

The *G. D.* might have further said, and with equal truth, that it is well known that very few Saints have been brought under condemnation by any reasonable law, with a fair trial, federal or local, which is saying still more to their credit. As for justice, that is precisely what the Saints most desire, but are seldom able to find.

MUM.

EVER since the explosion of the ridiculous Corinne Indian scare bubble, all the California papers which have come to us have been as mum as mice upon Utah matters, with the exception of their brief current dispatches from Salt Lake.

Discretion is often the better part of valor, and, considering the notorious character of this silly Corinne sensation, the partisan character of the entire fabrication, it must be conceded that our cotemporaries of the great Pacific State do show a degree of discretion in maintaining a respectful silence upon this farcical affair, now that it is patent, even to them, that there "never was nothing" in it, malice excepted. It would have showed a still greater degree of discretion if the same papers had either maintained silence, or indulged in more temperate and truthful strains of expression, for several weeks previous to the Corinne burlesque, so far as Utah affairs were concerned.

WHOSE FAULT WAS IT?

THE Washington Chronicle, speaking of the Lee trial at Beaver, says—

"We believe that the people of this country would sanction the use of the whole military force at command, and as much more as might be called for, to see to it that a fair trial should be instituted, and, upon conviction, proper punishment meted out."

The above assumes that the trial in question was not a fair one. If it was not, whose fault was it? The trial was conducted by United States Judge, prosecutor, marshal and deputies, under a United States law, under the guns, sabres, and bayonets of a camp of United States soldiers. During the whole course of the trial there was not the slightest interference from without with the proceedings of the court. The jury were accepted by prosecution, defence and court. The judge admitted or denied such testimony as he chose. The prosecution apparently talked to and abused the jury as it chose. The defence was eminently respectful and free from abuse. The jury could not agree upon a verdict, though rumors say many, if not all, of them would have been glad if they could have agreed. It is not the first time that jurors have disagreed, and have not been able to bring in a verdict in an important case.

Therefore the question is proper enough—"If there was not a fair trial, whose fault was it?"

Another question or two. On what ground is the assumption based that the presence of an immense number of troops is necessary to a fair trial? At Beaver there were a company or two, and there was nothing like interference with the court by the citizens? What less interference could there have been if every soldier and every officer in the U. S. army had been there?

On what ground is the assumption based that the presence of any soldiers at all is conducive to a fair trial in court? In Provo and in this city there have been as fair trials as could probably be obtained anywhere, and the influence of soldiery was not at hand. Any good citizen, any fairminded man, if empanelled and sitting to try a case, would render a fair verdict as he might understand the law and the evidence. He would do it if there were no soldier within a thousand miles of the court. If a hundred thousand soldiers were encamped immediately around the court house, and they even invaded the court room with their presence, it would have no appreciable

effect upon his verdict. A fair and honest jury would give a fair and honest verdict under any circumstances, unaffected by the presence or absence of soldiery in any number, small or great.

A LYING RELIGIOUS REPORT.

A CONFERENCE of the Rocky Mountain Methodist Episcopalians, including those of Utah, Idaho, and Montana, was recently held in this city. It is claimed by Methodists and most other religionists that their motto is that of the angels—peace on earth, good will to man. If this was the motto and the object of the late M. E. conference, then we are forced to the conclusion that the members of that conference had a very peculiar way of showing it. For towards the body of religionists who founded this Territory, who made it possible for a M. E. conference to be held in this city, who grew the bread and meat and potatoes which the members of the conference ate while attending the deliberations of the same, from whose ranks come, and have ever come, the purely local authorities of the Territory, and who constitute nine-tenths of the aggregate inhabitants of the Territory, this same M. E. conference did act in excessively bad taste, in an unchristian-like manner, and with wondrous ingratitude, in that it did, through the persons of some of its prominent members, with much prejudice and bitterness, and unjustly and falsely, make certain reflections and statements concerning said predominating religious body, reflections and statements wholly inconsistent with, and entirely foreign to, the spirit of that blessed angelic message before quoted—peace on earth, good will to man. It is a message worthy of serious and frequent meditation, and constant illustration, personal and actual, especially by those who profess to be followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Consequently, one of the most natural expectations would be that the M. E. conference, a special congregation of professed "ministers of Christ," would exhibit in a super-eminent degree the true angelic and heavenly spirit of that truly angelic and heavenly message. But what a woeful disappointment! Instead of the manifestation of such a spirit, there was the manifestation of a very opposite spirit—the bitterness of hatred to and the slandering of another body of religionists, of superior claims to scripturality as to their doctrines, and of at least equal devotion, by its members, to their professed religious convictions, and therefore at least equally entitled to the confidence, respect, and esteem of other religionists in the Territory and of the religious world at large.

During the sitting of the Conference, it appears that a number of reports were made by various committees, appointed for the purpose, that among these committees was a special one upon the "state of affairs in Utah," the affairs political as well as religious, though why a conference of Methodists, who claim that their religion has nothing whatever to do with things of the earth earthy, such as politics pre-eminently are, should interfere with such things, is not made very clear to the non-Methodistic comprehension. However, this particular special committee made a report, and a very pretty sort of a report it was, as made public, to come before a conference of "ministers of Christ," professed preachers of his holy gospel.

We will indulge in a few brief notes upon this report, our space being too limited for a more lengthy notice.

The chairman of the committee who made the report is one Rev. C. P. Lyford, who is generally credited with the reputation of being a mendacious mendicant, religiously and piously, from the circumstance of his peregrinations in the east upon preaching, praying, begging, and lying expeditions for the purpose of raising means to push in this Territory his peculiar Methodist notions of religion. This is the man who is reported to have urged his religious begging enterprises in the East by stating that he considered it prudent when in Utah to go into the pulpit to preach with the Bible in one hand and a

revolver in the other, possibly on the old showman's principle, "Whichever you please, my little dears; you pay your money and takes your choice."

In considering this special report, then, it is in order to consider the source thereof. Considering the source, then, the production is by no means a disappointment, it is among the things that might have been expected to flow from such a source. But there may be some disappointment that a conference of Methodist "ministers of Christ" should unanimously adopt, as it is reported they did, a report which is a mere tissue of prejudice, bitterness, hatred, misrepresentation, slander, and falsehood, concerning another locally larger and more influential body of religionists.

1. The report is exclusively occupied with considerations of "Mormonism" and the "Mormons." To this we can have no objection. It indicates that even the Methodists considered that "Mormonism" and the "Mormons" were things of chief interest to the conference and to all people. Moreover the committee could not have had a better subject to consider, nor one of greater importance to mankind.

2. The report says that "Mormonism" is entirely hostile to the American government and to American institutions. We think we know more about "Mormonism" than the Methodists do, and we do not know that it is hostile as said. Indeed, we believe that the "Mormons" are the most loyal people in the Union to the Constitution of the United States.

3. The report says "Mormonism" is an organized system of outlawry, and a plundered nation of its timber and its lands, and defies and tramples underfoot the law of Congress concerning polygamy.

Part of the above appears to us supremely silly. Have not settlers, from time immemorial, when they have gone into the wilderness, used the air, land, grass, water, rock, sand, clay, lime, wood, and timber to support and make comfortable themselves, families, and domestic animals? The settlers in every embryotic and actual State and Territory have done so, and now do so. When the United States extends its regulations specially over such land and the people comply with them. The "Mormons" have done just the same as all other frontiersmen in these matters. They have sustained themselves as best they could, ever since they were thrust out, a thousand miles into the wilderness, in the Christian hope that they would perish. That they have obeyed the commanding instinct to live, and the divine commandment to increase and multiply, and replenish the earth, and in doing it have occupied a portion of what was a waste land and uninhabited, is now voted a crime by these exceedingly sapient Methodist religionists. As to defying law, the "Mormons" respect law, not defy it.

4. The report enlarges in invective against theocracy, Order of Enoch, polygamy, free schools, lithering, tears and groans, "one hundred thousand souls kept in bondage," etc.

These several important points we have not space to enlarge upon now. They have frequently been dilated upon before.

5. The report says that by the present jury system the law is absolutely without force. Which is a falsehood.

6. The report deplores the removal of "that eminent jurist and incorruptible man, Judge McKean," as a great calamity, etc.

Our lachrymal glands are dry as a bone on this subject. Where's "Brother Sherman?" He is a champion "weepist." McKean is a brother Methodist. If that is a qualification for a seat on the bench, then he is qualified, and that is his only qualification that we know of. He may or may not be honest. We don't know about that. We should not like to trust him too far. But his great manifest defect is his lack of self control, discretion, sound judgment, and unbiassed mind.

7. The report says that "a Mormon has never been punished under United States law."

If so, perhaps no "Mormon" has ever been found guilty under United States law. Would the Methodists have the "Mormons" punished whether guilty or not guilty?

7. The report says there is no reason at the ballot box. The ballot box shows the majori-