

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - MAY 19, 1886

CLEANSE THE INSIDE.

The heavy clouds of adversity are thickening over the community of Latter-day Saints. One anticipated source of relief after another is being swept away like straws upon the swollen current of popular antipathy.

These forbidding circumstances have a variety of effects upon the people who are apparently being driven to the wall. Some are disposed to give way to the promptings of the natural man and allow their souls to be fired with anger against their oppressors. Others incline to become weak in the faith of the Gospel and in the power and inclination of Jehovah to come to their relief. Still another and much the larger class constituting the bulk of the body-religious have their faith increased by every development of the present peculiar phase through which the Church is passing. They behold the hand of Providence and the fulfillment of the prophets in it all, and estimate the situation as but the deepening night before the brightest day that ever shone on the community. They do not sink down into their shoes at the apparently forbidding prospect. They are filled with that moral valor that inspires a determination to contend by peaceful means for every right to which they are entitled, at the same time being as willing that all other men shall enjoy whatever belongs to them. They have no disposition to impose oppression for oppression, nor insult for insult, because those who do so place themselves upon a level with those who wrong them. It is for the Saints to stand upon a more elevated plane than people who are treating them with cruelty and injustice.

A correct account of all the abuses, cruelties, injustice and inhumanity should be kept. But to engage in a war of epithets and vulgar abuse is not only unedified, but opposed to the spirit of the Gospel in every sense. Care should be exercised to have all exhibits of this kind free from the taint of hyperbole, exaggeration being no better than a form of misstatement. All fair, square expositions of that character carry weight now, and will have a mighty effect hereafter.

It is a question, under the present situation of affairs whether the same eager attention and importance accorded to circumstances pertaining to the outside pressure upon the Saints are given to the internal condition of the Church, by those who compose it. Yet if there be any difference between the degree of energy that should be displayed in those two directions it would be difficult to state which should be the more favored. Perhaps, however, the demands of the interior would be deemed the more urgent. The body-religious may be aptly compared in this connection, to the human organism. When it is fragile, sickly and disordered, within its own structure, it is unable to cope with those outside conditions that conduce to disease and dissolution. It is unable to bear up vigorously against exposure to storms, malarial atmosphere and epidemic maladies. On the other hand when it is pure, healthful and strong, it passes through adverse conditions almost unscathed. Internal forces are the best means of resistance to outside attacks that threaten destruction. To increase the health of the Church should receive a very great degree of attention under existing circumstances.

It is among the probabilities that before the community gets through with the present ordeal, which bids fair to be for some time continuous, every earthly source of redress may be appealed to in vain. It looks as if the stream of events was flowing more or less rapidly in that direction now. When that point is reached there will doubtless be a general appeal to Him who reigns on high. When the exhibit shall be made to that infallible Court, the petitioners must be in good shape or recognition and redress will not be assured.

What, then, will place the people in rapport with Divine Providence and insure the hearing of their representations; and an answer to their expressed desires for deliverance. Their claim should be founded in justice. The body-religious must undergo treatment by the introduction of certain specifics for the expulsion of conditions that vitiate the currents of its life. More humility will expel social inequalities and pride, which are unbecoming in Saints and an abomination in the sight of heaven. More of the true spirit of brotherhood will eliminate selfishness and conduce to greater unity, which is

an indispensable essential to strength. A wider application of the law of the Lord in relation to offenders against the principles of purity and righteousness would place the community on a more exalted moral plane, and be conducive to a more liberal flow of spiritual power.

A year or two since the Church was directed to purify its own ranks by eliminating sinners who do not repent. If this had been attended to with greater diligence and earnestness it is doubtful if there would have been such an abundant crop of traitors as the present persecutions have developed.

We repeat that the cleansing of the interior of the platter is a work to which it is impossible to attach too much importance, let the bolts fall where they may.

AGAINST BOGUS BUTTER.

A STRONG effort is being made to work a bill through Congress for the repression of the manufacture and traffic in butterine, oleomargarine and kindred counterfeits for butter, and for this purpose Joseph H. Reali, President of the American Agricultural and Dairy Association is in Washington, and has been for some months past using his influence among Congressmen. His efforts and those of the members and Senators who favor the measure are being strongly opposed by the manufacturers of counterfeit butter, who are said to have held a meeting and agreed to raise \$500,000 to defeat the bill now before Congress, and they can probably well afford to do so in view of the immense profits which they realize on their vile and deceptive trade. Those who realize what an influence money possesses in this corrupt and degenerate age will probably not be surprised to learn that the friends of the bill are apprehensive over the result. Mr. Reali makes a strong appeal for financial assistance in the cause in which he is engaged and requests those who are interested to send him at least \$5 each, and thus become members of the American Agricultural and Dairy Association.

HOW IT WAS DONE.

THE filling of the chair of the Utah Commission, made vacant by the resignation of ex-Gov. Ramsey before the appointment of General McClelland, has been a topic of journalistic comment. It has been intimated that it was a little premature, and that it had the semblance of stealing a march upon the late acquisition to the Commission. It appears that this reflection was not well founded, the appointment having been made upon the custom of seniority. The action of the Commission was explained the other day to a representative of the Omaha Herald, by ex-Senator Paddock, who is now sojourning in Nebraska.

He said:

"Gen. Ramsey was the chairman of the committee, made so by a rule regulating the selection of such an officer. He wanted to resign a year ago, but continued to serve until a few months ago. When he did resign the order of the list of our appointments brought my name to the head. I was nominated, but I thought with a democratic administration and three democrats or a majority in the Commission that the latter should have a democratic chairman. So I declined to take the position and Judge Carlton, of Indiana, the first democrat on the list, was selected. It would, therefore, not have made any difference whether or not we had waited until Gov. Ramsey's successor had been appointed. We thought it might be some time before the vacancy was filled."

THE PROBABLE EXTRA LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND has recommended to Congress the passage of a bill authorizing a special session of the Utah Legislature. This he considers necessary, in consequence of the obstruction of the late Governor to the passage of the appropriation bill. It will be remembered that when the idea was advanced that the President would call an extra session, the DESERET NEWS showed that it must be done through Congress. It is to be hoped that action will be taken on this matter at once. It is possible that the members elected to the last Legislature may be authorized to act in the special session. But it is probable that a new election will be required, when the late members could be re-elected as the most competent persons to attend to the business necessary to be done, because of their familiarity with all the details.

If the extra session is called, we hope sufficient time will be allowed for the re-enactment of several very important measures which were vetoed by the late Governor out of pure spite and malice. They are almost as necessary as the appropriation bill. Of course the new Governor would be put on his mettle, and if he approved of the bills he would be assailed by the conspirators who made such a tool of

Murray. But it would give the Governor an opportunity of showing how much sand there is in his composition, and whether he means to study the public interest or the wishes of a clique bent on "rule or ruin."

They will be terribly disgruntled if the extra session is authorized. They have not been able to bulldoze the President and cannot manipulate Congress as they handled Murray. They would not only prevent the extra session if they could, but would destroy the Legislature entirely. They are so anxious for Republican or Democratic rule that they would take away from the people to be governed all voice and control in the local government. First they want the "Mormons" disfranchised so that they—the little minority—can run the Territory. For this they clamored for the Woodburn bill, or preferably for a more stringent measure concocted among themselves, taking away the ballot from every person who belongs to or supports the "Mormon" Church. Second, if that fails they want a Legislative Commission—of their own crowd if possible—appointed by the Government in place of the Legislative Assembly chosen by the people. Third, that being impossible, they would like the legislation to be done direct from Washington. Anything but local self-government in any shape or form. They are nice Republicans, are they not? And what kind of Democrats are they who wish to destroy in this Territory the very fundamental principle of democratic government?

We may expect that when the President's proposition is considered in Congress, the representatives of this clique will do all that lies in their power by falsehood and misrepresentation to prevent the convening of the Legislature. But we do not think they can succeed. If Congress is not thoroughly blinded by prejudice, the necessity of the measure will be perceived at once as the only remedy for the condition of things brought about by the obstruction and nullification of the late Executive of the Territory.

Attached to the bill for the extra session should be the measure placing Utah on the same footing as all the other Territories in regard to legislative powers. The absolute veto should be removed. There is nothing in it that is justifiable in a republic. It is foreign to everything democratic in theory and practice. It is monarchical, despotic and anomalous. There is no need for it whatever. If all the anti-"Mormon" nonsense uttered on the subject was true, it is still entirely unnecessary. Congress retains the power to disapprove of every act of the Legislature, and this is surely sufficient for every purpose.

If the bill is passed for the extra session, it will no doubt be limited to a short term. The expenses will have to be specially provided for, because the law forbids any session of the Legislature until the money for its expenses is appropriated. The cost of a new election will fall on the government, because of the useless incumbrance known as the Utah Commission, which ought to have ended its existence after the Legislative session of 1884, as intended by the Act which created the Commission, but was kept in life by the connivance of the now defunct Governor. The extra session is needed for many things, and it is to be hoped that its powers will not be confined to the mere passage of an appropriation bill.

The question of the expenditure of public moneys, in the event of the passage of an appropriation bill at an extra session of the Legislature, has been sprung by the little party of obstructionists. There need be no dubiety on that point. The *de facto* Auditor and Treasurer have the undoubted right to act while they retain possession of their offices. They have faithfully performed their duties while they have been entrusted with the handling of the territorial finances, and there is nothing to hinder their still doing so. The suit against them is still undecided. The bogus appointees have merely gained one step in their advance to grasp the offices which the people do not want them to obtain. They are not in yet. The *de facto* officers are in, and the flimsy objection to their old bonds is removed, for they are under new bonds against which no objection can be raised. But in either event, they are fully competent, until the dispute is finally settled and they have turned over their offices to their successors, to handle the moneys belonging to the people who elected them, and who, as a matter of right, ought to decide as to the disbursement of their own finances. Anything that seeks to deprive them of this power, whether it be in the form of a congressional statute, an executive edict or a judicial ruling is opposed to democratic principles, is usurpation and oppression and is in violation of the spirit of those institutions which every patriot should struggle to maintain in their primitive integrity.

THE DECAY OF COMMON-WEALTHS.

JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE is one of the leading minds of the age. Being a historian, as an historical student he has few peers and fewer superiors. The philosophic deductions he draws from the vast accumulation of facts he has stored away in his capacious brain are likely to be sound. He has neces-

sarily given much attention in his copious researches, to the causes of the decay of nations. In his "Sketch of Cæsar," he thus expresses himself upon this momentous subject:

"If there is one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this; that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their constitution, the constitution itself will fall to pieces from mere incompetence for its duties."

"When the control of reason is once removed the catastrophe is no longer distant, and the nations, like all organized creations, all forms of life, from the meanest flower to the highest human institution, pass through the regularly recurring stages of growth and transformation and decay."

Commonwealths have proved as unenduring as any other natural object."

Whether prompted by an inherent disposition to extend the principles of her constitution, or from the more sordid motive of self preservation, Great Britain has so governed her provinces, as a rule, for half an age at least, in such a way as to cause them to feel as lightly as practicable the position of dependency. They have had their own parliaments and have enacted their own laws for all practical purposes. This liberalization in the treatment of her colonies has been a gradual process and has, doubtless, contributed largely to the perpetuity and solidification of the Empire. The British dependencies have been considerably left to govern themselves under the genial auspices of the constitution. The consequence has been that the tendencies to disruption of the body politic have been of a mild type.

Ireland is theoretically an integral part of the United Kingdom, but practically she has been treated as a dependency. She has long groaned under the burden of stern injustice. The result of this treatment affords a modern illustration, so far as it has been developed, of the soundness of Mr. Froude's theory regarding the causes of the decay of nations. The situation of Ireland bids fair to constitute a rock upon which the British Empire will split. Mr. Gladstone, at this late date, has made a gigantic effort to stop the progress of disintegration by according to the afflicted country her constitutional rights, in the framing of one of the most radical measures ever aimed at in the British Parliament. The remedy comes late, and present appearances indicate that it will be repudiated. It is difficult to tell what effect such an enactment would have in arresting the disintegrating forces engendered by the Irish question. It is easy to see, however, that the bringing of the proposed relief so near to a successful issue, and then dashing to the ground the hopes of those who were longing for it, by a signal defeat, which it is likely to encounter, will greatly increase the evils which it was intended, by its originator and chief promoter, to eradicate.

The creation and governing of dependencies by the freest system on earth—the republican form—is much more of an anomaly than in the case of a constitutional monarchy, such as Great Britain. It is much more foreign to the spirit and interest of democracy, where the people are presumed to be sovereign locally. Yet it practically exists, and nowhere so markedly as in relation to Utah. The people of this Territory are legislated against in a way that is foreign to the spirit, intent and express provisions of the Constitution of the country. The facts illustrating the truth of this statement have been so frequently exhibited that their enumeration here is unnecessary. That the Utah question, owing to the small number of people claiming to be oppressed, should have any bearing in producing processes of national dissolution and disaster will, doubtless, be treated scoffingly. Yet the principle laid down by Froude is involved in it. And so far as the extent of the trouble is concerned, no matter as to the comparative paucity of the number of the people oppressed, it will not be denied that the question as a whole has been made one of national import, and exceedingly conspicuous at that. It involves the nation to all intents and purposes. Then if Froude be correct evil to the country will be the result.

We firmly believe with Mr. Froude that, "when the control of reason is removed the catastrophe is no longer distant." The control of reason has been for some time removed in the treatment of the people of Utah. This is exemplified every day. The expression of Mr. Fred Dubois, U. S. Marshal for Idaho, uttered a few days ago, the making of the assertion being admitted by him in court under oath, is but a sample instance which applies to the anti-"Mormon" crusade throughout. He said he had a jury empaneled to try "Mormon" unlawful cohabitation cases that would convict Jesus Christ if he were on trial. Neither has argument the slightest effect in changing the merciless bent of those who are operating the anti-"Mormon" crusade. They appear to have, individually and collectively, determined that "The control of reason be removed" from the controversy. A saying of Paine—subsequently plagiarized by Ingersoll—applies precisely to them. He said that to argue with a man who lays aside his reason is as useless as to administer medicine to a corpse. They will not entertain any reason that a "Mormon" has to offer in support of his side of the subject.

If the Constitution and laws are

trampled under foot in order to crush any portion of the people, dwelling in any section of the Republic, the spirit of disregard for law will spread throughout the whole governmental fabric, and is uselessness, anarchy and strife will take the place of peace, order and prosperity. Already the symptoms appear in the very vitals as well as on the surface of the Republic. Would that the country would take to heart the lessons of history. But no; its tones, which come thundering down through the ages, fall without effect upon the ears of the nation.

AN IRASCIBLE AND INCONSISTENT JUDGE.

JUDGE ZANE very much dislikes to hear a "Mormon" advance any reasons why the extreme penalties of the law should not be passed upon him, when convicted of unlawful cohabitation. He asks for such reasons as a matter of form. But when defendants begin to present them, he becomes irascible and grumpy, and often uses the most insulting language and epithets in his unseemly wrath. He has not lately gone so far, as on some former occasions, to call his silenced victims "cowards" and their children "bastards," but he cannot control his impatience when they respond to his unmeaning invitation to state if they have anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced.

In the inflicting of the full penalties upon Brothers George C. Lambert and Henry W. Naisbitt, he interrupted them several times. He should remember that though he may not consider the reasons offered sufficient, he cannot judge of them until they are heard. And that the defendants speak from their standpoint, not from his. If the reasons seem substantial in their eyes they have the right to explain them. If not, why ask for their expression? Supposing they are not deemed good and sufficient, the judgment is in his hands, and he can sit down upon them after hearing them with better judicial grace and consistency than by interjecting such snappy expressions as, "I don't care anything about that," "I don't want to hear anything further!" "The Court doesn't care about anybody else!" etc. Such a course only puts him at a disadvantage when his snarliness is compared to the quiet assurance and calm consciousness of rectitude exhibited by the gentlemen upon whom he inflicts the severest punishment within his power.

Mr. Lambert's remarks were simple, pointed and relevant to the question, and would have been considered by a fair and impassioned court as reasons why the extreme penalty should not be pronounced. Still stronger reasons were advanced by Mr. Naisbitt. His explanations showed that he had kept the Edmunds Act under which he was convicted. As a matter of fact he had not broken the law. It was only by a strained and altogether inconsistent construction of the law that the jury could find any excuse for his conviction. The evidence showed most conclusively that he had not cohabited with more than one woman. He endeavored to explain this but while doing so was rudely interrupted by the Court. Surely, when a defendant is asked for reasons why sentence should not be pronounced, and he wished to show them or mitigating circumstances justifying a moderate sentence, he should be allowed to do so without interruption and without exciting judicial pettishness.

All that Judge Zane appears to be desirous of hearing is a promise from convicted defendants that they will obey the law as construed by the courts. This is something that he well understands they cannot do, honorably and consistently. For, in the first place the constructions of the courts have been so many and so various that no one can tell what is the settled meaning of the law. In the second place there are other persons concerned besides the defendant, who must be consulted as to their future, which is involved in the extorted promise.

In the Naisbitt case the meaning of the law is explained to be, that a man who has more than one wife, must not call upon a woman who has been connected with him by the most endearing and enduring ties, even if she is dangerously sick or dying. The one call which Mr. Naisbitt made upon the wife with whom he had ceased to live by mutual arrangement, at the time of her confinement, was construed by the Court into unlawful cohabitation, and for that he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment and a fine of three hundred dollars. So, if he had promised to obey the law in future, as required by Judge Zane, he would have promised that if a wife of his were to send for him when dangerously ill, he would not respond to her call. Any man that would make such a promise would either agree to something he did not intend to perform, or he would be as heartless, inhuman and fiendish as Judge Zane himself.

Then, according to the latest judicial dictum a man with more than one wife must agree to live with the first only. In the Daynes case the same judge ruled that the defendant could live with which wife he pleased, so that he only lived with one. But Mr. Naisbitt had lived with one wife only, and that the first