DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE

DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - FEBRUARY 17, 1886

THE LONDON RIOTS.

THE riots in London, news of which will be found in our dispatches, are the consequence of the terrible depression in trade which has been gradually pushing numbers of working people to the wall. It has been so heavy and has continued so long that Parliament had to take the matter in hand and institute official inquiry into the causes. A committee, with Lord Iddesleigh at the head, was organized not long ago for this purpose, but very little if any good seems to have accrued from it.

When to the trials of semi-starvation, which so many of the poor in the Old World endure, are added the rigors of winter and the sight of affluence and extravagance in vivid contrast to hunger, cold and wretchedness, it is not surprising that desperation should seize upon the masses of men assembled to discuss their grievances and utter their complaints. And it only needs some firebrand like the man Burns to influence their minds against the rich, and to make them believe that there should be some partition of the abundance which the few enjoy to the exclusion of the many.

There is no reason in a mob, and the scenes that were enacted on Monday in the British metropolis show how inadequate is any ordinary police power to cope with the populace when roused into fury. The worst elements of a great city are always to be found in a crowd that gathers in anger or distress, ready to join in and provoke an outbreak which will lead to pillage and plunder.

The poverty in London is but an indication of the general distress among working classes. It is only a short time since five thousand of the unemployed met on Glasgow Green in Scotland, and the plea of strong men for work which they could not obtain was heartrending. Similar meetings have been held in various parts of England, and the incapacity of the ordinary methods to afford relief has been made painfully apparent.

A sad sight may be seen any day at the large docks in London. Hordes of hungry men gathered there in hopes of getting a job, to earn a few pence to keep the wolf from the door. Only a few ever get the chance, but day after day those crowds may be met there, eager to jump at the first opening for temporary labor. The benevolent institutions of the country are many and praiseworthy. But they only give a little relief in comparatively few cases, and never reach to the root of the general trouble.

An example which has been set by the Duke of Westminister and Lord Tollemache would, if followed by other large land owners, do something toward putting many working people in the way of bettering their terrible condition. They have arranged to give laborers on their estates small holdings. This is just as well for them as to emigrate to the colonies, and while it helps them they aid to swell the produce of the country. If the game preserves, pleasure parks and deer forests of the British Isles were broken up, and other lands which are held for mere ornament or amusement were opened for settlement and agriculture, small farms might be had by thousands of laborers, who would be placed in a position of self-sustenance instead of being forced into the teeming and increasing ranks of pauperism.

The condition of the working classes and how to better it, by providing labor for the industrious, is one of the great questions that confront British statesmen, and is looming up as one of the pressing necessities in our own country. The labor problem is a giant difficulty, and the riots in London are only what we may expect in other parts of the British Isles, and also on this side of the Atlantic where, if they once begin, one may look for far more serious results than the breaking of windows and the plundering of shops and saloons. It will assume gigantic proportions and culminate in rapine and bloodshed.

DISGRACEFUL OUTRAGES.

THE anti-Chinese doings at Seattle, details of which will be found among our telegraphic items, are disgraceful to the Territory where they occurred, and will be so to the Government unless some measures are taken to vindicate the law that has been outraged. The tragedy in Wyoming has been shamefully passed over, and reflects dishonor on a Government that neither protects the weak within its dominions nor punishes the strong who prey upon them.

The Chinese question is one thing, the lawless attempts to solve it are another. No matter how serious that question may appear to many people, they have no right to attempt its solution by brute force. And when it is used as in Seattle, though not with such murderous violence as at Rock Springs, the strong arm of the powers that be ought to be stretched forth in an unmistakable manner for the enforcement of law and the protection of law-abiding people, in their rights of property and residence, no matter how unpopular they may be.

Washington Territory shares in the disgrace of Wyoming, and unless something more than the sham of indignation in the one and the pretense of vindication in the other are exhibited by the national authorities, that disgrace will rest most powerfully upon the Government that permits such evils or allows them to pass by unpunished.

This spirit of lawlessness is one of the greatest dangers to the republic, and if statesmen would turn their attention to its suppression, instead of pottering over imaginary evils of infinitely less proportions and consequence, they would be doing something worth while for the maintenance of stable government and the perpetuity of American institutions.

ANOTHER TWIST OF THE LAW.

THE trial of Samuel H. B. Smith for unlawful cohabitation gave occasion for another change of base in the crusade against the "Mormons." The third section of the Edmunds law seems capable of endless combinations and illimitable interpretations.

In this case the defendant, whose two wives dwelt under the same roof, as soon as the news of the passage of the law was received here, took steps to observe its provisions as far as he understood them. He put his plural wife in another house at a distance and lived only with his legal wife. The evidence, however, shows that the plural wife has a young baby presumed to be his. It was fully established that he has not lived with her since the separation of the families, but he has provided for her a home and support and has a few times visited her. The prosecuting attorney, nevertheless, claimed his conviction and of course the jury empaneled for the purpose did as they were directed.

Now compare the rulings on the meaning of unlawful cohabitation in different cases that have come before the courts. It was at first defined by Judge Zane as unlawful sexual intercourse. Next he ruled that that element need not be a part of the offense, but it meant the holding out and living with more than one woman as wives. In the case of a "Gentile" who had a wife and seduced her sister by whom a child was born to the defendant, Judge Zane ruled that as the man did not live with the woman nor hold her out as his wife, but the intercourse was only a few times and not continuous, he was not guilty of the offense. In the present case there is not a particle of evidence of either holding out or living with as a wife since the Edmunds law was in force, and yet the defendant is held to be guilty.

The grounds on which the prosecution relied for his verdict were, that the defendant "belonged to a class of people banded together to defeat the laws" and that the jury "ought to be zealous in their enforcement," also that to acquit the defendant would nullify the law.

Our readers are familiar with the "holding out and living with" definition of Dickson and Zane. These were "held out" as essential elements to unlawful cohabitation and comprise the offense. A "Gentile" could not be convicted because the ingredients to the offense were lacking, although the intercourse and the offspring were both established. But a "Mormon" is convicted, the jury being urged to convict on the ground of the defendant's religion, although neither of these elements to the offense exist and he has done nothing more than Judge Zane has stated in several instances was allowable.

Henceforth it seems that no "Mormon" who has married a plural wife—no matter how strictly he may have carried out the letter of the Edmunds law, is to be allowed to escape its penalties. No man can tell how it will be construed to his disfavor. When a jury is told that a verdict of acquittal will nullify the law, particularly a jury chosen for its "sympathy with the prosecution," it is not to be expected that any other word than "guilty" will be heard from the jury box, no matter how utterly the evidence against him may fail.

No "Mormon" during the present onslaught may expect a fair trial by a jury of his peers. "He belongs to a class" which it is determined to harass, perplex, assail and oppress until they deny their religion and promise to fear men rather than God. If they are prepared to do this, they may purchase peace for a season, but at what a price! If not, they must make up their minds to endure what shall follow, until God shall come forth in His might, and when they have manifested their integrity to Him and the endurance of their faith, sweep away the refuge of lies and the weapons of iniquity, and appoint the hypocrites and the tyrants, the traitors and the betrayers, the unjust judges and the wicked stewards to their portion, "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

VETO MESSAGES AND NULLIFICATION.

AT last Governor Murray has come out with those "other reasons"—which he has kept concealed while avowing their existence—for refusing to sign the bail bills that have been passed by the Legislature. The excuses which he offered for vetoing the two previous measures submitted for his signature, were met and dissipated by the third and latest bill on the subject, so he had either to sign or bring forth the cherished "reasons" which before were too big for utterance.

And what are they? Reduced to plain matter of fact, and stripped of the awkward clothing of words with which the Governor always contrives to dress up his notions, they amount to this: "If bail is made a matter of right in cases of misdemeanor appealed, the execution of the Edmunds law against Mormons will be delayed and defeated." That is all there is to it. Put truthfully it means: "I, Eli H. Murray, do not want any 'Mormon' to have the benefit of the laws granting appeals from the District Courts. This bill would make the appeal laws effective, therefore I will not sign it."

The strong reasons turn out, after all, to be no reasons at all. It is not true that granting bail defeats the execution of the law. It merely protects an improperly convicted person from false imprisonment. If the defendant who is bailed, on appeal to a higher court is found to have been lawfully convicted, the law takes its complete course and the punishment is fully inflicted. It is only when he is found to have been illegally convicted that he escapes the penalty. Such delay as is caused in the execution of the law when an appeal is taken is occasioned not by bail but by the appeal.

To be consistent, Governor Murray should demand the repeal of all laws providing for appeals from the decisions of courts and juries. Appeals are what delay the execution of the law. If it were not for them nothing would stand in the way of the enforcement of penalties, lawful or unlawful, just or unjust. But who would have the temerity to demand the abolition of the right of appeal from the lower courts to a higher, on the ground that it always delayed and sometimes defeated the execution of the laws? Appeals are for the protection of accused persons. The law aims to give them a legal trial and to shield them from unlawful punishment. But if appeals have right, bail pending appeals is right. One is a farce without the other. In denying bail the execution of the law of appeal is not only delayed but defeated. Its intended benefits are entirely destroyed in many cases and the law itself is nullified.

Governor Murray used to call appeals to higher courts from the decision of the lower, "nullification." This ignorant use of the word appears in several of his official documents. But what is refusal to grant bail in cases of appeal but virtual nullification of the laws of appeal? A man is sentenced to six months' imprisonment and takes an appeal. Bail is refused. He goes to the penitentiary, and while his appeal is pending he serves out his term. Of what force is the law of appeal?

The Governor says, Under the bill proposed the rich man will go at large and the poor man will go to jail. How does he know? Have poor men no friends who will answer for their appearance? But what difference will there be if bail is not a matter of right, but is left a matter of discretion with the courts? If the Judge admits a poor man to bail, will he not be in just the same condition as if he had been able to demand such admission? Can he get sureties any easier because the Judge allows him to be bailed than if the law gave him the right to be bailed? Would not the *right* to bail be of more advantage to the poor man than the uncertainty of a Judge's dictum? If a poor man knew he would have the right to bail pending an appeal, would he not have more opportunities to seek for sureties than if, as now, he had to depend on the caprice of a man on the bench who could grant or withhold bail at his own sweet will?

Are not the advisers of Governor Murray—no one imagines he has brains enough to invent "reasons" himself—ashamed to let him stand committed to such transparent idiocy as that "poor man" balderdash? Bail must not be granted as a matter of right, for fear some poor man would not be able to find sureties. So, no bail must be allowed to anyone because some one might not be rich enough to gain its benefits. This would deny bail even as a matter of discretion, for, according to Murray logic, a man who can find sureties must not be bailed, because some other man might not be able to do so; therefore the Judge must deny bail to all! A Governor who utters such stuff as that in a message to the Legislature, ought to look at his own folly and then go and hide his head in a bag—or perhaps a bottle would be more appropriate.

The people will now fully understand the Governor's position, which he might as well have defined at first. He is afraid that some "Mormon" improperly convicted of unlawful cohabitation will escape punishment on appeal to a higher court, and he wants every convicted "Mormon" to suffer the extreme penalty of the law, whether he was lawfully convicted or not. There is no getting from under this position in view of the veto. If bail is given as a matter of right on appeal, the only ultimate benefit that can come is justice to an improperly convicted defendant. A legally convicted person, though bailed, must ultimately suffer the punishment pronounced upon him. Therefore, bail as a right would not and could not defeat the law.

The veto means that an innocent person shall be liable to the same punishment as a guilty person and the law of appeal shall be rendered void in effect or nullified. That is Murrayism, nude and natural. It is anti-"Mormonism." It is intended to leave power in the hands of prejudiced judges to deny to "Mormons" convicted by packed juries, the benefit of the laws on appeal, while they may accord its benefit to "Gentiles."

We understood the Governor's position from the first, but he hesitated to announce it in a way that the public might perceive it. He is inordinately fond of dress parade. Now he stands forth in all its glory in full costume as the boss anti-"Mormon" embodiment of "nullification!"

DEATH OF GENERAL HANCOCK.

THE telegraph brings tidings of the death of General W. S. Hancock. Particulars will be found in our dispatches. The reputation of the soldier who has gone to his rest is unsurpassed by that of any warrior of the age. His martial glory may not be equal to the fame of a few of his compatriots, for his opportunities were not as extensive. But his purity of character, his freedom from the faults which speck the reputation and flaw the record of some of the nation's heroes, dead and living, lift him to a height which none can reach whose passions or ambitions have clogged their steps on the way to eminence.

His career through the war was that of a mighty chieftain, whose presence was a tower of strength and whose valor was invincible. Grant trusted him implicitly, his soldiers loved him and his brother officers admired him. He was wounded but not conquered in defense of the Union, and has felt the effects to the end of his life.

His defeat as a candidate for the Presidency did him no discredit. He was not a politician, and resorted to none of the schemes and tricks with which politicians are familiar. He was a soldier and a gentleman, and he was not suited to the life of the national Chief Magistrate. That he passed through the campaign into which he was pressed by the esteem of his friends, without a blot upon his fair fame, speaks more than we can tell of his integrity and honor; for no man who is not spotless can escape from calumny when politics sets him up as a target at which every enemy may spit slander.

When he rode as Marshal of the day at the funeral of the worshipped Grant, no thought was had that Hancock would so soon be numbered with the departed great. He served his country with true devotion, and as a pure and honest patriot the name of General Hancock will stand in the history of this nation, as an example to his countrymen and the admiration of the world. His memory will be precious and his death will be sincerely mourned wherever his name is known.

A SHAMEFUL MESS OF SLANDER.

THE infamous organ of the filthiest elements of this city has a lengthy libel on the person and family of Mr. F. A. Cooper, of West Jordan, who is under indictment for violation of Section Three of the Edmunds law, and so is fair game for that foul sheet. A collection of lies is strung together and comments by the bushel are added, to make out a case of cruelty and crime. Mrs. Cooper was hurried to her grave by the brutal raid made upon that village, the particulars of which appeared in the NEWS, when Mr. Cooper and others were arrested by deputy marshals and others, one of whom at least was acting illegally. Mrs. Cooper fell a victim to that shameful and violent raid, and now the vilest sheet on earth, to take away the odium from the creatures who committed the outrage, publishes a batch of villainous untruths to blacken the character of the man whose wife has fallen a victim to that inhumanity. Mr. Cooper authorizes a denial of the statements which scoundrels have worked up into sensational articles in the *Tribune*, and we do so with confidence, knowing that the slanderers who fill up its columns delight in spitting their spleen against an accused "Mormon," and in vilifying the living and scandalizing the dead.

BE RESOLUTE, BUT NOT RASH.

WE endorse the remarks of the Salt Lake *Herald* of Sunday morning on the necessity for keeping cool in these times of agitation and ferment. The pressure is likely to be closer and harder. Reason and justice seem to depart from rulers and people when the "Mormon" question stirs their passions and irritates their prejudices. Not only is the spirit of intolerance and oppression abroad, but, the spirit of murder. There are many people who count themselves civilized and "Christian," who would freely shoulder gun and fix bayonet to drive and butcher the Latter-day Saints and seize upon their property, as in earlier times in the history of this Church.

It is our best policy, as it is our duty and in accordance with our religion and the counsels of our leaders, to meet all afflictions with patience and to "suffer wrong rather than do wrong." Let nothing be done on our side to precipitate a physical conflict. We must not be the aggressors. "DEFENSE" should be our motto. We will do our fighting in the courts. God has promised to fight our other battles. If men take the law into their own hands and wreak personal vengeance on the enemy, they do so at their own peril and in violation of principle and counsel. We do not and will not justify the violence of aggression or revenge.

But we should show ourselves worthy of our manhood and our faith. If it is needful to repel violence with violence, that is another thing. Submit to every process of law. Bear with much that seems to exceed the law's limits. But we need not bow down to the dust and let our usurping and unprincipled foes stamp upon our prostrate bodies. We will meet them erect and repel lawlessness, while we sustain all law that is constitutional and for the maintenance of human rights.

"We want no cowards in our ranks that will their colors fly," nor do we want to show our valor by acting the rowdy or playing the fool. Calmness and patience, with decision, firmness and unflinching courage when action becomes needful, mark the policy of the true Latter-day Saint.

DEATH OF GOVERNOR SEYMOUR.

THE dispatches to-day announce the death of another of America's "bright particular stars" in the sphere of statesmanship—ex-Governor Horatio Seymour, who expired at the residence of his sister, Mrs. Roscoe Conkling, at Utica, New York, at 10 o'clock last evening.

His name has been a familiar one throughout the Union for over forty years, and especially so in the Empire State, where, in the county of Onandaga, he was born, on the 31st of May, 1810, and which State has been the chief arena of his active and influential life. He received a first class education and was admitted to the bar in 1832, when he entered upon a successful practice.

In 1841 he was elected a member of the Legislative Assembly of that State and four years later became its speaker. In 1842 he became Mayor of Utica and in 1852 Governor of the State of New York, to which position he was again elected in 1862. On the outbreak of the civil war he became conspicuous for his opposition to the Conscription Bill, but when the invasion of Pennsylvania took place, he forwarded immediately more than the required quota of militia to repel it, and during the time of the great New York riots distinguished himself by the conservative course which he pursued.

In 1868 he became a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, but was defeated by General Grant. Since that time, with one exception, he has positively declined to be a candidate, though his chances were scarcely inferior to those of any other man. He remained a staunch Democrat up to the last, and in his death the nation has lost one of its soundest statesmen. Peace to his ashes.

BEHOLD, HE BRAYETH!

THE delirium tremens logician of the morning *Slanderer* occupies nearly a column to-day in a vain attempt to get out of the bad box in which he put himself in defining "free speech." His free abuse does not help his case a particle. He asserted in effect that preaching plural marriage was not free speech. He stated in so many words that: "Speech which advises the breaking of the laws is not free speech." We showed the nonsense of the remark and also of his definition of free speech, which was this: "To counsel people to obey a law, even if it is wrong, but to fight to have it amended, that is free speech." According to this, nothing is free speech but that which counsels obedience to law, however vile, unjust and oppressive the law may be. Our contention is that free speech signifies liberty to express one's views, whatever they may be. All the roundabout verbiage and low-lived scurrility in which he indulges this morning, does not affect the point in the remotest degree, and we leave the readers of both arti-