

way to entertain and dispose of questions of belief and opinion, and that is by investigation and argument. People should be encouraged to form rather than embrace opinions. Society sets too high a value on uniformity in opinion, hence it is there is a great deficiency in honesty of opinion. Let every man think as he can, but by all means let him think. If we differ, we can compare notes, and let us never deny to those with whom we differ the same privilege to speak and think and write which we claim for ourselves.

I am, etc., A. CAMPBELL.

We think the New Zealand journals are entitled to credit for fair play, and we hope friend Batt will continue to avail himself, in wisdom, of the opportunities thus afforded him to defend the truth.

STILL STANDING UP FOR THE RIGHT.

WE look in vain for a square endorsement of Governor Murray's blunder, outrage, assumption, rashness, usurpation, infamy, or what other name the papers please to call it, even among the most rabid anti-"Mormon" journals. Those papers that are glad of it because they think that by some peculiar process it can be made available for congressional action on polygamy—with which it has no real connection—are still compelled to acknowledge that the act was contrary to law. The *Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate*—which by the by cannot truthfully be called a journal, being only a miserable apology for a paper, and merely an outlet for the puerilities of the person commonly known as Poverty Pierce—has this to say:

"Governor Murray has given the certificate of Delegate to Congress to A. G. Campbell. We honor him for it."

Why? Because it is lawful or right? No, but simply because the retired plate-passer and decayed subscription-bore thinks it will do harm to the "Mormons." The pious man honors the rash man for violating the law and breaking his official oath! It is queer how these religious sticklers for law will "honor" those who dishonor the law, when it suits their bigotry and sectarian prejudice.

We copy here two or three more expressions of the press on this subject. And it is notable that the papers which condemn the wrong done by the Governor, have reasons to offer for their views, while those which express pleasure at the expected results of the act, have no arguments to support it on either legal or moral grounds. The *New York World* says:

"That abiding reverence for law which marks the republican party is signally illustrated by its more innocent organs in their treatment of the case of Cannon in Utah. There is no dispute that Cannon was chosen delegate from Utah by a great majority. It is alleged that he was ineligible. The question thus raised is expressly reserved in the Constitution for the decision of the body to which he was elected. The Governor of Utah has no more to do with it than the governor-general of Canada. Yet the Governor of Utah has usurped the powers of the House, and certified in the face of the notorious fact, that Cannon's opponent was elected. All this has been repeatedly pointed out and is not denied. It was scarcely to be believed that anybody with the knowledge of these facts before him would dream of defending the Governor's action. Yet it is defended by a considerable number of republican papers, and always on essentially the same ground, that Cannon is 'a bad man.' The argument runs as follows: A bad man is one who, being evidently guilty, is not entitled to the benefit of a legal trial to discover whether he is guilty or not. The Governor of Utah is right in withholding Cannon's certificate and in disfranchising Cannon's district because Cannon is a bad man—from which of course it follows that the men who voted for him are bad men. When this view has been taken occasionally of a case of murder by an assemblage of citizens, and Judge Lynch has held that the defendant, being a bad man, ought to be hanged at once, we seem to recall some republican remarks (provided the incident did not happen in Pennsylvania or some other northern State) about 'a spirit of lawlessness.' Of course the whites of the

South are notoriously bad men, while the Governor of Utah is evidently a good man, so that sauce for the southern lynching goose is by no means sauce for the Utah gubernatorial gander. As an indignant American in London once remarked upon the success of the Irish obstructionists in Parliament and the failure to enforce the 'previous question' of his native land, 'Hell itself could not be successfully conducted upon such principles as those.'

The *Grand Rapids (Michigan) Times*, an exceptionally bright and pithy journal, clips an article on the subject from the *Sacramento Record-Union* which strikes the nail right on the head, and adds:

"The press of the Pacific coast, with few exceptions, condemn the action of Governor Murray, of Utah, in giving a certificate to Mr. Campbell for Congress, instead of Geo. Q. Cannon, who was elected by some sixteen or seventeen thousand majority over his opponent. It is conceded by ultra-Republican journals that the Governor made a grave blunder, and in presuming to pronounce against Cannon's eligibility, usurped functions not belonging to the executive office."

The following is from the *Washington Post*, which still stands up for the right and has repeatedly expressed itself on the certificate business as pointedly as in this instance:

"We have yet to find a single republican newspaper of any prominence or accredited influence sustaining Governor Murray, of Utah, in his high-handed counting out of Cannon, the delegate elect. There is not one that dares to do it—not a journal in the country, however bitter and unscrupulous its partisanship in ordinary cases, that can afford to compromise its decency by endorsing so gross a piece of turpitude. Even the *New York Times*, which goes to great lengths in the service of its party, is shocked and disgusted at Murray's disgraceful performance."

Public condemnation of the outrage perpetrated by Governor Murray, of Utah, has been prompt and emphatic. Not even the most hide-bound of partisan organs have attempted to apologize for, or defend his denial of a certificate to Cannon and his presentation of a certified lie to Campbell.

Mormonism has been utterly ignored, as it should have been in the treatment of this matter, by the press. The question of polygamy has no more connection with Cannon's right to the certificate of election than the doctrine of election, or immersion, or the law of gravitation. The only question presented to Governor Murray, the only point he had any right to determine, was, "Who has received a majority of the votes?"

There was no allegation of fraud. The record showed that Cannon had received 13 votes to every vote cast for Campbell. Yet on this record, Governor Murray certified that Campbell had been duly elected.

Condemnation by the press is not sufficient punishment for such a crime. The office which this man has thus disgraced should be taken from him. Such an example as his immediate removal is due to the dignity of outraged justice and violated law. Mr. Hayes will fail of doing his plain and imperative duty in the premises, if he does not proceed, without delay, to take off the official head of this usurper.

BLOWING AWAY THE DUST.

THE *Louisville Courier-Journal* attacks what it supposes to be "Mormonism" in violent and intemperate language, but like most of the press opponents of our faith, manifests immense ignorance of the subject. It is easy to trace the cause of that paper's present bristling up on the "Mormon" question; it is the representations of Mr. Murray, who, as the *Times* and the *Post* of New York have shown, has been hand and glove for a short time past with Watterson, the editor of the *Courier-Journal*; a "stalwart" Republican linked with a "Bourbon" Democrat for a political purpose, in which each is playing his own game, although in pretended coalition with the other.

The *Louisville paper*—the only one of influence which takes up the cudgels for the Governor—like the smaller fry of the press that path him on the back, avoids the only real question involved in the certificate

business, and attempts to obscure it by kicking up a dust about polygamy. But this is easily seen through by any person with ordinary penetration. There is nothing in the lawless act of the Governor that bears on the marriage question. The conspirators who captured the Executive know that as well as anybody. But they think they can avail themselves of the popular prejudice against "Mormon" family arrangements, and the desire of our national legislators to do something to settle a perplexing public question, to cover over, not to say justify, the violation of law, precedent, justice, and both Democratic and Republican principles, by mixing up two totally distinct subjects for public and congressional consideration. In this, however, they will effect a signal failure.

For illustration, let us suppose a case in Mr. Murray's own State. There exists in the South a practice which is commonly called "moonshining," being nothing more nor less than the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits in violation of the revenue laws. It is an offence against the statutes of the United States. At an election for Representative in Congress, a person who has the reputation of a "moonshiner" is elected, and it is generally known that many individuals understood to be "moonshiners" voted for him. He receives an immense majority, so great that his opponent has not as many hundreds as he has thousands of votes. Yet the Governor gives the certificate to the minority candidate. Of course great indignation is aroused against the Executive, for violating one law to show his aversion to a man reputed to be a violator of another law, and an attempt is made to cover over his flagrant wrong by raising a hue and cry about "moonshining."

Would not any discerning mind detect the patent deception? Would the House of Representatives in an investigation into the claims of the candidates, find it necessary to go into the merits of the question of "moonshining"? Would there be any necessary connection between the subject of the fraud committed by the Governor and the alleged private character of the cheated candidate and some of his supporters? Would not the sole question to be decided be, who received the greatest number of votes? The seating of the member would have nothing to do with it. The general matter of "moonshining" belongs to the laws enacted against it and their execution. The House of Representatives could inquire into the acts of the seated member, and if it could be shown that he was convicted of an offence against the laws they might expel him, but all the clap-trap that could be made would not connect the two distinct and separate questions in a contest for the seat in Congress.

That this is clearly understood by lawyers and legislators, as well as editors, may be seen from the extracts we have made from the papers. Below we give an account of interviews with Congressmen from Mr. Murray's own State and other gentlemen whose views are weighty, such as Mr. Young, of Tennessee, Messrs. Money and Chalmers of Mississippi, and Mr. White of Pennsylvania, all opposed to polygamy, but equally so to Murray's lawlessness. Their opinions were given to the *Washington correspondent* of the *Courier-Journal* and form more than a complete offset to the virulence of that paper, while at the same time they blow away the dust with which it has endeavored to obscure the main and only question before Congress and the country.

"Washington, Jan. 22.—'What do you think,' I asked of Delegate Cannon this afternoon, 'of the *Courier-Journal's* editorial of the 20th; 'The Twin Relic' is a rattler, isn't it?'"

"I did not read it all," Mr. Cannon replied; "but I read enough to see that Gov. Murray has poisoned Mr. Watterson's mind against the Mormons. I have no doubt he has both heard and repeated any number of false stories about us since he went to Utah. The editorial speaks of danger to Gov. Murray's life out there; such an idea is utterly absurd, for his life is as safe in Utah as it is in Louisville. There are two sides to every question, and a wise man will scan them both fairly and carefully before making up his mind. There are any number of people in Utah who would be glad of any excuse to inaugurate violent measures against us, and they would

scruple at nothing to effect that end."

I thereupon started out in search of the Kentucky delegation and other prominent members to ascertain their views on the subject under discussion since it is exciting so much comment in the press, and I met Hon. Joe Blackburn. "Personally," said he, "I like Governor Murray very much, but I can not really find terms in which to express my disapprobation of the action he has taken in the Cannon-Campbell case. I have written him a letter on the subject."

"Governor," I next asked Hon. John G. Carlisle, one of the best lawyers in the House, "what do you think of Gov. Murray's decision in the Utah case?"

"It is emphatically an outrage," Mr. Carlisle said. "All he or any other governor has to do in such cases is to issue the certificate of election to that candidate who has received the greater number of votes. It is the power of the House alone to judge of the qualifications of its members."

Mr. Willis had not thought of the subject sufficiently to express an opinion on the subject—such a legal opinion as might be of any value, hence he could not, and Mr. Knott would not talk.

"Judge Phister," I began on the member from Maysville, "what are your views touching the action of Governor Murray in withholding a certificate of election from Mr. Cannon and giving it to Mr. Campbell?"

Judge Phister—"I recognize Gov. Murray, from my acquaintance with him, as a very honorable gentleman, but in this matter I think he committed an error, not that I have any sympathy with polygamy, but that matter, as I conceive, does not enter into the present question. His duty was merely ministerial or executive, to ascertain from the returns who had received the larger number of votes, and give the certificate accordingly. It seems to be a fact that Mr. Cannon received much the larger number, and therefore he should have received the Governor's certificate of election. The Governor, as I conceived, had no right to inquire into or decide as to the qualifications of the candidates."

Hon. J. A. McKenzie says: "Congress is the judge of the qualifications of its members, not the Governor. Governor Blackburn might as well refuse to issue me a certificate after I had received a majority of the votes in my district, because he may have heard it reported I was not of lawful age. That won't do."

Hon. Tom Turner thinks Gov. Murray's action was very arbitrary, from what he had read of the matter.

Hon. J. W. Caldwell agrees with him who goes farthest in proclaiming Gov. Murray's action as most absurd and reprehensible. "He has," said he, "no more right to unseat a member than I have."

Applying the pump to Hon. P. B. Thompson, Jr., "Well, really, now," replied "Little Phil," "do you think it either wise or proper for one who must sit as a juror to prejudice the case, or even discuss it? I do not say that I am right in this instance in taking such a view, but it strikes me in an off-handed way that we ought to wait until the evidence is taken before we render a verdict."

Having exhausted all this delegation I could meet, I next ran upon Hon. Casey Young, of Tennessee, a sound, clear-headed lawyer. In response to the usual questions in this connection, he said: "The Governor has no right, either to convict a man or to withhold a franchise or privilege, even after he hears the evidence. What right then had Gov. Murray, without lawful evidence of any character, to withhold Mr. Cannon's certificate? How does he know legally that Cannon is a Mormon? I don't know it, neither does he. He has no right to take the course he has taken, even if he had such information."

The chairman of the committee on post-offices and post-roads, Hon. H. D. Money, said: "Governor Murray's action in the premises was infamous; he ought to be removed from office at once, without the benefit of clergy or the formalities of impeachment."

Gen. J. R. Chalmers, of Mississippi, said: "I have not looked into the matter carefully, but, from what I have seen, I consider that Governor Murray committed an outrage on general principles."

Gen. Harry White, of Pennsylvania, a republican, replied: "I am preparing a bill on the subject of polygamy; but as to Governor Murray's official conduct in the Cannon-

Campbell case, I hold it against all precedent and unwise."

The gentlemen with whom I spoke, while believing that Mr. Cannon will be entitled to his seat in the next Congress, and will certainly get it, protested that they abominated 'the twin relic' as heartily as any one possibly could or should."



Scientists now all admit that most diseases are caused by disordered Kidneys or Liver, and that if these great organs are kept in perfect condition, health will be the result. WARNER'S SAFE KIDNEY AND LIVER CURE

Is made from a Simple Tropical Leaf OF RARE VALUE, And is a POSITIVE Remedy for the following Troubles:

Pain in the Back; Severe Head-aches; Dizziness; Bloating; Inflamed Eyes; A Tired Feeling; Night Sweats; Pains in the Lower Part of the Body; Palpitation of the Heart; Jaundice; Gravel; Painful Urination; Malarial Fever; Fever and Ague;

And all diseases caused by the Kidneys, Liver or Urinary Organs being out of order. It is a SAFE and CERTAIN cure for all Female difficulties, such as

Leucorrhoea; Inflammation of the Womb; Falling of the Womb; Ulceration of the Womb.

It will control and regulate Menstruation, and is an excellent and safe remedy for females during pregnancy.

As a Blood Purifier it is unequalled, for it cures the organs that make the blood. For

Bells; Carbuncles; Scrofula; White Swelling; Salt Rheum; Poisoning by Mercury or any other Drug.

It is certain in every case.

For Incontinence; Impotence; Pains in the Lungs, and All Similar Diseases,

It is safe, sure and quick Cure. It is the only known remedy that has cured Bright's Disease.

As a proof of the purity and worth of this Great Natural Remedy, read the following

CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.

S. A. LATTIMORE, Ph. D., L. L. D., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Rochester, N. Y., knowing the popularity and merit of WARNER'S SAFE KIDNEY AND LIVER CURE, after a thorough Chemical Analysis, has furnished the following statement:

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, Chemical Laboratory, ROCHESTER, N. Y., Jan. 8th, 1880.

Mr. H. H. Warner has placed in my possession the formula of the medicine manufactured and sold by him under the general designation of Warner's Safe Kidney and Liver Cure. I have investigated his processes of manufacture, which are conducted with extreme care and according to the best methods. I have also taken from his laboratory samples of all the materials used in the preparation of this medicine, and upon critical examination I find them, as well as the medicine into which they enter, to be entirely free from poisonous or deleterious substances.

S. A. LATTIMORE.

This Remedy which has done such wonders, is put up in the LARGEST SIZED BOTTLE of any medicine upon the market, and it is sold by Druggists and all dealers at \$1.25 per bottle. For Diabetes enquire for WARNER'S SAFE DIABETES CURE. It is a POSITIVE Remedy.

H. H. WARNER & CO., ROCHESTER, N. Y.



The ONLY BLACKING that meets the demand for a quick and brilliant polish. "BIXBY'S BEST" absolutely nourishes and preserves the leather.

S. M. Bixby & Co., 173 & 175 Washington St., N. Y.