

circumvent his unscrupulous foes is, in their eyes, an unpardonable sin.

And now we come to something more specific. The *Tribune* says:

"One woman who had made an affidavit, later made a second affidavit asserting that she did not read the contents of the first one. The secret of her counter affidavit was that she had married a son of Charles W. Penrose of the DESERET NEWS, and when reproached for making the counter affidavit, she as good as admitted that it was in the interest of her own people that she did it. If that pointed to anything direct, it pointed to the fact that an arrangement had been made between Marshal Parsons and C. W. Penrose, and on account of the Church and through the influence of Penrose the counter affidavit was forced from this poor woman."

If there was any sense of shame in the author and suggester of the foregoing falsehoods, when he thinks of his own underhand but now useless work, he should wear a perpetual blood-red blush. It is a fact that one of the false or exaggerated affidavits was signed by a lady married to a son of C. W. Penrose; that she was persuaded into signing it by a personal enemy of the Marshal's; that she did not read it; that it turned out to be an exaggerated statement of an occurrence over five years ago; which did not involve "gross immorality," and which would never have been mentioned but for strong pressure and importunity; that when the purport and object of the paper were disclosed, she made another affidavit as to the circumstances under which she was induced to sign the former statement; that she did so without being "forced," or "influenced," or being "under stress," and without any intent "to carry a false impression" or do anything else than set a crooked matter straight.

The villainous insinuation that "an arrangement had been made between Marshal Parsons and C. W. Penrose" in any way relating to this matter is utterly false and all of a piece with the rest of this shameful garment of slander. It is altogether worthy of the Salt Lake *Tribune* and characteristic of its gentlemanly method of conducting journalistic courtesies.

The undersigned, so far as he remembers, never had but two interviews with Marshal Parsons and these were at the Marshal's office, in relation to the detention of prisoners in the penitentiary after their terms had expired, for costs when no fine had been imposed. The Marshal explained that he could

not do otherwise than hold them because the commitment in every case specified imprisonment until the costs were paid. A writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out in one of these cases before Judge Zane, the detained person was liberated, and the Marshal then agreed that such prisoners should be discharged on the expiration of their respective terms.

Marshal Parsons never asked C. W. Penrose to do anything respecting the affidavit referred to, or in regard to his confirmation, or in relation to his office or the efforts to oust him. He never entered into any "arrangement" of any kind whatever with C. W. Penrose, unless the promise to do his duty in regard to the discharge of prisoners after their terms expired can be called an arrangement. There is not any foundation or excuse for the libel uttered by the *Tribune*, which was doubtless suggested by the same individuals who have endeavored to intimidate persons unwilling to join in their scheme.

As to the fitness of E. H. Parsons for the office of Marshal we have nothing to say, because we know nothing about it. We have had no intimate acquaintance with the man, at any time, and are not familiar with his qualifications. But we do know that he has been assailed in a mean and despicable manner, and therefore we are not grieved that failure and chagrin and discomfiture have come to the clique that plotted his downfall. If there shall be need of further steps in regard to these shameful libels and false insinuations, and we are placed under the "unpleasant necessity of taking other than defensive action, the weapons used will not be such as can be turned aside by the shield of stern fact nor be melted into thin air by the sunlight of truth.

That the full and sole responsibility for this article may not be misunderstood, the writer departs from the ordinary rule and hereunto appends his signature.

CHARLES W. PENROSE.

"Brethren and sisters," and the patient old pastor buttoned his threadbare coat closer about his spare form, "I notice that some members of the congregation are shivering from the cold. I should have replaced the broken pane of glass in this window behind me weeks ago with rags if they could have been spared from the family wardrobe. The collection for foreign missions will now be taken up."

THE DISFRANCHISEMENT BOOM.

By the *Herald* Washington special, which appears in this issue, it will be observed that the scheme for the disfranchisement of the "Mormon" people, on the ground of religious belief, is being vigorously pushed.

It seems as if those who favor it are not deeply anxious to have the subject discussed. The reason for this is obvious—those who have made up their minds to do a thing that has no element of consistency or justice in it are not made comfortable by having the monstrous character of their conduct appropriately depicted. To that class sound argument is a source of annoyance, but does not cause any change in the course they propose to pursue.

The amendment to include the "Mormons" in all the Territories in the disabling process is highly absurd as well as monstrously unjust. The people of the Territory of Arizona, through their representatives in the Territorial Legislature, several years ago, passed a test oath law similar to that existing in Idaho. Public sentiment ran high against it, on the ground that the "Mormon" people of Arizona were among the best and most law-abiding of its population. It was recognized that they were deserving of better treatment and should be on an equal political footing with other citizens. This feeling became so pronounced that a subsequent legislature repealed the test oath law, which had been tried and found wanting in every element of justice and consistency.

Now comes an outside effort to enact a measure for Arizona in direct conflict with the expressed will of its people. The scheme is in opposition to the very genius of local self-government. Not only did the legislative representatives of the people of Arizona, make their wish on the subject known in a way that could not be mistaken, but their representative in Congress protests now against the proposition to disfranchise probably the most thrifty, industrious and well-behaved class of his constituents.

A portion of the plot is doubtless not yet developed, although it has occasionally come to the surface. That is, to give Arizona, which aspires to statehood, the alternative of remaining out of the Union indefinitely, or adopting in her constitution a clause similar to that in the Idaho instrument disfranchising all members of the