

"And now comes a new proposition. It is to the effect that the Territory be allowed to elect all of its own officials—practically to have all the privileges of statehood without being admitted, Congress to retain its present supervising power over all the Territorial legislation. A bill has been introduced in Congress to this effect, and in opposition to it a convention has been called in Salt Lake City by the Liberals. The proposed bill would, if passed, be as bad as statehood, and the fact is so recognized by the Gentiles of that Territory, excepting of course those who have sold themselves to the Mormon Church for the promises of political preferment. It will meet with vigorous opposition in the Territory itself, and from everyone who understands the real intentions and purposes of the Mormon hierarchy. Utah is abundantly fitted for statehood, but her admission to the Union until the Gentiles dominate the Territory would be a crime without parallel in the history of the country."

Everybody here who knows anything is thoroughly satisfied that the Church leaders have had nothing to do with the "home rule" bill. Nor with the Statehood bill. And everybody who has a sense of justice and regard for republican institutions will perceive the animus which, while admitting that "Utah is abundantly fitted for Statehood," wants her excluded from the Union until a certain class can gain control of its affairs, which is tantamount to indefinite postponement of her political rights.

In opposition to the irrational views of the *Denver News*, here is an editorial from the *Cumberland, Maryland, Times*, headed "Let Utah be Admitted at Once:"

"Senator Teller has introduced a bill in the Senate looking to the immediate admission of Utah as a State and of course our Republican friends who suffered no pangs of conscience at all in creating the pocket boroughs of Montana and the two Dakota's, are suffering from an attack of political cholera morbus as a consequence.

"That Utah will possibly be a Democratic State once she is in the Union is of course the real reason for their agitation and opposition. But they are like Mr. Pecksniff, too devilish sly to say so. Their objection is based upon the alleged presence of polygamy. We shall see what it amounts to.

"Judge Charles S. Zane, the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Utah, has presided at the trials of all the Mormons who have been tried for polygamy. He is therefore entitled, as no other man is entitled, to describe the present situation in the Territory. Judge Zane has reached the conclusion, that, when the President of the Church and his advisers formally renounced polygamy (President Woodruff having had an inspiration that the Church no longer required polygamy as a doctrine), they were sincere, and that this institution is now dead forever.

"Judge Zane does not look forward to the early statehood of the Territory, but he does explain how, with the disappearance of polygamy, the Mormon Church will readily cease to be a hurtful institution, and that men in the Territory will divide in their political opinions along the same lines that divide men elsewhere. More than this we cannot ask and these people should no longer be disfranchised simply because of their Democracy.

Antagonistic to this, the *Troy, New York, Telegram* argues:

"It was doubtless with a view to forestalling a partisan discussion that the senatorial advocacy of the movement to admit Utah was entrusted to a Republican, Senator Teller. In so far as this consideration alone is concerned, the idea is entirely commendable. Questions of the fitness or unfitness of Territorial candidates for statehood should be decided in every case simply upon their merits. The injection into such discussions of partisan feeling is a wrong which has never failed to elicit emphatic protests from the people.

"Nevertheless, it cannot be overlooked that in this particular instance the Utah movement for statehood had no other origin and has now no other hope than the Democratic majority in the lower house. Though this movement bears evidences of Gentile co-operation, it is essentially Mormon in purpose and control.

"It is true that Utah is growing rapidly. It is also true that as an organization the Mormons have made a public renunciation of the offensive and, in America, the intolerable doctrine of plural marriages. But the coincidence which immediately supplements this renunciation with a concerted demand for statehood is, we believe, too transparent to succeed. The American people must have more than mere assertion that the federal anti-polygamy law will be honestly obeyed, and that Mormonism's first act as a State will not be a return to its former evils in aggravated fashion."

The *New York Advertiser* says:

"It is to be hoped and believed that Utah is approaching the point when she will be properly qualified to become a State. The polygamy objection has been overrated. A greater objection is and has been the command of the Church authorities has over voters. Making a State government out of a hierarchy is not a wise thing to do. A little further delay in the case of Utah is advisable."

The *Baltimore Sun* talks very plainly in this wise:

"Senator Teller's bill to admit Utah into the Union as a State is a surprise. Utah has the population to justify its admission. It had that many years ago. It ought to have been admitted in preference to most of the six States created by the last Congress. Its misfortune is that it is reported to be Democratic in sentiment. This has kept it out, together with New Mexico. It is alleged that Utah is unfit for statehood because some small percentage of its people have more than one wife. That is insincere. If it were a valid reason for keeping Utah out it would be a valid reason for wishing to put New York and a half-dozen other States out. The records of the courts of these States show a larger number of men with several wives than Utah has. It is politics, not polygamy, that keeps Utah waiting. The Republican policy has been to keep it out of the Union because it would probably add two to the strength of the Democrats in the Senate. Hence the surprise that Senator Teller favors Utah's admission. Does he wish to reinforce the silver contingent? Or, is Utah turning Republican?"

The *Boston Herald* has a long editorial on this matter in which this is the most pertinent paragraph:

"The especial danger of Utah as a State will be at once recognized as the institution of polygamy among her people. If the proposition had come from a Democratic Senator, we should have expected to have seen it treated as a wicked de-

vice to corrupt the virtue of the American nation; but, as it is, we presume that people will be allowed to listen to argument upon the subject. This argument, as offered by Senator Teller, is that polygamy is dead in the Territory, and that it need not, therefore, be a disturbing element in forming the State. We assume also from Mr. Teller's action that there will be Republican votes in the Senate in favor of its admission, and this symptom seems to indicate that there are Republican hopes of two more Senators of their party faith from Utah. Yet it is possible that the Colorado Senator has finance rather than politics in mind. He showed in the late Congress that he cared more for silver than for party."

The *Detroit, Michigan, Sun* thus touches up the inconsistency of certain papers that object to Mormons being endowed with political power:

"The *Boston Advertiser* editorially objects to the admission of New Mexico and Arizona as States on the grounds of the influence they would have on silver legislation and the fact of their having too many Mormons and Mexicans to be eligible sisters in the Union. The latter objection comes with poor grace from a paper which advocated conferring the voting franchise upon nearly 800,000 blacks, 99 per cent. of whom could not read or write."

The *Philadelphia Press* has a long correspondence from Washington in which this paragraph appears:

"While the Mormons are thus united in one solid body, the opposition is divided among Democrats and Republicans. Until within a few months there have been only two parties in Utah, the Mormons and the Anti-Mormons. But the Anti-Mormons have recently split up, and organized into Republican and Democratic parties, while the Mormons hold together. The danger of giving Utah statehood under such circumstances is self-evident, and no little surprise was caused today by the fact that Mr. Teller proposed to admit Utah as a State without any restrictions. It is said that other free silver Senators are of the same way of thinking on this matter. The Mormons on national issues are all Democrats; probably because the Democratic party has always been friendly to them. A bill to admit Utah as a State, along with New Mexico and Arizona, is almost certain to pass the House at this session, and, if the free coinage of silver Senators, on the Republican side, are going to vote with the Democrats for the admission of these new States, the bill will also pass the Senate.

"Senator Faulkner recently introduced a bill giving the people of Utah all the privileges of local self-government without admitting the Territory to statehood. Senator Teller says that this is a mere makeshift, and he is in favor of admitting the Territory to the Union of the States."

It is evident that the press of the country, and correspondents at the seat of government, still need considerable enlightenment on the Utah situation, which they seldom get exactly right. It is the "Mormon" people who have divided as Democrats and Republicans, while the masses of "Gentiles" in Salt Lake City are holding together and opposing both the "home rule" and statehood measures, for purely selfish purposes.

It is very significant that the public journals of the country do not seem to think it possible that a prominent Senator or Congressman can be in