The Deseret Weekly.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY,

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE.

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, - - - $2.50.
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, - - 1.50.
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, - - - EDITOR.

Saturday, - - September 21, 1889.

"YOUNG UTAH," MARK THIS.

THE "Liberal" organ published yesterday the annexed communication purporting to have come from Beaver:

"There must be something rotten in Denmark, or in the Second District, among the Marshals. The petit jury was summoned on the open venire system by the preseut Marshal, who assured the Prosecuting Attorney that some of these men who are on the jury and who passed a rigid examination, were straight men, when in fact they were in excellent standing in the church.

Beaver, Utah, Sept. 8. 1889."

That paper then recommends Judge Anderson to give attention to this matter, "that he may have knowledge of what is charged upon officials of his court," and says:

"If his court is being imposed upon in this most vital point, he will no doubt know how to protect it and correct any wrong that may be found."

From the foregoing it appears that part of the "Liberal" doctrine and policy is the entire exclusion of all "Mormons" from jury service. This is worse than "Liberalism" in Idaho. While members of the "Mormon" Church are there forbidden to vote and hold office, they are permitted to act as jurymen. This is the practice in the Idaho District Courts and is declared by Judge Berry to be sustained by the law.

In Utah there is no law, local or congressional, which excludes men "in excellent standing in the Church" from serving as jurors, in either civil or criminal cases, except in a trial under the Edmunds Act of 1882 or the supplemental Act of 1887. On the contrary, the laws of Congress contemplate a mixture of the two classes of the population as jurors. The Poland law provides for it, the Edmunds Act plainly implies it by making the exception we have indicated. So that not only are members of the "Mormon" Church "in excellent standing" not excluded, but the spirit if not the letter of the law of the laud is violated by attempts at their exclusion.

The officers at Beaver, then, exhibit nothing "rotten" in doing that which the "Liberal" organ "charges" against them. Judge Anderson has no right to find fault with them in the premises, his court is not "imposed upon," and there is nothing "wrong" in this for him to "correct." The "rottenness" exists only in the purposes and suggestions we have here exposed.

The point to be considered in all this is, that the "Liberal" organ is attempting to add to the infamous plots by which laws have been procured for the abrogation of jury rights in Utah, illegal methods for still further discrimination against citizens solely because they are members of the "Mormou" Church.

Let it not be forgotten, in all the coutroversies that may arise over political issues in this City and Territory, that the "Liberal" party, through its organ, aims to strip every member of the "Mormon" Church of the commonest as well as the dearest and most sacred rights of American citizenship. This is its ultimate object, aud all its political movements and projects lead up to that most infamous end.

ANOTHER WARNING.

THAT was a singular reasou for which au Ogden officer let loose an inebriated ruffian, who had not only disturbed the peace by his violence and resisted the police so that it took three of them to take him to jail, but did his level best to kick lown the prison door after he was locked up. He informed the officer that he had been a detective for four years and so he was promptly liberated. Whereupon, the same night, he committed still further depredations, smashing furniture and other things in a vile house which seems to have been "running" without official disturbance, and he had to be arrested a second time.

If it had been a "Mormon" policeman who had thus played fast and loose at his own sweet will, we would have heard about it from "Liberal" organs with a vengeance, and the roar would be kept up at intervals for at least a year. But the whole thing seems to be smothered over, and no official or journalistic censure appears. If this is the "Liberal" style of conducting mu nicipal affairs, Salt Lake is afforded another salutary warning.

STRETCHING A POINT.

THE St. Paul, Minnesota, *Globe* has, under the above heading, the following sensible article on the anti-"Mormon" planks in the Idaho State Constitution:

"The Territory of Idaho has adopted a State Constitution, and claims a population that has not been exceeded in uumber in more than three or four new States. In the effort to exclude its Mormon settlers from any participation in the goverument, if it is admitted as a State, provisions have been put in the constitution that are radical and dangerous, and conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Any person supposed to be a Mormon, presenting a ballot, is required to take the oath of the Edmunds bill abjuring polygamy, and still he will not be allowed to vote. He is to be put on probation two years, and at the expiration of the time, if he still wants to cast his ballot, he must present evidence satisfactory to the hostile judges that he has not lived in polygamy. This is a palpable invasion of religious freedom. It is geing beyoud the Edmunds bill or the authority of any government iu this country. There is no right to inquire as to a man's religious faith. The voter has the same right to believe in Joe Smith and the Mormon creed as citizen and voter Robert Ingersoll has to disbelieve in any religion. Some Mormons believe in polygamy, and some do not. Congress has outlawed the practice, and those who live in its multiplied relations. The Idaho people could follow in the steps of Congress iu this matter, but they must not ask the voter what religious theories he holds. It is the criminal practice alone that is a matter of investigation. There is infinitely more danger in trenching upon the rights of religious freedom than there is in the development of Mormonism. The idea of allowing a man to take the oath and then refusing him the right to vote looks farcical and an aggravation. It is not likely that any State coming with such provisions will be allowed admission, even if the object sought in the ostracism is commendable."

SOMEWHAT ABSURD.

IN ANOTHER column appears a statement of the conspiracy case in Malad, Oneida County, Idaho. Fifty-six persons were charged in one indictment with conspiracy with each other to break the infamous test oath statute, by voting when they knew they had no right to do so under that law. The result was funny. The verdict declared that all were not guilty except one—Mr. Davis, of Samaria. He alone was declared to be guilty.

It was a handy verdict for the side of the defense, but not a consistent one from any standpoiut. It involves a new departure on the part of the jury and the Court, but such novel innovations on common law and common sense re frequent in our sister Territory in the north. There is a wide divergeuce between the result of the trial in point and the definition of the word "conspiracy" as given by standard lexicographers. For instance, Webster thus defines "conspiracy:"

A combiuation of men for an evil purpose; an agreement between two or more persons to commit some erime in concert, as treason, sedition or insurrection; an agreement