

## DESERET NEWS.

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

WEDNESDAY, - JAN. 28, 1880

## AN ABSURD STORY EXPOSED.

THE *Denver Tribune*, which has published several fabrications about the "Mormons" and the Utes, has an article in its issue of the 14th inst., containing a cock-and-bull story of a pack train, loaded with rifles and cartridges, said to have been seen on Big Spring Creek, between Bear and Snake Rivers; and the inference is drawn, without any reason or basis for such a conclusion, that this war material was furnished by the "Mormons" for the use of the hostiles.

Let us look at the story before we say anything about the deductions therefrom. A reporter alleges that he interviewed a man named Ranker, from Rawlins, who says he was told by some cattle men or prospectors, he does not seem to be sure which, that some time during the previous week they saw on Big Spring Creek, between Bear and Snake Rivers, and directly west of the White River agency, a pack train of seventy burros with drivers making their way due south. As pack trains at this season are rather uncommon, the men said they examined the loads and found them to be nothing but rifles and cartridges.

This is the yarn out of which all this new sensation about collusion of "Mormons" with the Utes is manufactured. Somebody says a man told him that he heard a number of persons say that they saw this pack train, and that the attendants in charge of these seventy loads of war material being secretly conveyed, allowed these cattle men, or prospectors, or whatever they were, to examine all the loads so carefully that they were able to pronounce them in the words of the alleged narrator, "rifles and cartridges, only this and nothing more."

They were traveling "due south" and this, so says this wonderful story, "would indicate that Utah had been the starting point and Grand River the objective point of the animals." Now, let any one examine a map of the Territories and see if he can find any such place "west of the White River agency;" then tell us how any one traveling from Utah "due south" would reach Grand River; then give a common sense reason for inferring that a pack train traveling "due south" from Big Spring Creek between Bear and Snake Rivers, came from Utah or that its "objective point" was Grand River.

The reporter who spun that yarn is evidently ignorant of the geography of the country in which he located his pack train; he is doubtless the paternal progenitor of those mules, and any one who can accept his story after investigating it, must surely be one of his near relatives. From this stupid story the *Denver Tribune* draws a lot of equally stupid deductions about the Saints and the hostiles, mixing in its former untruths about Chief Ouray's statements of "Mormon" connection with the White River Utes, and other papers, copying the article, help to spread the folly to prejudice the people of Utah before the country, and add fuel to the flame of falsehood lit up by the "Christian" pulpit and fanned by the "Christian" press.

Of such stuff are nearly all the sensational reports about the "Mormons" fashioned. Originating in the brain of some sectarian priest or a reporter hard pressed for a taking item, they are picked up and handed round and copied without thought or care as to their genuineness, and the whole country is led to wonder why such things are allowed to continue.

We warn respectable papers and persons against being deceived by such misrepresentations, declare that the people of Utah have at least as much interest in the protection of the whites from Indian outbreaks, as any other people in the land, and defy our bitterest enemies to bring forward anything but a malicious distortion of facts, straight, unscrupulous falsehood, or the offspring of evil imagination to substantiate the absurd theory of "Mormon" collusion with hostile Indians, against the peace and welfare of the whites.

## EXPLANATORY.

THERE seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the measure now before the Legislative Assembly for removing the political disabilities of the women of Utah. This misapprehension of the subject is chiefly caused by misrepresentation. We prefer to believe that the latter is the offspring of ignorance rather than to attribute it to malice. A great hubbub is being raised by a few impetuous persons outside the Assembly, with whom it would at present be waste of time to argue. When they cool down sufficiently to be able to see clearly, reason may resume its sway.

We wish to offer some explanations for the benefit of the public, that they may not be deceived in relation to the merits or demerits of the case. The bill now before the House, subject to be taken up from the table at its call, simply provides that the word "male" be stricken out from the statute defining the qualifications for voting and holding office, and for the insertion, in the woman suffrage act, of the words "and hold office." The effect of all this, if the bill should become a law, would be to place it within the power of the people, if they so desired, to elect women to office.

Now let us consider this matter reasonably, fairly and without prejudice if possible. The Act conferring on women the elective franchise is measurably inconsistent with the statute from which it is asked that the word "male" be stricken out. For that statute provides that none can vote or hold office in this Territory but "male citizens of the United States," while the woman suffrage act says that women may vote at any election in the Territory. Why should the half-repealed word "male" be still retained? Solely to keep the women, who are allowed to vote, from holding any office whatever under the law. Is this right? Does not the right to hold office generally run parallel with the right to vote? Is it just that men should monopolize all the honors, emoluments and privileges of office, and leave none whatever to women? Is it fair to put the ballot into the hands of women and say, "you may vote for men but you shall not vote for women?" The duties of citizenship for women, the privileges, pay and perquisites for men only!

Are there no offices in the gift of the people which can be filled by women efficiently, with profit to them and benefit to the community? The offices of Engrossing Clerk and Enrolling Clerk in the Utah House of Representatives have been filled by ladies for several sessions. Yet this is in opposition to the law requiring all offices to be filled by males only. These positions are bona fide offices, made so by a law of Congress; the incumbents take the oath of office, are placed on the list of officers and receive their pay like the male officers. No one has ever complained that the work was not performed well and to the satisfaction of those principally concerned. We know of a gentleman, who, in a place outside of this county but in this Territory, has been elected Treasurer for many terms successively, because the duties of the office have been honestly and efficiently discharged. Yet to our knowledge his wife has done the work, handled the money, kept a faithful account and discharged the duties of the office for which the man gets the credit and the pay. We have no objection to this if they are both satisfied, as we believe they are. But where would be the wrong if the woman who does the work should also get the name, honor and salary of the office?

In Kansas and in Massachusetts, women have the right to vote on school matters, and with that the right to fill school offices under the law, one right running parallel with the other. In Utah, although she has the right to vote for all officers in the Territory, she has no right to be elected to any herself? Is this right, consistent and equal? But the objection is raised, if women are eligible to office, they will be compelled to sit on juries. No such thing. The Poland bill prevents this, and the statute of this Territory

providing for the qualification of jurors, which is separate and distinct from that defining the qualifications for holding office, also bars women out of the jury box. Then it is said, women are not fit for judges, justices of the peace, constables, sheriffs and similar offices. Very good; do not elect them to such positions. No supporter of the bill that we know of desires that any woman should be elected to an office of that character. The object is merely to throw down the obstacle in her way to offices that she is fitted to occupy. Just that, and nothing more.

"But if the bill becomes a law, will not women be compelled to accept certain offices?" Certainly not. Neither is it necessary that a woman be even nominated for any office. "Will not women, if they are eligible to office, be compelled to pay poll tax, serve in the militia, and do and perform other such duties only suitable for men?" Ladies, if any one has told you such nonsense, your informant was attempting to deceive you; there is not the slightest foundation in truth for any such surmises, and the fact that resort is had to fallacies of that kind is proof that the inventors of these alarms have no valid argument to offer.

We think, from what we know of those who support the proposition to allow the people of Utah to elect whom they please to office, and this is all that the bill provides for, are as strong in the conviction that "man is (or should be) the head of the woman" as any opponent of woman's rights as a citizen. No member of the House has advocated the fitness of woman for a presidential, judicial or executive office. There are offices within the Church, (we do not refer to priesthood) which she now occupies with honor, but she is not called to dictate man. Why should woman not be legally eligible to such offices as she can fitly fill in the State—or Territory? We do not believe that a rational, sound answer can be given in the negative.

It may be asked "why not designate the offices for which women are adapted instead of leaving the whole list open?" We might as well ask why not designate the offices to which certain classes of men, who are unfit for the higher and most important positions, may be eligible? The answer is, the law leaves the matter open, and the good sense of the people or their popular vote decides what men shall be called to fill the various offices in the gift of the people. Exactly; and that is just what is proposed in the case of women. Is it any more likely that the people, if they had the power, would elect a woman to the office of Probate Judge, or Sheriff or Constable, than a man totally unfitted for the position? If the people of Utah were allowed by law to do as they wished in these matters, is it to be supposed that they would lose their natural reason in consequence? The objections urged about what the people might do in this connection are a gross reflection upon their common sense.

Now it is not to be expected that reforms, however just and rational, can be reached at a bound. Innovations are not judged generally on their merits. Deep-rooted prejudice often interposes its broad and rank leaves and hides the right from the common vision. The friends of this movement, male and female, should, we think, be contented at present with a measure approximating towards the unstinted right. Let certain offices that no one can reasonably deny to women be made eligible to them by law, and wait for time to give them full justice, in the abolition of invidious legal distinctions.

And meanwhile let those who are hostile to any measure of this kind, exercise their right to oppose with that sincerity, truth and honor which should dignify the "lords of creation," and be careful not to overstep the bounds of fairness, justice and manly regard for the rights and reputation of those who differ with them. For, it is certain that misrepresentation will recoil, and those who resort to it will signally fail in their object. We do not offer these final reflections to any member of the Assembly; they are intended only for those to whom they will apply. We favor a free expression of thought, respect the sincere objections of an opponent, and accord to all the right of individual opinion. But we think that of all people on the face of this fair earth, the Latter-day Saints should

be the freest from prejudice, and the last to oppose a measure simply because it is an innovation.

## THE "CHRISTIAN" METHOD.

THE following from *Pomeroy's Democrat*, so clearly and sharply contrasts the "Mormon" and the Christian way with women that we cannot forbear copying it into our columns, although the article may appear to some a little too caustic for as mild a paper as the *DESERET NEWS*:

Some very pious people, the Presidential fraud at the head, are conducting an active campaign of chin against the Mormons. There is an anti-polygamy society in Utah which has forwarded a memorial to Congress demanding the firing out of Congressman Cannon, now serving his fourth term. The ground for this modest request is found in the fact that the said Cannon is a big gun among the Mormons, an Apostle, in fact, with four wives. These four wives are given by name as follows:

First Wife—Elizabeth Hoagland Cannon who has six children—four sons and two daughters.

Second Wife—Sarah Jane Jennie, has four sons and one daughter.

Third Wife—Eliza Tinney; has two children, boys.

Fourth Wife—Martha Tilley; has five children, twin girls and three boys.

It is further charged against Cannon that he lives with these wives, supports them, and provides for the children, 22 persons in all, and acknowledges them as his wives and children everywhere. These be serious charges, George. First, that you should boldly acknowledge all of them; when the Gentile Christian custom acknowledges but one and keeps the others shady. Second, and mainly, George, that you should have married them all; when the Gentile Christian custom confines the ceremony to one, and provides for the others on the sly. Third, that you should have acknowledged the co—the children, and provided for them; when the Gentile rule is to swear them on somebody else, or have them plumped into the nearest sewer at birth. Fourth, that you should brazenly support four wives; when good Christian examples have so often been set to have but one and let her support you. George, we're afraid you're a bad man, if you are a member of Congress. You'll contaminate some of those fellows about you, like Ellis, or Acklen. It is grievous to think of your possible contact with our Matt, or Simon Cameron, and the many other truly pious and virtuous men still left us about the Capitol. There is only one way out, George Q., and that is to desert all of your wives but one and disown all but one set of children or go to the penitentiary like a gentleman. Civilization demands this, your pious constituents demand it, Hayes demands it. Congressman Cannon, you must unload or go off.

## Local and Other Matters

FROM FRIDAY'S DAILY, JAN. 23.

**Good for Davis!**—The petition of the citizens of Davis County, asking that Antelope Island, in Great Salt Lake, and the waters intervening between it and the western boundary of that County, be annexed to Davis County, has been favorably reported upon and the enlargement will doubtless be made. Tourists from Davis County need then no longer spend their summer months in Europe.

**Look Out for Him!**—A short time since we cautioned the people of southern Utah against a man giving the name of Harris, hoping that our cotemporaries in that region would have sufficient journalistic courtesy to republish the warning. This not being the case, we can only again notify the public there and elsewhere that Harris is a fraud, and we have and will have nothing to do with him. He is dark complexioned, of medium height, and is evidently consumptive. We learn that he has lately been victimizing the people in Beaver county, especially at Minersville. Look out for him!—*Junction.*

**Accidentally Shot.**—A young man named William Jones, of Kaysville, was brought to the city yesterday afternoon, from Grass Mountain, about 70 miles west of

Grantsville, where he had been herding sheep. His right foot had been shot through the instep, and was bound in cloths. Inquiry elicited the fact that on Tuesday, while taking his gun out of his bed-clothes, which were lying in a wagon, the muzzle of the piece fell upon his foot, and the gun being discharged in some unaccountable manner, he received the wound described. He did not seem to be in much pain, and conversed quite freely of the accident. While our reporter was interviewing him, Dr. J. M. Benedict, who had been summoned, came up, and the patient was conveyed to the Sisters' Hospital.

**Supreme Court.**—Proceedings on Friday, Jan. 23, 1880, all the Justices present and presiding:

Elizabeth Handley respondent vs. Eric M. Cast, appellant, from Third District. An ex-parte motion by Z. Snow, Esq., for respondent, to dismiss the appeal of this cause because the transcript was not filed in the clerk's office of this court within the time required by law, was submitted and taken under advisement by the court.

Wells, Fargo & Co., respondents, vs. Samuel Neslen, appellant, from Third District. A motion, in behalf of the respondent, that this court make additional findings of fact in this cause, was argued by J. G. Sutherland in support thereof and by J. C. Royle against the same; the latter, however, protesting that this court has no jurisdiction of this subject matter, and that objection of want of jurisdiction was not raised by such appearance and argument. The motion was submitted and taken under advisement by the Court.

Paul Beus, assignee, appellant vs. M. Shaughnessy United States Marshal, respondent, from 3rd District; cause argued by R. K. Williams for appellant and by E. D. Hoge for respondent, submitted and taken under advisement.

On motion of R. Baskin, Esq., it was ordered that the resolutions adopted by the Salt Lake bar on the death of M. J. Hempstead and published, be entered on the minutes of this Court.

Court adjourned until Monday, the 26th inst., at 10 a.m.

**Bishops' Meeting.**—The meeting of the Bishops and Ward officers, last evening, was, as usual, well attended. After the customary preliminaries, Bishop Edward Hunter arose and delivered a brief and pointed address on the paying of tithing, showing the blessings that would accrue from the faithful observance of this commandment, as well as the disadvantages which would, in the end, result from robbing the Lord of his rightful share of the temporal increase of his people. One-tenth was what was required, and to freely offer this should be esteemed a privilege instead of a burden. He then reverted to the duties of the Bishops in Zion. He knew they worked hard, and got more blame, sometimes, than encouragement for so doing. But God would reward them eventually, for he always rewarded according to men's deeds. President Taylor once said: "If men were to be rewarded for work, the Bishops would get a pretty good reward." But work was what we were put here for, not play, and the Saints would yet see more of it. These were peaceable times compared to those that were close at hand. At one time it was only Missouri against us; then Missouri and Illinois; then those States and the Government; but now it was to be America and Europe arrayed against little Utah, and it would soon be the whole world in arms against the Church and Kingdom of God. But our hearts need not fail, for God was on our side, and would see us through triumphant.

Counselor Jos. E. Taylor being invited to speak, made a few well chosen remarks in his usual forcible manner. He first alluded to the primary meetings to be held next Monday evening, and urged all good men and honest voters to attend them, as well as to be interested in the coming election. He then continued the subject of tithing, from Bishop Hunter's remarks. In early days it was the custom for the bishop to sit as a judge of what a man's tithing should be, now it was left more or less to the man himself. There was a complaint that many took advantage of this freedom to either pay no tithing, pay it irregularly, or not pay a fair tenth of their increase. He advised the bishops to seek out such