

go. Heavy taxes are the inevitable result of municipal extravagance, and it is better to "go slow" and do without some wished for but expensive luxury than to involve a city in liabilities that cannot be readily lifted.

The Utah Legislature has wisely restricted the borrowing powers of the municipal corporations in this Territory. It is only by special permission of the territorial law-making department and taxpayers that any of the cities can run into debt of great consequence. These restrictions should be maintained and only for some necessary enterprise requiring a large present outlay, and certain to be of immediate public benefit, should the citizens give their sanction by ballot for the enlargement of the borrowing powers of any municipality. Let the fate of Elizabeth stand as a general warning.

THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

THE press of the United States has had a great deal to say lately on pauper immigration. The subject has obtained unusual prominence because of the efforts of Sullivan and his Irish-American followers to prevent the influx of poor people from his native land. It is charged that England has been shipping to the United States men and women from the workhouses and prisons of Ireland—people who are unable to support themselves or unfit to associate with the honest and industrious. A portion of one ship's company of Irish immigrants has been prevented from landing, and ordered back whence they came at the expense of the steamship company which brought them over.

It may be possible that the British Government has been forwarding to America many poor people from the disaffected districts of the Emerald Isle. Even paupers from the workhouses may have been helped to emigrate. But we do not credit the report about convicted criminals being shipped to these shores. In the first place, there is no evidence whatever that this has been done in any instance. And in the second place, that is not the policy of the Government nor consistent with the administration of justice in Great Britain. Convicts do not usually escape the penalties of the laws they have broken in that country. People are not punished until they are actually convicted, there, but when sentence is pronounced you may look for its full enforcement. Convicts are not released until they have served their terms, unless proofs of improper conviction are obtained and they are regularly pardoned out.

Now as to the shipment of indigent people to America. It does not follow because men and women are unable to earn their own living in England or Ireland that they will be in the same condition after arriving in the United States. The avenues to remunerative employment are wider and more numerous in this country, and thousands, aye millions, who have come to this free land to better their condition were penniless when they landed, but are now well to do. It is possible that even "pauper immigrants" may become, under new conditions, not only self-supporting, but a source of wealth to the State or Territory in which they make their home, and consequently to the nation.

The United States have the name of being "an asylum for the oppressed of all nations." The oppressed of Europe may not be expected to own much wealth. They are likely to be very poor. They look to this great country as the goal of their hopes, the land of their deliverance from tyranny and poverty. Every man and woman who arrives on this soil who is able and willing to work should be welcomed and encouraged. Only those who, it can be proved, are worthless and helpless, likely to become objects of public charity, and have been shipped to this country for the purpose of shifting the burden of their support, can be justly and lawfully refused admission to the liberty and opportunities of this great Republic. To reject men and women and children simply because they are poor is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, the practice from the beginning and the letter of our laws. And even helpless persons may come here to be supported by relatives or friends who have

been fortunate in their adopted country, without injury to the nation or violence to its regulations.

A great deal of nonsense is indulged in in this connection, in regard to "Mormon" immigration. It has been demonstrated that it cannot be classed with "pauper immigration." Efforts to bring it under that designation have signally failed. The assumption that "Mormon" converts come to this country to break its laws will not stand the test of the briefest scrutiny. It is known that the "Mormons" are a law-abiding, peaceable and thrifty people. Only in one respect are they considered culpable by the National Government; that is in regard to their disregard of the anti-polygamy laws. And it has been proven beyond dispute that the very great majority of them are not to be charged even with that offense. To assume, therefore, that the people who come here to live with their co-religionists intend to break any law of the land, is simply preposterous, and to attempt to prevent their landing because of such groundless guess-work is still more ridiculous.

The New York Tribune, commenting on the landing of the large company recently arrived, says: "No reasonable person can doubt that most Mormon immigrants now are just about as bad material as any that drifts to our shores." But a great many reasonable persons not only doubt this but know to the contrary. And the New York journal that makes this statement cannot offer anything to substantiate it that may not be easily controverted. The emigration commissioners have been compelled, in justice, to admit that the "Mormon" new comers are superior in every way to the general class of immigrants. They are not pauper; they are not idlers; they are not ignorant; they are not dirty and untidy; they are not a rabble; they are not of any particular class or of one sex. They are admitted to be honest, working people, the number of the sexes being about equal, people with their families who have not only paid their passage but usually have a little means to spare, and are able to give an intelligent reason why they come here and an exposition of their religious faith.

The press of the East usually exhibit the most consummate ignorance on this subject, and the editors do not seem to pay attention even to the reports of their own attaches published in their own columns, for these give the lie to the stupid charges and insinuations contained in the leaders.

The whole subject of immigration should be considered more thoughtfully by our contemporaries. The plans of a few Irish plotters against the Government of Great Britain ought not to figure in the regulations on the landing of people who come to the United States to make their homes. In self-protection this Government should, doubtless, take suitable means to prevent other countries from dumping upon our shores the criminal and helpless elements which they cannot assimilate or sustain, but poverty is not a crime, and heterodoxy is not a lawful objection. Good citizens may be and have been made out of people who have peculiar religious beliefs and not a coin in their pockets; and the bone and sinew of this great country, with quite a large proportion of its brains and skill, have come from the indigent but industrious classes of other lands, and there is yet room enough for millions more. If the United States have been too liberal in throwing open their doors hitherto, let them not fly to the other extreme and shut the portals of the land against the worthy of any nation or race.

THE BOSTON "HERALD" AND "MORMONISM."

The New York journals are beginning to take some interest in "Mormon" immigration, incited probably by the recent attempts to unload Irish paupers at Castle Garden. They inquire why it is, when Mormonism has been declared outside the pale of the law, that 700 recruits for the proscribed cause are allowed to sail from England and land in this country? The query is a pertinent one and demands an answer. If the Mormons are to continue violating the law at Salt Lake, the only way the government can retaliate is by cutting off the foreign recruits to polygamy. In no way could a more effective blow be

struck against the ineolent hierarchy that defies our laws.

THE above is from the Boston Herald, a paper with brains, published in the centre of New England "culchaw." And yet it is as full of nonsense as a rising balloon is full of gas. To begin with, "Mormonism" is not "outside the pale of the law." That is a nickname for a system of faith and worship which numbers its adherents by hundreds of thousands; and they are acknowledged to be sincere, devout believers in Jesus Christ and the Christian Scriptures, and apart from one feature of their creed and practice a pattern of zeal and earnestness. Who has declared that religion "outside the pale of the law?" And what would it amount to if all the newspapers and pulpits in the country were to make such a declaration? It would be nonsense. It would be contrary to the spirit of American institutions. It would be opposed to the Constitution of our country. It would amount to nothing in fact or in law. "Mormonism," as a religious system, is independent of law and also of public opinion. Those who believe and practice it are amenable to the law if they do anything against the law; if, to use the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, they "break out into overt acts against peace and good order."

But even then their creed will be untouched by the law, for doctrines and principles of religion are not under governmental control, and belief in them is and must of necessity be free in this land of religious liberty. To say then that "Mormonism" has been declared "outside the pale of the law," is to say that somebody has been talking unmitigated foolishness.

The term "proscribed cause" is of the same nature. There is no such thing in the country as a proscribed religion. A little reflection will show this beyond controversy. The highest court in the land has formulated a decision declaring that, in effect, Every religious faith is free. People may believe anything that seems right to them. The free exercise of religion is guaranteed to all, and while the law proscribes no religious system, it is bound to protect the adherents of "Mormonism" in their faith and worship, just as much as the followers of Methodism or Catholicism, or any other ism. If any of them break the law, they are answerable to the law, but their faith and cause is not and cannot be proscribed by the law.

The question why "700 recruits" are "allowed to sail from England and land in this country" is not pertinent, but irrelevant and indicative of ignorance. If any answer is needed it may be given briefly in these words: because there is no law against it. There is no law of England forbidding the emigration of believers in any religious cause or organization. The Latter-day Saints, or "Mormons" as they are vulgarly called, may leave Great Britain as freely as any other people if they can pay their passage, and the Boston Herald would be sorely perplexed if required to give a tangible reason why such emigrants should be detained. It is just the same with their landing in this country. The law does not take cognizance of any person's faith. There is nothing in the Acts of Congress relating to emigration which can be stretched or twisted to meet the case of the "Mormon" immigrants. They break no law in landing; they are not likely to become a public charge, they are of the kind of human material that is likely to add strength and solidity to the nation, and the presumption that they may at some future time break one of the laws of the United States, if correct, would not be sufficient to constitute a reason for closing the ports of the country against them, and might be urged against every immigrant seeking the liberty and opportunities for advancement offered by this land of the free and home of the brave.

The idea that the Government of the United States should "retaliate" in the manner suggested by the Boston Herald, is as great a mark of imbecility as the other remarks of that paper which we have noticed. "Retaliation" is not the proper policy of any government towards its citizens. The enforcement of constitutional law is right and requisite. If any of the "Mormons" violate the law at Salt Lake, it would be proper for the Government to proceed in a legal manner against the offenders. But it has no right to "retaliate" by doing anything

whatever against persons of the same faith who are not offenders. On the Herald's rule, if a number of Catholics should break a law of the United States, the Government would be justified in "retaliating" against the Catholics by "cutting off all foreign recruits" to Catholicism in this country. If some Presbyterians violate the revenue laws, no Presbyterian from abroad should be permitted to land in this country, and so in regard to the members of any Church, Association, Order or Society.

The term "foreign recruits" is not applicable in this connection. It is used because of a lack of information. It is supposed that our Elders go to Europe with money to recruit for Utah, and that the "Mormon" companies which land at Castle Garden are the results of their gleanings. The Boston Herald would find on enquiry that most of the people who form these companies have been for many years members of our Church, and that they have paid their own way across the water. Our Elders go out "without purse and scrip" to preach the gospel of faith, repentance, baptism and the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. That is their mission. People who receive and obey that gospel are moved with a desire to gather to the abode of their co-religionists, and as soon as they can obtain the necessary means, either by their own savings or help from relatives and friends in Utah, they emigrate. They come here in families. They have no intention to break any laws. They are not "recruits" in the sense in which that term is used concerning them. As a matter of fact they are quiet, orderly, working people who aid in developing the country, and are a source of wealth to the nation, being producers and not paupers in any sense, and from the nature of their faith are sober, saving, permanent residents, becoming solid citizens as soon as time permits.

And, friend Herald, there is no "insolent hierarchy that defies our laws." Defiance is not breathed in the spirit of the so-called "Mormon" Church. Search its sacred books. Listen to its teachings. Obedience to the laws is one of its main tenets. Its people, as a rule, are law-abiding. Take the "Mormons" as a community, and there is less infraction of the laws among them than among any other people on this continent. This is an irrefutable fact, demonstrable by the criminal statistics of this Territory and of the various States. But someone will begin to shout, "polygamy, polygamy." Well, what of that? Some of the "Mormons" have more wives than one. Many of that number entered into their plural marriages previous to the passage of any law of the United States on the subject. But the voting statistics have proved that the very great majority of the people have not entered into plural marriage at all. Those who have done so believe that their action is right. They have no doubt that they have complied with a divine law. They have not been defiant. A law has been framed against an establishment of their religion, and some of them have disregarded that law. That is all there is of it.

What, then, should be done? Punish all the people, including those who have never broken the one law that a few may have ignored? Assume that all who believe in the gospel of "Mormonism" intend to break that one law, and prevent them from landing when they come to these shores? Retaliate against all for the alleged sins of a few? Proscribe a creed because some of its adherents are accused of violating a statute which constitutes part of their religion a crime? Go back to the deeds and days of intolerance, and set up the Inquisition in a free Republic? Drag the Government down to the level of the hiring clergy and sectarian bigots who are howling for the extermination of "Mormonism" because they cannot overcome it by argument nor meet its religious power by scripture? For shame, Boston Herald! Look at the nonsense, error and anti-republicanism of the paragraph we have clipped from your columns, and never make such blunders again.

It Seems to Satisfy.

A family want, and I wonder how we ever got along without Parker's Ginger Tonic. It cured me of nervous prostration, and I have used it since for all sorts of complaints in our family, Mrs. Jinx, Albany.

Strength for Mind and Body.

There is more strength restoring power in a bottle of Parker's Ginger Tonic than in a bushel of malt or a gallon of Milk. This explains why invalids find it such a wonderful invigorant for mind and body.

NOTICE

In the Probate Court in and for Salt Lake County, Utah Territory.

MARY MULLETT,
Plaintiff,
vs.
DAVID MULLETT,
Defendant.

SUMMONS.

The People of the United States in the Territory of Utah, send Greeting, to David Mullett, Defendant:

YOU ARE HEREBY REQUIRED TO APPEAR in an action brought against you by the above named plaintiff in the Probate Court, of the County of Salt Lake, Territory of Utah, and to answer the complaint filed therein within ten days, (exclusive of the day of service) after the service on you of summons—if served within this County; or, if served out of this County, but in this district, within twenty days; otherwise within forty days, or judgment by default will be taken against you, according to the prayer of said complaint.

The said action is brought to obtain a decree from this court dissolving the marriage contract existing between said plaintiff and you, and awarding to Plaintiff the custody of Leonard Mullett and Louisa Ann Mullett, minors, the issue of said marriage and for such other order and decree as to the court seemeth proper and for costs of suit. Plaintiff alleges as grounds for this application that defendant has cruelly treated the plaintiff to the extent of causing great bodily injury, and also to the extent of causing great mental distress to plaintiff, and that defendant for more than two years last past has willfully neglected to provide for the plaintiff the common necessities of life. And you are hereby notified that if you fail to appear and answer the said complaint as above required, the said plaintiff will apply to this court for the relief prayed for and cost of suit.

Witness, the Hon. E. Smith, Judge, and the Seal of the Probate Court of Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah, this 22nd day of June, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty-three.

D. BOCKHOLT, Clerk.
CHAS. F. BLANDIN,
53 East Temple St., Attorney for Plaintiff.
w 234w

RE-ORGANIZATION

OF THE FIRM OF

Fish Brothers & Co.

TO THE PEOPLE OF UTAH:

The Co-partnership between T. G. FISH, E. B. FISH and J. C. HUGGINS, under the firm name of Fish Bros. & Co., expired by limitation on January 1st, 1883. At that date, J. C. HUGGINS retired from the firm D. J. MOREY and S. S. LYON purchasing his interest. In the re-organization of the new firm of Fish Bros. & Co. which then took place, our Utah trade was thoroughly discussed, and we determined to give the Utah trade that attention in future which it deserves, and which was, to some extent, neglected in 1882.

S. S. LYON, one of the new members of the firm, who had been in the employ of the old firm many years, spent several weeks with Mr. Lovell at Salt Lake last fall, and gave his special attention to ascertaining all defects and all needed improvements in the Fish Wagon, to keep it in the future, as in past years, the STANDARD WAGON of Utah and adjoining Territories.

Call on The John W. Lovell Wagon Company and examine this year's make of the Fish Wagon, for we assure you it will be found a BETTER WAGON THAN WE EVER SENT TO UTAH BEFORE. We are selecting all the timber, and taking special pains in manufacturing all Wagons for Utah trade.

Yours Respectfully,

FISH BROS. & CO.

Racine, Wis., April 18th, 1883.
c1883w234w