

DESERET NEWS.

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - SEPT 19, 1888.

GENERAL SEMI-ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The Fifty-ninth Semi-Annual Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints will commence at 10 o'clock Friday morning, October 5th, 1888, in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City.

The officers and members of the Church are respectfully invited to attend.

A meeting of the Deseret Sunday School Union will be held at the Tabernacle on Friday evening, October 5th, one of the Priesthood on Saturday evening, October 6th, and of the Young Men's and Young Ladies' Mutual Improvement Associations on Sunday evening, October 7th.

WILFORD WOODRUFF,
In behalf of the Council of the Twelve Apostles.

SURRENDER OF APOSTLE GEORGE Q. CANNON.

The voluntary surrender of Apostle George Q. Cannon, and his appearance before Judge Sanford in Third District Court this morning, will occasion much surprise not only in Utah but throughout the country. Many newspapers have echoed the foolish story, manufactured by a Topeka, Kansas, reporter, that the gentleman had gone to Mexico with his family. They will have to admit that their news was wrong and their comments superfluous. Mr. Cannon has not given the slightest foundation for the rumor.

It is well known, that the gentleman has been for a long time in retirement, and that he could not be found when diligently hunted for by the officers of the law. That he should now step forth in the light of day and submit to trial on the charges preferred against him, will cause considerable comment and many inquiries will be made as to the reason.

Being familiar with many facts in the history of this case, we speak with confidence concerning it. When Brother Cannon was arrested about a year and a half ago, there was such a strong feeling against him on the part of our opponents here, that the general impression was he could not obtain a fair trial. He was quite willing, however, to take the risk, but was dissuaded from doing so by friends whose opinion was entitled to the gravest consideration and respect.

At that time the reverse of the established rule of jurisprudence, that an accused person is to be considered innocent until he is proven guilty, seemed to prevail in the courts in all cases relating to polygamy. The presumption was that the defendant was guilty and he was required to prove his innocence. There was a disposition on the part of those charged with the execution of the law not only to push it to the utmost limit of its letter, but to exceed its provisions and punish an offender several times for the same offence. The "segregation" system was invented to effect this and was the practice in the courts until set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States.

What could be expected by an accused person from officials who openly declared their vexation that the law did not inflict greater penalties against a polygamist, and who expressed their intention to multiply the punishments provided by statute? In the case of Brother George Q. Cannon it was reported and generally believed that extreme measures would be resorted to. The boast was made that he would be kept in prison for the term of his natural life. The enemies of the Church were more than ordinarily bitter. His position as one of the First Presidency was cited against him. It is well known that prominent Elders in the Church were special objects of attack, and that unusual efforts were made to entrap and punish them, and that their ecclesiastical importance rendered them more liable than others to the vengeance of the officers of the law. The employment of the military at the time of his arrest, and their custody of Mr. Cannon when he was only charged with a civil offense and that of minor importance, was proof of the animus against him.

The excessive bonds demanded in

Brother Cannon's case gave strong color to the prevalent opinion as to the intentions of the prosecution. The sums demanded amounted in the aggregate to \$45,000. And this for a simple misdemeanor and when the utmost penalties that could be legally imposed were six months imprisonment and a fine of \$300. Brother Cannon yielded to the counsels of his friends and did not appear for trial. He has since kept in seclusion. He now comes to the front of his own volition for several reasons.

He has always been ready to meet the issue if there was a probability of a fair trial. With a packed jury, a prejudiced court and a vindictive prosecuting officer, this was out of the question. There is now a change of public officials. The fair presumption is that the new Chief Justice will administer the law as he finds it and in the spirit of justice, and that vengeance will be eliminated from the prosecution. Brother Cannon preferred not to wait to see what would be the course of the new incumbent of the bench in this Judicial District. He desired to be the first to take the risk. Everybody acquainted with him knows that he is no coward. His personal courage has been established beyond question on many occasions. He has come to the front boldly, presuming that he would receive fair treatment under the law, and that his position in the Church would cut no figure in his prosecution.

Another consideration moved him to this step. He thought that perhaps when his case was disposed of there might be less disposition to severity against his brethren who have not been so much sought after as himself. He earnestly desired that they might be liberated from the bondage that has kept them from liberty and usefulness, and has been willing to do anything that was possible to accomplish that end.

In surrendering to the law he has made no sacrifice of principle. This should be distinctly understood. He meets the consequences of his own acts, and would have done so before but for the reasons we have mentioned. When the first proposition was made for a test case to determine the constitutionality of the law of 1862, he was willing and offered to stand in the gap, and would have done so but for the fact that the statute of limitations barred action against him for polygamy.

In stepping forward to-day Brother Cannon took considerable risk. But the results show that his judgment was sound. The first to test whether fair treatment of offenders against the anti-polygamy laws would be accorded under the new judicial regime, he has demonstrated that his expectations were correct. His sentence, severe as it is, indicates that the laws of Congress applicable in this Territory are to be administered as other laws are in the different States and Territories of the Union. This is all we have asked for since this anti-polygamy crusade commenced. Respect for the law and its duly appointed officers is far more likely to be maintained when it is fairly executed, than when there is good ground for the charge that its powers are made the vehicle for special vengeance against the votaries of a creed.

Apostle George Q. Cannon has long been a respected and honored servant of the people. In his high calling as one of the heads of the Church he has been ever diligent, faithful and eminent. As Delegate in Congress for this Territory he was elected five times, and not only labored for the interests of Utah with uncommon ability and success, but gained for himself a deserved and enviable reputation among the statesmen of the nation and all who became acquainted with him, and their regard continues to the present day.

He now suffers for a principle. He has strong convictions and has given evidence of his faith by his works. He will have the prayers of the Latter-day Saints for his preservation and return in peace, and it is to be hoped that even his enemies will be satisfied with his acceptance of the situation and his willingness to abide by the decision of an unbiased Court.

When honorable men go to prison for a principle, surely the just will recognize the difference between them and the essentially criminal, and those who are charged with the administration of the law, unless strongly biased by hostility to that principle and those who adhere to it, will rather be lenient to persons whom they regard as mistaken, than pursue them with greater determination and severity than is common against pronounced malefactors.

We extend our sympathy to Brother George Q. Cannon, and with a host of his friends, invoke upon him the blessings of heaven, and hope that he will come forth from captivity to renewed usefulness and the full enjoyment of life and liberty.

GEN. HARRISON'S LETTER.

GENERAL HARRISON'S letter of acceptance is a well written and concise paper, but it is not great nor does it convey anything original.

The writer betrays anxiety to make himself solid with the opponents of Chinese immigration and with those Mugwumps who have not committed themselves to Cleveland but are dissatisfied with his attitude to civil service reform.

On several topics General Harrison echoes the views of his opponent, notably on pauper immigration, the fish-

ery question and trusts. His utterances on the last named point do not harmonize with those of the real Republican leader in this campaign—James G. Blaine. But as that gentleman made such a terrible blunder on the trust question, it became necessary for Harrison to do something to make amends for it before the public.

On the tariff question, the only actual issue in this political fight, General Harrison stoops to the tactics of his party. He cannot say, in so many words, that the Democratic policy to-day is for free trade, but he insinuates as much. He raises the transparent and battered bugaboo of something that is to be, because he cannot claim that it is. He says concerning the Mills bill that "it is only a step," but he tries to frighten the country by supposing something that it may lead to. He says of the Democratic revenue reformers: "It is not what is done, but what they may do." This reminds us of the beautiful girl in the picture, who is described as saying to her "feller": "Let me alone, can't ye, Jonathan." "Why," he responds in surprise, "I aren't a touch in' on ye, am I." "No," she artlessly replies, "but ain't ye a gold' to?"

Tariff reform must not be inaugurated, according to General Harrison's argument, because it is a step toward free trade. And yet he is forced to admit that "the schedule must be revised," that is tariff reform is a necessity. If that is the case, then by his method of logic the Republicans, in revising the schedule, would themselves be taking a step towards free trade. He thus offers a refutation of his own argument in his own manner of putting it.

Another fallacy, common to Republican contentions, is his assumption that in desiring American competition in the markets of the world, they want to lose the home market. Every person who understands anything of this question knows that this is untrue. It is a wilful and shameful misrepresentation of the whole subject. No Democrat expects to lose or limit the home market, but to extend our manufactures, by the use of free raw materials, so that to the supply of the home market with cheaper goods, will be added an opportunity to sell in the markets of the world, the effects of which would be, a wider market at home and abroad, and consequently the employment of more home labor which involves good wages because it will find employment for all who wish to work.

General Harrison refers to some of the claims of the Democratic party in reference to the bad effects of a high tariff for protection, but does not even attempt to disprove them. In this he shows some wisdom but not very good policy.

The whole letter is somewhat weak, but is clear and perspicuous so far as its dictation is concerned, and conveys the impression that its author is eminently respectable, but not endowed with those characteristics that indicate a man of force capable of becoming a great public leader.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR CITIZENSHIP.

SEVERAL applicants for naturalization in the Third District Court have recently been sent back to wait until they become better informed in relation to the institutions of the country. Judge Sanford seems to be more concerned on this question than as to the religious opinions of candidates for citizenship.

This is a departure from the course of the courts of the Territory in later times, or rather a return to former methods. Probably the catechism which applicants had to be able to master, was more prominent than anything else in the minds of the applicants who have not passed examination during the past few days, and this accounts for their failure.

We think every consistent American citizen will approve of Judge Sanford's course in this matter. The duties and responsibilities of citizenship can scarcely be properly borne by one who has not read the Constitution, and who is not informed as to the nature and genius of republican institutions. It is true that many native-born Americans are unable to give intelligent answers to questions on the government of their country, and yet they exercise all the rights and privileges of citizenship. But while the suffrage is free to the ignorant and educated alike this cannot be remedied.

But it is within the jurisdiction of a Judge, in the exercise of his discretion, to require an alien, who must be well disposed towards the government and Constitution of the United States, to exhibit some understanding of these matters and not to take upon himself obligations as to things he does not comprehend.

In five years, it would seem, every sane person desiring to become identified with this nation, could acquire all the information concerning its fundamental law and principles, necessary to the assumption of the responsibilities of citizenship. If applicants have not done this, we think a Judge is justified in refusing to issue the needful certificate.

Aliens living in this territory should be instructed in reference to the general principles of republican government, and should be made familiar with the Declaration of Independence and the National Constitution. And those citizens who attend court as wit-

nesses for an applicant for naturalization, should see to it that the friend for whom they vouch is sufficiently informed to be able to pass muster and show fitness for the citizenship he desires to assume.

We think this of far more importance to the people and Government of the United States than the religious views of the applicant. And if no person were permitted to vote who could not stand the test of fitness, such as that required now in the Third District Court as a qualification for citizenship, we think the elective franchise would be exercised in a far more intelligent and effective manner than under the present unrestricted, manhood suffrage system.

"COZY BELL," EXHUMED.

It seems that the remains of "Cozy Bell," the pampered pup which was interred in Woodlawn Cemetery, New York, enclosed in a purple lined and expensive casket, were not allowed to remain in peace. People whose deceased relatives reposed in that enclosure, sacred to the memory of the dead, raised a rumpus about the carcass of a dog being laid in the midst of their dear departed. The directors of the cemetery considered the matter and came to the conclusion that none but human remains should be interred therein.

Mrs. Bell, the lady whose puppymania induced her to go to the extremes which were recently described in these columns, was visited by an official who urged the removal of her pet's remains. She had paid \$200 for the lot in the cemetery, so the dog's body having been exhumed the afflicted owner will remove her husband's body from Massachusetts, to occupy the lot vacated by the canine. The comptroller of the cemetery claims that the dog's interment took place during his absence and he is much relieved by this settlement of the trouble. The dog's name was Cozy, but his rest was not. The casket and its contents are now placed in a less pretentious but perhaps quite as comfortable a spot, and the affair will cease to trouble the public mind of New York. "Every dog has his day," Cozy Bell's is done and his tale is ended. *Requies purp in pace.*

THE "MORMONS" SINNED AGAINST.

UNDER the above heading the Chicago Times, usually very severe in handling the "Mormon" question, publishes the following article in refutation of the falsehoods said to have been told by the Rutter woman and which were telegraphed by the Associated Press and dished up as "Mormon" horrors in many newspapers. The Times is entitled to credit for fairness in thus giving facts:

"Some weeks ago Chicago newspapers gave prominence to a story of an English woman—Mrs. Elizabeth Turnbull Rutter—passing through town on her way home to the old country, a refugee from the land of the Mormons, where her husband had been slain by emissaries of the Latter-day Saints. The story was highly sensational, and appears to have wrought on the minds of some good people here who assisted the woman in her poverty and sent her away. Letters and sworn affidavits have now been laid before the Times, which would indicate, without much room for doubt, that the woman's story was false. By these statements the Rutter—husband and wife—were ignorant and shiftless people from North Shields, England, and were not converts to the Church, though attracted to Utah by the opportunities for cheap immigration. One day Rutter, who was doing farm work in Weber County, was found drowned, and his wife, who had been in domestic service at Ogden, thereupon concluded to beg her way back to England with what success is best known perhaps by those Chicago people—including the British consul—who helped her along. The Mormons whose names were made to appear in the woman's sensational narrative, feel aggrieved that after they had done much, and cheerfully, to help these poor people, who were almost incapable of helping themselves, they should now be so falsely accused."

THE OUTLOOK IN NEW YORK.

THE renomination of David B. Hill for Governor of New York was a wise step on the part of the Democrats of that State. Its accomplishment by acclamation, and without any opposition, shows that the party is united, and that the reports spread by Republicans about the split and the hostility of certain prominent members of the party, were falsehoods vainly framed for the purpose of creating the very division which they declared was in existence.

Governor Hill has made an admirable executive for the Empire State. Notwithstanding the hostility some of his vetoes have evoked, and the stories that for a time seemed to damage his prospects and were designed to make him appear corrupt, he has maintained the confidence of the great body of the

people, and today has greater popular strength than any man mentioned for the position.

That he is a shrewd politician as well as a highly competent public officer no one will deny. For a long time it was thought he would be the choice of his party for President of the United States. His name was so often and so prominently mentioned in this connection, that it was supposed President Cleveland and he were at enmity. Those, however, who could pass into the inner circle of Democratic politics knew better. They understood that the friends of both gentlemen were in accord. And when Grover Cleveland was nominated by acclamation at St. Louis, for re-election to the Presidency, they counted on the nomination of David B. Hill at New York, by acclamation, for the Governorship of that State.

This movement greatly strengthens the Democratic cause in New York. That State is essential to the success of Cleveland and Thurman. Hill will in all probability carry the State by a good majority, and most of the people who vote for Hill will vote for the whole Democratic ticket.

The unanimity of sentiment at the convention is an encouraging sign. It shows that the city and county sections are working together. It is only through division in their ranks that there is danger of defeat. United they can sweep the State. The prospects are fair for victory to the Democrats in New York in November.

THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE PEOPLE.

THERE is nothing clearer, in the authorized written exponents of "Mormon" doctrine and discipline, than that the body of the Church, composed of its baptized members, male and female, is to be consulted on all questions of ecclesiastical polity and government, and that all things in the Church must be done "by common consent." Therefore the statement made by Apostle Moses Thatcher, in the Tabernacle on Sunday Sept. 8th, that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is a "theo-democracy," is precisely correct.

Utterances of this kind seem to engage a certain class of minds, extremely. Having misrepresented the "Mormon" people persistently for years, they are angered beyond decency when conclusive arguments are made that shatter their falsehoods and grind them into impalpable dust. One of the most frequent untruths told to the world is that "Mormonism" is a religious despotism, in which the priests rule as an irresponsible hierarchy, and nothing is left for the mass of the people but to do as they are bidden.

This answers very well to deceive the multitude. The pulpit takes up the refrain and the press echoes the error. Scarcely an effort is made to do out the facts. And so the country resounds with remarks about "the Mormon hierarchy" and "the absolute rule of the Mormon priesthood," when a little fair inquiry would show beyond doubt that no such thing exists in the Church that is thus defamed.

The principle of ecclesiastical government in this Church is a union of the will of God and the will of the people. *Vox Dei et vox populi.* When they agree and the agreement is made active in practice, the highest and most perfect form of government is reached. Divine wisdom and authority, with human assent and voluntary obedience make a combination of power and right, rule and liberty that cannot be excelled. It unites the heavenly and the earthly and establishes order without tyranny.

It is difficult, apparently, for some of our opponents to comprehend how there can be any liberty where there is belief that God reveals His will to man. They cannot see how people can be free to act in any matter, on their own volition, when the word of the Lord is given concerning it. This comes from hasty judgment and failure to investigate.

One principle that must be kept in view in studying the dealings of God with mankind is the agency of the creature. The mind of man is free. He may choose good or evil as he elects. Both are placed before him and he can make his own selection. As the tree of life and the tree of death were placed in the primeval paradise, and man could pluck the fruit of either at will, so are the rights and the wrongs which man can do in this world placed before all people during their earthly career, and their actions are left free. God told the pair in the garden not to eat of the fruit of one tree, but they did eat of it, all the same, and they had to suffer the consequences. The will and word of the Lord did not prevent their act of disobedience. Neither did the temptation of the opposing influence compel their disobedience. They had their agency. So have all their posterity and God never interferes with it, nor can Satan deprive them of it.

It is a mistake to suppose that the mere fact that God reveals or even commands a thing, implies man's obedience to that which is revealed. The history of the race proves to the contrary. The story of sin is a narration of human disregard of the laws of Deity. The idea that knowledge destroys sin is erroneous. The more light the greater the sin of disobedience. It is those who know the