



GEORGE Q. CANNON,
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Wednesday, - - - May 22, 1872.

DOUBTLESS many of the persons who found their names appended to the copy of that remarkable Petition and letter accompanying, which was published in last evening's NEWS, were very highly interested when they discovered the real nature of the document itself. For it is but charitable to suppose that many whose signatures there appear were ignorant of the contents of the petition, further than that it was a petition in opposition to a State government for Utah, if even they knew so much as that. People would see and read the document when published in the NEWS, whether or not they heard, read or saw it in the original manuscript, if indeed that was ever before them when they "signed the paper," or when it was signed for them by others, for it is hardly supposable that infants can sign their names when so many adults can scarcely make a legible scratch. Of course the signers did not expect to see the Petition with their names attached to it in the DESERET NEWS. O no! Much less did they whose names are there and who did not sign it have any such expectation. O no! They never apprehended that. If such contingency had been dreamed of by many of those who appear as signers, it is probable that they would have indulged in a little more thought and less action in the premises. But secret things are frequently fated to come to light, sometimes when least expected, and really such disclosures are occasionally very awkward matters.

This petition is one of the curiosities of literature. It is very remarkable, very—"something very good." The signatures are very remarkable, very. The most was evidently made of the assumed facts that the signers had been residents of the Territory for so and so many years and some of them had been members of the church for so and so many years. We have no disposition to deny that a child of five years of age, who was born in the Territory and had never been outside of it, had really been residing in the Territory five years. Again, a child of five years old, born in the church, may be assumed to have been five years in the church, although said child may have had no distinct idea of what constituted the church. But we can hardly become reconciled to the idea that any children of such tender years voluntarily signed that petition. We can hardly believe that any children of such an age signed the petition at all, though doubtless officious and accommodating individuals were not lacking to sign for the little ones, with or without their infantile consent or knowledge. We are very well assured that many of the reputed signers, whether infantile or adult, had not the most remote idea of the peculiar statements contained in the petition. Moral—never affix your signature to a document which you have not read, or with the contents of which you are not well acquainted, and not then unless you heartily approve of them and they are worthy of an honorable man's or woman's hearty approval. Be sure and suspect those Bohemians or others who make it their business to importune people to sign a petition, and never sign any such thing merely to get rid of the importuners.

This petition business is a very ticklish one. This present whole affair is very peculiar. The petition was manifestly a got-up, manufactured-to-order concern. The purpose—well, a good guesser would find no difficulty in divining that. It is patent to anybody with half an eye. The signers were a motley crowd, mostly "Gentiles," hating the "Mormons," or apostates, hating them still worse. In either case the large majority were rankly prejudiced, and consequently their petition, if they read it, and if their signatures were bona fide, was open to suspicion, and in the cases where the reputed signers did not read nor properly un-

derstand the petition, that document was a fraud and their approval a fraud, being only apparent, unless expressed otherwise than by the unauthorized application of their names to the document. Part "Gentiles," part apostates, part unthinking juveniles, all more or less ignorant, or more or less prejudiced. It will hardly be contended that the juvenile signers were not ignorant, or that the "Gentile" signers were not prejudiced. As for the apostate signers, such characters are notoriously untrustworthy the world over and have been from time immemorial. The question is, were they truthful and honest before their apostasy, or after, or at all? Now, or then, or ever, that's the question, solvable only by abundant and satisfactory evidence, which, somehow or other, is usually very difficult to obtain. There is another very peculiar thing connected with some of these signers. There are several signers "18 years in the Territory," "20 years in the Territory," "23 years in the Territory," and some as long or longer "in the Mormon church." Now without casting discredit on the figures, it will be at once considered exceedingly wonderful, nay miraculous, how these people could possibly stay here so long and live to sign a petition describing the horrible nature of society in this Territory, and furthermore in said petition plainly indicate that they were even yet anxious and determined to stay in such a dreadfully unpleasant portion of the country. This is one of the most peculiar of all the very peculiar things connected with this very peculiar petition and the very peculiar signers thereof. However, some people do like to be miserable, and they do like to talk about their misery too, though it is not everybody that likes to take his troubles to Congress.

This brings us by an easy transition from the signers to the petition, and now we will give a few moments consideration to the ponderous subject matter of the petition, which is of a truly fearful character. The petitioners first are very anxious for protection, just as if they were contemplating the doing of some mean or criminal thing, and wanted to be protected therein. Then they say only the Federal Government can secure constitutional rights in Utah, of which we have nothing to complain, providing the local Federal Judiciary are excluded from that meaning, for they have been the great preventers of people enjoying their constitutional rights in Utah. There is further some claptrap nonsense about bloody despotism, atonement for disobedience, people possessing nothing of their own, petitioners being robbed, women deprived of shelter and children of bread by Brigham Young's command, and other vile calumnies.

The petition states that no man's life, no woman's honor has been safe in Utah, when there is not one of the signers who has arrived past the years of childhood and does not know that in no Territory has human life been held more sacred than in this, that in no community on earth has woman's honor been held in such high regard as in this, and that no system is so calculated to honor and exalt womankind as "Mormonism" is. "Thousands of women within the Territory of Utah are to-day in a condition of abject slavery," and "many of them would proclaim their wrongs to the world if they dared." We have heard something of this abject slavery before, but we have never been able to discover any of the abject slaves, not one. How this statement that these slaves "would proclaim their wrongs to the world if they dared," is to be reconciled with the previous statement that "now, when liberty of speech, so long denied, is vouchsafed, it is fitting that woman's voice should be heard," the petitioners do not rise to explain. "Some of your petitioners have known what it is to incur his displeasure and tremble for their lives." We do not doubt it, for very likely some of the petitioners are as great criminals as ever went unhung. "Others have had their property torn from them, and their dearest rights ruthlessly trampled upon." Have they, when and where? We know people who did not sign that petition, but who have lost property and have had their dearest rights ruthlessly trampled upon by Federal judges. That is the heaviest trampling of the kind we have seen, but the petition never mentions it.

But the funniest thing of all in this petition was that a number of two-year-old-resident petitioners, very peaceful and mind-their-own-business sort of people withal, had felt as if they were in an enemy's country and had been

told by the DESERET NEWS that if they did not like the condition of things here, the railroad was open and they could leave. We do not think any "Mormons" are enemies to such people. But why find fault with us for telling them that the road was open and if they did not like to stay they could leave for a more congenial locality? They surely did not wish us to tell them that they could not go away, did they? They could hardly have wished us to say that we would have the road blocked so that they could not get away, could they? They did not expect nor desire us to say that here they were and here they must remain, *volens volens*, did they? That is not our disposition at all. We hold that Utah is free for all, to come or go at their pleasure. We should not blockade the railroad to prevent and please them. There has been blockade enough already. Once more we say, and say boldly, even in the face of the contingency of our words being incorporated in another dreadful petition, that any persons who do not like to stay in Utah can go away if they choose. We will go further than that and say that any persons who do not like to stay in Utah can stay here notwithstanding, and stay as long as they like or dislike, at their own individual option. We do not see how we can be more liberal than that. But some people are never satisfied—it is impossible to say or do anything to please them.

In all that we have said of this petition, we desire to cast no aspersions upon those whose names were procured for the petition upon false pretences or through incorrect impressions. They are doubtless sufficiently mortified by finding their names in such undesirable connection.

We live under a republican form of government. The popular idea of such a government is that its officers are the friends and fellow citizens of the people. One cannot conceive of such officers being tyrants, and enemies of the people in whose midst they act; for conduct of this kind on their part would be incompatible with every idea of true republicanism. But while this is correct in theory, and Utah Territory is a part of the Republic of the United States of America, we have in our midst men, acting as officers, who, since their advent here, have conducted themselves towards us as if they were determined to accomplish our ruin. Were we a conquered race, instead of a free people, they could not deport themselves towards us with greater apparent determination to crush us and destroy our liberties. No rulers sent here by a victorious power to carry out its despotic behests could more persistently and unrelentingly pursue a course of high-handed oppression. They have not only endeavored to break down every bulwark erected by constitutional law and statutory enactment to guard the liberties of the people; but, to justify themselves in their atrocities, they have, by means of the telegraph and the press, flooded the country with falsehoods, and endeavored to create the impression everywhere that the people of Utah were disloyal to the government, that they lived in a state of chronic rebellion, that, in their midst, the lives and property of people who came from other places were not safe and that they stood in an attitude of perpetual hostility to the execution of the laws. This has been the course pursued by many of the present officials of this Territory.

In thus speaking of these men we do not make assertions unsupported by proof. Let the record of the present judges of this Territory, since their advent here, be examined, and those not familiar with the past two years will be astonished that such actions as theirs could be perpetrated in free America, or that free people would endure them.

Governors and Judges of States and other Territories have some pride in their sections and people. They, at least, do not malign and abuse them. They do not seek to excite the animosity of the nation and of the government against them. They do not make it their constant aim to gain advantages over them, to set aside their laws, to neuter contempt for their regulations, to array class against class, to constantly misrepresent their conduct and place it in an unfavorable light before the country. But how has it been with these officials in Utah? Who can give us an instance, during the incumbency of our present Governor and Judges, of their speaking favorably of the settlers of this Territory? Have they not always spoken and acted, in their official capacity, as if they were

our enemies, and bent upon accomplishing our destruction?

Visitors sometimes ask why it is that these officials have so little sympathy with the citizens. No men who seek to injure a people and steb their reputations can have sympathy with them. If they express it, those who listen to it feel that it is hollow, and from the lips and not the heart. The people themselves instinctively know who are their real friends; they cannot be imposed upon for any length of time by the hypocritical pretensions of sympathy from men who at heart are their enemies. Look at the case of Judge McKean. What sympathy can there be between him and the people of Utah? True, he is the Chief Justice of the Territory. But what was the business in which he was engaged at the last advices? Calumniating the citizens of Utah, and endeavoring by that means to obtain legislation from Congress that would enable him to come back here and carry out his infamous purposes in which he was so signally defeated by the Supreme Court. Can there be any sympathy between such a man and us—a man who urges the passage of laws, which, if enacted, he is to enforce, and by which he would be enabled, he hopes, to tread on our necks? There is no more sympathy between such a man and the people than there is between a prowling wolf and the flock of sheep which he seeks to devour.

How is it with his associates? The answer is to be found in the recent decisions of Judge Strickland in certain liquor cases, that the municipal authorities had no judicial powers.

As to Judge Hawley his letter to Gen. Ord, in a congressional document, which we publish in another column, exhibits the sympathy which he has for the people of the Territory. Had this letter been written after the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States had been made, it is probable that the writer would scarcely have styled himself "one of the associate justices of the supreme court of the United States in and for the Territory of Utah." That is one of the many assumptions of our Judges which the Supreme Court has thrown aside, as shown by the following extract from the Clinton-Engelbrecht decision—

There is no supreme court of the United States, nor is there any district court of the United States, in the sense of the constitution, in the Territory of Utah. The judges are not appointed for the same terms, nor is the jurisdiction which they exercise part of the judicial power conferred by the constitution or the general government. The courts are the legislative courts of the Territory, created in virtue of the clause which authorizes congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories belonging to the United States. (American Insurance Company vs. Canter, 1 Peters, 545.)

The supreme court of the Territory was doubtless misled by the inadvertent use of the words "Marshal of the district court of the United States for the Territory of Oregon," in the Organic law. This act defines the duties, liabilities and fees of the marshal for the Territory by reference to those of the marshal of the district court of the United States for the Territory of Oregon. On reference to the act organizing that Territory, we find that the duties of the marshal were to be the same as those of the marshal for the district court of the United States for the Territory of Wisconsin. On reference to the act organizing the last named Territory, the duties, liabilities and fees of the marshal were described to be the same as those of the "Marshal of the district court of the United States for the northern district of New York." Hence, the words "Marshal of the district court of the United States" have crept into the various acts organizing these Territories. But the description of a court which was proper in a State would be improper in a Territory.

The Organic act authorized the appointment of an attorney and a marshal for the Territory, who may properly enough be called the attorney and marshal of the United States for the Territory, for their duties in the courts have exclusive relation to cases arising under the laws and constitution of the United States.

We have touched upon the evidences of sympathy and good feeling manifested by the judges to the people of the Territory; we have it, also, in our power to show what the attitude and feelings of the Governor are towards them. We refer our readers to the letter from Governor Woods, accompanying that from Judge Hawley to General Ord.

We do not know of any such place as Knob in the Territory, or in the neighboring Territories. If Judge Hawley meant Kanab, there were only about thirty men in the place, including the members of Major Powell's exploring expedition.

The plea that a fort at Beaver was necessary for the protection of the