

ment of their own purposes, it is not difficult to imagine what might be the consequences where an attempt made to enforce upon them something they were determined not to submit to.

#### UNREASONABLE AND BASELESS.

THE political plotters who inaugurated and are conducting, against the interests of the people, the disgraceful proceedings that have occupied the Third District Court for several days, never fail to take every available opportunity to refer to the half-masting episode of the Fourth of July, 1885. Their object is always the same—to distort the purpose of that incident into an insult to the emblem of union and liberty, which every true Latter-day Saint reveres.

None know better that such a construction of the intent of the act is utterly false than the parties themselves who constantly seek to give it a sinister aspect. They know, as we know, that no such purpose as they present was ever intended, and their understanding of this fact renders them all the more determined on the subject and evinces their injustice and malice.

Their conduct in this respect is intended to cover up the real object of the half-masting, which was occasioned by a condition of things they had been largely instrumental in producing. They have thought that if they could fasten upon the "Mormon" people the odium that attaches to disloyalty, which would be indicated by disrespect to the flag of our common country, prejudice against the community they have been seeking for years to reduce to political serfdom, would be increased. Under this cloud of popular bias they could conduct their wicked schemes with impunity.

Half-masting a flag is an expression of a sentiment—that of sorrow. This voiceless manifestation of grief is given when some widely respected publicist or benefactor leaves the mortal state, or when any other event transpires that is regarded as a public calamity. Was it to be presumed that the "Mormons" should be jubilant over the condition of affairs that had existed for some time? Wholesome laws passed by the local legislature for the public weal had been vetoed by wholesale by the operation of the one-man power vested in a prejudiced and one-sided Governor. A large proportion of the community had been

disfranchised without due process of law; a condition of things had been inaugurated which made practicable the wicked and illegal multiplication of indictments of "Mormons" for one offense; W. H. Dickson, who figures in the present crusade being the father of that nefarious system, which was eventually smashed by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Delegate to Congress elected by the people by an overwhelming majority, had been denied his certificate by the Governor, the latter being induced by clamoring active politicians to give it to a man who received a comparative handful of the popular vote. The initiatory steps had been instituted which have led to the present situation, when "Mormons" are practically excluded from the jury box, and are virtually denied the common right of trial by jury. The base had already been laid for the present condition, when the property of the Saints has been seized by a special and unequal process, contrary to the genius of American institutions.

In the midst of these circumstances and confronted with a future that foreboded further encroachments upon their rights and liberties, could it be expected that a people thus treated and menaced should feel otherwise than grieved at what appeared to them the partial decay of liberty? The position in which the glorious old flag was placed upon some of the buildings in this city in 1885 was simply and solely an expression of that sentiment. That and nothing more nor less, no matter what individual opinions may exist to the contrary. There was not the remotest intention of any insult to the emblem of liberty and union, any more than would be the case if it had been placed in the same position, as it often has been, on the occasion of any public calamity. Indeed, the majority regarded the wrongs that had been heaped upon them as not only disastrous to them, but that they would ultimately have that effect upon the nation, on the ground that the rights of one class of citizens cannot be invaded without those of the whole being sooner or later detrimentally affected.

We re-assert that there was no intention to show disrespect to the flag, which was planted upon Ensign Peak by the Pioneers who came to this Valley in 1847, and whose subsequent battles with the crude elements made this part of

the Republic habitable. They thus symbolized their purpose of upholding the national ensign and maintaining, to the best of their power, the glorious institutions of the country. The majority have never shifted from that ground, the falsehoods of their enemies and detractors to the contrary notwithstanding.

The most diabolical fabrications have been invented for the purpose of showing that this is not the case. Appearances may favor for a time these wicked schemers, but the fact is indestructable, and will, in course of time, be made as clear as the sun at noon-day. Until then an honest, patriotic and virtuous people must wait and struggle, and struggle and wait, till the light bursts forth, and victory perches upon the banners of those who are engaged in the battle for freedom.

The charge that the half-masting incident was or could be intended as an act of disrespect to the flag is devoid of reason or logic, is without precedent, and utterly baseless.

#### THE POLITICAL SCHEME.

THE proceedings in the Third District Court, Judge Anderson presiding, are growing more and more peculiar in their aspect. In a number of particulars they are violative of the common law, because they tend to withdraw from the citizen the protection which it guarantees. One of its provisions forbids that a witness shall be required to testify to anything that would render him infamous.

The Judge has insisted, in the proceedings that have been consuming the time of his court for several days, that a witness shall answer a question propounded by the attorneys claiming to represent the "Liberal" party, as to how many wives he has. In this instance the relation of the question to the protective provision of the common law alluded to can be seen at a glance. Judge Anderson has already ruled that a man who has at any time had more than one wife is not a man of good moral character, and has refused application for naturalization on that ground alone. The case of Mr. William C. Dunbar is in point. Mr. Penrose, as a witness, is coerced into stating, in effect, whether he is or is not a man of good moral character. This is equal to an insistence that he be compelled to render himself infamous in violation of the common law provision already cited. It is in-