

EDITORIALS.

HOME OWNERSHIP.

STUDENTS of sociology maintain, with arguments and statistics that cannot be controverted, that the influence of house ownership tends to promote all the qualities that constitute good citizens. It helps to make men conservative, orderly, moral, temperate, economical, thrifty and patriotic. The comparative exemption from strikes of Philadelphia is cited in support of this proposition. It is a great American workshop and a large number of its artisans own their own houses. Co-operative building associations have assisted the working man to rear and own a home. The great benefit to the whole community of those organizations is recognized by the State of Pennsylvania, in exempting their capital stock and mortgages, amounting to \$50,000,000, from taxation.

A learned writer in the *Age of Steel* gives some particulars furnished to him by an eminent Philadelphian bearing on this subject. "In the riots of 1877 the 20,000 members of building associations acted as an efficient counterpoise to the lawless throngs that crowded the streets. The instinct of self-preservation, of social order, was as strong with them as with the wealthier classes, and was even more effectual. It neutralized, in their own camp, the clamors of a vicious and riotous rabble, so that the presence of the mayor and the police was sufficient to quell all disorder without collision. These associations have been a potent factor in making the people prosperous and moral, encouraging sobriety, and preventing dissipation. The absence of any socialistic tendencies can undoubtedly be traced to the general ownership of homes."

The remarkable patriotism and prosperity of the Swiss people are largely attributable to this cause. The same writer says: "In Switzerland out of 485,000 households, 455,000 are householders." They are a home-owning and home-loving people. Labor troubles do not prevail there as in most civilized countries, and they are a mechanical, skillful and progressive people.

One of the prominent features of the "Mormon" system is its encouragement of home-ownership. The story is extensively told that the Church owns most of the land in Utah and thus has a hold upon the people, tending to their subordination. The truth is that there are more people in proportion to numbers in Utah, that own their own houses and the land upon which they are built than in any other part of the United States or in Europe. Every man is advised and urged to acquire "a stake in the country." The title to the real estate, held chiefly in small parcels in Utah, as vested absolutely in the holders and comes to them by patent from the Government, not by sufferance of the Church. The farms are mostly small, and owned by the cultivators. Renting is discouraged, individual ownership promoted.

The effects of this are the very opposite to what is supposed to be the tendency of "Mormonism." People are made measurably independent. They learn to think and act for themselves. They become attached to the soil and the homes they rear upon it. Notwithstanding what part of the globe they came from, they are localized and identified with their possessions. True patriotism and permanent residence are mutually promoted. They make stable and desirable citizens. The social disorders that disturb the world are unlikely to mar their peace. Industry and morality are encouraged, and the natural consequence is a peaceful and thrifty community.

The serfdom and ecclesiastical domination talked about as prevailing in "Mormondom" would not exist under these circumstances. The very atmosphere of these mountain regions, with the ownership of the land and the habitations the people occupy, tend to establish liberty. But what about the charges that the people of Utah have no freedom, that they vote as one man dictates, that they are compelled to do and say and pay as ordered by their leaders? *All lies.* Not mistakes, except of those who repeat them believing they are true, but willful, malicious, groundless fabrications, concocted with the intention to deceive, and told over and over again in various shapes and forms by local anti-"Mormon" sheets, knowing that they are absolutely and entirely false.

The older members of this community have come out from the thrall of sectarianism and the control of wealthy and masterful employers, to gain and rejoice in religious, social and political liberty. They acquire a home, they worship God according to their faith, they become citizens and—both male and female—have a thoroughly secret ballot. There is no power to prevent them from acting and voting as they please within the law. They are as free as it is possible for men and women to be in a Territory, where many of the privileges of citizenship are withheld by the power of the national government. Their unity, whether religious or political, comes from choice. If they take advice on either subject it is because they choose to do so. There is nothing that can compel them.

They know that the preservation of their liberties depends upon that union which gives them strength, and therefore they hold together.

We are glad when we learn of people who work for others breaking loose from the position of wage-laborers, and striking out into newer districts to gain and own a home and achieve independence. A small place with a clear title is better than a large domain encumbered with another's proprietorship. The "Mormons" are and should continue to be a community of house-owners.

A great deal of vile and nonsensical abuse has been heaped upon some of our leading men because they have advised the people not to sell out their homes to strangers. Can any candid and sane person say that such advice is not wise and beneficial? If the "Mormons" sell out their homesteads to their enemies, is it not tantamount to giving them the victory? Common sense and the most ordinary prudence protest against the turning over of lands and houses to those who are striving to gain that political and financial control in Utah which they pretend to denounce and oppose. While the "Mormons" keep possession of the soil and own the houses built upon it, they will retain the balance of power, and will not become a prey to their enemies.

Let them all strive to be home owners free from debt to Jew, Gentile or "Mormon," serve the Lord in faith and humility, teach their children correct principles and set them good examples, and they will grow into a mighty State famous for all the virtues and strong in the power of righteousness; and all hell and its minions, whether in the flesh or in the spirit, will be unable to conquer them and bring them into captivity.

"THE MORMON INVASION."

AMONG other papers the *Christian Union* is exercised over what it calls "the Mormon invasion." Endorsing the endeavor to suppress "Mormonism" by legislation, it deplores the influx of "Mormon" immigrants and the impossibility of preventing it under the laws. A representative of that paper visited Castle Garden a short time ago and had a long interview with Mr. Stephenson, the disgruntled emigration commissioner, who feels so bad over his inability to send our emigration back to the countries from whence they came. The *Union* reporter says:

"The Superintendent is of the opinion that it is impossible to do anything to prevent this immigration under our present laws, and that any effective legislation would be almost impossible unless we rewrite the Constitution. The fact that the immigrants are bound for Utah does not prove that they are Mormons; the fact that they are Mormons does not prove that they intend to become polygamists. The Superintendent said that the Mormon immigrants are fully up to the average in appearance and in intelligence, and that they are infinitely superior to the Italians and Hungarians. He said that the classes which the officials wished most to exclude were the very classes which they could not exclude. The Mormons had homes awaiting them in Utah, and the Italians were able to live on what the Irish throw away."

We clip the foregoing because it is testimony from a hostile source in regard to the general character of the "Mormon" immigration, which contradicts the untrue assertion made by many, that the "Mormon" arrivals are of a low and degraded class. The objections of Commissioner Stephenson to the two classes of emigrants appear more singular than sensible. If the "Mormons" have homes awaiting them in Utah, they certainly are not likely to become chargeable to the public, and if the Italians can live where others would starve, they are less likely to become a burden on the public than the Irish, against whose landing the Commissioner does not appear to object.

The *Union* seems to have waked up to the comprehension of two facts in regard to Utah emigrants, that other journals which touch on this question would do well to consider: There are people who come to this Territory from the old world who are not "Mormons," and it does not follow that because a man is a "Mormon" he intends to practice polygamy. The two terms "Mormonism" and "polygamy" are foolishly confounded by many otherwise intelligent people, and thus there is a general misapprehension of the subject.

Commissioner Stephenson and other anti-"Mormon" cranks would like, no doubt, to re-write the Constitution so as to suit their bigoted and sectarian notions. But it is not probable that they will obtain a contract for that job, nor that the country will change that instrument of freedom for the purpose of extinguishing "Mormonism." And, judging from the tendency of recent times and sentiments, it is probable that, with a very large number of the people of this country, the Constitution will not count for much, but whatever appears to be the popular will of the moment, as Senator Edmunds has intimated, will be taken for the Constitution.

Under the provisions of that heaven-

inspired document the "Mormon" has just as much right to land on these shores, and to preach and promulgate his religious principles, and worship God in his own way, as a member of any other religious body. For these rights the "Mormons" are likely to contend in their own interest and on behalf of all other religionists, orthodox or otherwise. And without violating the solemn guarantees of the Constitution of this country no injury can be done either to the "Mormons" or their creed. The fact that there are people who want it changed or ignored in the treatment of the "Mormon" question, proves that the cause of those opponents is wrong and that they cannot assail our religion with lawful weapons. "Mormonism" will remain a puzzle and a stumbling block to this generation, until public opinion is so changed that the system will be investigated on its merits. The change will come in due season.

BEHOLD! THE PERFECT MAN.

A few hot-headed anti-"Mormons" at Malad City, Idaho, have been heaping up hyperbole. They hoisted United States Marshal Dubois upon a very long and slender political pole. Ten chances to one the fragile reed will snap in the middle and let the poor man down with a thud. This is the way they whetted and resolved:

"WHEREAS, We, the anti-"Mormon" citizens of Oneida County, in mass meeting assembled, having the most unbounded faith in the integrity, honesty of purpose and unquestionable loyalty to our cause of Fred T. Dubois, and believing that with his spotless name and unimpeachable character he could do more at the national capital to speedily settle the overshadowing question of Mormonism than any other single individual; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates from this county to the Territorial Republican Convention, to be held at Hailey, Idaho, on the 8th day of September, 1886, are hereby instructed to cast their ballots, first, last, and all the time, for Fred T. Dubois Esq., as Delegate to Congress.

An analysis of the idea of the rabid anti-"Mormon" as to what constitutes "integrity, honesty of purpose and unquestionable loyalty"—combined with "a spotless name and unimpeachable character," will doubtless prove interesting to future generations, should they ever revert to the subject. To be entitled to such an eulogy it is only necessary to trample upon the rights of an unpopular people, and set at defiance, in dealing with them, every principle of justice and mercy. This is Dubois' chief virtue. To exhibit this fact it is only necessary to quote his boast, which he admitted, under oath, that he had made: "I have now got a jury that will convict any Mormon charged with unlawful cohabitation, innocent or guilty. It would convict Jesus Christ if he were brought before the court for trial on this charge." This characteristic is what has, in the eyes of the Oneida anti-"Mormon" orgies, cleansed Mr. Dubois from sin and made him the ideal angel of their resolution. Doubtless the dare-devil Dubois laughs in his secret sleeve at such gigantic jokes on facts that are cracked at his expense.

Let the Republican political war cry be heralded through every vale of Idaho and from every high mountain let it be sounded in trumpet tones: "Dubois the spotless." Let fall ordinary mortals take a back seat and veil their faces when such an embodiment of resplendent purity is brought before the popular gaze. Mr. Dubois should soon illuminate Malad with his presence, that his worshippers may have an opportunity to hug his pedestal and wipe the dust from his number nines.

A WONDERFUL MAN.

If the Panama Canal is not completed with European capital, in spite of all opposition and the numerous drawbacks with which the enterprise has had to contend, it will not be the fault of its vigorous projector. Although M. de Lesseps underrated by at least one-half the probable cost of the canal, and the French Government refused to authorize a farther loan, yet the money—\$120,000,000—has been raised in small amounts by private subscription, and the great engineer, financier and manager has again triumphed over apparently insurmountable obstacles. De Lesseps is a living and notable example of the possibilities of skill, determination, pluck and energy. He is a wonderful old man, and it really looks now as though the builder of the Suez canal will, after all, achieve another and greater engineering victory at Panama.

AN EVIDENCE OF DISLOYALTY.

The *Signs of the Times*, of Oakland, California, in one of its issues, published the following note:

"In the report of the last meeting of the 'Home Protection Society' the following paragraph occurs:—"

"Mr. — said there was a higher law than the law of man—the law of

God. He did not believe in violating the law of God by enforcing the law of the Legislature."

The same paper thus comments:

"Correct. We could not have stated our position any more clearly. We hope the gentleman will continue to impress this fact upon the members of the Society."

Had the editor of the *Signs of the Times* been a "Mormon" and published his paper here, he would have been denounced by the anti-democracy clique as disloyal, and the statement would have been heralded as an evidence of the disloyalty of the community with which he was connected.

THAT WIDESPREAD SPEECH.

We are reliably informed that the hotels and other public places on the Pacific Coast have been flooded with copies of the speech made by District Attorney Dickson at the recent "Campfires," held in this city. The utterance, publication and spread of such a scandalous campaign document, especially in view of its original source—a Federal official—constitute, in our estimation, a heinous crime. It affords some gratification to know that this view is also held by many intelligent non-"Mormons," who have some regard for fairness and truth.

The accusation against the "Mormon" people, of perpetrating wholesale perjury before the courts in cases of unlawful cohabitation, etc., is not only ungenerous and cruel, but utterly unwarranted by the facts that have been constantly under the cognizance of the gentleman himself. In fact no one is better informed on the subject than he. If there has been any perjury or even perversion on the part of the class of people against whom Mr. Dickson laid the gross accusation, they must necessarily have been limited to but a few persons. Of course it would not have served his purpose to have directed the attention of his listeners to the powerful temptation under which they were placed. Ordinarily when a person is accused of a breach of the laws there is a prosecuting witness, and the surroundings and proceedings are of an entirely different character to those in the class of cases to which Mr. Dickson referred. In the latter the rules for a complaint to be sworn out by some person, on information supplied by some secret informer. Neither the person who informs nor the one who complains is called upon to act as a witness for the prosecution. In fact the latter is generally in total ignorance of details further than perhaps those he may have heard from the undercurrent sneak. The persons relied upon by the prosecution are the wives (including the legal wife) parents, children, general relatives and intimate friends of the accused. They are dragged before commissioners, grand juries and courts to testify against the husband, father, son, brother or esteemed friend as the case might be. In yielding to legal or judicial compulsion in this trying ordeal, witnesses have to set aside the most overwhelming sentiments that can possess the human heart—the love and devotion of the wife to the husband, the yearning of the mother for the son or daughter, the affection of the child for the parent and the friendly devotion of which all properly constituted people are capable. Couple this condition with the fact that the witnesses believe the offense charged is merely a crime by prohibition and not intrinsically together with the sentiment of duty, which cannot, in some of the relationships, be discarded or eliminated. Bring the whole together and there is a situation of the most trying, perplexing and—the sneers of the stonyhearted to the contrary notwithstanding—intensely pathetic character. Even if some instances of departure from truth should occur, under such a unique and trying ordeal, should there be any astonishment? Or is there any room for unqualified denunciation?

It is here reasserted, if there has been departures from truth under such tempting conditions they have been necessarily meagre, and this should be a cause for surprise. The prosecution of "Mormons" by the courts for unlawful cohabitation, etc., demonstrates that they, as a whole, are strongly entrenched in a love for truth and are not readily tempted to prevaricate, even when to do so would be to their apparent advantage. Mr. Dickson, their wholesale accuser and denouncer, knows that probably not more than one-fourth of the cases have ever been ordinarily tried in the courts at all. The three-fourths or thereabout of the accused frankly admitted, in court, their family relationships, etc. Had he been frank, generous, or even truthful, would he have passed over this exhibition of honesty and truthfulness in connection with the great majority of cases? Nor can he state correctly that as a rule the testimony in the cases of those who elected to set up a legal defense—which was their right—that his own witnesses—the relatives and friends of the persons in jeopardy, were untruthful in their statements. If he had any knowledge on which to base such a shameful accusation, he would doubtless, in pursuance of his duty as a prosecuting

officer, have pursued them for perjury. The fact that he has not done so, demonstrates that he spoke without knowledge or he neglected his duty.

Believing that Mr. Dickson, in making the statements that he did, committed an act but little if anything short of an egregious crime, we have treated upon his action with some severity. We are not prompted, in doing so, by personal animus. Neither is it actuated by his public assault upon this journal, for which we care not a rush, but our duty is clear in regard to doing what can be done to correct his misrepresentations. Such tasks are herculean, however, in view of the flood of falsehood, and the foul brood of which she is the mother—prejudice, hate and persecution. It has already been demonstrated that Dr. Dickson made a false statement in which he slandered the dead as well as the living. Also that he made an assertion which would require a revolution of the laws of physiology to render true—that he knew a man who had married a mother, daughter and granddaughter, and was raising children by each. No doubt the utter absurdity of the statement was lost sight of by him in the anxiety to create an anti-"Mormon" impression on the G. A. R.

Now we make another quotation from his "campfire" speech. He knew at the time that (when he uttered the assertion) it was untrue, yet it is published abroad as a veritable fact. Here are his precise words:

"There has never been a man called for sentence in the Third District Court or in the First or Second District Courts, but who had the chance to go thence free, without punishment of any kind, if he would but simply say: 'From this time forward I will obey the laws of the United States.'"

It is not necessary to hunt up the record to prove the falsity of this utterance. The evidence is fresh in the public mind that Messrs. Orson Arnold, John Sharp and S. W. Sears were each fined \$300; John Daynes \$100, and T. O. Angell, if we recollect aright, a similar amount. The two latter had pled for leniency owing to their financial inability. With all of these cases Mr. Dickson was officially connected as District Attorney, yet they each and all promised to obey the law in the future as construed by the courts. The only instance, in our recollection, of a "Mormon" charged with unlawful cohabitation being allowed "to go thence (from the Third District Court) free, without any punishment of any kind," under the condition cited by Mr. Dickson was Mr. C. V. Spencer. The same general course has been pursued in the other two districts.

We have no epithets to hurl against Mr. Dickson, because their use is a vulgarity to which no respectable journal should stoop. But we must express regret that he or any other man—especially an official representative of this great government—should descend to such contemptible and malignant procedure in a public capacity as his notorious and wide-spread speech shows that he has been guilty of. It lays at his own door the charge he so flagrantly made against innocent men, women and children. The difference between an untruth uttered under oath and one not covered by that sacred obligation is not so very great in a moral sense, if it is so legally. Those who will be guilty of the sin in the one case will not be likely to be over particular about it in the other.

THE OUTLOOK FOR IRELAND.

THE Queen's address to Parliament is very meagre and non-committal. It leaves the Irish question open for any policy that the new Government may see fit to adopt. But the policy of coercion seems to have been abandoned by the new administration. Instead, we may look for a scheme looking to the home rule principle and embodying the essential part of Gladstone's bill, while eschewing its most objectionable features.

Lord Randolph Churchill's speech in the Commons and Lord Salisbury's in the Lords, are pointers in the direction of concession to Ireland. The political gymnastics in which the new Chancellor of the Exchequer has often indulged, justify the belief that he may turn a complete summersault on the Irish question, and thus bid for the support not only of the Hartington and Churchill faction of the Liberal party, but also of the little band of Parnellites whose united vote forms an important factor in the sum of the new Parliament, as it did of the old one.

We believe the final result will be very much of a vindication for the Grand Old Man who has set his heart on the liberation of Ireland. No effectual plan can be adopted which does not recognize the main principle of his measure, which the Tories rejected. He still holds to his former views and sees no reason to change them, unless it may be in some minor details. And whether the Tory government manages to perfect a home rule scheme, or there comes another change of cabinets, Gladstone's object will no doubt, in the main, be eventually accomplished.

It is not at all unlikely that Churchill will prove more radical than the Radicals, and more liberal than the Liber-