

## EDITORIALS.

## THE GENEVA AWARD.

THOSE schemers who are advocating the distribution of the Geneva Award fund by the coming Congress, are now actively engaged in preparing the merits of the different classes of claimants in which they are interested, for presentation. Though there are different plans for the final distribution of this fund, the different classes of claimants will combine in resisting the third proposition for its disposal, namely: to make it a part of the sinking fund for the reduction and payment of the public debt. So we learn from our Washington correspondent.

This Geneva matter has claimed the attention of Congress at almost every session. Since the Award was made, by Great Britain, much discussion has been had upon it, but not one good and valid reason has yet been advanced why the money should not be distributed to claimants, their different merits to be declared, of course, by Congress. The plan of using this fund for the reduction of the public debt is simply an easy way of getting out of a troublesome question.

The money was paid to this country for damages sustained by citizens. The understanding plainly was that the money should be used for the purpose awarded, and it would clearly be a breach of faith, a blot upon the national honor to use it for any other purpose. The award says the money is paid for the "satisfaction of all claims referred." The "claims" were for damages; hence it follows that the money was awarded to pay those claims for damages, and to use it for another purpose would be other than contemplated when it was paid.

The United States did not claim the money to reduce its public debt, but to remunerate those who suffered by the *Alabama* and her sister cruisers. Every honest man in this country should feel an interest in this subject. It is one not only concerning ourselves but another nation. Our Congressmen and Senators will not show themselves men of honor unless they award this money to those for whom it was demanded and paid.

## THE AIM OF RADICALISM.

OUR Washington correspondent informs us that "the most emphatic portion of Secretary Sherman's speech at the serenade to him on Monday evening, and that which received the most applause, was his attack upon the doctrine of State rights and his demand for a central government based upon 'the changed condition of our affairs.' His declaration that as the States became more numerous, the relative importance of each one became less, was tumultuously applauded."

This shows the tendency of Republican thought, and indicates the policy of prominent men in the party which has ruled the country for twenty years. The design is to destroy a fundamental principle of American liberty. The doctrine of "States Rights," as held by the leading and influential minds of the Democratic party, is fully expressed by Article X of the Amendments to the Constitution:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The powers of the United States are distinctly defined in the "Supreme law of the land." But the Radical portion of the Republican party aim at extending the national or Federal powers far beyond the limits there defined, and the excuse is, that which is offered by Secretary Sherman, and a very poor excuse it is. Push the doctrine of that class to its logical ultimatum, and the whole character of our form of government would be changed. We could no longer call our country The United States, for there would remain but one State—the Republic. It would not be any longer "The Union," a federation of several commonwealths, but one single Nation with all its powers centred and vested in a Supreme Government, between which and a monarchy the distance or difference would be almost imperceptible.

It is chiefly because the Democracy hold to the Constitutional principle of a Union of several States each

holding rights and powers that must not be invaded by Federal authority, that we, in common with a great many of the "Mormon" people, feel interested in the present political campaign. Not that we expect any favors from a Democratic administration; not that we anticipate great changes in the conduct of public affairs by the advent of Hancock to the Presidency. But we are strongly and intensely in favor of the Constitution as it is, and view with forebodings of the national downfall, every attempt to merge the powers of the States and of the people into a centralized government, the very opposite of that which was founded by the fathers of our country, and intended to continue as the guardian and not the usurper of state and popular rights.

We do not join with those who predict the country's ruin as a consequence of either Garfield's election or Hancock's triumph. So far as the men go, as we expressed at their nominations, we believe either of them would make a good President. We take no stock in the sensational stories about either of the two candidates. The country and its material, commercial prosperity will perhaps be little affected by the victory or defeat of either of them. But the drift towards a "strong government," as the advocates of centralization call their revolutionary object, is, as we view it, dangerous to Constitutional liberty, and as the Democratic party is the only one now wielding any political power, which promises to stand in the way of this departure from the path marked out by the founders of our institutions, we have desired to see that party obtain control of public affairs, that it might be seen whether or not in its hands the original principles of our Government would be vindicated and maintained.

We do not believe in disunion; we do not advocate State Sovereignty, in the sense in which the term was used before the war; but we do believe in States Rights because we believe in the Constitution, and desire to see it sustained and kept inviolate. When the powers of the individual States are abrogated or swallowed up in an oligarchy, behold! that will be the beginning of the end!

## A FOSSIL SAURODONT.

UTAH offers a wide field for the naturalist, the geologist and the antiquarian. Specimens which would delight the enthusiastic student of pre-historic times and creatures, are frequently discovered in various parts of the Territory, and quite a number of them find their way to the Museum here, where all the most important natural curiosities should be stored for public information.

Brother C. R. Savage, the enterprising photographer of this city has taken some splendid views of a fossil recently placed in the Desert Museum. It was exhumed from the Temple quarry, Sanpete, by Bros. W. H. Folsom and Joseph J. Taylor. It is described by Professor Barfoot, as the upper part of the head of a fossil *Sauroidont*, taken from the cretaceous, Oolitic, marine strata near Manti. The *Sauroidonts* of that epoch were carnivorous, rapacious, possessing paddle like fins, and related to the pythonomorphs forms described by Prof. Marsh. In the photograph, the roof of the mouth is seen, the upper part of the head being imbedded in the country rock, a portion of which has been cut away to reveal the bone.

A small stuffed lizard is placed in front of the fossil for comparison with the pre-existing Saurian type. It is twenty-three inches long, is popularly called "The Mountain Alligator," and is the *Heloderma Suspectus* of Cope.

Both are finely brought out in the photograph, which will be an object of interest to all who pay any attention to the natural history of this wonderful mountain region.

## VICTORY OR MASSACRE?

THE whole country has been rejoicing over the "victory" achieved in Mexico by the slaughter of the famed Indian Chief Victorio and his band of warriors. It appears that they were destitute of ammunition, and being surrounded by a large number of troops, were shot down with little danger to their assailants, only three of whom bit the dust in

the encounter, while three score of the Apaches were slain on the hill where they took their last stand.

Victorio has been a terror to the settlers on the Mexican border, and has committed many savage and inhuman depredations since he was forced by military power to leave his hunting grounds and go upon a reservation that he hated and where he would not stay. Perhaps his death is a good thing for the colonists of Arizona and New Mexico, and the settlers over the Mexican line. But if the same disaster had overtaken one of the Generals who have felt the might of his arm, and seen the effects of his strategy, the news would be sounded through the land as a "massacre" and the horrible slaughter would be loudly denounced as another reason why the Indians should be exterminated. When defenceless red men are shot down by scores it is a victory. When white soldiers are overpowered by numbers and slain it is a massacre. It all depends upon the color of the skins of the victims.

## SINGULAR INCONSISTENCY.

THE New York *Herald* is often remarkably inconsistent. One day it will be Democratic in tone and the next day Republican. Not long ago it was vehemently opposed to Grant, being quite bitter in its denunciations of "General Grant" as it pointedly referred to that gentleman, never alluding to him as the ex-President; and suddenly it veered round and lauded him to the skies.

But the most singular of the *Herald's* peculiar movements is its attack on the Democratic nominee for Mayor of New York City, simply because he is a Catholic. James Gordon Bennett, the founder of that paper, was a Catholic, his son, its present proprietor, is also a Catholic, so far as his religion goes which is not very extensive, and a large number of its chief patrons are of the same creed. Besides, the *Herald* has opposed, often and with great force, the introduction of religion and religious animosities into the domain of politics. That paper admits Mr. Wm. R. Grace's personal fitness for the office, his sincerity, and the fact that a large portion of the population of New York are of the same faith, also that they are as a rule good citizens. Yet it assails Mrs. Kelly herself, the Tammany chief, a Catholic, for procuring the nomination of one of his own creed, and tries to make it appear that in doing so he has forced a religious issue into the political campaign, while the truth is, that the *Herald* has done this by its present factious opposition.

Why should not a Catholic be nominated for Mayor just as freely as a Protestant? The *Herald* does not inform us. The assault on Mr. Grace because of his religion is a big blunder, and the attack on Mr. Kelly because of his choice of a Catholic is another big blunder. The two wings of the Democratic body agreed to unite on the question of the Mayorship, on this wise: The Irving Hall leaders made a list of a dozen names of prominent citizens, either of whom would be acceptable to the followers of that branch of the party, and submitted them to Tammany. Mr. Grace was selected by the latter branch, and the whole body of the New York Democracy has thus selected him as its candidate. Mr. Kelly is not individually responsible for the nomination, and if he were, the fact that the nominee is a Catholic would not be anything to the discredit, either of the candidate or of the person who nominated him.

A man's religion, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, Gentile or Jew, "Mormon" or Methodist, should not form any feature in a political controversy, and the New York *Herald* has certainly exhibited very bad taste as well as great lack of good judgment in its latest glaring inconsistency. The editor in chief cannot surely be keeping a proper watch upon the columns of the great journalistic chameleon of America.

## MORE CORRUPTION MONEY.

As the great political day of judgment approaches, the rival parties increase their exertions and redouble their diligence. The Republicans have an immense advantage over their opponents. They can squeeze

money out of a host of office holders fearful of losing their positions and their consequent bread and dinner. There is no disputing the fact that an immense amount of money was spent in Ohio and Indiana at the State elections, and this must have somewhat depleted the treasuries of both parties. The Republicans seem to have spent the most. Indiana was doubtless won by greenback influence, although the Greenback Party received no benefit.

But the Republican sponge can be used again and again to suck up the needful element to liquidate the expenses. The following circular will clearly explain the *modus operandi* by which the corruption fund, drawn upon so heavily in October, can be replenished in November. It is addressed to office holders, many of whom dare not fail to respond for fear of the official guillotine, which will not be ready for the heads of the "unpatriotic" should the party in power be continued at the head of public affairs:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE, 1217 F Street Northwest, Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
October, 1880.

Sir.—The splendid achievements of the 12th of October show what republicans can do when their blood is up.

This committee has yet much to do to meet the energy of democratic desperation and make our coming victory complete.

To make assurance doubly sure, its hands should be strengthened.

It, therefore, appeals to you to promptly contribute to its funds an additional one per cent. of your salary.

It makes this appeal to your patriotism—the patriotism of a republican who desires not alone the election of Garfield, but also that of a working majority in both houses of Congress—in the full expectation of a hearty and prompt response.

You have hitherto sustained it nobly, and assurances crowd upon it that you are not weary of well-doing.

Remit, as before, to Geo. Frs. Dawson, Treasurer, P. O. Lock Box 723, Washington, D. C.

JAY A. HUBBELL,  
Chairman.

EW'D MCPHERSON,  
Secretary.

This phlebotomy is a disgrace to any party, and a reproach to the nation in which it is tolerated. The like of it is not known throughout the civilized world, and the heathen would blush at such shameless proceedings.

## THE "NATIONAL CITIZEN" AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE *National Citizen and Ballot Box* for October has a long article on the recent attempt of the Utah "Liberals" to deprive our lady citizens of the right to vote. Particulars are given of the *mandamus* case and the result in favor of woman suffrage. That paper takes the ground that there will be no security for the women who have the suffrage and no great progress in the cause of woman's rights, until an amendment to the Constitution is passed recognizing the right of voting as inherent in the citizen.

We have always recognized the principle—which has been sustained by the Supreme court of the United States—that while citizenship is defined and regulated by national law, the right of suffrage is to be defined and regulated by the laws of the various States. But since the Government has been entrusted with power by Constitutional Amendment to secure suffrage rights to the negro, we do not see why it should not have equal power to protect women citizens in the exercise of their political rights. Still we do not believe that an amendment of the character proposed by the Woman Suffrage Association would be approved by the people throughout the country, as it would extend the voting power to every citizen, male and female, irrespective of any local restrictions or regulations, to the entire abrogation of States Rights in this matter, and it is not likely that such a revolution would be effected. We think the proper course is to convert one State at a time to woman suffrage, and are not afraid of

political rights once vested and enjoyed, being taken away again by arbitrary rulings or enactments.

The *Citizen* closes its article with the following paragraph:

"Let this attempt to deprive the women of Utah of their political rights, nerve the heart and soul, and fire the brain of every woman to more strenuous effort for a sixteenth amendment which shall recognize the right of all United States citizens to the ballot. When once this is gained, no isolated State or Territory can strike such a blow at suffrage rights."

## Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
October, 23, 1880.

Editor *Deseret News*:

The political campaign can not be said to have lost its interest to Washingtonians, but active effort in connection with it has ceased so far as they are concerned. In the last two months they have sent numberless documents to doubtful States, and have contributed money liberally. The *Baltimore Sun* says the democrats of this city have raised more money for campaign purposes than those of Baltimore have. That the republicans, office-holders, and otherwise, have paid their full share is certain. This has all ceased now, in view of the nearness of the election. A large proportion of the clerks are, however, on their way home to vote. The older citizens of Washington are democratic, and the larger portion of her business men. But nearly all the Government employes, and perhaps ten per cent. of other white citizens, and all the negroes are republican. A loss of position consequent upon the election of Hancock would be a great hardship to the Government clerks, many of whom have bought and partially paid for houses, and most of whom are unfitted by long continuance in their present work for more active outside employment.

President Hayes writes that he will not be here before the 5th of November. He will be in Ohio in time to vote.

Those interested in the final settlement of the Geneva Award will, doubtless, be pleased to note the interest now taken in the subject by those engaged or interested in our shipping. In this connection I notice that the shipping convention recently held in Boston, in which was represented the largest ship owners and builders in the country, a resolution was proposed and unanimously adopted asking "that Congress take early action providing for the distribution of the balance in the Treasury on account of the Geneva Award fund." LEM.

Mt. Airy,  
Surry County, N. C.,  
October 22, 1880.

Editor *Deseret News*:

When I last wrote you, I was with Elder R. A. Ballantyne, in Russell County, Virginia. We had just returned from our visit through Scott and Lee Counties, Virginia, Clayborne and Hancock Counties, Tennessee.

We visited in Virginia and Tennessee Mr. Jas. J. Dickinson, Castle Woods, Russell County, Virginia; J. D. Boatright, Stony Creek, Scott County, Virginia; A. L. Loyd, Rocky Station, Lee County, Virginia; and Jno. Baker, Mulberry Valley, Hancock County, Tennessee. These gentlemen received us with kindness, some of them sent for Church works, while all were interested in what we had to say, and kindly invited us to call and see them again. They are in good circumstances, and leading minds in the localities mentioned, and will doubtless receive our elders with kindness, and assist them in getting places to preach in. We held a number of meetings in their neighborhoods and good attention was paid to our teachings.

Mr. Dickenson has a church of his own, and gave us the privilege of preaching in it as long as we desired. We held three meetings in the church which were well attended and visited a number of families, traveling like the apostles of old, carrying neither purse nor scrip, preaching wherever and whenever we had an opportunity indoors or outdoors.

On the 13th of July we started on foot with valise in hand, for North Carolina to attend conference on the 24th and 25th. Stayed a few days in Tazewell Co., Va., where we