

NEWS OF THE DAY.

The Babcock trial at St. Louis terminated today, with a verdict of "not guilty."

Counterfeit bonds of the New York Central and California and Oregon Railroad Companies have been discovered at Brussels.

The House committee on ways and means have voted to report a bill to carry into effect the treaty between the U. S. and the Sandwich Islands.

A melancholy railway accident occurred last night near Wallingford, on the Harlem extension railroad. Mr. Blueli, keeper of the Sherrin House, was killed.

Intense cold weather last night at Philadelphia.

Fifteen thousand dollars damage by fire at Evansville, Ind.

Twenty-one houses burned at Caseyville.

General Schenck's connection with the Emancipation considered today by the U. S. House committee on foreign affairs.

In the inquiry on the investigation of the Strachan disaster, a verdict of manslaughter was returned against the officer in charge of the Franconia.

Another bill for Utah has been introduced in Congress by Senator Christianity.

A sleeping car burned and inmates have a narrow escape, on the railway between Louisville and Memphis.

The Orphan Home, three miles from Buffalo, N. Y., burned yesterday.

Seventy thousand dollars damage by fire at Davenport, Iowa.

Revolution and financial panic imminent in Hayti.

Von Arnim is given three weeks respite and is summoned to surrender and go to prison.

Twenty-eight thousand Herzegovinian insurgents in Dalmatia.

CHRISTIANITY'S UTAH BILL.

It appears that Senator Christianity has introduced another Utah bill into the Senate—a bill to "regulate" elections and to restrict the suffrage in this Territory. The "reg" here is tired of being outvoted, badly outvoted, all the time, and consequently is anxious to procure a law to disfranchise a large portion of the people of the Territory, and so bring the vote of the minority to a majority, as everything is fair in politics.

This bill restricts the suffrage in this Territory in three ways—

1. By abolishing woman suffrage.

2. By allowing the United States to can citizens over 21 years old to vote.

3. By disfranchising all citizens who may have entered into plural marriage since 1862.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

By Telegraph.

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

Last Night's Dispatches.

EASTERN.

Sleeping Car Burned.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., 23.—About 3 o'clock this morning the sleeping car between Memphis and St. Louis was discovered on fire. Before the train could be stopped the flames caught heavily that the passengers were unable to escape, leaving their clothes and light baggage behind, which, with the car, were entirely consumed. Many of the passengers, including some ladies, arriving here in deplorable condition.

Democratic Convention.

NEW HAVEN, 23.—The democratic State convention was held today. Every town in the State had a full delegation. The old ticket was re-nominated. It is as follows: Governor, Charles R. Sargent; Lieutenant Governor, George C. Sargent; Treasurer, William E. Raymond; Comptroller, Albert R. Goodrich.

Closing Speech in the Babcock Case.

ST. LOUIS, 23.—District Attorney Dyer, at the conclusion of his closing argument in the Babcock case this morning, referred to his conduct in office, since he assumed it nine months ago and entered upon the prosecution of the case. He disclaimed the idea that he had been led into the prosecution of any case, and told the jury that he had appeared with malicious intent, that as a representative of the people to prosecute the great wrong.

The case he characterized as a most remarkable one, and the course of the defense as still more remarkable. He accused Judge Porter of trying to drag the President into the case needlessly and groundlessly, and said the President's decision is for the jury; he has been examined, and I shall comment on his testimony as I would on that of any other witness. But when the gentleman for a purpose of his own, represents the President as on trial, I don't intend that the red flag which he has thus planted in my face shall be followed to the battle. As well might he have said that the President was on trial when John McDonald was tried, or as well when any other of these conspirators were before the Court.

At some length Col. Dyer attempted to show that this case was used by the defense to influence Republicans on the jury, and he then continued his attack on the address of the gentleman who had put me in the attitude of assailing the administration. I intend to bring this defendant from behind the desk of the President, where they have tried to place him, and I intend that he shall stand on his own merits in this case, and that they shall not bring a verdict from this jury by pretending that the President is on trial. When, or by whom of the prosecution has the President been assailed? Col. Broadhead has not done it in his argument; I did not in my opening, and yet, for an hour yesterday, Judge Porter has here and there defended the President. Sensible and wise as they say General Grant is, he will not thank the gentleman for dragging him into this case in this manner. What motive should actuate me in attacking the President? There is not a man on that jury, or on the bench, or in my voice, who does not know that I am a Republican. Why should I insult General Grant? I voted for his nomination for the Presidency, and the polls will show that I voted for his reelection. Nine months ago he signed the commission which enables me to speak here to-day, but I do not intend that General Babcock, the private secretary to the President, shall escape because he is the private secretary. I would try him as I would try Bassett or McFall.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

By Telegraph.

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

Last Night's Dispatches.

EASTERN.

Sleeping Car Burned.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., 23.—About 3 o'clock this morning the sleeping car between Memphis and St. Louis was discovered on fire. Before the train could be stopped the flames caught heavily that the passengers were unable to escape, leaving their clothes and light baggage behind, which, with the car, were entirely consumed. Many of the passengers, including some ladies, arriving here in deplorable condition.

Democratic Convention.

NEW HAVEN, 23.—The democratic State convention was held today. Every town in the State had a full delegation. The old ticket was re-nominated. It is as follows: Governor, Charles R. Sargent; Lieutenant Governor, George C. Sargent; Treasurer, William E. Raymond; Comptroller, Albert R. Goodrich.

Closing Speech in the Babcock Case.

ST. LOUIS, 23.—District Attorney Dyer, at the conclusion of his closing argument in the Babcock case this morning, referred to his conduct in office, since he assumed it nine months ago and entered upon the prosecution of the case. He disclaimed the idea that he had been led into the prosecution of any case, and told the jury that he had appeared with malicious intent, that as a representative of the people to prosecute the great wrong.

The case he characterized as a most remarkable one, and the course of the defense as still more remarkable. He accused Judge Porter of trying to drag the President into the case needlessly and groundlessly, and said the President's decision is for the jury; he has been examined, and I shall comment on his testimony as I would on that of any other witness. But when the gentleman for a purpose of his own, represents the President as on trial, I don't intend that the red flag which he has thus planted in my face shall be followed to the battle. As well might he have said that the President was on trial when John McDonald was tried, or as well when any other of these conspirators were before the Court.

At some length Col. Dyer attempted to show that this case was used by the defense to influence Republicans on the jury, and he then continued his attack on the address of the gentleman who had put me in the attitude of assailing the administration. I intend to bring this defendant from behind the desk of the President, where they have tried to place him, and I intend that he shall stand on his own merits in this case, and that they shall not bring a verdict from this jury by pretending that the President is on trial. When, or by whom of the prosecution has the President been assailed? Col. Broadhead has not done it in his argument; I did not in my opening, and yet, for an hour yesterday, Judge Porter has here and there defended the President. Sensible and wise as they say General Grant is, he will not thank the gentleman for dragging him into this case in this manner. What motive should actuate me in attacking the President? There is not a man on that jury, or on the bench, or in my voice, who does not know that I am a Republican. Why should I insult General Grant? I voted for his nomination for the Presidency, and the polls will show that I voted for his reelection. Nine months ago he signed the commission which enables me to speak here to-day, but I do not intend that General Babcock, the private secretary to the President, shall escape because he is the private secretary. I would try him as I would try Bassett or McFall.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

By Telegraph.

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

Last Night's Dispatches.

EASTERN.

Sleeping Car Burned.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., 23.—About 3 o'clock this morning the sleeping car between Memphis and St. Louis was discovered on fire. Before the train could be stopped the flames caught heavily that the passengers were unable to escape, leaving their clothes and light baggage behind, which, with the car, were entirely consumed. Many of the passengers, including some ladies, arriving here in deplorable condition.

Democratic Convention.

NEW HAVEN, 23.—The democratic State convention was held today. Every town in the State had a full delegation. The old ticket was re-nominated. It is as follows: Governor, Charles R. Sargent; Lieutenant Governor, George C. Sargent; Treasurer, William E. Raymond; Comptroller, Albert R. Goodrich.

Closing Speech in the Babcock Case.

ST. LOUIS, 23.—District Attorney Dyer, at the conclusion of his closing argument in the Babcock case this morning, referred to his conduct in office, since he assumed it nine months ago and entered upon the prosecution of the case. He disclaimed the idea that he had been led into the prosecution of any case, and told the jury that he had appeared with malicious intent, that as a representative of the people to prosecute the great wrong.

The case he characterized as a most remarkable one, and the course of the defense as still more remarkable. He accused Judge Porter of trying to drag the President into the case needlessly and groundlessly, and said the President's decision is for the jury; he has been examined, and I shall comment on his testimony as I would on that of any other witness. But when the gentleman for a purpose of his own, represents the President as on trial, I don't intend that the red flag which he has thus planted in my face shall be followed to the battle. As well might he have said that the President was on trial when John McDonald was tried, or as well when any other of these conspirators were before the Court.

At some length Col. Dyer attempted to show that this case was used by the defense to influence Republicans on the jury, and he then continued his attack on the address of the gentleman who had put me in the attitude of assailing the administration. I intend to bring this defendant from behind the desk of the President, where they have tried to place him, and I intend that he shall stand on his own merits in this case, and that they shall not bring a verdict from this jury by pretending that the President is on trial. When, or by whom of the prosecution has the President been assailed? Col. Broadhead has not done it in his argument; I did not in my opening, and yet, for an hour yesterday, Judge Porter has here and there defended the President. Sensible and wise as they say General Grant is, he will not thank the gentleman for dragging him into this case in this manner. What motive should actuate me in attacking the President? There is not a man on that jury, or on the bench, or in my voice, who does not know that I am a Republican. Why should I insult General Grant? I voted for his nomination for the Presidency, and the polls will show that I voted for his reelection. Nine months ago he signed the commission which enables me to speak here to-day, but I do not intend that General Babcock, the private secretary to the President, shall escape because he is the private secretary. I would try him as I would try Bassett or McFall.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.

But this provision itself is open to the very serious question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality, inasmuch as Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, plural marriage constituting an essential part of the religion of nearly all the inhabitants of this Territory.

The flagrant inconsistency and wicked hypocrisy of the authors of this bill are manifest in the asserting of the charges who are to be disfranchised by it. They are two—

1. Women—mothers, sisters, daughters. No matter how pure, how womanly, how noble. If they are the queens of society, the glory of their sex, they must not be allowed to vote because they live in Utah.

2. Those men who marry more than one woman. But all other male "citizens" over twenty-one are abundantly welcome. They may be thieves, liars, swindlers, adulterers, whores, or absolute criminals of any class, but if they have not married more than one wife, they can go to the polls and vote.

It is not stated how it is proposed to be known that a citizen is open to that objection—whether he must have been convicted of the same by due course of law, or whether he must be confronted with an iron-clad oath to the effect that he is or is not open to that objection.