

THE EVENING NEWS.

PUBLISHED DAILY, SUNDAYS EXCEPTED.
AT FOUR O'CLOCK.

Tuesday, April 23, 1874.

DAVID O. CALDER,
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

The temperance crusade was recommenced yesterday, at Columbus, O. A saloon keeper there advertised a free lunch and some new drinks, called "Crusaders' water." About seventy of the temperance ladies went to the saloon, desiring to partake of the lunch and to taste the drink; but the saloon keeper refused to permit them to taste the good cheer, and ejected them from his saloon.

Three hundred families residing in West Baton Rouge, La., have been rendered homeless by the flood.

Twenty-five thousand suits of clothing, and four thousand blankets were issued yesterday, by the U. S. quartermaster, for the relief of the sufferers in Louisiana.

A draft of male citizens, between 25 and 35 years of age, has been ordered by the Captain General of Cuba.

A new finance bill was introduced by Mr. Poland, in the U. S. House of Representatives yesterday.

Yesterday being the day set apart for that purpose, eulogies on the life, character and public services of the late Senator Sumner were delivered in both Houses of Congress.

For synopses of Japanese news, to the 7th inst., see to-day's telegraphic columns.

The telegrams, yesterday, announced that the Suez Canal difficulty was settled. To-day the dispatches say that the Khedive of Egypt took military possession of the Canal before the directors consented to acquiesce in the decision of the international commission in regard to their tariff.

Obadiah Brown, an ex-member of Congress, committed suicide last night, at a hotel, on Staten Island.

Battles between the Dutch and Achoness forces took place on the 11th and 16th of the present month.

A fire, which did \$100,000 damage, occurred at Ontario, Canada, this morning. A large amount of damage was caused by fire at Logansport, Indiana, last night.

Three buildings fell, in Newgate St., London, this morning, killing and injuring a number of persons.

Each of the contending governors of Arkansas has telegraphed President Grant that an armed insurrection exists in that State, and asking aid to suppress it.

CRIME DECREASING.—In an address to the grand jury on discharging the members thereof, April 20, Judge Brady, of New York, took occasion to express his gratification at the unusual absence of crime, which absence his honor attributed to the energy and firmness with which the criminal laws were administered. It is good to hear this crime is decreasing in the commercial metropolis of the country. There was abundant necessity for a decrease a short time ago.

Our Country Contemporaries.

Ogden Junction, April 27.—

The basket carried by Mrs. Hansen, the missing woman, from Ogden Valley, has been found, leaving little doubt that the unfortunate woman fell into the Ogden river while attempting to cross.

Sheriff Brown, this afternoon, arrested a young man on the depot platform, who answered the description of a party who was "wanted" for a jewelry robbery at Salt Lake.

The corner stone of the Protestant Episcopal Church—now being erected in our city on the corner of Fourth and Young streets—will be laid on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 29th inst., by the Rev. Robt. Daniel S. Tuttle, D. D., Episcopal Bishop of Montana, Idaho and Utah. Several other clergymen will be present to assist in the ceremonies, which will commence at two o'clock, Ogden time. The custom of having outdoor rites at the laying of foundation stones is in honor of the fact that in this instance, it is proposed to make the exercises appropriate and impressive. A formal invitation is extended to all.

Ocean Disaster.

The past twelve months have been marked by an unusual fatality in ocean travel. In no year have the press of the country been called upon to record so many disasters of the sea, attended by so terrible a loss of life, so great a loss in property, and such a fearful array of human suffering. To render this more remarkable, nearly all of this great destruction has occurred in the broad highway between our eastern ports and Europe. The first event in point of time, and magnitude of horror was the loss of the steamship *Atlantic* of the White Star Line, which went ashore on the coast of Nova Scotia on April 1, 1873.

In this calamity 553 persons and 3,000 tons of cargo were lost to the world in the depths. In less than three months, the steamer *City of Washington* of the Inman line was wrecked on the same treacherous coast, within fifty miles of the rock where the *Atlantic* struck. The passengers, numbering 25 cabin and 48 steerage, were saved, as was the crew, but the cargo, valued at \$1,000,000, was a total loss. On September 29, 1873, the steamer *Republic* of the Anchor Line, from New York to Glasgow, carrying freight and no passengers, was lost at sea. She has never been heard of since, from man or sea. On board the *Republic* were 233 lives lost, and the shadow of death cast across the lives of 233 who were rescued and returned to their homes. The last instance is that of the French steamer *Europe*, from Havre to New York, which went down a little more than a

week ago in mid ocean, with all her cargo on board, her passengers and crew being saved by the *Greco*. This number five first class ocean steamers lost within twelve months, all supposed to be perfectly constructed and commanded, and elegantly appointed, with 772 souls and unknown millions of property. Verily, those that go down to the sea in ships and do business (or pleasure) on the great waters, ride with death over the billows.—*St. Louis Republican*.

UTAH JUDICIAL MATTERS.

The Omaha Herald has the following under date of Washington, April 24—

"The House Judiciary committee to-day decided to report an amendment to Mr. Poland's bill providing for the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists. These lists to be composed of United States citizens residing at least one year in the Territory, and from this list jurors will be drawn in open court; and a bill authorizing each circuit and district to appoint an official stenographer at a salary of eight dollars per day."

The Poland bill, as recently reported from the House Judiciary committee to the House, so far as we have learned, places the duty of selecting jurors upon the U. S. Judge, the clerk of his court, and the U. S. marshal. This amendment provides that the Governor appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court.

This amendment might or might not be an improvement on the provisions of the bill as reported. The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies.

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

Our Country Contemporaries.

Ogden Junction, April 27.—

The basket carried by Mrs. Hansen, the missing woman, from Ogden Valley, has been found, leaving little doubt that the unfortunate woman fell into the Ogden river while attempting to cross.

Sheriff Brown, this afternoon, arrested a young man on the depot platform, who answered the description of a party who was "wanted" for a jewelry robbery at Salt Lake.

The corner stone of the Protestant Episcopal Church—now being erected in our city on the corner of Fourth and Young streets—will be laid on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 29th inst., by the Rev. Robt. Daniel S. Tuttle, D. D., Episcopal Bishop of Montana, Idaho and Utah. Several other clergymen will be present to assist in the ceremonies, which will commence at two o'clock, Ogden time. The custom of having outdoor rites at the laying of foundation stones is in honor of the fact that in this instance, it is proposed to make the exercises appropriate and impressive. A formal invitation is extended to all.

week ago in mid ocean, with all her cargo on board, her passengers and crew being saved by the *Greco*. This number five first class ocean steamers lost within twelve months, all supposed to be perfectly constructed and commanded, and elegantly appointed, with 772 souls and unknown millions of property. Verily, those that go down to the sea in ships and do business (or pleasure) on the great waters, ride with death over the billows.—*St. Louis Republican*.

UTAH JUDICIAL MATTERS.

The Omaha Herald has the following under date of Washington, April 24—

"The House Judiciary committee to-day decided to report an amendment to Mr. Poland's bill providing for the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists. These lists to be composed of United States citizens residing at least one year in the Territory, and from this list jurors will be drawn in open court; and a bill authorizing each circuit and district to appoint an official stenographer at a salary of eight dollars per day."

The Poland bill, as recently reported from the House Judiciary committee to the House, so far as we have learned, places the duty of selecting jurors upon the U. S. Judge, the clerk of his court, and the U. S. marshal. This amendment provides that the Governor appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court.

This amendment might or might not be an improvement on the provisions of the bill as reported. The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies.

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

Our Country Contemporaries.

Ogden Junction, April 27.—

The basket carried by Mrs. Hansen, the missing woman, from Ogden Valley, has been found, leaving little doubt that the unfortunate woman fell into the Ogden river while attempting to cross.

Sheriff Brown, this afternoon, arrested a young man on the depot platform, who answered the description of a party who was "wanted" for a jewelry robbery at Salt Lake.

The corner stone of the Protestant Episcopal Church—now being erected in our city on the corner of Fourth and Young streets—will be laid on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 29th inst., by the Rev. Robt. Daniel S. Tuttle, D. D., Episcopal Bishop of Montana, Idaho and Utah. Several other clergymen will be present to assist in the ceremonies, which will commence at two o'clock, Ogden time. The custom of having outdoor rites at the laying of foundation stones is in honor of the fact that in this instance, it is proposed to make the exercises appropriate and impressive. A formal invitation is extended to all.

week ago in mid ocean, with all her cargo on board, her passengers and crew being saved by the *Greco*. This number five first class ocean steamers lost within twelve months, all supposed to be perfectly constructed and commanded, and elegantly appointed, with 772 souls and unknown millions of property. Verily, those that go down to the sea in ships and do business (or pleasure) on the great waters, ride with death over the billows.—*St. Louis Republican*.

UTAH JUDICIAL MATTERS.

The Omaha Herald has the following under date of Washington, April 24—

"The House Judiciary committee to-day decided to report an amendment to Mr. Poland's bill providing for the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists. These lists to be composed of United States citizens residing at least one year in the Territory, and from this list jurors will be drawn in open court; and a bill authorizing each circuit and district to appoint an official stenographer at a salary of eight dollars per day."

The Poland bill, as recently reported from the House Judiciary committee to the House, so far as we have learned, places the duty of selecting jurors upon the U. S. Judge, the clerk of his court, and the U. S. marshal. This amendment provides that the Governor appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court.

This amendment might or might not be an improvement on the provisions of the bill as reported. The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies.

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.

Leaving out further reference to the marshal, as he is not an inviting character to contemplate anyway, we may say of the judge that as things are now, a strict "Mormon" honor refuses to naturalize, and on that account solely, if it were in his power, there is, analogically, every reason to apprehend that he would disfranchise every naturalized and every native American "Mormon," solely for the very same reason. Yet this Poland bill proposes to put into the hands of this most proscriptive judge this most proscriptive power of selecting jurors. What is the inevitable inference? Plainly, that the judge would select, in every instance, those who are enemies to the "Mormons," to sit as jurors upon those who are "Mormons." Any one who is acquainted with the bitter prejudices of his honor and of many of the non-"Mormons" against the "Mormons," would be perfectly satisfied that the arrangement of a "Mormon" before such a court and such a jury would be the certain prelude, and therefore tantamount, to his conviction and sentence.

Every person charged with crime is entitled to be tried before a jury of his peers, not of his known enemies, purposely chosen because they are such. The studious exclusion of any class of religionists from the jury box—and especially when one of that identical class of religionists was on trial, would be such a palpable violation of the spirit of the constitution as to well cause a tremor of apprehension to creep over every honorable citizen, as to the influence of such a device upon the impartiality of the jury.

To enact a law which would make such a palpable choice of prejudiced and inimical jurors not only probable, but morally certain, would be almost, if not quite, as palpable a violation of the spirit of the constitution. These points the New York Herald, by no means very friendly to the "Mormons," appears to see pretty clearly, as indicated in the following passage from that paper of April 24—

"The Judiciary Committee has reported a bill which gives the duty of selecting jurors to the Governor of Utah to appoint a commission to make up jury lists, from which jurors are to be drawn (as we presume) in open court."

"The bill gives the choosing of the jury into two hands—the judge and the marshal. True, the clerk of the court is included, making three persons, but the insertion of the clerk is a mere nominal matter, it amounts to nothing. The clerk is the creature of the judge, being appointed and removable by him, and therefore could hardly be expected to choose any other jury than such as would be in accordance with the wishes of his official creator. The judge, then, and the marshal would be the two persons who would decide who should constitute the jury. Two individuals, neither of them chosen by the people, neither of them acceptable to the people, as is the case in this district, but both of them known to entertain virulent prejudices against the majority of the people, and therefore looked upon in the light of bitter enemies."

These two men are to choose the juries to try the people, or such of them as might be so unfortunate as to be arraigned before the court. What sort of justice might be expected from such courts and such juries? They would do business, no doubt. They might indeed rush business through the courts, but what kind of business would it be, and in what manner would it be done? We forbear to attempt an answer just now. It is to be hoped there never will be a practical answer furnished to these questions.