

EDITORIALS.

SPEAK ONLY THAT WHICH YOU KNOW.

In the merciless crusade against a part of the religion of the Latter-day Saints, the position assumed by its promoters appears to be, that the people against whom it is waged ought to join with their persecutors and assist them in the vengeful prosecution of an unjust and special law.

Witnesses are compelled by legal process and in some instances by illegal process—that of the dictum of a deputy—to appear before courts and grand juries to give evidence against their dearest friends. They regard the whole proceedings as wrong, inhuman and needless. They sympathize with the accused and in their hearts resent the restraint imposed upon them, and the attempts to extort testimony for the purpose of condemning persons whom they do not consider have committed any crime. Can it be reasonably expected that they will be eager to tell all they think, or imagine, or have reason to believe concerning the objects of official intolerance? When they know that the zeal exhibited in these prosecutions springs largely from an inordinate greed for fees, are they likely to aid in them as though a holy purpose prompted the proceedings? When every little legal quibble and contemptible quirk and possible technicality are taken advantage of by the prosecution, are they to be blamed if they take legal shelter when suspected to the pumping process and outgaged by a professional inquisitor?

We unhesitatingly take the ground that these ignored witnesses are justified morally, legally, and rationally in stating nothing but what they really know of their own knowledge, and in answering only such questions as are proper to be propounded in a decent court. A mother in reply, "I do not know," to the question, "Is your daughter married to the defendant?" does exactly right unless she actually knows of the alleged fact. So with any other relative, or friend, or neighbor of the individuals said to have contracted marriage. The overbearing anxiety of the Prosecutor and Court to fix the charge upon the accused, and to take rumor for fact and opinion for evidence, should have no weight with the witness. What he or she knows is to be told, what he or she surmises is not to be told, under oath.

The ravings of a buffed attorney and the abuse of blackguard writers for the press should have no bearing upon conscientious witnesses. It is granted that often they are unwilling witnesses. They are forced into court. The accused are frequently their closest friends if not dearest relatives. They do not consider the charge a crime. They are not injured, nobody is injured by the act alleged against the accused. The only injury is in compelling people to come into court at great personal inconvenience to be worried and insulted by a coarse and brutal questioner.

But the promoters and abettors of this crusade seem to expect that wives will be as anxious to testify against their husbands and children against their parents, as the fee-hounds are to push profitable proceedings against men marked out for attack. And if those wives and sons and daughters will not go beyond their knowledge, and testify to suit the accusers, they are accused of perjury and held up for public reprobation. The whole business is cowardly and contemptible, and would be endured by no other people but this maligned community.

We make bold to say that under the peculiar circumstances that surround the people, every man and woman who respects the rights of conscience and has regard for the principles held dear by the majority, is wise and prudent in not seeking for intimate acquaintance with the marital affairs of his neighbors and relatives. No decent man or woman wants to play the role of an informer. The whole crusade is a cruel and special onslaught upon a peaceable community. It may be rightly viewed in that light by men and women who cannot be truthfully charged with violating the law. They can be careful to avoid knowing too much, and to refrain from swearing to anything they do not know. If they testify under oath to that which they know not, then they will become perjurers.

It requires very little to put any good man in the penitentiary. Rumor, opinion, reputation, is plenty with a packed jury, a vindictive attorney and a zealous court, to imprison and impoverish any victim selected for the sacrifice. Witnesses ought to be careful what they say. They should not be browbeaten into giving hearsay testimony. They should of right be protected by the court from stating anything but what they know. They are to be commended, not blamed for their scruples. The perjurers in spirit are they who pretend to know more than the witnesses and who call them by that name. If attorneys and foul-mouthed and whisky-blotched scribes knew that witnesses are perjured, why do they not go upon the stand and testify to what they know? If they are so sure that a defendant has actually committed the offence with which he is charged, why do they not go before grand juries and

give their testimony? But no. They can hide behind official authority or sneak under shelter of the press, and call people vile names who are as far above them as virtue is above vice and decency above devilry.

If courts and officers want to be respected let them act so as to secure respect. Pettifoggery, brow-beating, overbearing conduct, descent to the small tricks of the low class practitioner, or rage at a lack of evidence and abuse of witnesses will not accomplish what is wanted. It only brings both courts and the law they are specially engaged in, prosecuting into general contempt, and to rivet upon the minds of the class who are assailed the firm convictions they hold of the justice of their cause.

A VITAL SUBJECT.

In this issue a communication, from *Observer* touches upon a vital question—the folly and inconsistency of Latter-day Saints sending their children to sectarian schools. The same subject was very forcibly dealt with by our Chicago correspondent in his letter which appeared on Saturday last.

Those educational institutions are evangelical, and their chief purpose is to wean the children of the Saints away from the religion of their parents. There can be no doubt that when the opportunity is furnished the object can be accomplished. Seeds that are sown in the virgin mental soil of childhood, can never be entirely weeded out.

Parents who take a course to have their children drawn away from the religious principles which they profess to hold sacred are surely as guilty as one of three deplorable crimes—hypocrisy, a criminal indifference to the welfare of their own offspring, or a species of mental imbecility that prevents them from grasping consequences which spring from causes.

Every sincere religionist, having the welfare of his children at heart, will be imbued with anxiety to have his offspring imregnated with views and principles that he believes to be saving and beneficial. If he does not manifest that disposition, then he either makes an outward profession of religion that is nothing short of a miserable sham, or he is indifferent as to the present and eternal welfare of the precious charges entrusted to his care.

This is stated without regard to the character of the religion involved. But so far as Latter-day Saints are concerned it can be but the first of the two causes—insincerity—which leads him to place his children in a position to be led away from the path of the religion he professes. The very act of thus placing the feet of the little ones on a path that will take them away from what is esteemed to be the plan of salvation, is a direct and flagrant breach of the principles professed. Children are an heritage from the Lord, bestowed upon those to whom they are given, and the Gospel imperatively demands that they be preserved and trained as most precious treasures. Otherwise there is no promise regarding their eternal redemption.

The district, or common schools are non-sectarian, being neither one or the other. Their tendency is to create indifference to religion as a whole. Doubtless this is the cause of a good deal of the apathy existing among a considerable class of our young people upon subjects of that character. This leaves a more or less open field for the mission schools, established for sectarian purposes, of an evangelical character. Perhaps it is not creditable to the zeal of the Latter-day Saints, exhibited to a remarkable degree in other respects, that there are so few schools to offset their operations. Indeed, outside of the Brigham Young Academy of Provo and the Brigham Young College at Logan, there are practically no schools under the exclusive control of the Saints as a religious body. Consequently they are about the only educational institutions in which the religious principles professed by the majority of the people of Utah can be taught. There should be a direct tendency on the part of the body-religious of the Saints, to a local capacity, to establish schools compatible with its faith and principles, and in which they can be inducted in the minds of the young.

The Latter-day Saints in the 18th Ward are striking out commendably in the direction now indicated. They are resuming operations in the erection of a school house, begun some time ago, which will be under the direct control of the corporation of the ward, without being under legal constraint in relation to the character of the teachings conducted in it.

SIGNS ABOVE AND BENEATH.

The dispatches published in this issue convey startling intelligence from New Zealand. The earth has burst forth in fearful fury in that part of the globe. A belt of 120 by 20 miles in extent in frightful throes and convulsions is a fearful phenomenon. Accompanied by subterranean noises, the deep roar of thunder, the gloom of daytime impenetrable darkness, and the flare and flash of lurid lightning must have added

terror to the situation. Nor were those the only elements calculated to paralyze the people of that land with fear. While destruction was rampant, and the earth, by upheavals, sent up overwhelming clouds of dust and mud, only to receive them again upon her agitated surface, the gloom overhead was illuminated by the most striking signs in the heavens—balls of fire, acting like living bodies, chasing each other, as if disporting themselves in playful mockery of the pitiable condition of the terror-stricken people. Surely we are living in the latter times, when signs are numerous in the earth beneath, and in the heavens overhead—blood and fire and vapor of smoke—earthquakes in divers places.

INCLINING THE TENDER TWIG.

AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT.

Editor Deseret News:

This morning I heard a gentleman connected with some of the Mission Schools of this city say, "We are doing a great work here in Utah." He referred to the many children of "Mormon" parentage they were leading into their schools and consequently away from the "Mormon" Church.

I have been traveling in other parts of the United States, and often having seen the care used by other denominations to see that their children are educated in accordance with the religious belief of their fathers, I was astounded to learn that people who pretend to be "Mormons" would allow their children to go to other sectarian schools, and that too when the avowed object of these schools is to turn the hearts of the children from the faith of their fathers. Why, good Catholic fathers and mothers would no more think of sending their children to a Protestant or "Mormon" school than they would of sending them to infidel teachers.

If the children of such parents do not rise up and curse their parents, it will be because the children have more sense than their parents.

But to show how particular sincere religionists are about the proper education of their children, I will refer to an instance which I know occurred.

Some years since the Legislature of Texas passed a law establishing free schools and compulsory education. The school officers, knowing how particular the Catholics are to have their children taught in conformity with their religious belief, sent to New York Catholic summaries for Catholic teachers so as not to do injustice to the Catholic part of the community. But it was found that even these teachers were not zealous enough to suit the priests, and they told the people to not send their children to their schools. The sincere Catholics obeyed the priests, and the authorities arrested them and sent them to jail, but they never succeeded in getting them to entrust their children in the hands of those whom they feared would fail to give them the religious training they desired them to have. The law was a failure and has never been enforced. Knowing the greater light which has been given to the Latter-day Saints I was surprised beyond measure to learn what professed Latter-day Saints are doing. I asked myself the question: Is it possible that the people have not learned that a kind teacher has more influence over the children entrusted to his care, than do the parents of those children?

It is the duty of the teacher to teach and it is his study how to teach and rivet his teachings upon the minds of his students, but parents are engrossed in the cares and duties of life and have but little time to teach their children. They are under the care of the parents probably one day in the week, but under the teacher's five or six.

It is inconsistent to suppose that a parent has as much influence over a child as does the teacher, and those who do not realize it now will learn it sooner or later, possibly to their sorrow.

In view of all these things we must conclude that this carelessness is due to one of two causes, either ignorance of the consequences or insincerity with regard to their religion.

Those who allow the tender minds of their children to be led astray in this way, God will hold accountable for having disregarded his law and neglected the most sacred charge entrusted to their care, and their children will rise up and curse them as being the cause of their destruction.

Well has it been said that the innocent blood of some children will be required at the hands of their parents.

AN OBSERVER.

Salt Lake City, July 12, 1886.

COMMISSIONER'S LAW AND LOGIC.

The character of the crusade against the Latter-day Saints has received another illustration in the Hyde case, committed on Monday for action by the grand jury. The defendant, against whom there was not a particle of evidence, was bound in the sum of \$2,000, and the witnesses, who had no testimony to give against him, were each bound in the sum of \$500 to appear before the grand jury when required.

The peculiar genius who issued the edict to this effect, admitted

that no evidence had been adduced against the defendant, but gave it as his opinion that the witnesses had perjured themselves by not giving such evidence. He also intimated that they might be considered as witnesses for the defence because they were relatives and friends of the defendant. And as there was no evidence, he proceeded to require heavier bonds than if there had been evidence. In cases of unlawful cohabitation, from \$1,000 to \$1,500 bonds are usually required; but, as in this case no evidence had been presented against the accused, he would increase the bonds to \$2,000. When witnesses know something of use to the prosecution they are usually held, in these cases, in the sum of \$200. But as these witnesses did not know anything tending to criminate the accused, they must be held in \$500 bonds. The acuteness of intellect and profound logic displayed by this latter-day Dogberry entitles him to a free certificate to the territorial establishment on the Provo bench.

The theory of the prosecution is that A. E. Hyde has married a daughter of Mrs. Wilcox as a plural wife. Not a jot of evidence has been adduced to prove this or even indicate it, although the prosecution compelled a number of witnesses to appear, and put them through a rigid examination. But Commissioner McKay claimed that these were the defendant's witnesses, although one of his reasons for committing the defendant was that "the defence had offered no testimony." And the reason why they were the defendant's witnesses was that they were his relatives! They could not be claimed as his relatives in any sense—with the exception of his young daughter, who knew nothing of the matter—unless it was proved that he had committed the offense charged.

McKay's logic is: "There is no evidence against the defendant, but I shall hold him probably guilty, because there is no evidence. These witnesses for the prosecution are the defendant's witnesses because they have not testified in his behalf. If he is guilty of the offense charged these are his relatives. There is no evidence that he is guilty, therefore I shall hold that they are his relatives. The fact that a witness for the prosecution is related to the defendant does not make him a witness for the defence, therefore I hold that these witnesses for the prosecution are witnesses for the defence." What can be more conclusive?

Unless some further evidence can be produced against Mr. Hyde, it is clear that he cannot be indicted on any justifiable grounds. It is a case of complete failure to bring the slightest evidence on which to predicate a conviction. What, then, is the purpose in blinding over the defendant and the relatives. Those who seem to understand how this crusade is worked think that the design is two-fold. First Mr. Hyde is an object of hatred because he rendered aid to President Cannon when he was sick and injured on his way home under arrest, and the intention to "catch" him, it is said, has been freely expressed. Second, blinding over defendants and witnesses is a matter of money. Fees are involved in the transaction. Whoever knew McKay to miss a chance of piling up the fees that a lax law has put within the reach of avarice? This blinding over business is better than a mile for some folks, and it is worked for all it is worth. And then when it is done in the name of the law and under the pretense that it is in the interest of society and morality, what could hypocrisy and cupidity combined desire better than such opportunities?

The Hyde case is another application of the principle, "you'll be damned if you do, you'll be damned if you don't." "If there is evidence against you, you will stand committed because of that evidence; if there is no evidence against you you will stand committed because there is no evidence, for there ought to be." And when there is no evidence against a defendant he should be placed under heavier bonds than if the evidence against him was conclusive, for this is the logic and the law of a one-man committing magistrate hungry for fees.

The public is indebted to this functionary for a new definition of perjury. It consists, in his view, of not giving the evidence required by the prosecution. When a witness is not knowing to an alleged fact and so testifies, he is perjured. The common idea is that swearing to knowledge of something that one knows nothing about is perjury, but the new explanation of the term knocks that idea on the head. There is something more. When a witness cannot or does not give the evidence required by the prosecuting magistrate, he is not only to be considered a perjurer, but subject to insult and abuse from a brave, and logical, and courteous, and magnanimous creature swelling with a little brief authority and the importance that comes from a rich run of fat fees.

This is the style in which the crusade against the "Mormons" is conducted, and we hope the "Christians" and "statesmen" who are urging it on, admire the consistency and humanity, the dignity and legality, which recommend it so highly to a people required to bow before the majesty and equality and justice of national law.

Clouds ameliorated the condition of the atmosphere somewhat to-day.

THE SCANDINAVIAN EMIGRANTS.

The arrival of another company of "Mormon" immigrants gives occasion for another batch of silly remarks from editors who think they know all about the "Mormon" question. The San Francisco *Chronicle* starts out with the statement that "The Saints are fond of the Scandinavians." The reason given for this supposed predilection is "Norwegian and Swedish girls are in demand as wives, because they can do as much work in the field as men."

An important item to a "Mormon" who wishes to secure low-priced labor for his ranch." Then follow the usual rubbish about the duty of Congress to stop these "wholesale importations," and the assertion that "These people, seldom hear anything about polygamy and the other offensive features of 'Mormonism' until they are securely settled in Utah, from whence escape is well-nigh impossible."

All these "chestnuts" have the odor and mildew of the "long ago." They might have done service before the advent of the iron horse and the visits of tourists from all parts of the world, but they are too stale for these times. It is well known that these immigrants, whether from Scandinavian or English speaking nations, come chiefly in families and are from the infant in arms to the gray-haired grandma and grandsire. Norwegian, Swedish, English or German "girls" are not conspicuous for numbers in any company of "Mormon" arrivals, there are more males than females in the present company, and there is less "dead work" done by women in Utah than in any other agricultural community of the same numbers.

One day, fault is found with "Mormon" immigrants because they come here "to practice polygamy," and the next day because they are brought here without knowing anything about it. Congress is required to prevent their landing for the first alleged reason, and then for the second. And the talk about "escaping" from Utah is less rational than about "escaping" from San Francisco.

The Scandinavian element is not one of which the "Mormons" exhibit any extra "fondness." They usually make good citizens, however, quickly learn the language, are seldom chargeable to the public, add to the bobe and sinew of the Territory, are thrifty and accumulating, law-abiding and peaceful, and are welcome whenever they arrive.

The present company is a good one, and we congratulate both young and old, whatever may be their nationality, upon their safe arrival although in such heated weather; and if anti-"Mormon" and other erratics don't like it, well, they can do the other thing—it's none of their business, any more.

A MOUTHFUL OF NAILS.

It is a common thing for carpenters, but more frequently lathers and shinglers, for convenience in their work to carry nails in their mouths. This is a practice fraught with danger in more ways than one. An illustration of a serious character of one of its evils is afforded in the case of Robert Gray, a lather in Brooklyn, who was in the habit of filling his mouth with latn nails while at work. He has had a terrible experience.

According to accounts furnished to the press, about two years ago he commenced to be troubled with sharp, neuralgic pains starting from the right side of the tongue and shooting in every direction until his head was racked with agony. He was treated for neuralgia by several physicians in succession, but without relief. The cause of the trouble was not discovered until a bright red spot on the side of the tongue was detected, which increased in size and finally formed into an ulcer of a malignant type, and he was unable to eat or move his tongue without excruciating pain. His health was destroyed and he became weak and emaciated, and was at length taken to Bellevue Hospital, where a portion of the tongue was removed. It was believed, after a thorough and critic examination, that the diseased part was entirely cut away.

The patient began at once to improve, and in a short time was able to resume his employment. Again he hammered away, with his mouth stuffed full of nails. In six months the old pains returned, the haggard look, yellow skin and physical waste and torture were repeated, and it was found that the disease had eaten deep into the tissue of the tongue. The only chance for his life was dismemberment.

We will not stop to describe the surgical process by which the jawbone was severed, the lingual muscles freed and the arteries cut and tied, but suffice it to say, the tongue was entirely cut out, being twice the ordinary size and terribly diseased. The mouth at throat were cleaned, the jaw restored fine holes having been bored in it and silver wire used to hold it in place, and the patient was tenderly cared for. He was young and vigorous, but he lingered so long on the verge of the grave that hope of recovery was almost relinquished when he suddenly rallied and rapid