

## DESERET EVENING NEWS

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING.

(Sundays excepted).

Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Charles W. Penrose • • • Editor.

Horace G. Whitney • Business Manager.

## SUBSCRIPTION PRICES.

In Advance:	25c
One Year	1.00
Six Months	.50
Three Months	.25
One Month	.12 1/2
Saturday Edition, Per Year	2.00
Semi-Weekly, Per Year	1.50

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR.

Address all business communications and all remittances:

THE DESERT NEWS

Salt Lake City, Utah.

Entered at the Postoffice of Salt Lake City as second class matter as per the Act of Congress, March 3, 1893.

SALT LAKE CITY, JUNE 7, 1906

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

At the risk of offending some of the virulent antagonists of Senator Reed Smoot, we notice a few more comments on his case, the course of the committee on privileges and elections in relation to it, and the probable action of the Senate when a consideration of it is reached by that body.

In spite of the seven-to-five vote on the Dubois resolution, there is a general feeling of doubt as to the vote upon the main question when it is taken up in the Senate, and the feeling of the press of the country seems to be largely against unfavorable action by that body.

We have quoted some remarks made by the New York Sun on this matter as reported in a contemporary, and we now reproduce the entire editorial from the Sun, entitled "Intimidating the Judges," as follows:

"Ever since Reed Smoot of Utah took his seat in the Senate of the United States, on March 4, 1903, the Congressional Record has borne constant testimony to the unceasing activity of the persons and organizations that want to see him ousted from that body. Practically each number of the Record has contained a long list of petitions presented to influence the minds of the Senators against him, and not that early action seems probable their efforts.

Yesterday a number of bulky volumes, each containing the petition of protest of a single State, were presented

in the anti-Smoot library.

"In deciding on Mr. Smoot's eligibility to membership in the Senate the members of that body act as his judges. In seeking to influence their conduct by the means that have been adopted, it is apparent that his opponents have given little or no thought to the judicial nature of the task for they evidently desire a decision based on popular prejudice and not on the facts and the evidence. One distinguished Senator regarded these efforts to force the Senate to expel Mr. Smoot as improper and indefensible. On November 11, 1903, George Frisbie Hoar of Massachusetts, presenting several anti-Smoot petitions to the Senate, said:

"I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to say, for the information of the very excellent and admirable citizens who have signed these petitions, that the decision of the trial is a purely judicial question, to be determined upon evidence and the application to the evidence of the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that it seems to me, with all due respect to those petitioners, it is an much out of place to address such petitions to this high court which is to determine those cases as it would be to petition the Supreme Court of the United States to take up some case which was before it or decide it in a particular way."

"If Mr. Smoot is disqualified for membership in the Senate, his disqualification rests on the fact of his membership in the Mormon Church and the obligations he owes to that organization, and not on the prejudice against that Church that exists among many worthy persons. In considering his case the Senate should be guided only by the evidence that has been produced against him. The cartloads of petitions that have been got up against him show a distinct plan to intimidate individual Senators and sway their judgment by introducing outside considerations. It is seriously to be hoped that no such scheme will bear fruit and that every Senator will vote in the Smoot case on the evidence, and not in accordance with the prejudices of the respectable but mostly uninformed supporters of these petitions.

tion seems to have gained ground that a majority vote against him is possible, while a two-thirds vote is not to be expected."

The Springfield Daily Republican, which has on the whole been opposed to Senator Smoot's cause, seems to be under the impression that the action of the committee is not very likely to produce the effect desired by the agitators and the enemies of the Senator, and remarks:

"While the committee stood 7 to 5 in favor of the declaration that Senator Smoot is 'not entitled to his seat,' the same men could not reach a conclusion as to whether he should be merely 'excluded' or 'expelled.' Exclusion, which requires only a majority vote of the Senate, was voted down, yet on the question of expulsion, which requires a two-thirds majority, the committee found itself evenly divided, the result being that of returning, the committee voted for Mr. Smoot's removal, yet failed, neither exclusion nor expulsion. If the Senate divided in much the same way, whatever the motives of the various members may be, the Utah senator may find himself in some anomalous position hitherto unheard of."

The New York World gives an account editorially of the voting in the committee and then makes these comments, although it considers that "the Smoot case is of little real importance, as an unfortunate product of religious passion."

"That the Senate has power by a two-thirds vote to expel a member for any reason whatever is disputed by nobody. Even if the Senate were to undertake by a mere majority to exclude Mr. Smoot there is probably no tribunal which could review its decision, but the propriety of its action would be open to grave question. Such action would establish a precedent which at some period of intense partisan passion might be the source of the greatest public mischief and evil. If Mr. Smoot is to be deprived of his seat at all—and we cannot see why he should be—the Senate should expel him."

The Montana Missoulian has an editorial on the current question which, after explaining the action of the committee and the rights of the Senate concludes with these paragraphs:

"Whatever may be said to the contrary, the expulsion of Mr. Smoot from the United States senate means the triumph of the petticoat; a pretty good batman, by the way, but it has its limitations."

"Mormonhood has been attacked on account of his religion. The claim is made that the Mormon Church is a menace to our free institutions; that a Mormon holds his Church above his country and that he can not be a true citizen because his first allegiance is given to his Church. A. P. A. uses the same argument, but that is neither here nor there. They are not the flowers that are blooming in this particular spring."

"Some of the Mormons in Idaho took a decided stand against Senator Dubois, who can never represent Idaho again in the United States senate. He has proceeded to get even. Of course, there is always trouble in Utah between Mormons and Gentiles, but Dubois has made the fight a national one. He has been the prime mover in the gospel of mystery. In every state and territory in the Union women have forwarded maledict petitions to the United States senate, praying for Smoot's expulsion, and for no other reason than that he is a Mormon. He was fairly selected. He is a clean man. He has but one wife. He is a good citizen—but he is a Mormon. This means that Mormons will be disfranchised. Bear this in mind. A successful warfare against one religious denomination means a successful warfare against another. Which will be the next?"

These excerpts may not prove very comforting to the irrational opponents of the senior Senator from Utah, nor to the hysterical religionists who have pleaded for his exclusion or expulsion, but they will be read with interest by a large portion of the public, which can form its own conclusions as to the probable result.

## THE PLAIN TRUTH.

One of the notable magazine articles of the present month is that which appears in the North American Review in the form of "An Appeal to our Millions." The writer points out that we are now confronted with the conditions against which Daniel Webster uttered a warning word, to the effect that if the tendency of the laws should be to create a rapid accumulation of property in a few hands, the great majority of the people would have slight cause to interest themselves in the support of the government. This condition, the writer in the Review thinks, exists now. And the conviction has become general that the accumulation of property in a few hands has been the result of illegal and reprehensible practices. For this reason, he says, it is of the highest importance, if we are to escape violent revolution, to consider whether we cannot find some basis for private property which might receive the approval of the majority of the American electorate. He adds:

"The truth is that no genuine service in any department of human effort has been rewarded, upon mankind merely for the sake of money, nor is any person who is destined to have 'money to burn' capable of rendering any really valuable service. The two qualities of mind always have been and always will be incompatible."

The good work of the world has never been done from such an incentive. The good men of the world have never done any work from such an incentive. Exceptive gains, like excessive salaries, are inherently dishonest, and the men who seek them cannot possibly be of any genuine value to the American people.

For less temptation, therefore, we often turn to work merely to amass great fortunes for them and for us, and the more sternly we confine everybody to honest returns for honest service the better for them and for us. Whoever has a dollar for which a dollar is worth, in property or service, has not been given, has a dishonest dollar, and if he keeps it, he is a dishonest man, no matter by what fine phrases he seeks to cover such dishonesty. And a dishonest man can confer no real benefit upon an honest community."

"If the Senate had investigated the charges before letting Mr. Smoot take the oath of office, a bare majority would have been sufficient to exclude him. This power the Senate has under the Constitution, which provides that:

"Each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members."

"Some of the opponents of Senator Smoot insist that even though he has been sworn in, and has held his seat so long as he has, this power can be used against him now."

"His friends, who are supported by some of his opponents, say, however, that the Senate exercised its power in this respect when it allowed Senator Smoot to take his seat, and that if it wishes to get rid of him now it must act under another provision of the Constitution, which reads:

"Each house may, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member."

"It will remain for the Senate to decide which method of action it will adopt. Its decision will be of vital importance to Smoot for the impre-

ation seems to have gained ground that a majority vote against him is possible, while a two-thirds vote is not to be expected."

The Springfield Daily Republican, which has on the whole been opposed to Senator Smoot's cause, seems to be under the impression that the action of the committee is not very likely to produce the effect desired by the agitators and the enemies of the Senator, and remarks:

"But the weight of the scientific argument is lessened, when it is remembered that scientists necessarily must be cautious in accepting hearsay testimony. They refused for a long time to accept as true the assertions of travelers concerning gorillas, and pygmies, until convinced by 'ocular demonstration.'

"Recently the skin of a strange inhabitant of the African jungles has been brought to London from Congo. The first accounts of this creature, the Okapi, sounded quite as fantastic as any description of sea serpents. The Okapi was said to be a short-necked giraffe with yellow cheeks, red forehead and ears (ears fringed with black); a sepius neck and wine-red body; hind-quarters snowy white; tail chestnut; hind and fore legs snowy white or pale cream color, the whole touched here and there with orange and boldly marked with purple-black horizontal stripes and blotches. Now this wonderful freak has been proved to exist. Why should not some future explorer be so fortunate as to catch a sea serpent?"

The New York World gives an account editorially of the voting in the committee and then makes these comments, although it considers that "the Smoot case is of little real importance, as an unfortunate product of religious passion."

"That the Senate has power by a two-thirds vote to expel a member for any reason whatever is disputed by nobody. Even if the Senate were to undertake by a mere majority to exclude Mr. Smoot there is probably no tribunal which could review its decision, but the propriety of its action would be open to grave question. Such action would establish a precedent which at some period of intense partisan passion might be the source of the greatest public mischief and evil. If Mr. Smoot is to be deprived of his seat at all—and we cannot see why he should be—the Senate should expel him."

The Montana Missoulian has an editorial on the current question which, after explaining the action of the committee and the rights of the Senate concludes with these paragraphs:

"Whatever may be said to the contrary, the expulsion of Mr. Smoot from the United States senate means the triumph of the petticoat; a pretty good batman, by the way, but it has its limitations."

"Mormonhood has been attacked on account of his religion. The claim is made that the Mormon Church is a menace to our free institutions; that a Mormon holds his Church above his country and that he can not be a true citizen because his first allegiance is given to his Church. A. P. A. uses the same argument, but that is neither here nor there. They are not the flowers that are blooming in this particular spring."

"Some of the Mormons in Idaho took a decided stand against Senator Dubois, who can never represent Idaho again in the United States senate. He has been the prime mover in the gospel of mystery. In every state and territory in the Union women have forwarded maledict petitions to the United States senate, praying for Smoot's expulsion, and for no other reason than that he is a Mormon. He was fairly selected. He is a clean man. He has but one wife. He is a good citizen—but he is a Mormon. This means that Mormons will be disfranchised. Bear this in mind. A successful warfare against one religious denomination means a successful warfare against another. Which will be the next?"

These excerpts may not prove very comforting to the irrational opponents of the senior Senator from Utah, nor to the hysterical religionists who have pleaded for his exclusion or expulsion, but they will be read with interest by a large portion of the public, which can form its own conclusions as to the probable result.

## THE PLAIN TRUTH.

One of the notable magazine articles of the present month is that which appears in the North American Review in the form of "An Appeal to our Millions."

The writer points out that we are now confronted with the conditions against which Daniel Webster uttered a warning word, to the effect that if the tendency of the laws should be to create a rapid accumulation of property in a few hands, the great majority of the people would have slight cause to interest themselves in the support of the government. This condition, the writer in the Review thinks, exists now. And the conviction has become general that the accumulation of property in a few hands has been the result of illegal and reprehensible practices. For this reason, he says, it is of the highest importance, if we are to escape violent revolution, to consider whether we cannot find some basis for private property which might receive the approval of the majority of the American electorate. He adds:

"The truth is that no genuine service in any department of human effort has been rewarded, upon mankind merely for the sake of money, nor is any person who is destined to have 'money to burn' capable of rendering any really valuable service. The two qualities of mind always have been and always will be incompatible."

The good work of the world has never been done from such an incentive. The good men of the world have never done any work from such an incentive. Exceptive gains, like excessive salaries, are inherently dishonest, and the men who seek them cannot possibly be of any genuine value to the American people.

For less temptation, therefore, we often turn to work merely to amass great fortunes for them and for us, and the more sternly we confine everybody to honest returns for honest service the better for them and for us. Whoever has a dollar for which a dollar is worth, in property or service, has not been given, has a dishonest dollar, and if he keeps it, he is a dishonest man, no matter by what fine phrases he seeks to cover such dishonesty. And a dishonest man can confer no real benefit upon an honest community."

"If the Senate had investigated the charges before letting Mr. Smoot take the oath of office, a bare majority would have been sufficient to exclude him. This power the Senate has under the Constitution, which provides that:

"Each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members."

"Some of the opponents of Senator Smoot insist that even though he has been sworn in, and has held his seat so long as he has, this power can be used against him now."

"His friends, who are supported by some of his opponents, say, however, that the Senate exercised its power in this respect when it allowed Senator Smoot to take his seat, and that if it wishes to get rid of him now it must act under another provision of the Constitution, which reads:

"Each house may, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member."

"It will remain for the Senate to decide which method of action it will adopt. Its decision will be of vital importance to Smoot for the impre-

ation seems to have gained ground that a majority vote against him is possible, while a two-thirds vote is not to be expected."

The Springfield Daily Republican, which has on the whole been opposed to Senator Smoot's cause, seems to be under the impression that the action of the committee is not very likely to produce the effect desired by the agitators and the enemies of the Senator, and remarks:

"But the weight of the scientific argument is lessened, when it is remembered that scientists necessarily must be cautious in accepting hearsay testimony. They refused for a long time to accept as true the assertions of travelers concerning gorillas, and pygmies, until convinced by 'ocular demonstration.'

"Recently the skin of a strange inhabitant of the African jungles has been brought to London from Congo. The first accounts of this creature, the Okapi, sounded quite as fantastic as any description of sea serpents. The Okapi was said to be a short-necked giraffe with yellow cheeks, red forehead and ears (ears fringed with black); a sepius neck and wine-red body; hind-quarters snowy white; tail chestnut; hind and fore legs snowy white or pale cream color, the whole touched here and there with orange and boldly marked with purple-black horizontal stripes and blotches. Now this wonderful freak has been proved to exist. Why should not some future explorer be so fortunate as to catch a sea serpent?"

The New York World gives an account editorially of the voting in the committee and then makes these comments, although it considers that "the Smoot case is of little real importance, as an unfortunate product of religious passion."

"That the Senate has power by a two-thirds vote to expel a member for any reason whatever is disputed by nobody. Even if the Senate were to undertake by a mere majority to exclude Mr. Smoot there is probably no tribunal which could review its decision, but the propriety of its action would be open to grave question. Such action would establish a precedent which at some period of intense partisan passion might be the source of the greatest public mischief and evil. If Mr. Smoot is to be deprived of his seat at all—and we cannot see why he should be—the Senate should expel him."

The Montana Missoulian has an editorial on the current question which, after explaining the action of the committee and the rights of the Senate concludes with these paragraphs:

"Whatever may be said to the contrary, the expulsion of Mr. Smoot from the United States senate means the triumph of the petticoat; a pretty good batman, by the way, but it has its limitations."

"Mormonhood has been attacked on account of his religion. The claim is made that the Mormon Church is a menace to our free institutions; that a Mormon holds his Church above his country and that he can not be a true citizen because his first allegiance is given to his Church. A. P. A. uses the same argument, but that is neither here nor there. They are not the flowers that are blooming in this particular spring."

"Some of the Mormons in Idaho took a decided stand against Senator Dubois, who can never represent Idaho again in the United States senate. He has been the prime mover in the gospel of mystery. In every state and territory in the Union women have forwarded maledict petitions to the United States senate, praying for Smoot's expulsion, and for no other reason than that he is a Mormon. He was fairly selected. He is a clean man. He has but one wife. He is a good citizen—but he is a Mormon. This means that Mormons will be disfranchised. Bear this in mind. A successful warfare against one religious denomination means a successful warfare against another. Which will be the next?"

These excerpts may not prove very comforting to the irrational opponents of the senior Senator from Utah, nor to the hysterical religionists who have pleaded for his exclusion or expulsion, but they will be read with interest by a large portion of the public, which can form its own conclusions as to the probable result.

## THE PLAIN TRUTH.

One of the notable magazine articles of the present month is that which appears in the North American Review in the form of "An Appeal to our Millions."

The writer points out that we are now confronted with the conditions against which Daniel Webster uttered a warning word, to the effect that if the tendency of the laws should be to create a rapid accumulation of property in a few hands, the great majority of the people would have slight cause to interest themselves in the support of the government. This condition, the writer in the Review thinks, exists now. And the conviction has become general that the accumulation of property in a few hands has been the result of illegal and reprehensible practices. For this reason, he says, it is of the highest importance, if we are to escape violent revolution, to consider whether we cannot find some basis for private property which might receive the approval of the majority of the American electorate. He adds:

"The truth is