and sold them and put the money in their pockets, (and I understand my friend from Delaware [Mr. Higgins], who expressed so much indignation against the slaveholders and slavery, is a member of a slave-holding family grown up with the institution)to speak in terms of condemnation of the people who were forced by circumstances against their own protest and against their will to receive these slaves, driven from Massachusetts, who were exiled by their law which made it an offense for any negro to go into the State — for these Southern people, who under the influence and favorable conditions of soil and climate received these people, and under whose fostering care, as members of the same family, they were protected in their personal rights and subjected to less of cruelty than today prevails in all of our great Commonwealths in the North, cruelties in the domestic relation, murder, heads cut off, wives and husbands poisoned—for these people who in their relations with these Southern States are in abundance and comfort, protected in their property interests, with the Gospel preached to them, members of the church, growing up in relations of mutual comfort and mutual dependence into a people numbered by millions—for these people, for whom even the disasters of the war and the Freedman's Bureau and the intermeddling of politicians seeking their own promotion, seeking their own wealth, seeking their own party advantage—for these people whom even these adverse causes could not divorce from their friendship and their dependenee and their confidence, and on the other hand could not separate from the affection and the friendship of the white people—are these people to be assailed and a bill of this kind proposed under the pretence that it is necessary to enable the negroes to vote, when in the State of Oregon, in the State of Connecticut, in the State of Massachusetts, in the State of Rhode Island, in all the Republican States there is today by the statistics which I will read here and publish, which were prepared by my colleague [Mr. Pasco], and I give him the credit for his careful observation and accurate study of these statistics, more complete than can be found in the previous speeches upon the subject, I say, Mr. President, under these circumstances, with this record of the Republican States, 1,888,000 qualified male voters not voting, and in the Democratic States, 1,484,000, including the Southern States—with this census record, is this bill to be proposed and advocated on the theory of hardship, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Spooner] said, because some judge had sent some negro to jail for failing to perform his contract to work? These idle pretenses are put forth to herald and sustain a bill in the interest of capital and aristocracy, the twin sister of the McKinley bill, which pours its tribute by the hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of individuals, tribute taken from the poor man's home and from the clothing of his wife and children and from the wares which are necessary to eat his humble food upon, aggregating in the mass not hundreds of millions but thousands of millions of dollars, and supplemented here by a bill to forbid the people of the country from ever relieving and protecting themselves. It looks as if the great Farmer's Alliance demanding free money and cheap money, demanding cheap transportation, which is practicable, and demanding new financial measures which are practicable, and open, fair discussion should be accorded them—it would seem as if this were a bill thrown in the very teeth of this demand of the people for relief, and designed to perpetuate, as in my judgment it is, the imposition, and the tribute which great bounty-fed monopolists have fastened upon them."

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION.

WE publish today the full text of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Bassett appeal case. The chief point involved in this important cause was the admissability of a legal wife's testimony against the husband in a trial for polygamy.

Under a provision in the Utah Code of Civil Procedure, an exception is made to the rule of law against such testimony, to the effect that the husband or wife may testify against the other, "in a criminal action or proceeding for a crime committed by one against the other." This provision, when taken in connection with provisions in the criminal code and with well known rules of the common law, was clearly meant to apply to acts of violence, or crimes against the person committed by the husband or wife upon the other.

But the Utah courts, pursuing a policy of special proceeding against persons accused of infractions of the anti-polygamy laws, construed the provision to signify any unlawful act of the husband that might be offensive and injurious to the wife and thus make it apply to polygamy, The Supreme Court of the United. States sustains the law and the practice and the precedents of centuries. and reverses the ruling of the Utah courts. It adopts the arguments and is guided by the authorities which were so strongly presented by Hon. F. S. Richards, counsel for the plaintiff in error, and in doing so complies with his request that the law be construed without special reference to a practice sought to be suppressed, and which now offers no reason for extraordinary measures.

During the presentation of his case, Mr. Richards showed that by the recent action of the "Mormon" people in reference to polygamy, the necessity for strained constructions of the laws affecting them had been removed, and it was now only needful that the laws be administered in their ordinary course, and according to precedent and common interpretation. The attorney for the Government admitted this, and did not ask the Court for a special construction to meet a special case, and the Court has evidently modified the spirit in which it has treated the "Mormon" question in former instances.

The decision is of great importance, not only to the appellant but to the people of Utah generally, and is the end of controversy on this much disputed question.

THE MOVEMENT FOR LAW, ORDER AND MORALITY.

THE citizens' meeting held in the First M. E. Church on Monday, Dec. 29 was a significant occasion. Its object was laudable from every standpoint. A large body of reputable people assembled to express alarm at the appalling rate at which crime, immorality and corruption have increased in Salt Lake during the last few months. The citizens met to express their detestation of the situation and to formulate a demand upon the city government that its officers shall enforce the laws in order to produce a social rectification.

The speeches, as a rule, were telling and spirited and the statements in reference to the shortcomings of the officials were refreshingly frank. Some of the remarks were not in unison with the general character of the call for the gathering; neither were the resolutions when first presented, but the pronounced sentiment of the great bulk of the assemblage was unmistakably generous and broad. This was manifested at once by the alacrity with which the resolutions were, by amendment, almost entirely cleared of their originally sectional or contracted aspect.

The meeting was mostly composed of citizens belonging to the "Liberal" party. The reason for this was that the committee only sent the call for the meeting to one newspaper (the chief Liberal organ) and it was published only on the morning of the day on which the citizens were invited to meet, and again the same evening in this journal. A special invitation was received at this office from the committee. The people who gathered were a fine audience. The occasion drew together a goodly representation of the respectable and moral element of the community. The turbulent, depraved and vicious could have no inducement to participate in such a movement, or to be present except to obstruct its laudable object. The purpose of that gathering was such that, in