cessity, assaults or beats any person, is punishable by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year." (Compiled Laws, p. 581.)

When an officer is lawfully engaged in the execution of his duty, no matter how much the feelings of the people may be worked up at what they may deem injustice, they must not obstruct or hinder the officer in that duty; neither must they attempt to take any person from his custody who has been lawfully arrested; if they do they render themselves liable to fine and imprisonment.

We would be very sorry to learn of any "Mormon" resisting, delaying or obstructing the lawful enforcement of law, whether that law be deemed constitutional or not by the individual. We will support peace officers, Federal or Territorial, in the decent and lawful discharge of their duty, however obnoxious it may sometimes appear to be. We are now only objecting to lawlessness under the name of law. This must be put a stop to by some means, the more peaceable the better.

Deputies had no right to burst into a house in American Fork at an unseasonable hour, and without demanding admittance and producing their warrant of arrest. They had no right to prevent a witness from telegraphing to her friends. They had no authority over the telegraph office or attendant. Their order to him was of no more value than the demand of a tramp forbidding him to perform a duty incumbent upon him. They had no right to burst into a house at West Jordan and claim the authority of an axe. They had no right to arrest a man for whom they had no warrant, whether he was riding a horse or running or walking along the road. They had no right to push their way into a man's house without legal process, throw him to the ground, or intimidate his wife into disclosing the whereabouts of a neighbor. They had no right to compel a woman with a babe not four weeks old, to face the inclement weather and come to this city a dozen miles distant as a witness.

Witnesses cannot be arrested without a warrant, and that warrant cannot be issued until they have refused to obey a subpœna, and a reasonable time for preparation and travel to the place of attendance must be allowed to the witness. (Laws of 1884 p. 309.)

If deputies want to be treated as gentlemen, let them act like gentlemen. An arrest can be made, a paper can be served, as the conduct of some officers amply prove, without offensive language or deportment, without insult and without violence. It was a pity that some male relative of the young, unmarried lady at West Jordan, who was insulted by the ruffian that told her the lie that he knew she had slept with a man the night before, had not been present to have resented it in the only manner fitted to the occasion.

Marshal Ireland cannot be expected to select kid-gloved dudes or drawing-room delicates to serve the process of courts. But he can put a stop to lawless violence on the part of his underlings, and he need not keep in his employ cowardly bullies who want to ride rough-shod over the rights of citizens, refuse to show their authority to make searches and seizures, insult weak women, assault feeble men, and force sick or half convalescent people from their homes in inclement weather.

And we advise all citizens to stand upon their rights. Do not obstruct an officer nor treat him with indignity while he respects the law. But when ruffians overstep its bounds bring them to justice and let the law take its course with them. And let it be understood that the constitutional protection of house and home will not be trampled down with impunity, by lawless villains under cover of a little brief authority.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN UTAH

There is now pending in the Senate a bill introduced by Senator Edmunds to deprive the women of Utah of the privilege of voting. Senator Hoar of Massachusetts opposes it, and in doing so he unquestionably is wrong. His opposition is probably in deference to that peculiarly New England idea which would place women, in the government of this country, upon a perfect equality with men. Woman suffrage would be wrong in any State or Territory, but it is particularly so in Utah. The giving to the women of Utah the privilege of voting conferred much additional power upon the Mormon Church, for it has long since been shown that the Mormon women are more faithful to the Church than the men are. They vote for the Church candidates and in favor of Church measures. It was believed at one time that if the ballot were placed in the hands of the Mormon women they would seek their own redemption by voting with the Gentiles. The result proved that this was based upon a false assumption. It is apparent, therefore, that the law giving the women of Utah this privilege ought to be repealed. It may be said in this connection that the mistake made in giving the Utah women the ballot is the same that is made with reference to woman suffrage by its advocates everywhere. Women would vote with their husbands, fathers and brothers in all places. This would be true, not because of any subjection that women are under, but because in regard to most questions the male and female members of a family think alike. A father and his sons generally agree upon political questions, and it is folly to suppose that the mothers and daughters would depart from this rule. Whenever a man is opposed to prohibition, his wife will likely be opposed to it also. Woman suffrage would therefore not better the condition of things at all. It would only increase the number of electors, and it is recognized that the number is already as large as the safety of the country can endure. For this reason it would be well if Congress would prohibit woman suffrage in all the Territories.—*Denver Tribune-Republican.*

The foregoing is a sample argument against woman suffrage in general and in favor of abolishing it in Utah in particular. It is like all such arguments, weaker than tepid, sky-blue skimmed milk and water. Women will vote as their husbands, fathers and brothers vote, therefore they should be prevented from voting! The author of this twaddle says: "A father and his sons generally agree upon political questions." Well, then, on the same rule as he applies to women, the sons ought to be prevented from voting.

Would it be an argument in favor of woman suffrage if it could be shown that women will *not* vote as their male relatives vote? We think not. But it would be, if the Denver genius is right. To use his reasoning the other way, the voting of women who disagree with their male relatives would only increase the opposition and division which exist in politics, of which there is now far too much.

If there are too many electors, and the object is to decrease the number, why not establish a qualification, limiting the ballot to citizens of a superior class? Why discriminate against women who are likely to vote with, or in opposition to, their male relatives, any more than against sons and brothers for the same reason? It's a poor rule that only works one way. On this question it will be found that "what is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander."

The reason (?) advanced for taking the ballot from the women of Utah works in the same way. It is assumed that the women vote for Church candidates and Church measures. If that is true of the women it is last of the men. The argument (?) against one sex applies equally to the other. It means that the women were expected to vote with the ring of schemers who want to break up "Mormon" families and control "Mormon" poperty, prand as they will not vote for their enemies they ought not to be allowed to vote at all. Grand reasoning, is it not?

We have never seen a book or an article against woman suffrage that was not founded on prejudice, or that did not reflect on male suffrage when subjected to the same process. And we never saw an attempt to show that the women of Utah ought to be deprived of the ballot that did not commence with a falsehood and end with a fallacy.

THE NEW JURY BILL.

The bill for a supplementary jury list, introduced into the House by Mr. Thurman, of Utah County, the text of which we have already published, is a measure that no reasonable person will object to. It is simply an extension of the provisions of the Poland law to meet the requirements of an enlarged community. Of course it is unfair to the majority. We do not expect fair treatment of the "Mormon" part of the population, although it forms more than eight-tenths of the entire number. But Mr. Thurman is not responsible for the injustice which gives less than two-tenths of the people one-half of the jury list. That is a piece of Congressional equity, and he had no option but to carry out the principle while extending its operations.

That the present method of packing juries, after the regular list has become exhausted, is a disgrace to our judicial system no one who understands the situation can consistently deny. The Hampton case, if there was no other, is enough to show the wrongs that can be perpetrated under a method which permits a hostile officer to pick out a jury of a defendant's enemies, and carefully exclude any one who might be disposed to a fair consideration of his case. The spectacle of a jury composed of a man's opponents who admitted that they had formed an opinion before trying the defendant, is, we believe, without a parallel in modern times. It ought never to be repeated.

The evident intention of Congress was to make the jury list of two hundred the only source from which jurors should be drawn. It is not sufficient in number. What can be more proper and simple than to supplement it in the manner proposed? Of course objections will be raised by persons who favor packed juries. But they cannot offer one valid or reasonable argument against the measure. It is a piece of nonsense to say that it is in the interest of polygamic defendants, for the Edmunds law excludes all bigamists, polygamists, persons cohabiting with more than one woman, and those who believe in the rightfulness of those offenses, from any jury to try a case of either kind.

The only improvement that suggests itself to us is the insertion of a clause providing that no jurors shall be obtained by any other process than that provided in the bill. We admit that ordinarily this would be superfluous. The bill amply provides for all the jurors that would ever be necessary. But we have seen so much of the quirks and subterfuges and shiftings of judicial proceedings in Utah that we think this provision should be made specifically, as a double guard against the perversion that has prevailed of the plain intent of the Poland bill.

We hope the bill will be carefully examined and only enacted when it has passed scrutiny, and that it will be sent early to the Governor, who if he does not sign it will be responsible for the failure of justice in Utah that will be the consequence of his obstruction. It is a good bill.

THE ATTACK ON SENATOR TELLER.

The *Rocky Mountain News* of Jan. 11th contains the following pithy editorial, on the long bag of blackguardism and billingsgate which the Denver *Tribune-Republican* copied from the filthy Salt Lake *Tribune*. The News correctly discriminates with Senator Teller between the war on polygamy, and the attempt to rob a Church, very few comparatively of whose members are practical polygamists:

With customary cowardice the *Hyphen* copies a ribald attack on Senator Teller from the Salt Lake *Tribune*. The Salt Lake *Tribune* has done more by its bitter and relentless war upon the Mormons to bind those misguided people together and make them feel like martyrs on account of their religious belief than any other cause that we know of. It has branded them all as polygamists constantly, while it knew that many of them neither believe nor practice plural marriages. It has done nothing to convince the Mormons by kindly persuasion that polygamy must go. It has been actuated by the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition in all its utterances, and its bitterness has simply had the effect of binding the Mormons together, because they found that division would mean destruction for them. Its malicious misrepresentation of the speech made by Senator Teller on the Edmunds bill the other day is in the line of all its past conduct. Senator Teller made no defense of polygamy. He is as sincerely anxious for its overthrow as any man that lives, and he said so in his speech. Every one who knows him knows that this has always been his position. But he has questioned the wisdom and fairness of the Edmunds bill, and he gave good reasons for the doubt that was in him. That is the hardest measure ever passed by the Senate. In many respects it runs counter to all our accepted theories of the true basis of free government. In addition to the provisions for the suppression by forcible means of polygamy, it takes the control of the Mormon Church out of the hands of the people who form that sect and places it in a board of thirteen trustees appointed and paid by the United States government. It is in effect, if not in name, the introduction of a receivership into religion; it is a union of church and state that has always been repugnant to our form of government. With equal right Congress might appoint a board of trustees to administer the affairs of the Methodist church, the Catholic church or any other church in the United States. It is true that Senator Edmunds claims that the board he proposes to organize shall only have control of the property interests of the Mormon church, but it must be clear to all observing men that the distinction in this case is too fine for just application in practice. The Mormons would certainly look upon this measure as legalized persecution, and all history proves that persecution has strengthened rather than weakened the religious sect at which it was aimed. Senator Teller, very properly we think, questioned the wisdom of the means provided by the Edmunds bill for the eradication of the crime of polygamy. He held that the government had not done its duty in the past in dealing with this problem, and he expressed grave doubts of the wisdom and the justice of harshly punishing the Mormons for the mistakes of the government as well as for their own evil behavior. Many of the ablest members of the Senate agreed with him in this. Possibly he and they were mistaken, but it does not follow that they must be corrupt because they had the courage to express views at variance with the will of the majority in the Senate. The Salt Lake *Tribune* denounces Senator Teller as a "Jack Mormon" and a "Mormon Attorney" because he dared to express the belief that gentler legislation would prove more efficacious than Senator Edmunds' drastic bill in the extirpation of polygamy, and the cowardly organ of ex-Senator Hill in this city endorses those false and idiotic charges by copying the article in question on its editorial page. But if Senator Teller never does anything worse than that he will never forfeit the confidence of honest and intelligent men.

A SINISTER AND DESPOTIC INFLUENCE.

The *Tribune* makes a lame attempt to limp out of the stupid position it has assumed on the church and State question. It cited one instance of what it assumed was a proof of a rule that, "In the Legislature members take their places not according to fitness but according to rank in the Church." We showed that that instance was not as stated, and pointed out several other instances which proved the *Tribune* wrong. Now it tells us that our several cases were the "exception" and its one exploded and disproved case was the "rule!" That's just its style. It never acknowledges an error but after lying without compunction, it will wiggle, and squirm, and turn itself inside out to try and justify its mendacity.

We will notice it on this question once more, by giving two quotations, with a few remarks. The *Tribune* says:

"We object to the rule which makes the Mormon people accept nomination for political offices from the First Presidency and which makes them vote the ticket they are instructed to vote for."

"An influence which men command by their personal magnetism and ability, is one thing; an influence which men *dare not resist or even debate*, is another thing."

The *Tribune's* objection to a rule of its own imagining is the essence of "richness." There is no rule with which we are acquainted which makes the "Mormon's accept anything but the continual misrepresentations and abuse of their enemies. "The nominations for political offices" are made in regular caucus and conventions as much as with any political body in the country, and the ballot is free and secret and no one can be made to vote any way that does not suit him. All the rest is assumed by the *Tribune* and is so much balderdash.

The only influence that we know of that men *dare not resist or even debate*, is that which prevents members of Congress and other public men in many places from resisting or even debating iniquitous, tyrannical, unconstitutional, unrepublican and undemocratic measures against the "Mormons." It is the influence of popular prejudice, provoked by liars like the *Tribune*, and kept alive by plotting schemers like its friends and fellow-conspirators against right and justice. It closes the lips of men who know that such measures are wrong, and who admit it in private while they dare not resist the influence or debate it in public. When one who has some courage ventures to assert his manhood and express his views, he is hounded and pelted and besmeared with fetid abuse by such rampant mud-throwers as the *Tribune*.

Let a man open his lips in defense of the people marked out for a prey, and he is libelled into silence or called every name that a whisky-soaked blackguard of the press can spit at him. Let a juryman vote according to his convictions, if they disagree with the will of the clique that wants to dictate everything in this Territory, and he is treated to the same process. Let a "Gentile" in Utah give a vote for a "Mormon" or even speak a word in favor of a "Mormon" ticket, and he would be so belabored and maligned and cur-yelped by the same set of tyrants who talk about Church and State, that he would have to hide himself or live in perpetual hot water.

We know of no People's political matter or ticket in Utah but has been both "resisted" and "debated." We do not know of any "Mormon" influence or rule that prevents either. We do know of *Tribune* and kindred proceedings that tend to stifle both. The union at which "Mormons" arrive comes after resistance and debate, the few joining the many when that resistance and debate have ended. That union is what the *Tribune* and the other schemers hate, but they cannot break or control it, so they seek to ruin its promoters.

All the *Tribune's* nonsense about the "union of Church and State" resolves itself into fog and vapor when the light of facts is thrown upon it. The influence which good men exercise in Utah in all its material affairs, comes by kindness, persuasion, intelligence, experience and the regard which the masses have for the opinions of the tried and true, and there is no coercion of vote or voice in any shape or form, except such as is exercised by the little knot of conspirators of which the *Tribune* is the expression and the dog-whip, over "Gentile" citizens, who, in many instances, cower before that influence because they desire peace and shrink from public castigation. It is a sinister and despotic influence and it has no place or power within the pale of the "Mormon" Church.

VIRTUE MUST BE VINDICATED.

An exchange, speaking of the present prosecutions in Utah, says:

"Let the crusade go on, and increase in violence until the jails can hold no more adulterers, and then transport the rest to the Cannibal Islands. Virtue must be vindicated."

Just so. But what will be done then against the "Mormons." How many officials will be left to spy and sneak, and arrest good men, and shut tender women and innocent infants up in prison? How many will be left in Utah to raise a constant howl about polygamy? If virtue was vindicated and the adulterers were all put in jail, the crusaders abroad would have to send another lot here to persecute the "Mormons." The plan here is to protect that kind, surround them with all the technicalities of the law, refuse to prosecute them and keep them around the courts as a sweet incense to the noses of the canting advocates of theoretic virtue. "Let us prey!"

"TREMBLING."

"'Trembling' we are told is not unusual with lecherous debauchees and hell-hole resorters."—*News*. Please tell us whether "knot-hole" resorters ever tremble.—*Democrat*.

Yes; the new knot-hole scribe of the *Democrat* has been seen to tremble several times quite recently.

Did you Suppose Mustang Liniment only good for horses? It is for inflammation of all flesh.

SUMMONS.

In the Probate Court, in and for Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah.

Anna Almgreen, Plaintiff,
vs.
Lars E. Almgreen, Defendant.

The People of the Territory of Utah send Greeting:

To Lars E. Almgreen, Defendant.

YOU ARE HEREBY REQUIRED TO appear in an action brought against you by the above-named plaintiff in the Probate Court, of the County of Salt Lake, Territory of Utah, and to answer the complaint filed therein within ten days (exclusive of the day of service) after the service on you of summons — if served within this county; or, if served out of this county, but in this district, within twenty days; otherwise within forty days.

The said action is brought to obtain a decree from this court dissolving the marriage contract existing between said plaintiff and you, on the ground of wilful desertion of plaintiff by defendant for more than one year last past. And you are hereby notified that if you fail to appear and answer the said complaint as above required, the said plaintiff will apply to this court for the relief prayed for and cost of suit.

Witness the Hon. Elias A. Smith, Judge, and the seal of the Probate Court of Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah, this 5th day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five.

[SEAL.]

JOHN C. CUTLER, Clerk.

w44 5w

[2151.]

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION.

Land Office at Salt Lake City, U. T., December 2nd, 1885.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the following-named settler has filed notice of her intention to make final proof in support of her claim, and that said proof will be made before the Hon. Register or Receiver of the U. S. Land Office at Salt Lake City, U. T., on Saturday, January 23rd, 1886, viz: Emma Lym, H. E. No. 4797, for the E. ½, S. E. ¼, Sec. 32, and W. ½ S.W. ¼, Sec. 33, T. 2, S. R. 1 E.

She names the following witnesses to prove her continuous residence upon, and cultivation of, said land, viz:

Marion H. Brady, of Union, S. L. Co., U.T.
Timothy Marriott, of " " "
John T. Smart, of " " "
Thos. H. Smart, of " " "

H. McMASTER, Register.

STAYNER & SIMMONS, Attorneys.

w47 6w

CHICAGO SCALE CO.
151 S. Jefferson St., Chicago.
2 Ton Wagon Scale, $40. 3 Ton, $50.
4 Ton $60, Beam Box included
240 lb. Farmer's Scale, $5.
"Little Detective" ½oz. to 25 lb., $3.
FORGES, TOOLS, Etc.
Best Forge Made for Light Work, $10
401b. Anvil and Kit of Tools, $10
Farmers save time and money doing odd jobs.
Blowers, Anvils, Vises and other articles. Illust. Free.

HAIR REMOVED
From any part of the body in FIVE MINUTES, without injury to the skin, by UPHAM'S DEPILATORY POWDER. Mailed (securely sealed) for $1.00. Sealed pamphlet FREE. Procure of Druggists. ASK FOR IT. Don't be put off with some other. H. G. UPHAM, P. O. Box 1297, Phila., Pa.

FREE TO F. A. M. Fine Colored Engraving of the Old Sun Tavern in Philadelphia in which the first lodge in N. America was organized and held. Also large illustrated Catalogue of Masonic books and goods with bottom prices. Also offer of first-class business to F. A. M. REDDING & CO., Masonic Publishers and Manufacturers, 731 Broadway, New York.

PATENTS
MUNN & CO., of the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, continue to act as Solicitors for Patents, Caveats, Trade Marks, Copyrights, for the United States, Canada, England, France, Germany, etc. Hand Book about Patents sent free. Thirty-seven years' experience.
Patents obtained through MUNN & CO. are noticed in the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, the largest, best, and most widely circulated scientific paper. $3.20 a year. Weekly. Splendid engravings and interesting information. Specimen copy of the Scientific American sent free. Address MUNN & CO., SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN Office, 261 Broadway, New York.