

WOMAN'S EXPONENT.

EMMELINE B. WELLS, Editor.

Published semi-monthly, in Salt Lake City, Utah. Terms: one copy one year, \$2.00; one copy six months, \$1.00. Ten copies for the price of nine.

Advertising rates: Each square, ten lines of nonpareil space, one time, \$2.50; per month, \$3.00. A liberal discount to regular advertisers.

EXPONENT office, No. 25 E., South Temple Street, second gate east of Deseret News Office. Business hours from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day, except Sunday.

Address all business communications to

PUBLISHER WOMAN'S EXPONENT,

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SALT LAKE CITY, FEBRUARY 15, 1887.

APOSTLE LORENZO SNOW AT LIBERTY.

Washington, D. C., 3:30 p.m., February 7th, 1887.—The Supreme Court to-day reversed the decision of the Utah court in the Snow case. The syllabus set forth that where a district court in the Territory of Utah refuses to issue a writ of *habeas corpus* involving a question of personal freedom, an appeal lies to this court from its order and judgment of refusal. The offense of cohabiting with more than one woman, created by the act of March 22nd, 1882, is a continuous offense and not one consisting of an isolated act. After giving the history of the case, the court says: "On appeal to this court it is held—first, there was but one entire offense for the continuous time; second, the trial court had no jurisdiction to inflict a punishment in respect of more than one of the convictions; third, as want of jurisdiction appeared on the face of the proceedings, the defendant could be released from imprisonment on *habeas corpus*; fourth, the order and judgment of the court below must be reversed and the case remanded to that court with direction to grant the writ of *habeas corpus* prayed for."

COMMENTS.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Lorenzo Snow was something of a victory gained, and a cause for gratitude to God among this people, who have borne so much injustice from the misinterpretation of the Edmunds law. Those who have suffered unjust imprisonment, and submitted to it "willingly, because they were obliged to," being sentenced by a judge who seemed to think himself an autocrat, ought certainly to have redress for such a grievance, but whether this can or cannot be done is very uncertain. However, "It is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong," and one need not envy that judge his conscience who has sent men to prison in two or three or more counts, and made them pay unlawful fines, it must sting painfully, one would think, when he remembers the wives and little children that have had to suffer privation and wrongs for his cruelty, even if he does not consider the father, and his separation from those he loves, as well as his humiliating position behind the bolts and bars. O when will men discern the beam in their own eyes, instead of hunting and probing for the mote in their brother's?

The segregation business is at an end, though the officers still insist upon full fines, as in the case of Royal B. Young. Where the justice of the thing stands is not apparent, except to those who are after the dollars and cents of the Mormons, "whom they affect to despise."

Bro. Lorenzo Snow does not appear to cherish any ill feeling towards those who have unjustly accused and falsely imprisoned him, and stands up in defense of the principles of freedom and liberty as nobly and as grandly as though the prison

walls had never enviroined his freedom, or the ponderous iron gates had never shut him in from his family, his brethren and his people. Imprisonment cannot crush men's souls, nor hinder their communication with God and the Holy Spirit, if they are suffering for principle, and one would think that in the example of Apostle Lorenzo Snow and others, who have been sent to prison for conscience' sake, this fact would be sufficiently illustrated for all the world to comprehend it. Yet Bro. Snow, under the test oath in the Edmunds-Tucker bill cannot be accorded the privilege of an American citizen any more than as though he were actually guilty of a heinous crime; and his lineage, his descent from the Revolutionary fathers, avails him nothing. The liberty they fought and bled for, that their children might enjoy "the freedom, to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences" has been denied, and to their direct descendants, and there is no alternative, under the present *regime*, but to submit to this violation of that sacred principle, as Bro. Snow has, in such a manner as to dignify and ennoble the cause he represents, and bring the greater shame and disgrace upon those who so ruthlessly trifle with the finest feelings of the human heart, and scatter misery and sorrow broadcast over this fair land.

The Edmunds-Tucker Bill is at this date, Feb. 15, still pending. Hammond of Georgia, appointed to act for Tucker of Virginia, in his absence, submitted to-day the Conference report on this anti-Mormon bill in the House, and it was ordered printed and laid over until Thursday.

There are some very material changes, which have been made by the Conferees, that will disappoint the "Liberals" here in Utah, as well as elsewhere; in fact the Committee have, some of them at least, shown a little consideration, and have made some changes that will be in our favor, or that will not make the Governor of Utah an absolute monarch in the exercise of political power. The bill is bad enough as it is, and it is "devoutly to be wished" that the President will exercise the privilege of his position, and refuse his signature and the great seal of the United States to such an infamous bill, even if the Senate and the House should both approve the bill as amended.

A singular coincidence that has transpired with the authors of these two outrageous bills is that during the discussion of the first Edmunds bill, Mr. Edmunds buried a daughter, and that recently, while Mr. Tucker was at work upon the Edmunds-Tucker Bill, he has been compelled to leave his post to go down to Mississippi and attend the funeral of his daughter. Mr. Tucker, notwithstanding his present attitude on the "Mormon" question, is a man possessing an abundance of affection for his family. This death will be a severe blow to him, but it is not at all likely that it will make him any more tender or sympathetic towards "Mormon" wives or daughters. We sincerely wish it might soften his feelings and cause him to change his resolve to crush out the system of plural marriage, of which he knows so little, yet entertains such bitter prejudices.

When the new bill, now under consideration, becomes a law, if it ever should (which we most sincerely trust never may happen) then it will be given in full in the EXPONENT. By and bye, without studying for it specially, the Mormon people will become pretty well versed in law, *practically*.

The taking away of the suffrage from women after they have voted for seventeen years, is an inexcusable wrong, and more especially so in men, who profess to be the friends of women, and to protect their rights and "guard their best interests in the family and the home," and all that kind of sentimentalism, that means nothing at all, but is a lot of political rubbish and bombast, that

all sensible women perfectly understand. If such were indeed the case, they would give women the right to protect themselves in their own states and in the District of Columbia, the same as the "Mormon" Legislature did in Utah, and not leave them unprotected, with drunken husbands to beat them and squander their hard earned means, and woman would be considered in the election of officers, because her vote would count as much as the best man's in the country.

The brave suffrage women, who made a forcible protest to President Cleveland through their memorial against the suffrage being taken away from the legal women voters of this Territory, deserve the gratitude and commendation of all the supporters of the cause of woman's rights throughout this broad land. They have shown more interest for our rights than any man or set of men. We have not yet learned who all the ladies were, but we do know that the names we have seen published are a sufficient guarantee of the strength of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee was Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake, of New York, a woman whose keen sarcasm and clear cut witticisms are proverbial with all who know her. She has spoken up in favor of the women of Utah before, and in her amusing little "Book of Fables" she has two or three specially significant of the dealings of the United States' Government with the Mormons.

In the Resolutions adopted by the N. W. S. A. at Washington, during the recent Convention is the following:

Whereas, The anti-polygamy bill passed by both Houses of Congress provide for the disfranchisement of the non-polygamous women of Utah, and,

Whereas, The women thus sought to be disfranchised have been for years in the peaceable exercise of the ballot, and no charge is made against them of any crime by reason of which they should lose their vested rights, therefore

Resolved, That the association recognizes in these measures a disregard of individual rights, which is dangerous to the liberties of all, and while rejoicing in the majority vote by which the women of Washington Territory were protected, we would urge upon Congress that the rights of the women of Utah should be equally sacred; since to establish the precedent that the ballot may be taken away, is to threaten the permanency of our republican form of government.

The President may disregard the advice given to him by these *strong minded* women—we use this term in its best and most significant sense—but he will not be likely to forget their earnest and emphatic effort in behalf of women, even though they be far away. All these things make a decided impression, and will have their weight, even though the object sought is not obtained. We hope to receive full particulars of the memorial, with the names of the Committee who presented it, before publishing again. It is only just and right to recognize and record the event, that all interested may know there are some women not afraid or ashamed to speak in defense of the rights even of "Mormon" women.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

ON Monday, January 31st, a party of ladies assembled, by invitation, at the residence of Mrs. Maria Y. Dougall, to celebrate the birthday anniversary of Mrs. Zina D. H. Young. There were present on the occasion some of the veteran women of the Church, among the number, Sister Eliza R. Snow Smith, Catherine Horrocks, Sarah M. Kimball, M. Isabella Horne, Susan S. Young, and others not so far advanced in years, numbering about twenty-five or thirty guests. Delicious chocolate and refreshments were ele-