

NO. 18.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1890.

VOL. XL.

A BIT OF EXPERIENCE

I have met with a good many people In jogging o'er life's varied way I've encountered the elever, the simple. The crabbed, the grave and the gay: I have traveled with beauty and virtue I bave been with the ugly, the bad, I have laughed with the ones who were merry

And went with the ones who were sad.

One thing I have learned on my journey-Ne'er to judge one by what be appears The eyes that seem sparkling with laughter

Oft battle to keep back the tears, And long sanctimonious faces Hide often the souls that are vile. While the beart that is merry and cheerful Is often the freest from guile.

And I've learned not to look for perfection In one of our frail buman kind; In bearts the most gentle and loving Some blemish or fault we can find, But yet I bavene'er found the creature So low, so depraved and so mean, But had some good impulse-some virtue That 'mong bls bad traits might be seen.

And, too, I bave learned that some friend ahins

We make are as brittle as glass; Just let a reverse overtake us-Our "friends" on the "other side" pass; But, ah! I have found a few loyal-Some hearts ever loving and true! And the joy and peace they have brought me

Have ebeered my whole journey through.

ADMISSION OF IDAHO.

Speech of Hou. John T. Caine, of Utah, in the House of Representa-tives, Thursday, April 3rd, 1890.

On the bill (H. R. 4562) to provide for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union.

. Mr. Uaine said:

Mr. Speaker-I am in favor of the admission to statehood of all the Territories as soon as they have the requisite qualifications and adopt constitutions as the fundamental law of the future States, which are at least republican in form. Although the Territory which I have their country "a the honor to represent has for many years possessed all the requisite qualifications for statehood, she has be disfranchised?

been denied that precious boon because the majority of her people were members of a numerically weak and unpopular church; not because of pelygamy, for the great majority of them never practiced it, but because they were Mormons.

The same spirit which has denied statehood to Utah proposes now to disfranchise the members of the Mormon Church in the future State of Idaho. Because they are polygamists? Not at all; for it was shown in evidence before the committees on the Territories, both of the Seuate and the House, that not more than one hundred and twenty-five men out of the twenty or twentyfive thousand Mormous living in Idaho had ever been in any polygamous relation. At the present time those men, while supporting their families, are not living with them in violation of law. What, then, are the reasons for this wholesale disfranchisement? There are two: one religious—they are members of the Mormon Church; the other political it is supposed that they will vote the Democratic ticket.

The Mormon citizens of Idaho are counted to obtain the necessary population for statehood, and they will be heavily taxed to support the State government. Taxation with-out representation is just as odious now as it was in the days before the Revolution. Its enforcement by an alleged free and sovereign State will be no less detestable than it was by King George the Third. I fear we are gradually departing from those great principles of free gov-ernment founded by the fathers, which gave birth to the Declaration of Independence.

The speaker here quoted from the report of Governor Stevenson of Idaho, in which the "Mormons" are

thrift, judustry and temperance. This testimony to the character of the Mormon people of Idaho and the work they have performed in redeeming that once bleak sterile region speaks loudly in their praise.

spoken of in high terms for their

·Is it for these labors that they are

to be disfranchised?

Is it because they have rendered their country "abundantly fruitful in grain, hay, and vegetables of almost every kind" that they are to

Is it because they have erected substantial public buildings and the fluest church edifice in Idaho that they are to be disfranchised?

Is it because in Paris, with "a population of about 1500, all Mormons, there is not a saloon, or gambling-house, or any other place where intoxicating liquor is sold, and this is the case in all towns in ldaho where these people have ex-clusive control," that they are to be disfranchised?

Is it because "their towns and villages are thrifty and their farms well cultivated, their buildings geuerally substantial and many of them stylish, with all the modern improvements that make a country look progressive and prosperous, that they are to be disfranchised?

"Is it because "these people are, as a rule, frugal, industrious, and honest," that they are to be disfranchised?

If "all the best citizers of Idaho have no wish or desire to persecute, wrong or oppress the Mermou peo-ple, nor do they wish to deprive them of any of their rights as American outizens," then I ask why are they to be distranchised? I pause for a

reply. It will be said it is because they practice polygamy. But Governor Stevenson says that he was informed by men high in authority in the Mormon Church, and in whose word the highest confidence, he had "that they are willing to live up to the laws (which they claim are now being fairly and more humanely ad-ministered), and that the doctrine of plural marriages is not practiced as formerly or taught either publicly or privately, and that they do not teach, advise, connsel, or encourage the practice of polygamy or bigamy." Thus Governor Stevenson's statement, which agrees with the testimony given before the committees of Congress during the past two years, fully disposes of the charge of

polygamy.

The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. Dubois) has with much seeming pathos told you of "the wretched, appalling misery and degradation of polygamist women and children' he had witnessed in Idaho. Why, gentlemen, there are thousands of cases of misery and degra ation existing among women and children who are not polygamists in every,