

Pure morality is after all more important than so-called orthodoxy.

Another remarkable incident was the reception of Mr. Webb, the American apostle of Islam. He was also warmly received, but in quite another spirit. In his remarks he explained that Islam did not inculcate polygamy. "And yet," he said, "polygamy is no curse. A man can be a good, honest gentleman and yet be a polygamist. But I do not accept him as such if he be a sensualist." Here the speaker was interrupted by cries of "No, no; stop him," and hisses. These protests must probably be understood as directed against the statement that a polygamist can be a good, honest gentleman—not against the concluding reservation; and no doubt Mr. Webb, if he made the statement, is able to prove it. But whether or no, what is puzzling to the ordinary reader is to account for the fact that Christian men and women should feel called upon to deny him any more than any one else the right to state his views in this matter. He was there to expound his particular doctrine, and he would seem to have had as much right to do so as any other delegate had.

Coming down to the essence of the matter, if Mr. Webb's statement is false, then the only conclusion to be drawn is that no Mohammedan can be a good, honest gentleman. Nor is this all. Many of the heroes who in the books most revered by all Christians are held out as patterns of the highest standard must be denounced, and the descent of our Savior Himself must be traced through an ancestry consisting largely of "no good, honest gentlemen." Surely no Christian is prepared to accept that conclusion. Would it not be better, even for those who profess an ultra-morality, to admit that the peculiar doctrine has had its benevolent mission to perform at some stage of the world's civilization? That in a few countries it may be excusable still, and that consequently, Mr. Webb had some foundation in truth for his statement? To accord fairness to everybody was always a Christian duty.

It is with a view to pointing out the departure from this last-named virtue that these remarks are made. And as further evidence that they are justified we quote from the *Chicago Herald* of the 26th:

"Elder Roberts of Salt Lake did not deliver his address before the Parliament of Religions Sunday. The Elder's paper was on the program all right enough, but he is a Mormon, and after Mohammed Alexander Russell Webb's paper on polygamy had aroused such a decided opposition to a free discussion of polygamy, the members of the congress decided that an apostle of Mormonism would be out of place in the congress.

The Elder was told, however, that he could speak in Hall 3 before a select assemblage of people particularly interested in his doctrine. The announcement was made accordingly. The audience came and waited patiently for the Elder, but he did not appear. He decided that he would not enter the congress at all if he could not appear before the representatives of all faiths. Professor Merwin Marie Snell called the meeting to order, and said the elder did right in refusing to read his paper before a mere branch of the parliament. He said, further, that it was a blemish upon the name and future history of the great

parliament of religions that such an insult should be heaped upon the Mormon Church.

"The idea," he said, "of inviting the representatives of all nations and religions, heathen and otherwise, to participate in this great gathering of creeds, and then refuse to allow the Mormons to hold a presentation meeting. They were granted the privilege once of holding a presentation congress, but it was afterward revoked. I do not blame the elder for refusing to read a paper before a mere adjunct of the parliament."

### THE VOTER'S DUTY.

So far as concerns the forthcoming election, the News will be candid enough at this early stage of proceedings to say that there are in the community men and methods that we shall not under any circumstance countenance and for whose defeat no legitimate effort that we may be able to make will be left unapplied. This because we have the welfare of Salt Lake City directly and of Utah generally at heart.

We can conceive of nothing more detrimental to healthful growth and proper progress than the systematic discouragement of those who labor for their bread. This can be and has been accomplished here in various ways—employing men without just compensation and sometimes with none at all, and inducing others for political or other unjustifiable reasons to come into our midst and obtain the work that of right should go to those who are already here, whose homes are here, and whose temporal destinies at least are bound up with those of us who expect to live and die here. This latter is a gross injustice even to those who are induced to come, since it gives them but temporary employment; but it is much worse to the resident class, for they have a right to expect that they will be preferred so long as they are able to do all that is required. We would not encourage a spirit of selfishness or exclusiveness in this matter, but we do contend for the rightfulness of this conclusion—that when we cannot afford to those whom we already have all that they need to make their families comfortable, it is nothing more or less than a crime to bring in others to make still less and more uncertain the pittance received.

This states at once a proposition that every patriot and every workingman ought to take earnestly to heart. Shall we be asked to lend aid or encouragement to any political party or to any candidate or ticket that would counteract the acts above outlined and oppose? Nay, shall we give support to a party that makes no secret of its determination to live by just such proceedings? Should there be any room in this or any community for such a party and any toleration for such principles? There are questions for every voter to answer for himself. If he depends upon his daily labor for his daily bread, he will be forced to wonder at the impudence of those who, while asking for his suffrage, boldly propose to perpetuate themselves in power by importing hordes to take the labor that belongs to him. He will not be unmindful that such methods have been resorted to

before, and that the same old program will probably be carried out again. He will smile at the bewhiskered and delusive promise of "Salt Lake workmen for Salt Lake work," when he recalls the more practical campaign plan of "Imported voters for Salt Lake elections," because he will know that those imported voters must be given work to bring them here, and be given work to keep them here. If he uses the intelligence that God has given him and is enough of a freeman to act upon it, his vote will scarcely be given to a party that can only live by a policy so infamous, or to candidates whose personal greed for spoils so outrageously subdues the plain duty of men to their fellow men.

### SACRAMENT AND BLESSINGS.

A correspondent at Farmington writes to the News on the subjects of partaking of the sacrament and the blessing of children. He says:

In a sermon delivered by one of the First Presidency or one of the Twelve Apostles some months ago and published in the *Deseret News*, the speaker referred to Sunday meetings being held in the ward meeting houses in Salt Lake City and stated, in about these words, that it will give the ward officers an opportunity to see if Church members partake of the sacrament unworthily.

These remarks have suggested to my mind the following questions:

1—If any person is supposed to be partaking of the sacrament unworthily, what action should be taken in the premises?

2—If two persons have enmity or ill-feelings toward each other, in some instances to such an extent that they will not speak when they meet, and yet both of them partake of the sacrament; perhaps both are honest in thinking that the other is wholly in the fault, and in this case each one takes the sacrament, at the same time thinking that the other party is committing a grave error in so doing; can circumstances exist to justify either of them in so partaking?

3—Should each party be held equally responsible for the existing bad feelings, until a settlement of the dispute is effected, or until diligent and reasonable efforts are made toward a reconciliation?

4—If one of the parties refuses to appear at a hearing, and to be guided by Church laws, is the other party justified in taking the sacrament pending a settlement of the case?

5—Is it admissible to permit non-Mormon parents to have their children blessed by our Elders on fast days, if such parents are honest and sincere in requesting that they be so blessed?

6—In case children of non-Mormons are not permitted to be blessed, if only one of the parents is a Church member and the other consents for the children to be blessed by our Elders, is it then admissible?

The foregoing inquiries may be best replied to in a general way in a newspaper article. Should there be a desire for more elaborate explanation, the correspondent is referred to the presiding authorities of the district where he resides. The questions which he propounds may be disposed of as follows:

First—A mere supposition of unworthiness is not sufficient cause for withholding the sacrament from a Church member. There is a rule in the Church by which the fact can be