

ifornia and one in Montana. Congress appropriates money for the support of these schools. This year \$595,994 was appropriated for contract schools among Indians, 70 per cent. of which goes to Roman Catholic schools. The National League for the Protection of American Institutions protested against the appropriation. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Superintendent of Indian Schools were also opposed to the appropriations, yet the Senate passed it. The *Tribune* charges the Senate with insincerity, disloyalty and demagogism, and inasmuch as the *Tribune's* hero, Edmunds, did not protest against celibacy here, then he is, according to its logic, a hypocrite and a demagogue. The *Tribune* says:

"The Senate has struck a foul blow at Indian education. It has interfered with the policy of the Indian Commissioner to systematize the work and make it conform as far as possible to the common school system as adopted by the government schools, a policy which has been approved by the various Indian associations, by the Indian and Interior Departments, and by the leading newspapers and influential friends of Indians all over the country. It has said substantially that denominations may carry on their religious work and that the expense shall be paid out of the people's taxes. It has violated the Constitution, which explicitly declares, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.' The national government has nothing to do with turning young Indians or old Indians into Roman Catholics, Protestants, Hebrews or Quakers. Its powers stop, so far as schools are concerned, with giving them the common school education that will make good citizens of them."

This is a nice state of affairs. A few years ago the republican Senators made it an issue to denounce the celibate religion, today a republican Senate makes celibacy a State religion. The Chicago *Tribune* upholds the appropriation for the Salt Lake Soup house but condemns that for the Indian Catholic schools. One is as much sectarian as another. The whole thing is political party trickery. Just see how the words rebel and democrat are woven with Mormonism, and how the soup house is entirely lost sight of in the discussion.

The question simply is, what has the Salt Lake institution so abundantly provided for by the Senate done. How many refugees has it sheltered. The governor of Utah in his last report omitted stating the number of its inmates exclusive of paid officials. Dean Swift's congregation at one time in Ireland consisted of his coachman, and the sermon usually commenced with dearly beloved Roger instead of dearly beloved brethren. The same can be said of the Salt Lake soup refuge, yet a patriotic Senate gives it \$4,000 a year.

But why don't "Mormon" women accept the hospitality of the alleged Christians of Utah and Chicago? The *Tribune* indulges in a lot of claptrap about fanaticism and enthusiasm and so on. The "Mormon" women know well what can be gotten from outside. The *Vigilant*

line "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes" would apply here poetically.

If the elevation and purifying of American womanhood is really meant by these measures why not apply them at home. Here is a clipping from the Chicago *Tribune* in relation to Chicago women; and to Chicago religion:

Capt. Hayes of the Desplaines Street Station has about completed a little census of his own. In that portion of the West Side bounded by Carpenter Street and the river and Lake and Van Buren streets this census shows that there are now 100 respectable houses and fifty or more assignation houses. Some of the latter are situated in neighborhoods so quiet and respectable that their character is only known to those who frequent them. Among the curious and startling facts developed one may be mentioned which seems incredible, though it is vouched for. In a neat cottage in a highly respectable neighborhood on a quiet street west of Halsted Street lives a woman who is a faithful attendant of a fashionable church on one of the boulevards. She had no thought that suspicion rested upon her house until the brass-buttoned enumerator opened upon her his battery of questions, and even then she indignantly denied his imputations. But, finally, having to surrender to proofs, she admitted the character of her business, but pleaded in extenuation that no vulgar people were admitted inside her door and that all her visitors were, without exception, members of churches, most of them of her own. The enumerator tells several other stories, it is said, that are nearly as sensational, if not quite as incredible. What Captain Hayes is going to do with his returns is not known.

Would it not be better to transfer that Home to Chicago where there is need of it? Judging from the above the very churches here are assignation houses and bagnios. The Chicago *Tribune* is a good authority on Mormonism, then why not it be equally good on Methodism? It says that the good Christian housekeeper did not allow any vulgar people inside her premises, but mostly members of her own church, yet the *Tribune* wants the pure women of Utah to come into this fold to be sanctified.

In the *Tribune* issue of July 23, just after the editorial on "Mormonism," is another on Theosophy. In the latter Prof. Elliott Coues is highly commended for his explosion of many of the religious shams of the day. He is spoken of as a scientist who applies the cold steel of analysis to things spiritual and physical, and who ruthlessly exposes humbugs. The *Tribune*, in thus coupling Coues and Mormonism, even in an indirect way, affords to the student a fine opportunity for investigation. And in the manner in which it is done, it looks as if some providential interposition directed the hand or hands which wrote both articles. Mormonism in one is denounced and condemned, in the other Coues is regarded as a prophet, philosopher and scientist, before whom religious shams must retire. On investigation it is found that the life-work of Coues ends in what is the basic

doctrine of Mormonism, spirit entity.

Professor Elliott Coues is one of the best known scientists in America. He is a native of New Hampshire, where he was born in 1843. At 19 Agassiz recognized in young Coues a coming scientist, and recommended the young man as one fitted to accompany the Dodge expedition to Northern Labrador. He did so, and made a collection for the Museum of Comparative Zoology. Coues next studied medicine and entered the U. S. Army as surgeon. While discharging his professional duties with the army on the frontier, he made a special study of ornithology. He is the author of that well known work "Key to North American Birds." He published another work "Bibliography of Ornithology," which attracted the notice of British scientists, forty of whom signed a paper inviting Coues to reside in London and ally himself with the British Museum. He published another work of equal merit entitled "Fur-bearing Animals."

"In 1881 Professor Coues left the army, and though connected with the Smithsonian Institution, turned his attention to physis research.

It was this study which led to his publishing the works of the "Biogen Series." In these works he antagonizes orthodox materialistic science. He is at present engaged as an expert on the "Century Dictionary" and has been for three years. He has charge of the departments of zoology, anatomy, and general biology. His work will comprise some 40,000 words, a great number of which were never entered in any dictionary. He says the Encyclopaedia Britannica has 10,000 words the etymology of which has never been written.

The opinion or rather the reasoning of such a man on things spiritual and physical must be of interest. A scientist himself, and one recognized by the civilized world, a student, a close searcher, a clear reasoner, a sound thinker and a general scholar, his summary of life and death, of soul and body is certainly worthy of consideration. A short time since he visited this city where he has many relatives and friends, and then stated his ideas on physical matters.

Here is what he said:

"I accepted the conclusions of Lamarck and Darwin, but they were not satisfactory to me. In 1873 I became interested in spiritualism, and I had not gone far in this line of investigation before I was confronted by a form of force which was not mechanical, but was capable of producing mechanical effects. In these effects it seemed to me to reverse the law of gravity. I soon found myself substantially where William Crooks, of England, did. Spiritualists claimed that this force was manifested by disembodied spirits alone. However, by careful and repeated experiments I was convinced that a similar force could be manifested by living beings, and this brought me face to face with the question of mesmerism, animal magnetism or hypnotism.

"I could not conceive of any force acting without a medium of communication, but I had found one acting without any known medium. I there-