

after the dictates of their own conscience, as long as that worship is not in the nature of a violation of the Constitution and laws of the land.

We believe that no person should be proscribed in either public or private life on account of religious belief or sectarian affiliations.

We believe that any person or set of persons who do attempt to proscribe others on account of their religious belief or sectarian affiliations are enemies to the laws of the country and should be treated as such.

We believe that the American people should rule and govern their country in accordance with the mandates and provisions of the American Constitution and American laws, and not after the rules of fanatics and bigots.

We are opposed to any union of church and state and any sectarian interference with the public schools.

The foregoing reads very prettily; it is quite patriotic in its expressions. In fact it breathes the sentiment so strongly that it sounds much like the wolf's protestations of friendship for the lamb, particularly when that which follows this declaration is taken into full consideration. Each member of the L. and L. society is required to take an oath, not prescribed by the law of the land, in which he swears to "uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States," to not "discriminate against or in favor of any person on account of religious belief or church affiliation;" to "oppose any attempt at union between church and state;" and to actively participate in politics "and endeavor to secure the nomination of no person who has obligated himself to discriminate against or in favor of any person in public or private life on account of the religious belief" of such person. The oath further says:

I will do all in my power to further the interests of this order and of the individual members thereof, at all times and in all places.

That I will oppose at all times and in all places the public employment, nomination or election of the enemies to our government who have taken the obligation of the American Protective association, until such time as they have renounced such obligation and become once again honorable American citizens by taking the oath of allegiance to uphold the institutions and laws of the country.

I do further solemnly swear that I will divulge to no one not a member of this society any of the acts, proceedings or membership of this society, under penalty of being expelled from the society and of being denounced as disloyal to this oath."

The position assumed in this oath, particularly in the latter part, makes the new organization fully as bad as the A. P. A. which it antagonizes. To the covenant that is made to sustain the Constitution of the United States is attached a solemn obligation pledging an allegiance to a secret society above that which is given to the Constitution. The A. P. A. oath was directed against persons who the members believed were pursuing a policy inimical to the nation's good, but who had violated no statute of the land. It convicted them upon accusation and sought to punish them for an offense not designated by legislative enactment. It took the administration of the law into its own hands so far as it could within the scope of its

scheme, instead of leaving it within the bounds prescribed by the Constitution. The L. and L. society does precisely the same thing and then goes the A. P. A. one better. The latter directed its fanaticism and anti-constitutional measures against Roman Catholics only; the L. and L. directs its like qualities not only against the A. P. A., but all those who are not included within its own membership. It is specially pledged to further interests of the order "and of the individual members thereof," thus discriminating against American citizens who have no membership in any secret organization. It fairly out-herods Herod.

It is time the national government was doing something towards a vigorous treatment of these political secret societies. They are a direct menace to the existence of the Republic and should be dealt with as such. It is treason for people in the United States to take an oath against the government; it is treasonable to take an oath against any citizen. If a citizen does wrong he should answer to a legally constituted tribunal; the act that directs a secret society against him is the greater wrong. The government is threatened by a serious evil in permitting these organizations to go on. The national arm should be raised in promptness and determination against their unlawful exercise of power, which should be punished if need be by fine and imprisonment. The earlier this is done the better it will be for the country. We want in this land a government of the whole people, and not of any secret and abominable combination.

SUGAR AND SHEEP.

The labor of preparing a revision of the tariff in conformity with the Democratic plan has been completed and the document published in outline as it will be presented to Congress at the coming session. The changes have been sufficiently sweeping to satisfy almost any one who can tolerate the principle of tariff in any degree.

The parts of the bill which most interest Utah are its references to sugar and wool. The sugar bounty is to be disposed of in instalments, the process of reduction to begin in July, 1895, and to continue at a given rate till 1902, when the present bounty will have been wiped out. Wool is placed on the free list. The United States wool being thus brought into competition with the products of Australia and South America may have to succumb; but in this regard the realization can scarcely be any more disastrous than the speculators have made the anticipation. Besides, the probability is that the price of mutton will rise sufficiently to make sheepraising an object still in localities suited to the business. Whether Utah was ever a proper place for sheep, and would now suffer much if the industry went down, the News will not attempt to argue at length. There are two sides to the sheep question, and much can be said on each. Wool growing has indeed made some of our citizens wealthy and yielded a considerable profit to a goodly number. It has brought much money into circulation

and has made possible home-manufactured goods. But on the other hand, the Territory at large has undoubtedly suffered some by the enterprise; the anti-sheep men declare boldly the opinion that it has been damaged to an enormous extent, which may be overcome by time or may prove to be irreparable. They point out that twenty-five years ago our ranges were capable of sustaining without perceptible degeneration hundreds of thousands of cattle and horses, while today they are practically barren of grass—the sheep have dug it out by the roots. Of course there are extremists on both sides—sheep men who act as though they own the earth, and farmers who really do own a piece of it and to whom a flock of sheep is a provocation to nightmare. All will agree that sheep culture is a splendid thing in its place. The local controversy is as to whether its place is in Utah.

HARD TIMES.

There is no question that the times now are bearing heavily upon many people, particularly those who have been thrown out of employment by the general depression in business. There are many, however, and some of them complain most loudly, who have not really felt any inconvenience from the business dullness, but look upon it as a veritable boon because it has given them a fashionable opportunity to check much of their former extravagance. An instance in point is that of a well known official who occupies a rented city residence. A short time ago he removed from an elegant dwelling in a most fashionable part of town, and established his family in a less pretentious mansion nearer the suburbs. Asked the other day the reason for the change he replied, "Hard times." "But your salary is the same?" "Yes," came hesitatingly, as the official began to ponder over the subject. "As it is paid regularly as ever, where do the hard times come in?" "Well," frankly replied the gentleman, "the hard times gave me a needed opportunity to reduce the expenses for style, so I took it, and not any earlier than I should have done."

This is but one of many instances where the strugency has been a real benefit. It has pinched some strong men, but it has also strengthened many weak ones. Of the latter are those who have cut down expenses in style. But there are others who have had to cut down in actual necessities. Why cannot these be made sharers in the benefits of the others? We suggest as a proper observance of thanksgiving that those whom the hard times have enabled to dispense with unnecessary extras now come to the assistance of those who need extra necessities. It would be a graceful act to take some of the means saved from extravagance and dispense it where it will benefit and bless. The duty of those who have means to spend is that they should if possible spend more freely than ever in times of scarcity. Large-hearted, broad-minded men and women do not draw themselves into a nutshell when others are compelled to pinch, but come forth with a double portion to relieve the needs of their fellowmen.