EDITORIALS.

MORMON METHODS.

A Chicago paper suggests the enactment of a law that will "treat Mormonism as treason" against the United States. This will not turn any of the Church leaders pale. They very well understand that no such law would be worth the paper on which it was written. The Constitution defines treason strictly, and the law cannot go outside of that definition. It is a "levying of war against the United States or adhering to its enemies." Polygamy, which is the obnoxious and troublesome plank in the Mormon platform, is not within the scope of this definition of treason; therefore any law making it treason would be null and void. In every other part of the country polygamy is a felony, but in Utah, and even there it is felonious under United States law and works political disability. But the trouble is that no law which is distasteful to the Mormons can be enforced in any part of the country where they are in the majority. Men cannot be excluded from grand and petty juries simply because they are Mormons. Mormonism is not a crime. The crime is polygamy, and not more than one adult Mormon in fifty is living in polygamy, for the reason, perhaps, that there are not women enough to go around. But the polygamous Mormons are the rich, the intellectual, the influential and the ruling class. They compel the others to do their bidding, and when one not living in polygamy is called to a jury or to the witness stand, his verdict and his testimony are given as directed from this ruling class. No law that has yet been passed has reached the situation to remedy it. No law ever will that permits Mormon violators of it to be tried by a Mormon jury or by a jury with a single Mormon on it. Whether Congress under the present Constitution can enact a law to exclude a man from juries on account of his Mormonism or religion is not a question. It cannot. Whether it would be wise to amend the Constitution so as to give Congress this power is a very serious question. If the power were once extended to the exclusion of Mormons apart from polygamists, it might by and by be stretched so as to extend to the worshipers in other faiths and to those who do not believe in any religion, and that might lead to worse practices than polygamy."

The above is from the San Francisco *Chronicle*. It is in reference to an item telegraphed to the coast papers from Chicago stating that the *Inter-Ocean* declares the Commission "a failure," and that "what is needed is a law that will recognize Mormonism as treason and treat it as such," with other nonsense in a similar strain. The *Chronicle* has sense enough to see that this is all moonshine, and that it is impossible to make treason out of a creed or of a social practice, however obnoxious it may be to the government or the people.

The cry of "treason" has often been raised against the "Mormons," always without cause and with total oblivion of the definition of the term as given in the Constitution. But it remained for the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* to reach the sublime absurdity of arguing that a religion shall be legislated into treason.

The *Chronicle*, in commenting on this, falls into nearly as great an error as the *Inter-Ocean*. The talk about one class in Utah compelling another class to do their bidding is too nonsensical to need any reply. And the *Chronicle* seems to be entirely ignorant of the fact that the law and the practice are actually that which is stated in the above article to be an impossibility. In Utah no "Mormon" is allowed to sit on a jury when a case of bigamy or polygamy is tried, who is either a bigamist or a polygamist or believes it is right for a man to have two or more living and undivorced wives at the same time. The *Chronicle* says such a law cannot be enacted. But it has been enacted. And before its enactment the Federal Court here established the practice without any law.

With the *Chronicle's* statement, however, about the powers of Congress to enact such a law under the Constitution, we cordially agree, and also with its predictions about the extension of the principle. It has been done in reference to the "Mormons," and if the law is not declared unconstitutional by the Courts it can and will be done in reference to other unpopular religionists. It is a two-edged sword which will cut in other directions besides the "Mormon" side. We are glad to see the *Chronicle* taking such a sensible and constitutional view of this question, and only ask why it took such an opposite stand when the Edmunds law was under consideration in Congress?

IT'S A POOR RULE, ETC.

"The Salt Lake anti-polygamy papers always speak of polygamists as 'polygs.' It sounds a little like pig and a little like pigmy, and is altogether a good and suitable abbreviation."

We clip the foregoing from an eastern exchange, which figures as a first class paper. If "polyg" is a suitable abbreviation for polygamist, and sounds anything like pig or pigmy, would not "monog" be a suitable abbreviation for monogamist and sound still more like hog with a moan or a grunt to it? Even with the added aspirate it is not so much of a stretch of etymology or imagination as the other. And from a somewhat extended acquaintance with human nature in many lands we are forced to the conclusion that where there is one piggish or pigmy polygamist there are many thousands of hoggish and moaning monogamists.

PRICES OF WOOL.

WOOL is not likely to command very high prices this season. The effects of the new tariff are already being felt in the markets of this country. We will endeavor to keep our readers posted on the prices ruling in Utah. Below is a list of the figures now given at Provo:

Fine, good condition,	-	14 to 15cts.
" heavy "	-	12 " 13 "
Medium, prime condition,		17 "
" good "		15 " 16 "
" poor "		14 " 15 "
Arizona Wool,	-	10 " 12 "
Black	-	2 to 3cts lower

LEPROSY OR WHAT?

If the small clique of carpers who are trying to make a leprosy sensation out of an eruption on a boy's arms, will look among their own scribbling crowd, they will find a face which bears more resemblance to incipient leprosy, if nothing worse, than anything seen on the poor little Kanaka. If they can stand that color right under their own noses they should not sniff at a few fever sores at a distance of several city blocks. "Burly brutes" is a more fitting title for such persons than for quiet returning missionaries, minding only their own business.

A FAMINE OF PREACHERS.

THE religious circles of the United States are very much exercised at the present time over the announcement that there is a "famine of preachers." At the General Assembly of Presbyterians held in Saratoga it was announced that there are two thousand Presbyterian churches with empty pulpits. Inquiry has elicited the important information that the churches without a preacher are all of that class called "poor churches;" that is, they are not frequented and supported by the rich and fashionable, and are not able to furnish salaries to an amount large enough to engage the sympathies and services of the M. A's or D. D's or common "Rev's" ordained to the ministry in the Presbyterian faith.

This is a bad condition of affairs and causes great lamentation and bewailment. It has also brought forth many discussions of the situation and the cause and cure of the evil, from the religious journals of this country. And there is one thing that is particularly noticeable in the whole matter, that is, that the cause of the "famine" is shown to be the lack of inducement in the shape of sufficient salary; and the only suggestions as to cure are, higher figures for poor preachers, greater cash encouragement, fatter incomes as effectual calls. The glory necessary to arouse latent ministerial enthusiasm appears to be the glitter of gold, and the music required to unlock the dumb lips of religious eloquence the chink of dollars or the rustling of greenbacks.

Remember, these are the arguments of preachers in favor of preachers. They are all good "Christians," professing "Christians," professional "Christians," after the fashion of the Christianity of modern times. They are desirous that the bread of life shall be dispensed, but demand to be paid for every crumb of it. Plenty of preachers for the broad-clothed and silk-gowned habitues of gilded and cushioned temples, but none for the waiting worshippers clad in jeans and calico and meeting in the plain conventicle. Powdered and painted gentility can have a surfeit of the highest priced pabulum served up with the daintiest tidbits of orthodox eloquence. But to the poor the gospel is *not* preached, and for the plain and moneyless children of the All-Father there is a famine of preachers.

Just imagine such a condition of affairs in the Church of Christ as is announced in the Presbyterian Church! Fancy Peter declaring that Philip could not preach in Samaria nor Stephen at Antioch without a larger stipend. Think of Paul announcing that unless higher salaries could be raised no servant of the Lord Jesus could be induced to go over into Macedonia and help the needy; that without greater cash inducements Timothy could no longer officiate at Epheseus nor Silas at Thessalonica.

When the founder of the Christian Church sent out his disciples to preach, he said to them, "freely have ye received, freely give." The laborer, it is said, is "worthy of his hire." But what was the "hire" permitted to the Apostles and Elders traveling in the ministry in the early times? The same that the Savior had. "Into whatsoever house ye enter, eat and drink such things as they set before you, asking no questions, for conscience sake." Payment for preaching was never demanded, expected or permitted in the Church of Christ. It is one of those practices which, as the pastor of Plymouth admits, have sprung up in the churches of modern times. It is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Gospel. Salaries for preaching; fees for baptizing; fees for marrying; fees for funeral services; money, money, money! This disgusts and turns people away from so-called religion, and makes infidels of them because they see that the professed ministers of Christ are servants of Mammon; that they "preach for hire and divine for money;" that their anxiety for souls is a cloak for their hunger for cash, and that their profession is a trade the value of which is to be estimated by the amount of dollars it commands.

"But ministers must live." Of course. The ox must not be muzzled that treads out the corn. There should be no barrier set up to the liberality of grateful hearts wishing to demonstrate appreciation of kind administrations. Those who receive of spiritual things should be willing to impart their carnal things in the shape of contributions. But this does not argue that the preaching of the gospel of life and salvation should be a commercial commodity, to be bought and sold like so much grain or merchandize. That the poor should go without preaching while the rich are preached to *ad libitum*. That unless the cash is forthcoming the multitude may go to the devil. That except the sheep yield rich fleeces the stock may starve and perish.

In the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as in the early Church of which this is a restoration, no one is paid for preaching. From its President down to the simplest official not one is hired to preach. If any one is sustained or assisted from the general Church fund obtained by the tithing of its members, it is for services rendered other than preaching. Every man holding the Priesthood is expected to hold himself ready to preach the Gospel and dispense the bread of of life, at home or abroad, without money and without price. And he who, professing to be a minister of Christ, withholds the word of truth because he is not feed for it, is no servant of the Lord, but a money-grub and an impostor, a hireling and a fraud. And any Church that permits its congregations to be unfed and its pulpits to be unoccupied because money enough is not offered to pay preachers to fill them, is as far from being the Church of Christ as outer darkness is from the light and glory of the celestial kingdom.

MODERN INQUISITIONS.

THE Chicago *News* of May 23d contains a well written article comparing the Spanish Inquisition of old times with the English Inquisition of the present time. The writer does not pretend to say that during the investigations under the Crimes Act in Ireland, witnesses are subject to physical torture, yet he proves that in the secret inquiry and the power of courts to extort information, the spirit and object of the older Inquisition are adopted and carried into effect. He shows that the essence of Torquemada's Inquisition consisted in what its name implies—the inquest which it gave itself the right to hold upon every person it chose to accuse as a prisoner or summon as a witness. And this enters into the secret investigations authorized by the Crimes Act.

After describing in graphic terms the terrors of the times of Ferdinand and Isabella, when the sense of insecurity oppressed every citizen of Spain, no one knowing that he might not at any time be served with the dread summons of the Inquisition, he goes on to show what may be done under the law which has been enacted with the view of coercing Ireland:

> The 16th clause of the crimes act empowers every resident magistrate (the 10th clause of the new criminal code procedure bill, which seeks to have the inquisition made a permanent institution, extends this power to "every justice") to hold an investigation in his own house whenever he has "reasonable grounds" for supposing that he may be able thereby to obtain information with respect to indictable offenses committed in the district. That is to say, practically, the magistrate may hold this investigation whenever he himself pleases. The "investigation" is to be secret; no one is to be present except those with whom the investigator chooses to surround himself.
>
> The magistrate has power to summon 'witnesses' to this investigation, and, without charging them with any offense, he can thereby subject them to an examination conducted in any manner he likes and with regard to any subject he pleases to select. Should a 'witness' consider these questions impertinent; should he refuse to recognize the magistrate's right to extract information from him with regard to the most private concerns of himself or his family; should he be indignant that he should be supposed to know anything of the crimes the investigator chooses to pretend he knows all about; should he possess a secret locked up in his heart, which it would be dishonor and infamy to betray; should he have no information at all to disclose; should he, in short, not satisfy the investigator in the manner of his submitting to the investigation, he can thereby be held guilty of 'contempt of court,' and the magistrate has power, there and then, to commit him to prison for eight days. At the end of eight days when he is brought forward again, if he is still intractable, he can be committed to jail for another eight days! At the end of eight days, when he is brought forward again, if he is still intractable, he can be committed to jail for another eight days; at the end of these he can be committed for eight days more, and so on, "until," in the frank and extraordinary language of the act itself, "the prisoner consents to do what is required of him." There is, in fact, no limit to the "investigator's" power of sentencing or treating his prisoners. There is nothing to prevent him keeping a prisoner in jail from octave to octave for all his life. Should the prisoner have no story to tell, or should the object of the investigation be merely to prosecute this victim against whom he may have personal spleen or against whom some one else may have personal spleen, there is nothing in the legislation that now exists in Ireland to prevent him continuing that persecution as long as the legislation lasts itself."

We shall not pursue further the writer's comparison nor repeat his strictures on the adoption by Great Britain of the methods which she professes so much to abhor when enforced by the Catholic power. But we wish to direct attention to the similarity of the proceedings in the Belle Harris case with the extraordinary doings described in the paragraphs quoted above.

In this case, the witness, taken against her will from her home in a distant city, was brought before a secret tribunal and questioned by an impudent attorney, not in relation to an alleged crime, not concerning information she may have had in relation to an accused person, but in relation to her own social connections, her own private and family concerns. She naturally considered such questions impertinent, and refused to recognize the right of the inquisitors to extort such information from her; she was indignant at interrogations which had reference only to her individual honor and the legitimacy of her two children, and firmly declined to answer. She was taken before the Court and there required to reply under pain of punishment for contempt of court. Maintaining her position she was not merely committed for contempt, but was fined $25 and committed for an indefinite period, to be released when she had been accepted in case of criminals charged with the most heinous offences, being peremptorily refused by her. The object and intention was to keep her in the penitentiary place of confinement only to be found in the law for *convicts*, until she consents to do what is required of her. If this kind of things were authorized by law, how much better is law in America than law in Ireland, or than the style of doings in vogue under Thomas de Torquemada and Diego Deza?

It may be asked, will bear any comparison between the proceedings of the Second Judicial District Court, the bloodthirsty and vindictive Judges of intolerant Spain? We do not charge His Honor with any such disposition as that of the black-robed and masked Inquisitors. We think he blundered, as he is not unconscious of making mistakes in other decisions. But we think that in this case his judgment was blended with something like old misguided zeal that turned the thumbscrew and lit the fagot to force unwilling witnesses to testify when terror ruled in Spain.

The woman was a "Mormon." She was supposed to be a plural wife. A case was wanted and they thought that she would be made to give evidence that would go towards the proof desired. Her refusal to answer the questions agreed upon blocked the game to others, and so force was resorted to upon to compel her to divulge her private affairs to the Beaver Commission.

If the case in view was one of polygamy, and the parties were "Mormons," who imagined for a moment that any such proceedings would have been taken, never heard of a woman of the vilest vocation known to "Christian" social life being required under pain of indefinite imprisonment, to disclose the relations and holds to certain licentious persons? Such proceedings as those of the Harris and Gallifant case are unique. They would not be taken in regard to any supposed offence except polygamy. It is the spirit of persecution and prosecution which inspires them, and they are in the nature of Inquisition and in this country an anachronism and a disgrace.

While we see a close parallel in the proceedings at *Beaver* and Dublin we do *not* consider that exists in the laws of the two countries. The Crimes Act is an outrage *upon the liberties* of the people. The judgment in the Harris case and the refusal were not law, but error mingled with excessive zeal against a strict observance placed under the law. And in this case there is a remedy which will right that which is wrong, while in the case of unhappy Ireland no practice exists in the provisions of law and the latitude it gives to partizan tribunals.

TWO THINGS TO AV

THE death of Richard Fowler's body was buried to-day, but sorrow and distress to at least two families. We have no doubt that the slayer feels an acute consciousness of the wrong he has done, and have no desire or disposition to relate upon the ofisnce nor dwell on its sad consequences. But we wish to point out two evils connected with the lamentable occurrence which ought to be considered and avoided:

Indulgence in outbursts of [illegible] is one. While every passion of human nature is proper when [illegible] controlled, there is none but