

## EDITORIALS.

## IDAHO LEGISLATURE.

FROM the Boise *Idahoan* of the 22nd ult. we learn that up to that time the Legislature was still in a condition of internal hostility, the House being divided against itself on a party line, twelve Democrats against twelve Republicans, with two additional members not recognized by the latter but accepted by the former, giving the Democrats a majority; and this seems to be the root of the trouble.

A committee of the Democratic ring, composed of Messrs. George Chapin, J. C. Rich and H. J. G. Maxon have issued an address to the citizens of Idaho which is published in the above paper. From this it appears that on the 13th inst., at noon, the time appointed for the opening of the Legislature, fourteen Democratic members and one Republican were present, inside the bar, and two minutes afterwards, by the clock in the hall prepared by the Secretary of the Territory, the Clerk of the previous House called to order "the Tenth Session of the Legislature of Idaho." A temporary Speaker was elected with other necessary officers, and a committee on credentials appointed.

When the House was being called to order, several Republican members were in and around the doorway, and were invited to come inside the bar to participate in the proceedings. Instead of doing so, one of them entered and led away the only Republican member who was there. Messrs. Homer and Woodward, of Oneida County held no certificates, but produced documentary evidence which satisfied the committee that they were duly elected, and they were allowed to take their seats, no other credentials having been offered after they had been publicly called for, in their order. Half an hour after the House was called to order the Republican members entered in a body and commenced to interrupt, and on being called to order arose and filed out. The House proceeded to a permanent organization, the fourteen Democratic members being present, and they have since met and adjourned from time to time, to give the other members an opportunity of participating in the business. But the Republicans hold aloof, pretending that the House was called to order before 12 o'clock, and protesting to the Council against the proceedings, and hence the deadlock.

The address shows that, throwing out the fraudulent returns from Raft River, Ross' Fork and Oneida precincts, the evidence proves that Messrs. Homer and Woodward were clearly elected by a large majority. At Raft River none of the legal formalities were attended to and a list of names was forged on the poll book. At Ross' Fork and Oneida the election was held on the Fort Hall Reservation. The votes in these three places were therefore void. This was an old trick of the Oneida ring, which did not work well on this occasion.

We give these particulars, as they will prove of interest to our friends in Southern Idaho, and will show them that the Democratic party of Idaho evidences a disposition to sustain them in their rights. We hope the legally organized House will hold to its colors and not yield to the nefarious plotters, who have laid a scheme to hinder necessary legislation for the people in the southern part of the Territory, but will cleave to the right under all circumstances and fearless of every consequence.

## A "CHRISTIAN" MINISTER'S THANKSGIVING.

THERE is a person living in this city by the name of McEldowney, who is connected with the Methodist cause and acts as Associate Editor of the *Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate*. He delivered a discourse at the Union Thanksgiving services in the Presbyterian Church in this city, which is reported in full in the above named paper. The meeting was held simply for thanksgiving to God for His mer-

cies. But this malignant "Christian" could not even thank God without venting his bitterness of spirit in regard to the Latter-day Saints. Here are a few quotations from his "thanksgiving" discourse:

"Utah should rank first amongst the Pacific States of America. \* \* \* Yet Utah is under the ban of public opinion. Its name is a synonym for lawlessness, pollution and family degradation. It is repelled from the fraternity of statehood by its uncleanness, its record of crime and blood, and its polygamy."

"We are told that Mormonism has converted the barren slopes, and sage brush plains of this Territory into rich and productive fields of grain, grasses and fruits, and hence holds a prior and special claim to these lands. The plea is not well made. Had a Christian settlement entered Emigration Cañon, and located these valleys, Utah would have been vastly richer and happier in all elements of a true civilization. Mormonism has repelled the honest yeomanry, has refused a place to the miner, manufacturer and intelligent, home-loving citizen. It has claimed a monopoly of the mountain streams, of the temple rocks, and of the irrigated lands, to the exclusion of other settlers. Against the advocate of a free ballot, and independent citizenship, with equal laws and privileges, it has hurled its selfish, impudent and ignorant retort—'If they do not like things as they are, let them clear out,' and has made the stay of honest men uncomfortable."

These are the words of a "Christian" minister called upon to speak on the goodness of that Being from whom all blessings flow, as a cause for devout thanksgiving! He mingles falsehood with his praise, and spits out vile epithets against a portion of the human race, while proclaiming them all the children of a common Father! If Utah has a bad name abroad, who are to blame for it, but just such calumniators as this pretended Christian, who continually bears false witness against their neighbors? And what does he mean by his ravings about "a Christian settlement entering a cañon" and his silly objection to the claims of the early settlers of Utah? Does he mean to say they did not "convert the barren slopes and sage brush plains of this Territory into rich and productive fields," etc.? If they did not, who did? What has any one of his own fraternity done towards this work? Or indeed any other kind of work except plate-passing, subscription-list begging, lying about the "Mormons," and fraternizing with every one, drunkards, whoremongers and infidels included, that would join in efforts to break up the community who have made it possible for him and his kind to live in this mountain region? And we would like to ask, who has a better right to the lands which have been reclaimed from the solitude and sterility of centuries, than the people who reclaimed them? If he wants to reform and go to work and earn an honest living, instead of spending his time in "Christian" attempts to vilify and destroy those people, who is to hinder him? He can become a "yeoman, a miner or manufacturer," and, possibly, "an intelligent and home-loving citizen," and neither "Mormonism" nor the "Mormons" will lay a straw in his way. But if he thinks, as is implied in his complaint about the "monopoly of streams, temple rocks and irrigated lands," that the lawful owners thereof ought to make him or any other stranger a present of the results of their hard toil, he shows either childish folly or impudence worthy only of a western Methodist itinerant.

This is the logic of these men who stand up in pulpits and fulminate untruths against the "Mormons" in the name of the Lord: "These 'Mormons' who are in the majority will not yield up their rights of property, possession, supremacy in local politics and objectionable points of their religion to the minority. Therefore they are controlled by 'a degrading and bigoted priesthood' are 'selfish, ignorant and impudent,' they claim a 'monopoly' of what they have gained by hard labor and ought to be harassed and defamed and broken up by the strong arm of the law."

There is not a right to which men are entitled in any Territory of the United States that is denied to these persons who clamor so much about "Mormon monopoly." They are as free to vote as the

"Mormons." If their numbers are insufficient to control elections, are their rights abridged? They are as free to pre-empt unoccupied land as the "Mormons." But should they expect to enter upon the "irrigated lands" that McEldowney talks about, which have been brought under cultivation by the "Mormons?" How did these become irrigated lands? Did not the "Mormons" make the canals and the ditches? If so, have they not "prior claims," and should not those claims be respected? McEldowney thinks not. And therefore we are at liberty to consider that he is in sympathy with those pious "Christians," who, finding no unoccupied lands that suit their fastidious taste, attempt to jump the claim of some "Mormon," who has no rights that any "Christian" is bound to respect. All this outcry about "monopoly of lands" comes from rapacious persons who want to break through and steal from the "Mormons," land that they will not acquire by honorable labor or obtain by honest compliance with the law.

In what other part of the United States would men like McEldowney be tolerated as they are in Utah? They come here to a place made beautiful by well directed energy; to a region in which they would have perished if the way had not been smoothed before them by "Mormon" toil; they commence at once to abuse the people who number ten to one of their opponents, and a thousand to one of the kind of these malignant preachers; these men by persistent begging, gather means to build churches, some of the money being contributed by the "Mormons"; then they take every opportunity to berate the "Mormons," and particularly their leaders, attribute to them the vilest motives, invent baseless falsehoods for the purpose of inciting hostility to them, provoke them by every means at command, seek to induce legislation to break them up, hurl foul epithets against them, misrepresent and ridicule their religious doctrines and ceremonies, and while let alone to continue their diabolism under the pretence of piety, raise a howl about being abridged of their rights. If "Mormonism" did not inspire its followers with the spirit of the utmost tolerance and forbearance, would such men be allowed to continue their libellous and seditious course? Would they be permitted to do so in any other part of the civilized world?

But no one prevents or resents their impudent and mendacious assaults. They are simply despised. They are known to be the very small fry of their own society, they continually exhibit their ignorance, imperfect education and littleness of soul, and are regarded simply as a low order of wasps who would take honey instead of working for it, and sting the hands that gather it by honest industry. Let them buzz.

## "WOMANS WORDS."

*Woman's Words*, a very able paper published at Washington, D. C., in the interest of woman's cause in politics as well as social life, edited by Theresa Juan Lewis and Sarah A. Spencer, has the following in its issue for January:

"The fervent Christian women who are petitioning Congress for legislation to make effective the anti-polygamy law of 1862, either do or do not know that they are asking Congress to force Mormon men to repudiate their wives and disown their children; to make in Utah an army of outcasts and vagrants in the name of freedom and Christian civilization. If they do know it, they furnish a striking illustration of the 'rarity of Christian charity under the sun.' Their righteous zeal is needed nearer home."

If they do not know what they are asking, and who will be the sufferers, we commend their attention to the touching address made by cultured, conscientious Mormon wives at their recent conventions."

We will say for the information of the editors of *Woman's Words*, that those "fervent Christian women" are mere tools in the hands of unscrupulous scheming men, some of whom are thorough infidels, and others professing Christians, who fabricate the grossest falsehoods about the Latter-day Saints, and get these "fervent Christian women" to adopt and utter them. Whereupon they are telegraphed over the country and

published by the press as facts. The statements and appeals of "cultured and conscientious 'Mormon' wives" have no effect upon the scoundrels who are plotting for the breaking up of "Mormonism" in Utah, and the "fervent Christian women" have allowed themselves to be pushed too far forward to recede now from their false and disagreeable position.

That "Christian" wives and mothers can lend themselves to such an inhuman and inexcusable scheme, for the purpose of bringing suffering and distress upon thousands of devoted women and thousands more of innocent children, and assist in the propagation of such gross and abominable falsehoods as appear in the addresses and resolutions prepared for them, is passing strange and a remarkable illustration of the spirit of intolerance that still burns against unpopular creeds, and of the pious disposition to be voluntarily blind to the means so long as the end is accomplished.

## "THE CURSE OF TWO CONTINENTS."

We clip the annexed from the *Sellingsgrove* (Pa.) *Times* of Jan. 22nd.

"Since the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the Act of Congress prohibiting polygamy is not unconstitutional, many persons may be anxious to be informed what particular part of the Constitution authorizes either Congress or the Supreme Court to abolish or prohibit polygamy. We have scanned it carefully and have utterly failed to find, in that embodiment of our government any provision whatever in regard to polygamy or any other system of the marital relation between man and wife. We have not seen the opinion of the court, which no doubt contains at least a pretence to justify its decision; but no matter what the pretence is, it must be founded in prejudice, political demagoguism, or that obedience which men in power yield to popular prejudice whether right or wrong. Like the decision of Judge Gamble, of Williamsport, in the *Stack-O-Harra* case, it could not have been based on the American idea of true liberty of natural right and conscience, but has its base in blue-stocking Presbyterianism and blue-bellied Puritanism, the curses of two continents that have been the constant source of man's inhumanity to man causing countless thousands to mourn."

The writer may well have looked in vain for any power in the Constitution to legislate against polygamy. The preparers of that document intended to leave the people in various parts of the Union to regulate their own domestic institutions to suit themselves. There is nothing about marriage in the Constitution, for at the time of its adoption marriage was recognized as a religious ordinance, and the framers of that sacred instrument designed to protect all religious rites from governmental interference. And the Supreme Court, in rendering its decision, had to go a long way outside of the Constitution, and resort to round about reasoning in order to make any show of argument in support of the ruling. If the learned Justices did not know themselves what is meant by "an establishment of religion," they could have gone to the dictionary. But this would not have served their purpose, because the definition of the term religion includes actions—"practical piety," "duty or obedience to God," also "a system of faith or worship," and "religious rites."

Marriage was generally regarded for thousands of years as a religious rite, and is so held now by the majority of professing Christians of various sects, and certainly by the "Mormon" people, against one of whose "duties of obedience to God" the act now declared constitutional was specially framed, to answer the demands of just such persons as the *Times* denounces as "the curse of two continents." Religious intolerance inspired the Act of Congress; the same influence crowded the Court to its decision; and it is now at work urging further unjustifiable and unconstitutional measures, to crush an unpopular people and stamp out an unpopular religion. Religious big-

otry and sectarian hatred are, truly, at the bottom of all this mischief.

## MEMORIAL OF THE "MORMON" WOMEN.

THE following, which appears under the above heading in the *Washington Star*, will give our readers some idea of the work which the ladies who went to to Washington as delegates from Utah to the Woman Suffrage Convention, have been doing in the cause of their co-religionists. The article contains only a brief epitome of their memorial:

"A memorial from Emmeline B. Wells and Zina Young Williams, of Salt Lake City, Utah, (the latter a daughter of the late Brigham Young,) was presented to the Senate and House of Representatives to-day. It sets forth that a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has declared the anti-polygamy law of 1862 to be in accordance with the Constitution; that "we and Mormon women generally, previous to that decision, implicitly believed that this law was in violation of the Constitution, which says 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' that 'under our present civilization we have a peaceful, prosperous and healthful condition of society, our children are owned and supported by their fathers, and are equally recognized as heirs in the estate, and our women are protected from the temptation to infanticide and kindred crimes, that 'the enforcement of the law of 1862, would imprison our husbands, despoil and destroy our homes, crush our most sincere affections, render our children illegitimate before the world, and leave ourselves and thousands of women desolate and unprotected; that 'this example set by the United States would encourage mobs to persecute and violently assault and afflict us, as in times past, when our people were driven from State to State, far out beyond the pale of this republic; that 'we want for out into the wilderness by the advice, and at the suggestion of eminent leading American statesmen, that we might worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences, without fear or molestation, and at the same time extend to all, of whatever faith, the same precious privilege; that 'after the United States had taken possession of the land which our people had redeemed from the desert, and made prosperous, and which the Mormon battalion, under Col. Philip St. George Cook, had, together with what is now known as California, Nevada, New Mexico and Arizona, helped to conquer, President Fillmore, 'by the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed Brigham Young, then a practical polygamist, governor of Utah; we had good reason to believe the government would continue to protect us in our religious faith and its practices; that 'harsh measures toward our people, such as destruction of families and homes, will have a tendency to drive many to desperation, while just and humane treatment will foster and strengthen love and affection toward the government, thereby securing a peaceful issue of affairs now pending; that 'we ourselves, and a majority of our people are native born citizens of the United States, and desire to live in obedience to the laws of our country: Therefore, we pray your honorable body to repeal the anti-polygamy law of 1862, and to enact such legislation as will securely legitimize our children, and protect our names from dishonor, by preserving unbroken the existing relationship of families which are already bound together by the strongest ties of affection, and whose ties would be forever wrecked through separation; and that in any future legislation concerning the marriage relation in any territory under your jurisdiction, you will consider the rights, the hearts, and the consciences of the women to be affected by such legislation, and that you will consider the permanent care and welfare of children as the sure foundation of the state."

Skating is very healthful exercise. It not only puts in play all the muscles of the legs and arms, but it creates bumps on the head for future phrenologists to feel and report on.