

figure in the Utah District Courts. Language is wrested and distorted and given special significations for a purpose. And new definitions are improvised to meet different cases, so that no term brought into frequent use can be relied upon as having a settled meaning. Thus, the word "associate" now doing duty in the place of "holding out," may mean the most casual and unintentional meeting of two individuals, one of whom it is desirable to send to prison. So the Court rules that if a man has a plural wife, living apart from him, whom he visits when dangerously ill, or whose sick child and his nurse in her presence, or whom he meets at church or at the theatre or other public place, he is guilty of unlawful cohabitation, and is liable to be sent to the penitentiary for an indefinite period and to pay fines the limit of which is undefined. His crime is thus made worse than many felonies. Not by law, but by the unscrupulous and shifting constructions of a law and language resorted to by United States judicial officers.

To associate with as a wife, to live with as a wife, to cohabit with as a wife, are terms which can be understood by the common mind, and by the legal mind have had a settled signification for centuries. Do they mean anything like that which the Utah Supreme Court has attached to them? Everybody knows better. Those terms imply vastly more than those meetings in public or private which Judge Zane tortures into unlawful cohabitation. Is it not pitiful to see such casuistry and pettifoggery resorted to by the judiciary? To behold learned expounders and administrators of the law, perverting common terms for the purpose of inflicting penalties on persons who, by the utmost stretch of propriety, can only be found technical offenders against the law?

If the Congress of the United States had intended any such monstrous provision as that evolved by the Utah Courts out of the third section of the Edmunds Act, terms would have been used therein to convey that meaning. But how does the law stand? Simply thus:

"If any male person, in a Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, shall hereafter cohabit with more than one woman he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than three hundred dollars, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the Court."

"Cohabit with more than one woman" is the language of the law. To this the Court has added "as a wife." That is judicial legislation. It is no more part of the law because Judge Zane has put it in by the prompting of Attorney Dickson, than it is had been put there by a juror, a defendant or a bystander in the Court. The law was enacted for the District of Columbia and for the arsenals and dockyards, as well as the Territories of the United States, and applies to places where there are no "Mormons" or persons who practise plural marriage as a religious observance. What does "cohabit with more than one woman" mean in the District of Columbia and in the United States possessions anywhere? Is there any quibble about it there? Does it mean simple association of a man with more than one woman, either in public or in private? Is not the language understood to mean a continuous living together in sexual relations? Will Judge Zane dare declare to the contrary? Such being the fact, is it not double-dealing and pettifoggery, to say nothing of the unlawful addition made to the law, to so wrest the language of an Act of Congress as to make it mean something altogether different to that intended, for the purpose of taking advantage of men's religious sentiments and obligations?

The intention of Congress is also evident as to the penalty. A man guilty of "cohabiting with more than one woman"—the very language implying and requiring a continuous relation, when convicted is to be punished by a fine of not more than three hundred dollars or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both, in the discretion of the Court. Does this give authority to multiply penalties on a defendant's head? When he is convicted can he be lawfully fined more or imprisoned longer than as limited by law? All the additional fines and terms of imprisonment that have been imposed by the Utah courts have been in the nature of lawless oppression and vindictive persecution.

Segregation is a process resorted to in excess of the law, to gratify the spiteful desire expressed by Judge Zane from the bench, to punish men found guilty of unlawful cohabitation more than was intended by the body that enacted the provision. It has been resorted to in the same spirit that inspired the distortion of language and changing of definitions and constructions which have made the courts here both a public laughing stock and an object of contempt. It is all outside of legitimate procedure, and is a special movement against an orthodox class of people and their religious belief and service.

A new consideration grows out of the new definition of the offense which the courts here seem to think so cautious. If the crime of unlawful cohabitation consists of "associating" with a plural wife by meeting her occasionally in public or in private, how

many such meetings are required to constitute the offense? Will one visit to church or one attendance during sickness, or once waiting on a sick child, in company, be sufficient to prove cohabitation? If not, how many such occurrences will it take to justify an indictment? And if these acts, or each of them, constitute the crime, how can an indictment be found covering a period not reached by these acts? Can it be correctly specified that A. B., from June, 1883, to February, 1885, cohabited with more than one woman, if he, during that time, only once visited a plural wife or her sick child or met her at church? And how can the period be segregated if the defence consists not of living with her during the time but only of those specific acts?

Will not a separate indictment have to be found for each criminal attendance upon a sick woman or dying child in her company, or meeting with her in some public place? And will it not have a queer look to the world that A. B., for going to the house of a sick woman, his plural wife from whom he lived apart, was fined three hundred dollars and imprisoned six months, and for going to the bedside of his dying child, its mother being present, he was sentenced to a similar fine and term of imprisonment, and for going on a given Sunday with the woman to church he received an additional sentence to the same extent, aggregating eighteen months' imprisonment and nine hundred dollars fine exclusive of costs? Yet that is all in accordance with the ruling of Judge Zane, delivered last Tuesday, and his latest explanations of the law and construction of unlawful cohabitation.

We want this Opinion of that judicial functionary, embodying the decision of the court of final resort for the oppressed people of Utah, to be placed in the hands of the leading men of the nation and the representatives of the press throughout the country. Those who wish the "Mormons" "to obey the law as construed by the courts," ought to know what that term implies. And it should be understood both by the Latter-day Saints and all who are interested for or against them, that when a convicted "Mormon" is required to make that profane, it means that he will cast off the plural wife or wives who have borne him children and lived with him in love perhaps during the best part of their lives; that he will not go near them if they are sick unto death; that he will not soothe the dying child who has been born to them; that he will not attend its funeral if the mother is there; that he will not greet her in public; that he will not go to church with her; that he will not observe the same courtesies to her as he would to the merest acquaintance or even a needy stranger; indeed to come to the real requisition, that he will deny she is his wife and take make of her a thing to be despised, and of himself a miserable, cowardly wretch who breaks his sacred covenants with God and his wives, turns his back on his religion, and proves himself unworthy of confidence and self-respect.

This is the real requirement. If men would openly repudiate their religion and their wives, and promise not to regard them "as wives," they could do what they pleased in regard to actual cohabitation. There is no morality in the demand. There is no decency in it. There is no law in it. The object is to break up the religion which permits the plural family relation. Those who forsake it and repudiate their plural marriage vows, can, if they wish, revel in licentiousness and wallow in the mire of unbridled lust, and the zealous courts and attorneys will find no occasion to prosecute or interfere with them. It is the "marriage relation" that excites their ire and it against that that all their shafts are aimed, all their craftiness is exercised and all their perversions of law and language are directed.

**A PRUDENT RECONSIDERATION.**

IN yesterday's issue (June 31) appeared a card from a number of brethren who had interested themselves in arranging for a reunion of the people who had been associated with one of the "Old Country" conferences. The occasion proposed would have involved considerable expense to quite a number who would have been likely to participate, especially those who would have come to town from a distance. The members of the committee reconsidered their former action on that and other grounds, money being scarce, times dull and employment not being over plentiful, with a not over cheerful prospect for betterment in these respects ahead. These potent reasons and cause us to endorse the later action of the brethren as commendable on account of its prudence.

The final reason given for the post-

ponement is perhaps the most potent of them all. It is to the effect that owing to the present trying phase through which the Church is passing it is necessarily a general time of sorrow. It is exceedingly difficult for the truly sympathetic soul to engage in general festivities and rejoicings while many of his brethren are languishing in prison at Detroit, in Idaho and in Utah. The thought of their situation cannot fail to cause at least a passing pang to seize the heart even in the midst of conditions otherwise favorable for creature enjoyment. The cloud is deepened when it is considered that numbers of the leading and other men of the community are in enforced exile. Numbers of delicate women are in the same condition, and grief, more or less poignant, broods over many families, whose ranks have been invaded by the relentless hand of persecution. No person can grasp in all their details the sorrow and distress into which innocent people are plunged by wholesale by the villainous crusade now being pushed mercilessly against this community. The heads of families who are placed in jeopardy occasionally plead for a little time before being thrust into prison, that they may have an opportunity of arranging their concerns so that grim want might be kept as long or as far as possible from the doors of their dwellings. But as a rule these solicitations have no effect upon a cold unsympathetic District Attorney. The tears of grief-stricken women and the cries of children who may be suffering from the sharp pangs of hunger fall upon his ear as if they were fashioned from unimpressible stone. Indeed, so calloused does he seem to be, that some people look upon him as scarcely human. And the Chief Justice and his associates appear only to be second to him in the same direction.

If the Gospel precept that we should rejoice with those that rejoice and weep with those who weep, is taken home and acted upon in this community, there will be but little scope for "junketing" and wholesale festivity until the increasing cloud has passed the culminating point, burst and scattered, leaving the atmosphere clearer for its former presence, with the sun of peace smiling in effulgent splendor. The very best method of ministering to self-enjoyment is in contributing to the happiness of others. The present is pregnant with opportunities for engaging in that godlike labor. If people have a few spare dollars, they can find, without the expenditure of much labor in searching, instances where they can be spent in helping some of those who are touched by the paralyzing hand of distress, introduced by the demon of persecution.

We should not, however, be understood as discouraging rational enjoyment and a moderate degree of festivity. The young especially demand and should have a fair extent of freedom in that direction. But surely the more mature can afford to consider the character of the times, taking in the situation from a Gospel standpoint, and harmonizing their conduct with its nature.

**A VALUABLE ACQUISITION.**

AN important addition has just been made to the ample facilities of the Deseret News Company's printing and publishing establishment. It is in the shape of a Potter four-roller two-revolution press, manufactured by C. Potter, Jr., and Company, of New York. It is asserted that there is no finer machine in existence. A large number of the same manufacture are in use in various parts of the country, as it is increasing in popularity. Some of the improvements connected with it have only recently been added, and this establishment is fortunate in having secured one with all of them attached, being the only one so complete in use between this point and Philadelphia. It is as near perfect as could well be desired, and has a capacity for turning out all classes of work, from the most ordinary to fine book and cut. It runs easily at a rate of speed sufficient for 1,500 impressions an hour, which can be increased, in an emergency, to 1,800. It is now in complete running order and works like a charm. Mr. Thomas McIlroy, traveling mechanical engineer for the manufacturers, having come on from the East a few days ago for the purpose, and constructed it. With this addition to our facilities the News establishment is second to none in this entire region for turning out work of all kinds in the best style, at short notice.

**READ IT AGAIN.**

It is not long since the Utah conspirators became so impatient to gain political control of the Territory that they made an attempt to precipitate a violent conflict. The aid of the military was sought, and it looked as if it was guaranteed. At that time a bloody programme was favored as just the thing. It finally received an unmistakable rebuke from a high place, after the deception of the schemers was discovered. The publication by us of late of a sanguinary article that appeared in

the Salt Lake Tribune, continues to disturb that paper frightfully. It fairly foams over it and tries to twist the sentiment into some other meaning. It is a subject that cannot be "construed by the courts," so those who read can place their own construction upon it. Besides the murderous character of the enunciation, it proves what we have always held, that the people in the East have been deceived by the polygamy bugbear. The schemers care nothing about polygamy. It is the political control they are after. If we reproduce the editorial referred to a few times, perhaps our vulgar contemporary will get used to its own enunciations and not be so dreadfully worried over letting the feline out of the sack. Here it is, like Bango's ghost:

"The Pope of Utah should, in his underground retreat, read thoughtfully one sentence in the late letter of the Pope of Rome to the Spanish Bishops. It is this: 'I would strongly impress upon you that, although politics are based upon religion, you must not engage in politics.' When the Pope of Utah sends a message like that out to the shepherds of his flock, the troubles here will nearly all pass away. The interfering with politics in Illinois is what cost Joseph Smith his life; the anger which is caused—the anger and fear caused by all the thousands of Mormons in Utah voting solidly as directed, will never cease until that rule shall be relinquished. It is a menace to free government which Americans will never submit to. When it grows dangerous enough, if no other remedy can be found, the one resorted to in Illinois will be invoked again."

**FOR THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS.**

No man or woman can be properly called a Latter-day Saint who habitually violates the law of God in relation to the Sabbath. We are under special obligations to keep the Lord's day holy. The commandment to do this is not new in principle. It was given in the earliest ages and is founded upon the nature and necessities of mankind. Man was designed for activity. All his powers, physical, mental and spiritual, should be put to their legitimate use. Labor is honorable and beneficial, and is really essential to the welfare of humanity. It is good for the individual and also for society. But continuous work not only becomes monotonous but will soon wear out the organs put into perpetual motion.

Rest is a necessity. The nightly sleep recuperates both mind and body and preserves the system from premature decay. And one day's rest out of seven serves still further to promote vitality and prolong our earthly existence. The Sabbath was established by divine decree for man's best good. His spiritual nature needs cultivation and nutrition, as well as his physical nature. His Maker therefore claimed one day out of seven as His day, that man might rest from physical toil and, by being required to worship Deity and engage in religious duties, he might be refreshed in body and quickened in spirit, brought near to his Creator and be revived and inspired by the Spirit of light and truth and life.

The Sabbath was made a religious institution and its observance demanded as a Divine behest in early times, and was regarded by all the God-fearing as an essential to religion. That it was sometimes carried to extremes and the day made irksome and depressing, with the effect of driving people to other extremes of disregard and sin, argues nothing against the proper observance of the Sabbath nor against the divinity of its establishment. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath" was declared by the God-man who obeyed as well as taught the law and will of the Father. It is not designed for the bondage but the truest liberty of man; and that liberty can only be made perfect by submission to divine law and divine influences. For these are adapted to man's condition and capabilities, and tend to develop and free them from the slavery of sin and qualify him for the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

The Sabbath was as much an institution under the regulations of the Gospel, in primitive Christian times, as under the rigors of the law in the Mosaic dispensation. The day was changed to the first from the seventh day of the week—as Christ arose that day from the dead and the fact of his resurrection was a fundamental in the teachings of the Church—and the extraneous and strait-laced restrictions with which it had been encumbered by human rules were to a great extent cast aside. But the Sabbath was still preserved in spirit and in deed, and its observance was a duty incumbent upon all the Saints.

In this dispensation of the fullness of times, we are not left to the notions or opinions of sectaries on this important question, nor even to the letter of ancient scripture, whether Mosaic or Christian. Revelations have been given for our own guidance on this matter, and they are binding upon every member of the Church. Here is what the Lord has said to the Latter-day Saints:

"And that thou mayest more fully keep thyself unspotted from the world, thou shalt go to the house of prayer and offer up thy sacraments upon my holy day; for verily this is a day appointed unto you to rest from your

labors and pay thy devotions to the Most High; nevertheless thy vows shall be offered up in righteousness on all days and at all times; but remember that on this the Lord's day, thou shalt offer thine oblations and thy sacraments unto the Most High, confessing thy sins unto thy brethren and before the Lord. And on this day thou shalt do none other thing, only let thy food be prepared with singleness of heart that thy fasting may be perfect, or in other words that thy joy may be full." (Doc. and Cov. p. 224.)

"And the inhabitants of Zion shall, also observe the Sabbath day to keep it holy." (Ibid p. 251.)

The paragraph last quoted follows this divine injunction and is given in connection with it:

"And they shall also teach their children to pray and walk in all uprightness before the Lord."

There is no ambiguity about this. The inhabitants of Zion are to keep the day holy themselves and to teach their children to do so. A great many of them do this and take pleasure in it. The consequences cannot fail to be generally beneficial. There may be exceptions, but the rule is that children who are sent to Sunday School and kept within Sabbath regulations without unreasonable repression, are more likely to grow up to be a blessing to their parents and a benefit to society than those who are permitted to roam the streets, break the Sabbath and stray from the influences of religion.

The force of example is great. Parents who violate the laws of God ought not to expect that their children will be obedient either to them or to the Almighty. Men of influence in the community ought to be careful of the example they set to others. The weak will follow the strong. And every man is accountable for the influence he wields or can wield over the minds of others within his sphere of action.

It is a question for Bishops and others appointed to watch over the flock of Christ, whether they can fellowship those who habitually break the Sabbath and aid in causing others to do so. There is a responsibility resting upon them in regard to this matter. Teachers are required to see that "there is no iniquity in the Church." There are other things besides Sabbath-breaking that need attending to, but this is a subject that presents itself just now and demands notice. If we desire the help of the Almighty in the emergencies that are now upon us, we must certainly observe His laws and keep His commandments or we shall be woefully disappointed. How can people called Saints expect their prayers to be regarded by the Almighty when they disregard His decrees and wilfully disobey regulations which He has desired for their benefit and His glory?

This is not a time for roystering and revelry, of junketing and jollification, and especially on the Lord's Day it is discordant with right sentiment as well as the laws of God and of man. We earnestly invite attention to this matter and trust that all who profess religion and are called by the name of Saints will resist every inducement to improper indulgence and will strictly remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.

HAGAN'S  
**Magnolia Balm**  
is a secret aid to beauty. Many a lady owes her freshness to it, who would rather not tell, and you can't tell.

**PATENTS**  
MUNN & CO., of the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, continue to act as Solicitors for Patents, Caveats, Trade Marks, Copyrights, for the United States, Canada, England, France, Germany, etc. Hand Book about Patents sent free. Thirty-seven years' experience. Patents obtained through MUNN & CO. are noticed in the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, the largest, best, and most widely circulated scientific paper. \$3.20 a year. Weekly. Splendid engravings and interesting information. Specimen copy of the Scientific American sent free. Address MUNN & CO., SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN Office, 39 Broadway, New York.

**STANDARD CANE MILLS**  
FOR HORSE AND STEAM POWER  
**EVAPORATORS**  
FOR SYRUP AND SUGAR  
KNOWN AND USED THE WORLD OVER.  
We are Sole Makers of the VICTOR, GREAT WESTERN and NILES MILLS, and the GENUINE COOK EVAPORATOR. We have the largest line of Mills, etc., for Sugar Cane and Sorghum, made by any works in the World.  
BLYMNER IRONWORKS CO.  
SUCCESSORS TO THE BLYMNER CO. CINCINNATI, OHIO.  
U. S. A.