

EDITORIALS.

A GRAND MISTAKE.

THE *Tribune* puts in a specious plea in support of the Marshal, in offering a large reward for the arrest of a gentleman charged with a simple misdemeanor. The substance of it is, that President George Q. Cannon's offense, in the eyes of his enemies, is the influence he carries with the "Mormon" people. But this is not an indictable offense. It is not one that can be reached by the law, because it is no infraction of law. It merely makes him an object of hatred to those who want to force the "Mormon" people to forsake their religion.

Those bigots and tyrants for whom the *Tribune* speaks, want to make the preaching of a doctrine which they do not endorse a penal offense. In other words, they would stifle free speech, if that free speech is opposed to their notions. The reward offered, we are told, is because of the influence which the public teachings of Pres. Cannon has upon the minds of his hearers. The offense for which he is indicted is no different to that charged against many others, but he is singled out for special detective endeavor and as a special object of malevolence, because of his public enunciation of principles which he holds to be divine.

But the malicious promoters of this personal attack upon the gentleman, presume a little too much. Their organ says: "It would have been in George Q. Cannon's power last spring, by a word, to have stopped all the distress which has come to this people since." This is a grand mistake. The meaning of it is, that Pres. Cannon could, by a word, change the doctrine of the Church and the faith of its members, in regard to celestial marriage which includes the plurality of wives.

Let it be understood that no such power is held by any man on earth. The word of no mortal being could accomplish any such revolution. The faith of the "Mormon" people is not founded upon any man, living or dead. If the gentleman now hounded by his foes were to come out to-day with an enunciation such as the *Tribune* says he ought to make or leave the country, to-morrow he would be repudiated by the people over whom he is thought to exercise such unbounded influence.

The world ought to know by this time that the "Mormon" faith in plural marriage is rooted and grounded in the revelations of God and the manifestations of His spirit to them, individually. Principles, not men are their stronghold. The principles that guide them are not the creations of men. The leaders of the Church are but the expressers, expounders and exemplars of truths that are independent of all men and all things. Those truths are beyond the powers of congresses, courts, officers and even of malignant and falsifying scribes and Pecksniffian Pharisees. They are unreachably by pains and penalties, by the rifle or by the sword. Prison walls cannot confine them, chains cannot bind them, death itself cannot destroy them. They live and burn in the hearts and bones and finest fibres of the Latter-day Saints, and no edict of man, civil or ecclesiastical, will change them or drive out faith in them from the souls of the people who know of their truth for themselves.

Rewards may be offered, the bloodhounds of the law may be let loose, cruel and unusual punishments may be inflicted, confiscation, pillage, fire, rapine and bloody murder may be employed as weapons against those who believe and teach what heaven has revealed, and it will not tend to crush out faith in the remotest degree, to stop the spread of "Mormonism," as the world call it, a single hair's breadth, nor to force its adherents to recant and deny that which they know to be true.

On the contrary, all these measures which Latter-day bigots and howling sectaries, backed by political schemers have resurrected from the dark ages, wherewith to coerce the "Mormons," will but serve to spread their doctrines, intensify their zeal, unite them closer together and, under divine Providence, hasten the triumph of those principles for which the servants of God are living and laboring and for which if needful they are willing to suffer and die.

THE BAIL BILL VETO.

IN attempting to defend Governor Murray's senseless and illogical message in vetoing the bail bill, which the News ridiculed to pieces last evening, his organ says of the bill: "Except to provide some way through which polygamist law-breakers might evade the penalty of their crimes, the Utah Legislature would never have thought of passing the bills which the Governor has vetoed. It had been the law for years, and was satisfactory to all. That is all there is to it."

Well now, let us see. The bail bill does not provide any special relief for polygamist cases, in any shape or form. Granting bail to a defendant on appeal permits no one to "evade" any "penalty." It simply postpones the punishment until the

validity of the conviction is tested. Appeal is made a matter of right by the law. But appeal is of no use in misdemeanors, and of little use in some more important cases without bail is allowed, because the sentence would be served before the appeal could be determined. To refuse bail and allow appeal, is to say a defendant may be lawfully punished if unlawfully convicted. It is impossible to deny either the absurdity or the injustice of denying bail when permitting appeal.

The attempt to narrow the matter down to the relief bail would afford to appellants convicted of polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, is quite in keeping with the Governor's narrow mind and petty, carping and evasive spirit. On what principle of law or justice should such persons be denied the benefits of the law more than any other class of defendants? Yet the truth is, it is because some "Mormon," unjustly convicted might, by a reversal of the verdict against him, be relieved of an unjust penalty, that the Governor refuses to sign a bill that is undeniably in the interest of common justice and of common sense.

Now about the law existing "for years" and being "satisfactory to all." It has existed for nearly eight years. It was satisfactory so long as it was not misinterpreted by the courts for special vengeance in special cases. "In the discretion of the court," was supposed to signify the exercise of discretion in taking such measures as would secure the person of the defendant if the conviction should be affirmed. Not only that good and sufficient sureties might be required, but that the court might be satisfied that the defendant would not escape. It was not until quite recently that the courts acted upon any other view of the meaning of the law. The general principle obtained in practice, that if the attendance of the defendant was reasonably assured, bail could not reasonably be denied pending an appeal. No idea was entertained that good bail would be refused pending an appeal. But a special application was made in a special class of cases, and therefore, if the bill giving reasonable relief has an appearance of a special purpose, it is only because of the course of the courts in giving the bail law a special construction.

There is no getting away from these facts: The veto of the bail bill implies an absurdity. It maintains a palpable injustice. It was made with a special view to deny common justice to "Mormons." It renders void in their cases the law of appeal. It is, so far, "nullification." The reasons given for it are not reasons, but nonsense. They are not true, and they are self-refuting. They make the writer look like a noodle, and no defense can be made of the veto but just such shallow sophistry and begging of the question which is common to the Governor's disreputable organ.

ONLY BUNCOMBE.

JUDGE POWERS has given another charge to the Grand Jury of the First District. It is an extra speech thrown in. It is an extended plagiarism of Judge Zane's charge a short time ago concerning imaginary intimidation. When a Judge wants to show his excessive zeal against the "Mormons," he can suppose some attempts to influence a jury and then fulminate inflammatory exhortations about resistance, the right to use arms for self-protection and similar buncombe for effect at a distance. Judge Powers is not yet confirmed by the Senate, and it may be necessary to stir up the coals and keep the fire burning that the country may see his belated attitude. One point in Judge Powers' harangue is worthy of notice. It is that every man has the right to protect himself in his own house, and that when come to it in the night time to search it, it is the right and the duty of the innkeepers to protect themselves against the wrong. Of course everybody that knows his rights was aware of this before, but it is well enough to treature up these little judicial utterances for future use. We do not believe any one has been foolish enough to try to influence or obstruct a judge in any such way as is supposed in the Judge's charge, and it looks like an attempt to make a large mountain out of a small molehill.

A CAUTION.

THE reward which has been offered for information concerning the whereabouts of a distinguished gentleman, suggests something worthy of consideration by any one who has ambition to figure in the role of a Judas Iscariot.

It is but a short time since a reward was offered for a prisoner who had escaped from the Pen. His name was Warren, and he had been convicted of placing an obstruction upon a railroad. The sum of \$250 was published as the reward for his apprehension. He made his way westward and southward, and then, taking an easterly course, he found employment in a settlement not far from Sanpete. The reward offered was the means of his capture, his employer giving information which led to his return to the penitentiary.

But when the amount published was

claimed by the amateur detective, he was coolly informed that it was a mistake, that \$25 was the proper amount. A misplaced period and a missing cipher made all the difference.

Now it will be just as easy to make a similar mistake in the latest case of reward. If the period be shifted conveniently, \$500. can easily be made \$50, by either adding or omitting a cipher, and can be reduced to \$5.00 by simply moving the period without a change of a cipher.

There are creatures who would sell their souls or betray their friends for five hundred dollars, but who would feel like beating their heads against a wall on finding that they had given themselves away for a paltry 5. We impute no deception to any one concerned, but mistakes will happen and what has been may be again.

Therefore, if any one is anxious for blood-money be, she, or more properly speaking it, should make sure that the amount is right before attempting to go a-head. Disappointment might be fatal, and then what mourning would ensue in the community! This friendly caution is given gratis.

THE CHINESE STRIKE BACK.

THE expulsion of the Chinese from Western cities may prove quite costly. A suit has been commenced in the United States Court against the city of Eureka, California, for the sum of \$132,000, claimed as damages for the expulsion of Chinese from that city about a year ago. Papers have been served on the Mayor, and it is believed that the Chinese will recover.

A successful suit of this kind and rigorous action on the part of the Government, like the recent proclamation of the President with troops to enforce it in Washington Territory, will perhaps convince the rowdy and brutal element that even the Chinese have some rights which the "superior race" are bound to respect.

The laws of the land will not permit the forcible destruction of property. No person can be properly deprived of property without due process of law. If the city authorities in any place where Chinese are evicted do not interfere for their protection, it will be found that the city is liable like Eureka.

If people do not want the Chinese they need not have them. They can get rid of them without violence. They can refuse to employ them, and they will soon seek for more congenial quarters. It only wants a union of effort to "boycott" the Mongolians or any other obnoxious race or party. It is not unlawful to withdraw trade and patronage from anyone. The "boycott" may be made a legitimate and effective weapon against an evil in a class or clique or individual. It may not always be expedient, but it cannot be claimed that it is not lawful.

In any sense it is better than violence, and it is not open to a suit for damages. Eureka may have found a way to purge itself of the pitted disciples of Confucius, but it has also found that its plan was not very profitable nor its end very advantageous.

A STATE RELIGION.

A QUERY has arisen in the minds of not a few persons of late as to whether, in the event of the new Edmunds bill becoming law, "Mormonism" would not be the state religion. In view of it being the only religion for the direction and control of which Congress has legislated, and especially as the new bill provides for the appointment of a board of officers or trustees for the Church, it would certainly not be unreasonable to regard it as the state religion.

How will that sound to the world—that the lawmakers of the United States have not only violated the Constitution in establishing a state religion but in going so have made the stone which from the beginning the builders of national law have rejected the chief corner.

The Omaha *Herald* says of the pending legislation concerning this Church:

"The Constitution of the United States forbids a state religion or church, yet the Edmunds bill, which has passed the Senate, contemplates something very similar to such an establishment. The Mormons have for the management of the business affairs of their church a board of thirteen trustees, the duties of which are prescribed by the act of the legislature, under which it was incorporated, embracing the management of church property, the acceptance of bequests, the advancement of the Mormon religion, etc. The Edmunds bill compels the board to accept an addition of fourteen trustees appointed by the President, whose duties, as respects matters not polygamous, are defined by the act of the Mormon legislature, and are the same, of course, as those of their Mormon colleagues. This majority representation of the government, whose object is to exert an influence on Mormon theology, is clearly a transgression of the provisions of the Constitution. Can the American republic afford to take such a step?"

AN EARLY REVELATION.

IN the Book of Jacob, page 127, in the original Palmyra edition of the Mormon Bible, printed in 1830, will be found the following:

Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. Wherefore thus saith the Lord, I have led the people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord; for there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none. For I, the Lord God, delight in the chastity of women. And whoredom is an abomination before me, thus saith the Lord of Hosts. Wherefore, this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of Hosts, or cursed be the land for their sake. For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people, otherwise they shall hearken unto these things.

Probably not many of the younger generation of Mormons have ever been permitted to see the above, for it is apparent at a glance that it does not correspond with what they are being taught now. But that was from the pen of Joseph Smith; it was as much of a revelation as anything he ever wrote.

The foregoing is clipped from the Salt Lake *Tribune* of Tuesday, February 9. It shows how much the writer knows of his subject. He is never more absurd and an object of ridicule than when he attempts to enlighten the "Mormons" in regard to their creed, or lecture "young Utah" upon matters which they know much better than he can tell them. In the first place, few, if any, of the "younger generation of Mormons" ever see the paper in which those ebullitions of ignorance appear; and in the next place if they did, they would only laugh at his impertinence and folly in attempting to belittle their faith in things that they do not believe in.

The above quotation from the Book of Mormon he supposes is only to be found in the "original Palmyra edition." If he will borrow a copy of any edition of the Book of Mormon he will find the identical passage therein, and, further, he will discover no changes in the text in the present or any other edition from that of the first. Then if he will go to any Sunday School of the Latter-day Saints—and there are a great many in this city—he will find the Book of Mormon, containing that same passage, and learn that the younger generation of "Mormons," who, he thinks, have never been permitted to see it, are more familiar with it and understand it a great deal better than he does.

After disposing of his mare's nest and showing that there is nothing hidden, or mysterious, or to be kept from the "younger generation" in the wonderful paragraph which he has discovered, we will now examine his comments. He says "the above does not correspond with what the 'Mormons' are being taught now." He is mistaken again. That is just exactly what they are being taught now, in Sunday Schools, Mutual Improvement Associations and general meetings. He says it is "from the pen of Joseph Smith and as much of a revelation as anything he ever wrote."

There is a slight difference, which the younger generation of the "Mormons" understand well enough, but which we will point out for his benefit. Joseph did not write that paragraph, he translated it, and some one else wrote both the original and the translation. It is not a revelation to the Latter-day Saints, in the same sense as the revelation on celestial marriage. It is the translation of part of a sermon, preached by the Prophet Jacob to the Nephites, and only applied to them, in their own time and in their own circumstances. They were not allowed to have more than one wife because they committed whoredoms. People who are so corrupt are not fit for plural marriage. They justified themselves in their wickedness by the things written concerning David and Solomon. Wherein those men transgressed, such as David with Bathsheba and Solomon with "strange women," their acts were "an abomination" to the Lord. The Nephites were told that they should not have more than one wife. But the closing sentence in the above paragraph explains that this command was only to them, and that other laws might be revealed. "For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people, otherwise they shall hearken unto these things."

The revelation on celestial marriage, given direct to the Latter-day Saints, is in fulfillment and consonance with that sentence. The Lord desired His people to raise up seed to Him, so He commanded them. Until He so commanded, they, like the people to whom that prohibition was given, "hearkened unto those things." The intimation that he would so command is in the Book of Mormon, the command that He has given in accordance with the intimation is in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants.

But the would-be preceptor of the younger generation of "Mormons," wants them to believe that the later revelation is evidence that the Lord has changed His mind." Not at all. He merely gave a commandment under certain circumstances to a people who lived over two thousand years ago,

and has given a different commandment under different circumstances to a different people who live in this age of the world. To the early Israelites He gave a law of carnal commandments adapted to their condition; to the people in Christ's time He gave a totally different law. The Almighty adapts His commands and precepts to the conditions of those to whom they are revealed. And even in the same period what would be right and binding upon some persons might not be required of or be proper in others. Not because Delty "changes His mind," but because men's conditions, capabilities and circumstances are not all the same.

The writer who wants to enlighten "Young Utah" may thus perceive that his reasoning is on a par with his discovery. The wonderful disclosure of a "former revelation," and the notion that it is in conflict with what is taught now, are characteristic emanations from a source that is always misleading, generally sophistical, and often densely ignorant of the subjects it attempts to elucidate.

A FREE PUFF.

THAT most un-Christian and ungrammatical publication called the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, still lingers out a miserable existence and fulminates weak sophisms against "Mormonism" and the "Mormons." It has several writers and has changed editors many times, but it appears that none of them has yet learned how to spell. The orthography of the poor thing has been always bad and no improvement takes place with its years. Those who write for it claim to be educators, and have a great deal to say about educating the "Mormons," but before they proceed further they should take a spell at learning the orthography of common words.

The malice that sticks out all over its blotched and bleared pages is the very antipodes of its title, and the falsehoods which it puts forth as an explanation of "Mormon" doctrine, authorize the prefix of anti at its head. One of the chief contributions to its columns is a paper, by Prof. W. T. Lincoln on "The Work of the Teacher in Utah," and instead of pointing out that work, it attempts to explain "Mormonism," making a complete botch of the subject and exaggerating, misrepresenting and falsifying both that faith and the people who entertain it.

If the devil has not more to do with the concern than the Redeemer, then the New Testament is a fable and the teachings of the Nazarene count for nothing. As a compound of ignorance, mendacity, ungrammatical sentences and horrible spelling, in poor type badly made up, the *Anti-Christian Advocate* is a model anti-"Mormon" apology for a public paper. This notice is inserted without charge.

TOO DEAD TO BE REVIVED.

THE Philadelphia *American* speaks of "one more revival of the story of the Spaulding romance, from which it is alleged that Sidney Rigdon derived the Book of Mormon." That paper is mistaken. This time it is not a revival, it is a funeral. The story was killed long ago and now the discovery of the manuscript from which it was alleged the Book was written, is a clod on the grave of the stupid story, of such dimensions and weight as will prevent any further "revival."

The *American* wants to know what has become of the plates, and says if the Church would produce them it would be "an ample refutation of the Spaulding version of the origin of the Book of Mormon." The refutation of that story could not be more ample than it has been made already; the refutation is perfect and complete, and not a thread or shred of the story is left to any one who has investigated the proofs of its falsehood.

As to the plates, they are in the same custody as the tables of stone on which the ten commandments were given, written by the finger of God. They will be produced when the Almighty wishes the rest of their contents to be translated. And their production, to those who reject the ample testimony of the twelve witnesses to their existence and purport, would have no effect whatever in the direction supposed by the *American*.

To those who desire proof the way is open and clear. God has witnessed to thousands the truth of that record, and he is "no respecter of persons." But whatever may be thought of the divinity of the Book, the Spaulding story is too dead and decayed for any further use by the enemies of the sacred volume.

THE REMAINING SNOW APPEAL CASES.

ON Saturday evening the two remaining Snow cases were disposed of in the Supreme Court of the Territory, the decision of the lower court being in each case affirmed. Judge Powers gave the Opinion affirming his own decision in the case for 1883, and Judge Boreman delivered a similar Opinion