

wanted of course to handle the money obtained under false pretences, and they were as mad as hornets because it was placed in the hands of the board of control. The chairman had to see that it was disbursed according to the provisions of the law and not according to the whims of these women. The fuss that ensued was a matter of public comment at the time. The Governor clearly had the law on his side and only desired to see that its terms were complied with.

The women found that with all their wheedling, and coaxing, and sending persons to different country settlements to drum up inmates for the Home, "dependent women who renounce polygamy" could not be had in sufficient numbers to make a respectable showing in a report to Congress. They wanted the Governor and the Judges who composed the board of control to stretch the law beyond its meaning, so as to include persons who were never intended to receive its aid, and because this was not done to please them they have expended their wrath through their female representative in Washington, and then through Senator Hale upon the devoted head of Governor West.

Senator Blair backed up Mr. Hale and spoke on the delay that would be occasioned by turning the building of the Home over to the Treasury Department, and said:

"There can be no earthly cause for the delay desired by the Mormon Church and in the interest of the Mormon Church, possibly in the hope that future complications may arise and the whole institution be littered away and this great effort, born of the purposes of the angels of heaven, may be defeated in furtherance of the purposes of these devils from hell. I do not see any use in it."

Mr. Blair further attempted to frighten Senators who favored the proposition to put the money in the control of the Treasury Department, by intimating that if they persisted, "the American people would think this whole movement to be merely a device to accomplish that delay in the interest of the Mormon Church." He also claimed that the scheme had been "long delayed by reprehensible opposition from the Territory of Utah, stimulated by Mormonism but, as I believe, carried out very largely by the Government officials themselves."

Senator Cockrell, one of the committee and who, it is well known, is no friend to anything "Mormon," and Senator Call each had something to say on the other side of the question. Mr. Call's remarks we will print in full, as they are pregnant with sentiments which the whole country should consider. They will be found in another part of this paper. Mr. Cockrell said:

"Mr. President, it is due I think that I should state a fact which may not have appeared in the remarks of the Senator from Maine, and that is that the Mormons, the Mormon Church, the Mormon organization or whatever it may be styled, had no influence, directly or indirectly, in any shape, manner or form upon the discussion of this question which took place in the committee of conference, in my judgment—not a particle. And I do not believe that any member of the conference committee, on the part of the House or on the part of the Senate, was influenced by any such consideration."

Mr. Hale—Has the Senator any doubt that the Mormon authorities are bitterly hostile to this whole movement?

Mr. Cockrell—I do not know whether they are or not. That they may be hostile to the movement may be true. If they are, I have no information from any Mormon authority directly or indirectly that there was any hostility to it."

Senator Cockrell announced himself as favorable to the full appropriation, but said the whole ground of material difference was as to the placing of the money for the erection of the building.

Senator Teller, after having this point of difference explained to him, said he was in full sympathy with the movement, but could not say so with reference to the wording of the amendment. He did not like the words "who desire to sever their allegiance to the Mormon Church." He did not care to see in a statute "a provision that says we will enable somebody to leave or go into any church." He was "quite anxious to vote some provision that shall protect the class of people" who break connection with a life of polygamy. He would vote for the provision as it is, but would rather those words were not in it. Mr. Hale intimated that they could be changed to "dependent women and children of Utah and Idaho Territories," and Mr. Teller approved of the change. He said further:

"Since I have been in public life there have been two very important bills passed with reference to the people of Utah. The last one I thought at the time of its passage, and I think so now, trenches upon constitutional grounds. I thought it was harsh, cruel and wicked, and I so said, and I withheld from it my vote. I complained then, as I had years before when the other bill was passed, that we were breaking bonds that were existing between these people not rightfully but actually, without any provision, without any attention being given to the protection of them when they were broken."

After the matter had been debated some length, on motion of Mr. Hale the Senate agreed to stand by the

amount of the appropriation and its disbursement by the treasurer of the Association, and not accede to the objections of the House conferees. This left the matter still in dispute between the two Houses.

Since then, an agreement has been arrived at, by which enough money is appropriated to finish the building on present plans and the title is to be vested in the government.

It must appear strange to ordinary people why Senators Hale and Blair are so anxious that the large sum of \$80,000 of Government money should not be expended under Government direction. And why the Home Association should be so much opposed to so reasonable a proposition. It will be observed that Senator Call considered this as "very singular." The fact is Senators Hale and Blair have been influenced by the female lobbyist for the Association, and the ladies of that institution want to finger that cash themselves, that is all there is of it. We do not insinuate that they intend to do anything wrong with the money. They simply want the power its disposition will give to them in accomplishing the object of their ambition.

The enlargement of the scope of the institution to the extent of opening the Home to "dependent women and children in Utah and Idaho," would make it broad enough in all conscience. But it would take away from it entirely its anti-polygamous and anti-Mormon character, and throw the Home open to indigent women of all classes and sects. It is funny to watch the operations of this abortive scheme to corral "plural wives cast off by their Mormon husbands," and see it drift away entirely from its original intent. It has been in a turmoil and squabble from the beginning, and has been fostered by a certain class here, because it could be made the vehicle of misrepresenting the "Mormons" and of prejudicing Congress and the country upon the perennial "Mormon" question.

As we have said heretofore we have no objection to the appropriation by Congress of any amount of money to be expended in buildings in Utah for the benefit of women and children needing an asylum, but we do object to the deceit and falsehood and vilification of the "Mormons" which have been employed to secure the appropriation. That is the whole ground and full extent of "Mormon" hostility to the establishment of the Industrial Home.

THE "CHRONICLE" AT IT AGAIN.

For some unexplained cause the San Francisco Chronicle has lately commenced anew its insane attacks upon "Mormonism." There is nothing new in the style of these articles, nor do they convey a new thought. There are the same old epithets such as "a blot upon the American escutcheon," "a vile stain athwart the banner of our country," and the same old and stupid demand that the "blot and the stain" shall be "crushed out of existence."

In its latest editorial effusion on this subject the Chronicle revives the nearly defunct charge that "Mormonism" is "not a religion." This is because of "a serious attempt to defend Mormonism on the ethical side," and to show that it is entitled to the same constitutional guarantees which other religions enjoy. The Chronicle says: "It is universally conceded that religion, as it is understood nowadays, must be based upon morality."

Well, we are perfectly willing that "Mormonism" shall be judged by that rule. But the evidence must not come from the columns of the Chronicle, or of any other bigoted and nuttish paper that suppresses the truth and gives place to slander. The proofs that "Mormonism" is "a genuine religion" are irrefragable. It promotes faith in the Supreme Being as the Creator of the universe, the Father of all mankind, and a Revealer of His will to every soul that seeks Him in the way He has appointed. It is the "Christian religion," because it points to Jesus Christ as its living, communicating Savior and head. And it is a vital religion because it brings to every baptized believer the gift of the Holy Ghost, in power as of old, with all its former inspiration and the gifts which ever accompanied its possession.

It is the most strictly moral religion to be found on earth. It inculcates Bible morality and requires it of the members of the Church, who cannot remain such when they practice immorality. The following passages from the Doctrine and Covenants containing revelations from God to the Church through Joseph Smith, the Prophet, are instances of the morality of "Mormonism":

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy might, mind and strength; and in the name of Jesus Christ thou shalt serve him. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt not steal, neither commit adultery, nor kill, nor do anything like unto it. Thou shalt thank the Lord thy God in all things. 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."

"See that ye love one another; cease to be covetous, learn to

impart one to another as the Gospel requires; cease to be idle; cease to be unclean; cease to find fault one with another; cease to sleep longer than is needful; retire to thy bed early that ye may not be weary; arise early, that your bodies and minds may be invigorated; and above all things clothe yourselves with the bonds of charity, as with a mantle, which is the bond of perfectness and peace; pray always, that ye may not faint until I come, behold and lo, I will come quickly, and receive you unto myself. Amen.

"Thou shalt not be idle; for he that is idle shall not wear the garments of the laborer."

"Thou shalt not kill; and he that kills shall not have forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come. And again I say, thou shalt not kill and he that killeth shall die. Thou shalt not steal, and he that stealeth and will not repent shall be cast out. Thou shalt not lie; he that lieth and will not repent shall be cast out. Thou shalt not commit adultery; and he that committeth adultery and repenteth shall be cast out. Thou shalt not speak evil of thy neighbor nor do him any harm." "And if any man or woman shall rob, he or she shall be delivered up to the law of the land; and if he or she shall lie, he or she shall be delivered up to the law of the land; and if he or she shall do any manner of iniquity, he or she shall be delivered up to the law, even that of God."

These are a very few extracts bearing on the subject of morality. As to the practice of it, the testimony of all people who have fairly and without prejudice inquired into the matter is, that the "Mormon" people compare favorably with any people in the world, and that there is no more moral, temperate, industrious and honest community under the sun. Polygamy, which the Chronicle, repeating another old and dying error, says is "the corner stone of Mormonism," was part of the morality of the early patriarchs and other Biblical worthies, but has never been practised by the large majority of the "Mormons." The Chronicle says:

"It is true that among the religions of every kind or denomination, there are found individual instances of people who are liars and thieves and swindlers, and even worse; but no religion, except Mormonism, condones such offenses and encourages them, provided they inure to the temporal benefit of the religion or its principal supporters and devotees. Among certain sects in India murder is an act of faith, the highest proof of devotion to the deity whom they worship; but no civilized nation, no civilized humanity, concedes that murder is anything but murder, or that the unlawful killing of a human being can be any part of religion."

"Mormonism" does not condone any of these offenses, but condemns them more strongly than any other religion, and in making the insinuations contained in the above extract the writer goes against both the theory of "Mormonism" and the known facts as to "Mormon" life.

It is getting too late in the day for a live paper like the Chronicle is as to current news, to revamp these worn out falsehoods and try to make them do service in blackguarding a creed and a people that are beginning to be better understood. That kind of thing is at least a decade behind the times. Is there not enough material in the issues of the political campaign wherewith to make up editorial articles, without resorting to these hackneyed assaults on the people of Utah and in the stereotyped phrases of the long ago?

It is very dirty work for any writer to do, but the author of recent anti-"Mormon" attacks in that paper seems to be performing a labor of love. If he would only contrive to furnish something a trifle newer, and without those mouldy sentences which smell of the paste-pot and the fustiness of old files, there might be some satisfaction in meeting him on the field of journalism. But what is the matter with the Chronicle, anyhow, that this rash should break out on its mouth at the present time? We had an idea that its policy was to deal only with live issues. "Mormonism" is quick enough, it is true, but this manner of attacking it is like making weapons of the bones of the dead.

AFFAIRS IN UTAH.

The following comments on the stuff printed in the Congressional Record on behalf of "the loyalists of Utah," are taken from the New York Globe of Sept. 29th:

Mr. Edmunds of Vermont must have been pretty hard pressed for anti-Mormon facts, when he presented to the United States Senate, last Friday, the Memorial of Mrs. Aggie F. Newman, on behalf of "The loyalists of Utah Territory," and had it printed in the Record.

The Memorial is nothing more than a fanatical woman's repetition, in her shrillest voice, of a few of the vile falsehoods which the Salt Lake Tribune and the carpet-baggers of Utah are forever uttering against the Mormons of that Territory.

The editor of the Globe is in no way interested in either Mormonism or polygamy, but he knows, by personal observation, enough of Utah affairs to be able to assert positively

that Mrs. Aggie F. Newman's memorial is unspeakably untrue, and that the "indisputable statistics of the Hon. F. T. Dubois of Idaho" are "indisputably" false."

The Globe also refers to the detention of immigrants and the undeserved strictures of the New York Herald on "Mormon" proselytes, in the following language:

"All this outcry against the 'immorality of the Mormons' of to-day springs from the almost universal ignorance of our people of the real state of affairs in Utah and of the real character of the Mormon men and women—an ignorance which is taken advantage of, by as greedy a set of carpet-baggers as ever plundered a people, to disseminate all manner of falsehoods about the Mormons so that they may themselves carry out their own nefarious, carpet-bag designs against that people, and rob them of their lands and houses, as they have already robbed them of most of their rights as American citizens."

The Mormon women of Utah are just as modest and chaste, to say the least, as the Gentile women of that Territory, or the non-Mormon women of Nevada, or New York, and these girls whom Mr. Magone has sent back to Liverpool would have been more apt to grow up into chaste womanhood, and to have lived the lives of virtuous mothers, had they been allowed to go to Salt Lake, whither they had a perfect right to go, than they will be permitted to live in Liverpool.

The editor of the Globe has an advantage over the ordinary New York journalist in speaking of Utah affairs, having studied the Mormon problem on the spot. His estimate of "Mormon" character is correct, and his boldness and fairness in speaking the truth on this subject are as commendable as they are rare among editors.

THE SEWERAGE QUESTION.

The Water Part of it Intelligently set Forth as a Formidable Obstacle.

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 9th, 1888.

Editor Deseret News:

Now that the Fair and Conference are over, the great question of Sewerage, (which has been partially kept in the back ground during that time) has been started again in earnest and that by the Chamber of Commerce, which has appointed a committee of fifteen to canvass the owners of property in District number one, and if possible to influence them not to protest against sewerage. To this I have no objection, I believe in every man having the right to protest or not as he pleases, and if he is not sufficiently posted on the matter, to receive the advice or counsel of his friends who have studied the matter more, but that advice or counsel should be based upon a statement of facts and not fiction. The News has heretofore put the sewerage question truthfully before the public.

The main question to be considered, before the proposed system of sewerage can be successfully carried out, is a

SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF WATER.

and this I pointed out in my letter of Sept. 1st, and which has been enlarged upon by the News and others since, and it was suggested by Mr. Culmer in the Chamber of Commerce meeting last night, and was attempted to be answered by at least two of the subsequent speakers. It is the statements of these two gentlemen that I propose to examine and see if they were justified in making them, based upon the present supply of water for the city.

In the morning Herald I read that the question resolved itself into whether we had or had not sufficient water.

Mr. McCornick, an alderman of the City Council, replied, "That question was never considered doubtful in the minds of the City Council." And to another statement that they had never made it plain to the public, he replied that it would be made plain in a report to be submitted Tuesday evening.

This statement of Mr. McCornick is a fearful arraignment of the members of the City Council, for their lack of knowledge on so important a matter.

THE "WALL"

has been going on here all the summer for more water, to say nothing about the wall that has gone up in former years, and yet, according to Mr. McCornick's statement, the fact that Salt Lake City has not a sufficient supply of water for domestic purposes has never been considered by the Council as an obstacle to the proposed plan of sewerage.

We shall see if the promised report will actually increase the supply of water for the city, or will it be the belief only that we have a sufficient supply.

Councilor Dooley is reported in the same paper as saying that "the cry of a scarcity of water was a mere bugbear." "The city had an amply supply." "The canal supply had been doubled." "The waters of Parley's creek had been secured and Salt Lake had a supply of water large enough to supply her for the next twenty years. There was enough water going to waste in one place in this city to finish the sewers of a city with the population of San Francisco."

Now

I CHALLENGE THE GENTLEMAN

to prove any one of the foregoing statements. If such be the case let

the gentleman point out where the ample supply is, where the double supply of canal water has been running the last six weeks or more, and how it is that with such a large supply the people of the north and east parts of the city have been suffering for a little water for culinary purposes only. Let him take the watermaster to the one place where so much water is going to waste; perhaps he will be able to stop that waste, and see that some of it is given to those in need of it.

The remarks of the same gentleman on the manner of paying for sewerage is also misleading. The property outside of the sewer district will be taxed the same per cent (and I think a much higher valuation in proportion) as the property in the sewer district for the building of the main sewer and operating and keeping the same in repair.

In connection with this demand for sewerage I desire to call the attention of the public and the City Council especially to the fact that on the 4th day of September

A PETITION

signed by many heads of families residing on the north bench was presented to the City Council setting forth that they had not sufficient water for culinary purposes let alone for irrigation and that many trees were dying for lack of water, while many lawns were sprinkled from five to six hours every day, while they themselves could not get water to irrigate at the rate of two minutes a rod once a week, and asked for an immediate consideration of the matter without referring to a committee. The petition was handed to the committee on waterworks, where it has slumbered ever since, and this is the kind of treatment these same people have occasionally received from the City Council for years past. But some one may say, did not the council on Sept. 4, order the watermaster to turn into the Nineteenth Ward ditch the water belonging to the people of the district, and say that they were entitled to what belonged to them? Yes, they did; and I suppose from their subsequent action, that they felt sorry for their hasty act of justice and repented in the same breath—and reconsidered and made void the order. Here is justice in the face of the fact that Salt Lake City has an ample supply of water according to the statement of two members of the city council. After this action of the council the Watermaster was instructed to "do the best he can toward supplying the 19th ward ditch with water to be used for culinary purposes." This was what might be called a milk and water arrangement, no milk and but very little water.

I believe the watermaster tried to carry out these instructions for there was a little water allowed to run in the ditch for culinary purposes, and a special officer was detailed to see that none of the water was used for irrigation purposes, notwithstanding the people's trees or plants might be dying for want of it, while the lawns of the city were kept as comparative swamps every day in the week, and the time of sprinkling increased at this time from five to nine hours a day. The poor owners of lawns did not have enough hours to sprinkle, so they must be increased. True the ordinance provided for only twenty minutes in lower district and thirty minutes in upper district, for each 100 square yards each day, but who saw that they confined themselves to the time allotted, or who made complaint of any infraction of the ordinance against those who used it longer. Why no one. The ordinance is a dead letter.

I am

NOT IN FAVOR OF LAWSUITS

unless it is absolutely necessary, but I think the time has come when those entitled to water in the outer districts need not depend upon our City Council to permit them to use what they are entitled to, and for that reason I would urge upon those who have water rights in City Creek or other streams and who have been deprived of the same, to awake from their slumbers and organize themselves for the purpose of defending and maintaining their rights if necessary in the courts appointed for that purpose, for if they do not the next and following summers will be but a repetition of the past, only worse and worse. If the sewerage scheme as at present proposed should succeed, we may as well desert our homes that we have built at much expense, for without water they will be of no value to us. I would also suggest the propriety of calling a mass meeting of voters and taxpayers in every precinct of the city and if the majority at such meeting decide against the proposed system of sewerage at the present time, let them demand of their representatives in the City Council that they place their vote squarely on record against the system.

In conclusion let me say, give the city a good supply of pure water for domestic purposes and a sufficient supply of water for irrigation. After that I will vote every time for the best system of sewerage that can be adopted.

Yours,

JOHN N. PIKE.

While considerable is being said in Republican organs about Democratic extravagance at this time, it may be well to state the appropriations on the basis of House bills amount to \$413,000,000, and on the basis of Senate bills, \$425,000,000—or a balance of \$12,000,000 in favor of the Democratic House.