

EDITORIALS.

EVERY WORD OF GOD
ESSENTIAL.

MR. JOSEPH SMITH, of Lamoni, Iowa, continues to labor through the columns of the weekly *Herald* of that place, of which he is editor, to prove that there is nothing essential to the Church except that which was given to it as doctrine at its first organization, or at any rate any later than 1835 when the first edition of the Doctrine and Covenants was accepted. We have shown the fallacy of his arguments more than once, but will refer to the subject again, because he repeats his sophistry, and endeavors once more to create a conflict between the utterances of the DESERET NEWS and those of an Apostle of the Church. We quote from the Lamoni Herald, of Feb. 23d.

Apostle George Teasdale of the Utah Mormons, in a discourse delivered in the Assembly Hall, Salt Lake City, Utah, January 13th, 1884, as published in DESERET NEWS, said;

"I bear my solemn testimony that plural marriage is as true as any principle that has been revealed from the heavens. I bear my testimony that it is a necessity and that the Church of Christ in its fullness never existed without it."

How any man endowed with any sharpness, or common sense, can bear so foolish a testimony as the above is a curious thing.

Apostle George Q. Cannon, of the Utah Church, says that plural marriage "was not an essential doctrine of Mormonism at the beginning, nor is it now." Delegate John T. Caine, also a leading Mormon from Salt Lake, says it is "not essential." Charles W. Penrose, Editor of the DESERET NEWS, also states that the "Church existed without polygamy," or plural marriage.

The words imputed to Apostle Geo. Q. Cannon and to Hon. John T. Caine are garbled and incorrectly stated. Mr. Smith does not give his authority for them, and we pronounce them misrepresentations of the sentiments and expressions used by those gentlemen. The quotation purporting to be from the DESERET NEWS we stand by, whether correctly given or not, and challenge comparison between it and the remarks of Brother George Teasdale. He says, plural marriage is a "necessity," we said, as quoted, "the Church existed without polygamy." Now what is the inference? Simply that at one time the doctrine of plural marriage was not taught in the Church, but that now it is. We have to repeat our complaint of Mr. Smith's unfairness and quibbling in controversy. When pretending to quote from the News, why did he not state our position justly? Why did he not go on with the quotation and cite these words?—"although our plural wife system has become an essential part of our faith it is not and has not been the 'corner stone' of the Church." He knows as well as he knows anything, that the position of the DESERET NEWS on this question is that the Church of Christ is progressive; that, in the language of his martyred father: "We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God;" and that everything thus revealed becomes an essential part of the doctrine of the Church. But unfairness and disingenuousness are marked features of all Mr. Smith's controversial effusions against the Church in Utah.

We will now notice the argument he advances. He takes the ground that because the Church existed for several years without the promulgation of the doctrine of plural marriage, that doctrine cannot now be essential to it. And he makes many quotations from the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants with the object of establishing that position. One or two of these will suffice:

"And again, I say unto you, ye must repent, and be baptized in my name, and become as a little child, or ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of God. Verily, verily I say unto you, this is my doctrine; and whoso buildeth upon this, buildeth upon my rock; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against them. And whoso shall declare more, or less than this, and establish it as my doctrine, the same cometh of evil."—Nephi 5:9.

"Behold, this is my doctrine: Whosoever repenteth and cometh unto me, the same is my church; whosoever declareth more or less than this, the same is not of me, but is against me, therefore he is not of my church."—B. of C. sec. 10, (37), par. 16.

Do these passages support the idea that no doctrine revealed to the Church after 1830 or 1835 can become an essential part of its creed? If so, then God bound Himself not to make known anything new to the Church after those dates. What then would become of the "article of faith" which we have quoted above as coming from the Prophet Joseph, and which Mr. Smith, of Lamoni, pretends to adopt as part of his own creed? If a man comes to God "as a little child," will he not receive all that the Lord makes known to His Church? Will he not try to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God?" And if any man teaches less than this does it not "come of evil?" And does not Mr. Smith teach less than this in the article now under consideration? But we will quote also from the Doc-

trin and Covenants a revelation to Joseph Smith under date of April 6, 1830, the day the Church was organized:

"Behold there shall be a record kept among you, and in it thou shalt be called a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of the Church through the will of God the Father and the grace of your Lord Jesus Christ.

"4 Wherefore, meaning the church, thou shalt give heed unto all his words and commandments which he shall give unto you as he receiveth them, walking in all holiness before me," etc.

On the theory laid down by Mr. Smith, nothing is essential to the Church except that spoken of specially in the quotations made by him which we reproduce, and which are a sample of all the rest. What follows? Why that the doctrine of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, and for the healing of the sick, and for ordaining to the Priesthood, and for patriarchal blessings, being "more than this" are not the doctrine of Christ. That is the logical consequence of his argument. How is it then that he accepts that doctrine as part of his creed? There is nothing in all the quotations he makes which relates to ordinations, the quorums of the Priesthood, the law of tithing, the doctrine of consecration, the gathering of the Saints and of the House of Israel, the resurrection of the dead, and a great number of principles and covenants introduced by Joseph the Prophet as the seer and revelator to the Church. And under Mr. Smith's theory he must reject them because not specifically named in the paragraphs quoted as containing the fullness of the gospel.

Does he not know that if the Holy Ghost is given to the Church that it is to "guide into all truth," and that every principle of truth newly revealed is just as essential as any truth previously revealed? Does not the Book of Covenants teem with promises of fresh manifestations and revelations of principle, until not only all former things that had been lost should be made known, but things kept hidden from the foundation of the world should be disclosed? Has he not read in the revelation given through his father as late as 1841, that the Lord said in relation to the Temple to be built in Nauvoo:

"For I deign to reveal unto my Church things which have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world, things that pertain to the dispensation of the fullness of times?"

Now does Mr. Smith mean to say that all this when revealed will be non-essential? We feel almost ashamed to take up space in answering such childishness. The question at issue, now, is not the rightfulness of plural marriage, remember, but whether anything revealed to the Church after a certain date—we care not what it may be—if it is new, can be essential to the Church. Mr. Smith seems to think that because a doctrine, plural marriage for instance, was not originally part of the Church doctrine it cannot be essential now. He might just as well say that because the body of a man contains substance which was not in his body when a child, the new material cannot be essential to his existence and perfection. We take the ground that whatever doctrines, or principles, or covenants, or powers God reveals to the Church through the head—appointed of him to receive such things—when received become essential parts of the creed of the Church and therefore they are a necessity. Plural marriage was once not taught to the Church. But it is taught now. It was revealed through the head of the Church, has been received by the body, has become part of the established faith, and is now an essential, for the simple reason that there are no non-essentials in the Gospel and Church of Christ, whatever there may be in the Churches and creeds of men. This is our position, and it is in accord with the teachings of the Apostles who have been referred to, with the whisperings of the Holy Spirit and with the revelations of God laid down in the sacred books.

THE CASE OF MISPLACED
SYMPATHY.

In another column we print an account of an interview with Elder Silas S. Smith, which appears in the Denver Tribune. Brother Smith is a gentleman well known in these parts, and we believe his word will be relied upon by persons of all classes and creeds who have the pleasure of his acquaintance.

We allude again to the subject of the movement in aid of the San Luis Valley apostates, because it has been agitated in this city in a public meeting, where the utterances of the DESERET NEWS were commented upon. At the Federal Court House on Saturday evening, a small assembly discussed the question, and was addressed by Miss Kate Field, who has taken an interest in the people alleged to be suffering for necessities in Conejos County, Colorado. The lady referred to this paper as though our remarks were applied to her, personally. This was a mistake. We had no thought of alluding to her in connection with this question and do not doubt for a moment her announced willingness to lend her influence in aid of suffering humanity. Miss Field read at the meeting a cer-

tificate given to William L. Ball, similar to those given to all the Elders sent on missions, certifying that he was "in full faith and fellowship with the Church," and recommending him to the consideration of the public as a "man of God," etc. It is dated January 5, 1883, and Miss Field argued that because he was a man of God at that date, he could not now be such a person as described by the DESERET NEWS, which she said had "branded him as a thief because he had the manhood to assert his freedom and independence."

It is an error to say that this paper accused Mr. Ball because he "stood up for independence," and it is not good reasoning to maintain that because he was considered worthy of confidence in January 1883, he must be worthy of confidence in February 1884. All that we said about that individual was to state one of the reasons why he was excommunicated; namely, that he applied to his own use the tithing, donations for the poor and Relief Society money, facts that are not disputed. To illustrate this case we will refer to one in the days and experience of Jesus of Nazareth. He chose twelve Apostles and sent them out as "men of God" to preach the gospel. One of them apostatized and betrayed him, and while he was planning to deliver Jesus to his enemies, that man, Judas, pretended solicitude for the suffering poor, and the scripture says it was "because he was a thief and carried the bag." Now it would be a very poor defence of Judas Iscariot, after he was cut off the Church, to bring up his credentials given when he was "a man of God," and before he proved himself a thief, to prove that he must be still "a man of excellent character." Miss Field, who is very shrewd and acute, cannot fail to see the application.

We wish to say once more that we have no controversy with those kind-hearted persons who desire to alleviate distress. We have intended no insinuation against them. If they choose to apply means that might be used to assist the really needy, in behalf of persons who are not in the situation that has been falsely described or highly colored, that is not our affair. We did wish to caution them against placing that means in unworthy hands, where it was liable to stick instead of being distributed to the intended objects of charity, and consider that we were perfectly right in giving that caution. And our remarks about the disposition to help the people of Colorado, simply because they had left the "Mormon" Church, were intended, as intimated, to apply to those who are endeavoring to use this incident in the settlement of a new region, as an opportunity to vent their chronic spleen against the "Mormon" Church and its institutions.

In the early settlement of this Territory there were real cases of privation and hardship, compared to which the close times endured in San Luis valley are not a mentionable circumstance. To-day there are people in newly opened counties of Utah who have to struggle against frost, the inconvenience of distant fuel, and many difficulties incident to a new country, much more formidable than those that surround the people for whom aid is asked; but they would be ashamed to make a fuss about their condition, and would gain no such sympathy as is unnecessarily created in this instance, because they are not apostates, but simply Latter-day Saints, who do not pretend to charge their trials or failure to make a fortune in a year, to the Church of which they are members.

THE WOOL INDUSTRY.

The meeting of wool growers held at the Continental Hotel on Saturday, allusion to which was made in Saturday's ENENING NEWS, was attended by about a hundred prominent wool growers and wool dealers of this region, and the proceedings were interesting and full of energy. The following resolutions were adopted after speeches from several gentlemen:

Whereas, We, the wool growers of Utah and Idaho, being assembled in convention, and representing in this assemblage one of the most important of American industries, an industry to which we have devoted the best energies of our lives in developing in the Territories, despite the most trying difficulties of a desert country and a mountain climate—an industry which began with small investments, until today it represents in the aggregate millions of American capital, employing thousands of American citizens and amply supplying the American market; and,

Whereas, We learn with alarm and indignation the danger which threatens this great national industry by the introduction of the so-called Morrison bill in Congress in which a further reduction of 20 per cent. on foreign wool is demanded by the free traders of the east—which if it became a law would absolutely ruin the wool growing industry of this country; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention herewith heartily indorse the call for a meeting of the wool growers in Denver on the 12th of March, and that we herewith pledge our support to that convention in every possible way.

Resolved, That a delegation be sent from this convention to represent us at the convention to meet in Denver, March 12th next.

Resolved, That we request the restoration of the tariff of 1867.

Major Silva of Ogden, and E. M. Weiler, Esq., of this city, were appointed delegates to attend the convention at Denver, in the City Hall, on the 12th of March, 1884. The Convention is expected to be an important meeting of persons interested in the wool industry, and steps will be taken there to aid in bringing a pressure to bear on Congress for the restoration of the tariff of 1876.

It is evident that the reduction which has been made in the tariff on wool has had a depressing effect on the wool trade of the West. The dealers feel it as much at least as the sheep owners. Large stocks of last year's wool are now on hand in this Territory, shipment having been delayed because of low prices in the East. And if a further reduction is made, as contemplated in the Morrison bill, the Western dealers will be in a bad fix while the producers will have their profits reduced to a figure that may be described as next to nothing.

Sheep raising has been a very profitable industry at some seasons in this Territory. At others great losses have been sustained through the inclement weather and diseases to which sheep are often subject. But under the protective tariff formerly in operation the business was quite remunerative. How much of a reduction of the tariff the western wool industry could stand we are not prepared to say, but it is clear that with the sweeping change now proposed in Congress, the business of wool raising for exportation would be ruined.

Whether or not the ruin of this industry would be compensated for by benefits that would accrue to the great mass of citizens from the removal of the duty on imports, does not at present appear. Some free-trader can perhaps demonstrate this to his own satisfaction if not to that of others. However, the interests of the wool growers and wool dealers of the Western States and Territories are involved in a retention of the tariff, if not in its restoration to the figures of 1867, and it is in aid of that interest that the Convention will be held in Denver.

PROTECTION FROM CATTLE
THIEVES.

On Friday we noted the fact that three cattle thieves had been captured in Arizona by John R. Stewart, son of the late Bishop Levi Stewart, who was probably accompanied by one or two others. The thieves had committed the depredation in Southern Utah, and were tracked to the place where the capture took place.

This incident suggests a means by which Utah can be effectually cleared of cattle thieves. The capture of the three young men mentioned yesterday was effected through the operations of the Southern Utah Stock Protecting Association, which is composed of stock owners of that section of the country. Mr. Richard Bentley is President, Mr. James Andrus Vice-President, and Hon. W. D. Johnson, secretary. The names of the other officers we have not obtained. It has a board of directors and an executive committee, the funds for the furtherance of the object of the Association being supplied by the regular contributions of the members. The pro rata payments are light, but amount to a considerable sum in the aggregate.

The working of the organization is conducted with admirable thoroughness and precision, officers being employed to track and secure the arrest of stock thieves. Not only is this the case, but when any suspicious characters are seen in or near any part of the section of country within the purview of the Association, every point is informed of the circumstance, in every place stock owners are on the lookout for thieves, and thus depredations upon cattle herds are doubtless prevented.

Some idea may be formed of the completeness and dispatch with which the association acts in cases of cattle stealing from the fact that so soon as the depredation committed by the parties arrested in Arizona was known, men in the employ of the organization were immediately dispatched to every point of outlet from the country, for the purpose of either intercepting or tracking the thieves. The result proves the effectiveness of the work done by these agents or detectives.

We believe if the stock raisers of Utah would, in each section, combine and organize associations such as the one now under consideration and which was formulated last June, cattle stealing would soon be an evil of the past. This position is strengthened by the fact that the present Legislature has passed an excellent law in relation to the care, herding, branding and protection of stock. The tendency of the measure is to make the way of the cattle thief more difficult and thorny. This wise law provides against all persons driving stock belonging to other people off the range, rendering them liable to indictment for grand larceny. No "running brand" will be allowed. Persons disposing of or receiving any stock animals, by purchase, without giving or receiving a written bill of sale will be guilty of a misdemeanor. The measure requires also that no neat cattle shall be killed until distinctly branded; those engaged in slaughtering cattle are required to keep a detailed record in relation to each animal; bills of sale are also to be given and received when any

sale of hides is consummated, and the purchasers are required to keep a record of the articles purchased. Butchers are required to retain all hides of cattle at least seven days after the cattle are slaughtered, during which time they shall be subject to public inspection. All persons other than butchers are required to keep hides under similar circumstances for a period of at least twenty days. No person other than the owner or his agent or employee is permitted to remove the hide or pelt from any animal found dead. The County Courts are empowered, should they deem it necessary, to appoint one or more detectives to discover violations of the stock laws. They are also authorized to offer rewards for the detection of persons violating the act under consideration.

It appears to us that with such a comprehensive act as has just passed the Legislature, and stock protecting associations covering all the more exposed portions of the Territory, Utah may soon free herself of western desperadoes of the genus cattle thief. A thorough application of the means designated in this article would soon make this part of the country a place to which persons belonging to that disreputable class would be glad to give a wide berth.

A MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

A JOINT committee of the Council and House of Representatives has been appointed, to draft a Memorial to Congress asking for the appointment of a congressional committee to inquire into the affairs of this Territory, so that any action taken by Congress in relation to Utah may be based upon correct information. We have heard the questions asked: "What need is there for another Commission? Is not the Utah Commission composed of gentlemen qualified for the task, and if so why ask for another?"

These queries arise from lack of understanding. The Utah Commission, created by the Edmunds Act, has certain fixed and definite powers. The exercise of any authority beyond the limits defined in that Act would be unlawful and therefore void. Among those powers, investigation into the charges that have been made against the majority of the people here is not enumerated. That Commission is not an investigating committee, such as is contemplated in the action of the Legislature.

The necessity for a committee of this kind is plainly seen in all the bills and all the speeches made in the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States against the people called "Mormons." The bills and the speeches manifest gross ignorance of the facts, and much misunderstanding which has been produced by false information. It is desirable that the true condition of Utah affairs, her people, laws, customs, condition and prospects should be known to that body which has undertaken to enact laws for her regulation. This has always been the wish of the majority of her citizens. But the small minority who have persistently endeavored to misrepresent the facts, have always been opposed to such an investigation. And the reason for that opposition is and has been, that it is not the truth which they want to be established, and light would be unfavorable to their schemes of darkness and dishonesty.

Federal officials have frequently aided in the work of misrepresentation through which the passage of inimical laws has been secured. Their statements, often diametrically opposed to the truth, have been received as facts because of their official position; and without hearing "the other side," conclusions have been jumped at resulting in legislation which has been injurious to the Territory, and has not effected the object which its chief advocates had in view. It was false information, received without scrutiny or hearing anything from the defence, that prompted the so called "Utah war," in which millions of public money was spent in a fiasco that would have been disgraceful in a petty commonwealth, and in a great nation was as criminal as it was ridiculous. A committee of investigation sent here before the army was ordered out instead of afterwards, would have saved the country millions of treasure and from a false step that any sane individual would have hesitated to take—a rash and inexcusable movement without inquiry and, as the event proved, without cause.

The report of Governor Murray to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor's message to the Legislative Assembly, both official documents, contain not only gross misrepresentations of fact, but absolute and positive untruths. It is not to be wondered at that such official statements are received at the seat of government as veritable relations of Utah affairs, and, considering the prejudice which exists against those who take pains to refute them, that they should pass muster without much question or attempt to examine evidence to the contrary.

Under these circumstances an impartial committee of inquiry, if it be possible to obtain such a body, is urgently demanded, and no one can reasonably object but the rascals who lie and deceive public men in regard to Utah and the "Mormons." Investigation is the last thing that they desire. Their success depends upon the general disposition to gulp down