

line of action, and as a matter of opinion we will venture the remark that, as a Christian, he is a dismal failure. For evidence of this estimate being correct it is unnecessary to go outside of his obtrusive and satanic behavior in the M. E. Church conference on Wednesday last.

Poor Dr. Iliff seems to be completely demoralized, having of late taken the position of a pronounced enemy of a people who, according to his own statements often heretofore made, have treated him with Christian liberality and hospitality. He seems to have been going down the ladder of Christian demeanor ever since he entered the political campaign of February last and engaged in the intellectual occupation of carrying around a torch on a broomstick in the ranks of the ungodly. Since the torch went out he seems to have been groping in the dark; hence the terrible mistake he made at the "Liberal" jollification held at the Walker House, when the shadow that enveloped him was so deep that he continued to participate in the revelry after Saturday night had lapped over on to Sunday morning a clear hour and a half.

In the light of current events it may be appropriate to speculate as to which religious sect will next be favored with the affiliation of Bishop Thomas. He seems to esteem it to be his high prerogative to marshal the forces of the sectarians and lead them to "make war upon the Saints."

A CUNNING DEVICE.

The bill introduced by Senator Platt from the Committee on Territories, the full text of which will be found in another part of this paper, is a substitute for the Cullom bill. If it comes to a vote in the Senate it will probably pass. We hope for better things in the House.

We believe there is a general sentiment of repugnance to the drastic and un-American spirit of the Cullom and Struble bills. They may be regarded as practically defunct. The shelving of the Cullom bill means a similar fate for the Struble bill, if it ever reaches the Senate.

But the bill in relation to Arizona and Utah, now pending in the Senate, though milder in language and not burdened with so many details, is in animus and intent of the same character as the other measures. It is anti-"Mormon" legislation. It is

designed to prevent "Mormons" from voting and holding office in both these Territories. Therefore those fair-minded and impartial Americans who have opposed the other bills, should also exert themselves to defeat this equally obnoxious and anti-republican proposition.

The substitution of this bill for those so strongly objected to is a very cunning device on the part of the enemy. It is supposed that the protestants against the Cullom and Struble bills will be satisfied with the seeming success of their efforts, and so be lulled into apathy as to the present project. We therefore draw attention to the inherent viciousness of the Platt bill, and to the fact that its effects are intended to be exactly the same as would follow the passage of the other bills.

It ought to be clear to every lover of constitutional freedom, that disfranchisement of innocent citizens because they are members of the same Church as persons who may be guilty, is in spirit, if not in letter, a violation of fundamental law and subversive of republican liberty. Yet this is what the Platt bill is framed to effect.

The argument on which the supporters of this bill rely is, that the Supreme Court of the United States has declared the Idaho law, on which this bill is based, to be constitutional. The truth is, the Court has decided that the power of the Territorial Legislature extends to "all rightful subjects of legislation," and that legislation as to the franchise comes within the scope of constitutional legislative powers. That is the gist of the ruling. On the same principle Congress, which is held to possess similar legislative powers over a Territory to that which a State Legislature has over a State, has the constitutional authority to regulate the elective franchise in the Territories.

But it should be observed that the present question is one of right rather than of power, of republican principle more than of supreme authority. Is it right to deprive citizens who have not broken the law of all political rights and privileges? Is it republican to strike the ballot from hands that have done no wrong? And, further, is it politic to punish monogamists for the offenses of polygamists? These questions should cause just people to ponder and the friends of popular government to protest.

Wyoming is to be a State in the

Union. It contains a number of "Mormons." There is no restriction upon their participation in all the affairs of the State equally with other citizens. Why, then, should their co-religionists in Utah and Arizona be discriminated against? If a "Mormon" may vote freely in Wyoming, why may he not vote at all in Arizona and Utah?

Let it be understood that this bill is not directed against polygamy. Polygamists have been disfranchised since March 22, 1892. It is the members of the "Mormon" church who have never violated the law whom the Platt bill proposes to debar from voting, office-holding and jury service.

We here append an editorial from the *Denver News* which is pertinent to the subject and is worthy of general attention:

"A statement was recently published to the effect that Arizona and New Mexico might be admitted to Statehood if they would frame constitutions disfranchising Mormons. As there are few Mormons in New Mexico, such a provision would not be felt in that Territory. In Arizona, however, the Mormons make up in numbers quite a respectable portion of the population. Being interviewed at Chicago a few days ago on the subject, ex-Chief Justice Wright of that Territory said that Arizona would not accept Statehood on such conditions. He says the Mormons of Utah do not practice polygamy.

"They are as good citizens as we have," he says; "they are frugal, industrious and law-abiding, and wherever they go the community is prosperous. We believe in the Edmunds law and will see that all violators of it are punished, but all Mormons are not polygamists. If Mormonism is a bar to Statehood, why not Roman Catholicism, Methodism and Presbyterianism? As polygamy is not practiced in Arizona, and never has been, why should we humiliate the Mormons who form one twentieth of our population."

"These sentiments can but be indorsed by every lover of the organic law of his country, which guarantees religious liberty to the citizen. As well might a people be disfranchised for professing the religion of any other church as that of the Mormons. Polygamy is not only contrary to the law, but is offensive to good morals, but because some Mormons practice it is no reason why an entire church should be stigmatized, any more than it would be reasonable to hold any one of the powerful church organizations of the country responsible for the lawlessness of one of its members."

A CURIOUS phenomenon is reported from Batoum, on the shores of the Black Sea. During a complete calm the sea is said to have suddenly receded from the shore, leaving it bare to a depth of ten fathoms. The water of the port rushed out to sea, tearing many of the ships from anchorage and causing a great amount of damage. After a short time the sea assumed its usual level.