

Observe! The conditions are such that they do not believe it right for a man to have more than one living and undivorced wife or to practice unlawful cohabitation. But pressed as to what their belief might be under conditions that do not exist, they express their opinion that then it might not be wrong for a man to have more wives than one. It is, then, for what they might think under non-existing circumstances that they are rejected, not for anything they have ever done, or for what they believe is right or wrong today. They have always obeyed the law, they would enforce it against lawbreakers, and they believe the law should be legally and morally sustained.

We are not now finding fault with their rejection as jurors, though we regard it as a mistake under the law and its evident meaning and intent, because the law deals only with present actions and beliefs. But we wish to draw attention to the *Tribune's* perversion of the signification of the answers given by the rejected jurors, that it may be further seen with what logic that paper reaches its wild conclusions. It says today:

"A careful scanning of their testimony as delivered there ought to be good reading to this community. We think it is an indirect vindication of what we have repeatedly said, that Mormons in good standing are not entitled to sit upon a jury, not entitled to cast a ballot, not entitled to hold a political office under any kingdom or government except their own."

It is good reading for any community. But it is neither a direct nor indirect "vindication" of the un-American, unjust and unreasonable demands of that paper. It forms no excuse, or argument, or pretext for the disfranchisement of anybody, or the exclusion of the gentlemen referred to or anybody else from office. It simply gave the Judge a very slight show of reason for excluding them from the panel of the grand jury. Jury service is not an office under the law.

The Edmunds Act provides that a person summoned as a juror in any prosecution for polygamous offenses, may be challenged as to whether he believes it right to practice such things. It is only in such prosecutions that this challenge may be made. This is justified on the ground that a person who believes it right to practice polygamy would not be likely to aid in the punishment of persons accused of that offense. Belief in the rightfulness of that practice, however, is not made a bar to service as a juror in other cases. And the same law which makes this challenging provision, also provides that a voter shall not be excluded from the polls "on account of any opinion

such person may entertain on the subject of bigamy or polygamy." Thus, if these gentlemen were rightfully rejected as jurors under the law, they could not be rightfully rejected as voters under the law, and consequently neither their testimony nor their rejection as jurors is any vindication of the course of muddled fanatics, who clamor for the disfranchisement of men whom they acknowledge to be truthful and sincere, on account of their opinion as to a theory relating to social ethics.

The logic by which these addled reasoners (?) attempt to justify their monstrous demands and puerile conclusions, is enough to make Locke and Malebranche and Mill turn over in their graves. The language of the law and the common sense bearings of this question lead to the exact reverse of the "vindication" so triumphantly claimed as an indirect consequence of the law and the testimony.

But the quotation we have given above fixes this fact beyond truthful dispute: That the *Tribune* editor demands the disfranchisement of sincere, truthful, honorable and enterprising citizens of the United States, and their exclusion from office, because of the opinion they may entertain on a question which is so abstract that it does not affect their actions either as members of the body politic or as components of the social system!

It is evident to those who take the trouble to run through the daily repetitions of the *Tribune* writer, advocating the political robbery and destruction of thousands of American citizens, that his powers are rapidly failing. It is not only on this perpetual disfranchisement question but on the tariff and on silver that the same cloudiness of thought and obscurity of expression are observable. Also, he will say one thing today and contradict it tomorrow. The *Herald* has made a specialty of exposing this and has done it effectually. It would be very funny if it were not so painful. It is lamentable to see the gradual wrecking of a mind that has been brilliant and a pen that if not logical at least was pretty.

Just read the following which concludes an editorial in the *Tribune* today, urging the Idaho legislators to pursue the "Mormous" of that State further, and forge additional political fetters for their already hardened limbs:

"Hence, in accordance with the serious conclusions which the men of all parties reached in Idaho, and out of which the test oath was born, hence in following that conclusion up legitimately a Constitution, in accordance with it, was framed, which Constitution provided that the Legislature of the State should enact any necessary legislation to perpetuate the

principles set forth in the Constitution, and as Congress, with that Constitution fiercely debated before it, finally endorsed it, and gave to the Territory Statehood; we say the present Legislature of Idaho can do no less than to pass and make secure and perpetual in law the original test oath of the Territory."

Take that effusion with the "argument" we have given from another of his editorials claiming a "vindication," and see what ravages are being wrought either by time, or habits or cerebral infirmities! A change of subject and a change of air may work an improvement. These failing, Provo has an institution where unfortunates of this class and character may find a quiet asylum.

DECADENCE OF BROAD PATRIOTISM.

It is interesting to note the individual and press comments upon the late remarks of Mr. Cleveland regarding the free coinage of silver. He has been widely and deeply denounced by a numerous class of newspapers and persons. In most instances the basis of the strictures aimed at him has been that he has committed political suicide—made his nomination next November an impossibility.

Such selfish critics are incapable of understanding a man of Mr. Cleveland's calibre. They take the position that the utterances and operations of publicists ought to be in the interest, first of personal advancement, second, of party power. Such carpers are cast in a mould so small that they cannot comprehend why a man should speak out, when he deems it necessary, independent of the interests of self or party.

To such an extent does this political hucksterism exist that it is doubtful if those imbued with it can believe that Mr. Cleveland can possibly understand that he has, by his late expression upon free coinage of silver, damaged his personal political prospects, and perhaps those of his party. He doubtless understands it perfectly, however, as there are few men more capable of perceiving the drift of popular sentiment than he.

We do not say that he is sound in the position he maintains on the question referred to, but there is no reasonable room for doubt that he is thoroughly convinced that he is right. Hence he takes the broad, patriotic view of his duty as a citizen of the Great Republic, whose interests should be paramount to every selfish party consideration. He regards the free coinage measure as one which would disrupt the country financially, and has the courage to express his conviction. Whether his position be right or wrong, the trait of character which impels him to an ex-