

DESERET EVENING NEWS

Organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

CROENZO SNOW, TRUSTEE-IN-TRUST.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING,
(SUNDAYS EXCEPTED.)
Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets,
Salt Lake City, Utah.Charles W. Penrose, - - - Editor
Horace G. Whitney, Business ManagerSUBSCRIPTION PRICES.
In Advance. \$3.00
Six Months. 1.50
Three Months.75
One Month.25
One Week.10
Saturday edition, per year. 2.00
Semi-weekly. 2.00Correspondence and other reading matter
for publication should be addressed to the
EDITOR.
Address all business communications
THE DESERET NEWS,
Salt Lake City, Utah.NEW YORK REPRESENTATIVE.
R. A. Craig. - - - 41 Times Building.CHICAGO REPRESENTATIVE.
Craig & Woodward. - - 87 Washington St.

SALT LAKE CITY, - NOV. 23, 1899.

UNPARTISAN INDEPENDENCE.

We are in receipt of letters from
respected correspondents, in reference
to the alleged recent dispute in an ex-
ecutive meeting of State leaders of a
political party. We do not publish them
for the reason that they would
give ground for the charge, which some
folks appear anxious to prefer, that the
"News" interferes in political affairs.
Any reference in this paper to the ac-
tions or sentiments of either of the
great political parties, is interpreted by
the other as partisan on our part. The
oversensitiveness of some politicians on
this point would be very irritating if it
were not so highly ridiculous.

While the Deseret News intends to be
strictly unpartisan in its utterances,
and to abstain from favoring or sup-
porting any political party or faction,
it does not intend to be tied down or
fuzzed, either in publishing particu-
lars of current events or the expression
of views in relation to living questions.
There are principles underlying the
frame work of our national system and
of our State institutions which can and
ought to be freely discussed, no mat-
ter how they may affect any political
organization. There are also principles
of morality, of integrity, of social policy,
of religion and of philosophy which may
properly be ventilated in a non-partisan
public journal, even if they do come in
contact with ideas entertained by some
political faction or party or its organs.

The Deseret News has more than once
announced its independence on these
matters, and again takes occasion to
state that this does not imply its silence
on public questions, whether local or
national, that affect the general wel-
fare. On the contrary, that very inde-
pendence is an assertion of its freedom
from party bias, and of its determina-
tion to abide by its motto from the be-
ginning—"Truth and Liberty."

We claim the right, and purpose to
maintain the exercise thereof, to touch
on such public questions as appear to
us of general interest, or of conse-
quence to the people of the Church we
represent and the State in which we re-
side. Also to criticize the remarks and
the position taken by our contemporaries
in relation to any matter of mo-
ment, whether concerning the Church
or the State.

We can understand the desire on the
part of some papers to restrict the De-
seret News, to bind it with cords of their
own fashioning, and to put a gag in
its mouth so that its constantly in-
creasing influence and usefulness may
be cut short. But such attempts will
be in vain. The Deseret News has kept
within the limits clearly defined in its
first issue of the present year, and ex-
pects to do so in the future; but at the
same time will strive to fill to the full
the position which it then assumed.

As to the letters received as men-
tioned above, we do not suppress them
simply because they might displease
some extreme partisans, or because we
entertain any fear as to such displeas-
ure when we are in the right, but be-
cause they contain matters that could
be rationally and fairly objected to as
having a party tendency. Our corre-
spondents will therefore please take
notice, and understand the reason for
our action in this particular.

MORALITY OF CITIES.

The conference between the W. C. T. U. ladies and the Chief of Police on the
moral status of Salt Lake City should
result in some good. The arguments,
facts and figures presented by the city
official, who is thoroughly acquainted
with the practical side of the questions
discussed, may have convinced the
friends of reform that the problem is
more intricate than appears when
studied only from a theoretical point of
view. But that does not mean that it
is impossible to deal with.

A great many people seem to believe
that any public evil can be remedied
by the passage of laws, and their en-
forcement. Consequently they are in-
clined to blame law-makers and criti-
cize officers, if results are not as hoped
for. They are inclined to spend en-
ergy in a direction where the least
good can be accomplished. It is a no-
torious fact that all the large centers
of population are more or less infested
by an immoral element. But the cause
is not, as a rule, at least in American
cities, the lack of good laws and ordi-
nances; nor can it be charged to moral
corruption among the administrators
of the laws.

Reform movements will have to be
directed against the evil itself. The
fallen ones will have to be sought out
and redeemed one by one, with the
same care and tenderness with which
the Good Shepherd is said to leave the
ninety-nine sheep in the fold in order
to seek and save that which is lost.
This is a much slower process of reform
than that which dreams of wholesale
redemption by force, but it is the only
one that is effective. It is the work
of true Christian charity, of patience and
self-sacrifice.

The question of the morality of cities
is a burning one. The cities are grow-
ing, and it is not always the best ele-
ment that is attracted to them. They
furnish a large percentage of the crim-
inals of the country. Considering the

problems of the city, a close observer,
Professor Ely, has recently said:

"The need of the city today is a great
religious awakening which would shake
things down into the depths of most
lives and modify their characters. The
city needs religion. Without religion,
the salvation of the city is impos-
sible."

Exactly. Laws and ordinances are
also, but wherever religion shall have
done the part that belongs to it, there
would be but little evil left to the con-
trol of the law.

NOT IN SECRET.

Judging from occasional notices in the
press of the missionary work in which
the Elders of the Church are engaged,
the intention seems to be to create the
impression that the work is being car-
ried on more or less in secret. Nothing
can be farther from the truth. The
message of which those Elders are the
bearers is such that the greatest possible
publicity is desired for it. A "Mormon"
Elder, faithful to his calling, can truly
say, with the Master: "I spake openly
to the world. . . . in secret have
I said nothing."

Those who follow the numerous re-
ports from the different parts of the
missionary field, as published in this
journal from time to time, cannot fail
to notice that the Elders, wherever they
go, openly announce themselves as rep-
resentatives of the Church. Unlike
some missionaries, who for the sake of
policy and in order to make friends,
conceal their identity, they from the
beginning unfurl their colors to those
with whom they come in contact. They
make it a point to see the authorities
in the localities they visit, and ask for
the privilege of speaking to the citi-
zens. They seek the acquaintance of
newspaper men, and make public an-
nouncements of meetings. Their work
is not in a "quiet" corner, if by that word
is meant "secret." On the contrary,
they court proper publicity.

Those who know next to nothing
about "Mormonism," wonder at the
progress it is making wherever its doc-
trines are considered without prejudice.
It was just as much of a marvel to the
so-called enlightened world two thou-
sand years ago, that people should ac-
cept the doctrines of Christianity. Var-
ious explanations were offered then,
as now, generally wide of the mark.

The fact is that the message the El-
ders of the Church announce, commends
itself to all honest truth-seekers, for
the sufficient reason that truth itself is
an irresistible force to all who are
prepared to receive it. The message is
felt to convey such information, to im-
part such power, and to open up such
views for the future as the world today
stands in need of. This is the "secret"
of the success of "Mormonism," not-
withstanding the opposition encountered
in many places.

THE LUZON CAMPAIGN.

When, a few days ago, the war-bro-
ther of Mrs. Aguinaldo fell into the hands
of our troops, it was naturally inferred
that the rebel chief was within hailing
distance, and that his capture could be
reasonably looked upon as imminent.
But the latest Luzon dispatches an-
nounce that he has once more eluded
his pursuers. Perhaps the doughty
general had left his wife in charge of
the rear guard, to cover his retreat, in
order to give him greater liberty to
carry out the strategic running move-
ments for which he is celebrated.

Be this as it may, there is no longer
any organized resistance to our troops
in the northern Luzon. The question
seems to be now simply to occupy the
country and organize local govern-
ments, and to leave a sufficient mili-
tary force in each place to protect the
lawfully constituted authorities in the
exercise of their functions. The task
may not be an easy one, but there are
indications that the natives are coming
to their senses. Thus, for instance,
the governor of Nueva Viscaya has been
reported to be on his way to Manila to
offer his allegiance to the United
States. Undoubtedly he, with many
other chiefs, realize that Aguinaldo's
cause is lost.

With the Tagal rebellion practically
subdued, it should not be difficult for
Congress to agree on a future Philip-
pine policy. The duty of this country
toward the millions brought in under
the American flag is plain. The means
whereby it can be discharged, wise
statesmanship, coupled with experience,
should suggest.

NOTES AND BEAMS AGAIN.

Under the caption "A Case of Notes
and Beams" the influential and ably
edited Boston Evening Transcript, of
November 17, gives a synopsis of a com-
munication to the Boston Herald, on
the anti-Roberts agitation. The letter
is by Rev. Dr. Samuel W. Dix, a well
known sociologist. The writer approves
of the resolutions which place the en-
tire responsibility for any future ac-
tion in the matter upon Congress, but
he takes issue with the well meaning
view that "the time is now opportune
for such amendment to the Constitu-
tion of the United States as will make
it possible to wipe out polygamy within
its boundaries."

The Transcript says:
"With his experience in proposed con-
stitutional amendments he does not be-
lieve this could be made effective. If
polygamy cases were left to the juris-
diction of the States and their courts,
matters would go on about as they do
now whether in Massachusetts or in
Utah, and he doubts with apparently
good reason, whether any considerable
number of States would submit to a
surrender of their jurisdiction in such
cases to the United States courts. But
he also finds a deeper meaning in the
problem of polygamy in its relation to
our own marriage and divorce laws
and our own social immorality. We are
quite ready to fill halls and churches
to hear about the 'Mormons,' send mis-
sionaries to Utah and print millions of
pages to thwart their schemes of pros-
elytizing, while we too rarely do any-
thing toward the broader, more fundamen-
tal and inclusive work of protecting and
improving the family throughout the
entire country. In fact he has heard
several men of high standing agree in
the opinion that Mr. Roberts, holding a
seat in Congress would be far less of a
real menace to the family in this coun-
try than the incidents of a scandalous
marriage of certain parties in high so-
cial life."

In short, in our attacks upon poly-
gamy we are overlooking evils of a
kindred, yet even more subtle charac-
ter nearer home. He would not have
less said about the 'Mormon' assault
upon the family, but he would couple
with it in the crusade the 'common
problem of the family, which alike con-
cerns the East and the West, the North
and the South, though in different ways."

With divorce mills running night and
day in some of the new States of the
West, where men and women can sever
their marriage relations as easily as a
trust can be incorporated in New Jer-
sey or Delaware, there are other ques-
tions that force themselves upon our
attention when we begin to consider the
"Mormon" evil. We must recognize
hundred problems at our own doors be-
fore we can convince the world that
we are in earnest, or make much prog-
ress toward finally eliminating the
evil relic of barbarism."

We believe this view is the one that
will commend itself to all capable of
analyzing the situation without pre-
judice. It is the view to which Miss
Susan B. Anthony recently gave pub-
lic expression, and which has been
ridiculed as illogical. Both in principle
and logical force it is in perfect ac-
cord with that dictum which all Chris-
tendom regards as of infallible author-
ity: "He that is without sin among you,
let him first cast a stone." As Dr.
Dix expresses it: "We must recognize
kindred problems at our own doors be-
fore we can convince the world that we
are in earnest."

RATIONAL OPINIONS.

As was pointed out in these columns
a few days ago, the respectable por-
tion of the press of the country is com-
mencing to take a more philosophical,
calm and rational view of the agitation
over the Democratic choice of Congress-
man for Utah, The Springfield Republi-
can, of Nov. 18, thoughtfully argues:

"It is very doubtful if the influence of
Mr. Roberts of Utah, deplorable as his
matrimonial status is, upon the homes
of America, can be reckoned more harm-
ful than that of people who jump from
one carnal connection to another, by
the decrees of court and clergyman
into an complete facility as a man
can change cars. Mr. Roberts was
brought up to regard polygamy as
sanctioned by religion. It is all wrong,
of course, and must be condemned. The
Roberts system must be suppressed. At
the same time, Roberts is no more of a
menace to society than the million-
aires of New York who get secret di-
vorces from the courts and then defy
the decrees annulling their marriages by
contracting new alliances, within twen-
ty-four hours, in some other State."
Rapid-fire divorce, as a matter of
fact, is far more dangerous to the
American home than Roberts with his
three wives could ever be. That is be-
cause rapid-fire divorce has the veneer
of legality and is not frowned upon by
society, because it is insinuating and
subtle in its attack upon domestic mor-
ality. It is to be hoped that the force
of the anti-Roberts movement can be
brought to the support of divorce re-
form. If that result is accomplished, the
intrepid charge on Roberts' part will
have more far-reaching results than its
promoters have realized."

The Boston Herald takes up the ques-
tion of the Utah Congressman at con-
siderable length. From its editorial on
the subject we make the following ex-
cerpts:

"The United States made it a stipula-
tion precedent to the admission of Utah
into the Union that she should abolish
polygamy. She did so, and if she per-
mits polygamy after having accepted her
pledge. Here occurred a dilemma, how-
ever. There were several men in Utah
who had taken the oath of office as a plu-
rality of wives under the old law, and
the question arose what should be the
course pursued toward them. It was
a simple thing to repudiate all these
wives but one, and we think that would
have been the wisest course of a thor-
oughly heartless and bad man. But there
were those—and Mr. Roberts was one
of them—who recognized obligations to
these women. He had made a contract
with them, and he was disposed to
carry it out—to continue in their sup-
port, rather than to throw them un-
supported upon the world. He could
not detain them against their will. It
was easy for them to appeal to the law
for their freedom from him if they
wished it. But they did not wish it.
They preferred to remain, and Mr.
Roberts recognized it as a duty to con-
tinue to support them. . . ."

"But we shall be asked, should poly-
gamy under any conditions have been
permitted in Utah after its admission
into the Union? Strictly speaking, it
should not have been. The people of
Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above, and, therefore,
they decided to permit it. Strictly speak-
ing, it should not have been. The people
of Utah, however, seem to have recog-
nized that its immediate removal would
create cases of hardship such as have
been instanced above,