

EDITORIALS.

MANUFACTURED "INTER-VIEWS."

In the letter from our Washington correspondent, published in another part of this paper, reference is made to the reported interviews with Hon. George Q. Cannon, which have appeared in the public prints. We have well understood that in many respects those reports were not genuine. Those who are familiar with the situation here, and acquainted with Mr. Cannon, could perceive the numerous errors in the press dispatches purporting to relate conversations with him. They contained too many inaccuracies to be faithful accounts of remarks made by that gentleman, who is too thoroughly posted on Utah affairs and the sentiments and attitude of the "Mormon" people, and too cautious and exact in his utterances to make use of expressions that have been attributed to him by "enterprising" representatives of eastern journals.

It will be seen from our Washington letter, that a telegram concocted in Utah and sent east from Ogden, containing many flagrant errors, has formed the basis of some of the reported "interviews" with Mr. Cannon. It is very unfair, both to the "Mormons" and to the gentleman who so ably represents them, to fasten upon him the nonsense fabricated by anti-"Mormons." Yet many newspapers, in addition to publishing accounts of the alleged interviews, have commented extensively upon Mr. Cannon's remarks—manufactured for him by lively press reporters—taking for granted that they were his views as an authorized exponent of the system known as "Mormons."

We protest against this as injustice to him and to the "Mormons." Yet there are many papers which would much rather publish the stuff made up to deceive, than any true and reliable explanation of the principles and policy of the Latter-day Saints. However we consider it right to draw attention to the unreliability of the reports of interviews which occasionally come to hand, and caution the public if they accept such news (?) at all, to receive it *cum grano salis*.

THE PLAIN INTENT OF THE LAW.

It is worthy of special note that during the consideration in Congress of the Amendment by which the Governor of Utah was empowered to fill vacancies under a certain probable contingency, the soundness of the "hold over" principle was admitted and declared. During the discussion of the measure in the Senate, it could not be denied that the principle would hold good in the Territories as it does in the States. And during the debate in the House it was plainly expressed as the unanimous opinion of the Conference Committee, composed of members of both houses, and was not disputed by a single member of either the Senate or the House.

If members had been familiar with the Utah statutes they would have seen that the Amendment was totally unnecessary. They were under the impression that there was no provision by which the failure of the August election could be remedied, and that unless Congress legislated for the emergency the whole Territory would be without a legal officer. They were mistaken in supposing that all the Utah local officers are to be elected the same year, and they were not aware in how many instances it is provided by our statutes that the terms of office shall continue until successors are elected and qualified.

What they designed, as they declared in so many words, was that "no anarchy should arise through the failure of the August election," and to prevent this they so worded the Amendment that the Governor should fill such vacancies, and such only, as might be caused through the failure of the election. It follows then, beyond a doubt, that in those cases where the law provides that the incumbents shall hold their offices for a certain period "and until their successors are elected and qualified," there is no vacancy and therefore there can be no appointment.

The Amendment was rejected by the Committee on Appropriations, but when it came to the Conference Committee it was accepted with some others by way of compromise, each House receding from some of its objections to the other's amendments. In the Conference Committee Mr. Blackburn desired a change in the amendment concerning Utah, to make it clear and beyond question that no appointments should be possible in cases where the law provides that the incumbents shall hold until their successors are elected and qualified. But every member of that committee, as stated by Mr. Butterworth, and acknowledged by Mr. Blackburn, agreed that this is exactly what is provided by leaving the amendment in its present shape. Under that consideration they considered Mr. Blackburn's proposition unnecessary, and that gentleman said to the House:

"I mean to deal fairly in this matter, and I was going to say that while the amendment which I offered was voted down, every member of the conference committee insisted that the law itself provided for the case. I only sought to make it more specific, and to give it a construction which would prevent any such practices as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Converse) has suggested as possible."

If there is any vacancy then, any case in which an officer is elected for a given term expiring on the first Monday in August, 1882, with no provision for holding until his successor is elected and qualified, the amendment authorizes and empowers the Governor to fill it by appointment, so that "the machinery of government may go on."

But in no other case is he authorized to appoint, for that would be making difficulty and confusion instead of avoiding it, and would be the means of producing the very evil which Congress declared the amendment was intended to avert. It creates no vacancies, it abrogates no local law, and if acted upon in its plain intent will make no disturbance, but fill the measure of its creation as explained by its main supporters.

EFFECTS OF EXTREME PRESURE.

THE Philadelphia American refers to its prediction that the "Mormons" "were going to offer a solid and pretty effective resistance to the execution of the Edmunds law," and goes on to say:

"It is an interesting problem how far any community can be compelled, by a law externally imposed, to desist from practices which its public opinion religiously approves. The English experience in Ireland does not seem to promise success in the attempt. Mormonism, perhaps, never will be broken up, except from within; and every external attack heightens its *esprit de corps*, and postpones the dissolution of the sect."

This is good common sense, illuminated by the light of experience. History shows the failure of all attempts at compulsion such as the American points out, and also the effect of outside pressure upon religious bodies, namely, to consolidate and strengthen them. We have no fear that "Mormonism" will ever be "broken up" by any means. But we agree with the American that it certainly cannot be destroyed by the attacks of its enemies. Internal discords are the only agencies possible to weaken it, and they are rendered improbable by assaults from the outside which it is continually required to withstand.

The character of the opposition this system has to meet is such as to call forth all the sympathies and energies of its adherents. Even the slothful and undevotional are stimulated to activity and zeal in its defence, by the unwarrantable and oppressive measure designed for its extirpation. We deplore the existence of such anti-American and despotic schemes, under color of law and national authority, and of so bitter and malicious a spirit as is manifested by professed exponents of Christianity against that which they denominate "Mormonism," but we cannot but rejoice over the effects of their unreasonable hostility. This people cannot sink into the inertia that tends to dissolution. A ceaseless outside pressure and excitement compels union and activity. And thus the means intended

to destroy, actually help to keep alive and vigorous a system designed by the Almighty to prevail over everything that rises up against it. "God moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform."

OYSTERS IN THE GREAT SALT LAKE.

AN effort is to be made once more to raise oysters in the Great Salt Lake. The telegraph states that an order has been received by Fish Commissioner Blackburn from Mr. House, an old resident of Corinne Utah, for two barrels of seedling oysters for cultivation in the lake.

The statement is erroneously made that "this is the first attempt to cultivate the oyster in Salt Lake." A thorough trial was made several years ago at the mouth of the Weber River. The seedling oysters arrived in good condition and were planted and tended carefully. But the conditions were found to be unfavorable. Too much salt impregnated the water at a distance from the river, the mud that washed into the lake from the river's mouth was unsuitable to the bivalve, and the oysters soon "petered out" leaving not a sign of their existence.

It is possible that Mr. House may be more successful at the mouth of Bear River, than the promoters of the scheme were at the influx of the Weber, but his attempt is not the first of the kind. We should be very much pleased to be able to chronicle the successful cultivation of the oyster in the great saline lake of the North American Continent.

THE DIFFERENCE.

A LAND agent and attorney of this city recently received the annexed communication, which we publish, suppressing the signature, as a sample of others that occasionally reach this office:

NEW LATHROP, Aug. 1st, 1882.

To the Land Agent:

A I hear that you are offering homes to families that will come to your place and join your church, it has always been my belief, and I have got my wife to thinking the same, and she said if you had a mind to send me a deed of a farm that we could go. If you send this please send it as soon as you can. Send to John—&c.

It is popularly supposed that this Church is engaged in a general immigration scheme, and that its missionaries go out to the world chiefly for the purpose of gathering up recruits to swell the ranks of the "Mormons," regardless of the character of those who can be caught in the "Mormon" net. This idea has been fostered by the pulpit and the press opposed to our faith, and the language we have used here, is theirs in substance.

If this were the object in view we might save a great deal of trouble and expense by publishing invitations, setting forth inducements to persons desiring to emigrate and offering pecuniary assistance. The preaching and traveling of our missionaries might be dispensed with almost entirely. We could bring the people here by thousands, taking our choice of applicants.

But this is all a mistake. The "Mormon" Church has a mission to perform, included in which are the gathering of the Saints of God from all parts of the earth and the building up of Zion. But these are consequent upon the great work of preaching the gospel to all nations as a witness of the approach of "the end." This duty rests upon the whole Church. "Let every man that is warned, warn his neighbor," is the divine command to us. The first step in the latter-day work is the preaching of the Gospel; this is followed by administering baptism for the remission of sins to believing and repenting persons. Then comes the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. All this precedes the gathering. We have no general immigration or colonizing scheme to promote. The conversion of people from error and sin is what we have in view, first and foremost, and the gathering is a continuation of the work, that converts may congregate together where they may more fully practice the religion they have embraced than is possible to them in a scattered condition, and that the Zion of God may be established.

The supposed "inducements" offered to people to emigrate by "Mormon" missionaries have no existence except in the fancies of those who invent them. It is not true that people abroad are promised land and sustenance and other temporal favors to get them to emigrate. There is no need of this. More people desire to come to Utah than means of assistance can be obtained for. Our work of gathering is consequent upon the reception of the truths we preach, in the hearts and lives of converts. No conversion, no gathering. It is the bringing together of "the elect," the temporal redemption of the Saints; not an indiscriminate collection of people anxious to better their material condition.

Of course a few disingenuous persons incited by unworthy motives mingle with the throng of those who come singing the songs of Zion and desirous of serving the Lord. And they soon manifest themselves and exhibit their true designs. They usually become enemies to the men who have assisted them. This is to be expected. Ingratitude is generally allied to the baseness of the hypocrite. Everyone who professes to be a Saint must have at some time the opportunity to prove himself.

The writer of the above letter merely wants pecuniary assistance to come here and make a home. He therefore professes belief in our creed. There is little doubt that he knows nothing about it. We have no scheme to immigrate such individuals. We are not anxious for their presence. Professors of belief amount to nothing. Mere assent to a form of faith does not avail. Our Church is not made up of pretenders. Those whose hearts are not in it cannot remain attached to it, and we do not wish to aid such in moving to this part of the world. But the "honest in heart" who receive the truth in the love of it, obey it in sincerity and wish to gather with the Saints as a natural consequence of their faith and obedience, have our sympathies wherever they may be and whatever their country or condition. We gladly hail them as brethren and sisters, and are willing to help them all that lies in our power to come from "the four corners of the earth" and join in establishing the Zion of our God. There is the difference. We wish everybody could be made to understand it.

"CONCUBINAGE" AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A CLERGYMAN of the Church of England has made some stir in London by the publication of a book entitled "Hagar, or Scripture Facts Concerning Marriage, Especially in Reference to Polygamy, Concubinage, Divorce, Marital Authority, etc.," in which the author takes ground entirely unorthodox, but from which it appears that he cannot be driven by the orthodox. His name is Rev. Mercer Davies, M. A., and he is a practical advocate of the rightfulness of what he calls "concubinage." This term he uses in a different sense from its usual acceptance. It is commonly spoken as a term of reproach, and a concubine is popularly supposed to be a woman who, while unmarried, maintains sexual relations that are improper outside of the marriage bond. Mr. Davies views the term more in its scriptural sense, looking upon a concubine as an inferior wife, not as an unmarried woman.

The course pursued by the clergyman will be better understood from his own statement than from any narration of ours, so we here insert his petition to the Archbishop of Canterbury, designed for presentation to the Upper House of Convocation of the Established Church:

To the Most Reverend the Archbishop and the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled:

The humble petition of the Rev. Mercer Davies, M. A., and of Ellen his wife, residing in the parish of Chiswick, in the diocese of London, sheweth

That it appears by the example of the Patriarch Abraham and by other facts recorded in the Holy Scriptures, that the practice of Concubinage, as a distinct and lower form of marriage, was allowed in former days without rebuke by Almighty God, and is not forbidden or censured in any part of Scripture:

That it was expressly permitted to Christians by some of the canons of the early church: That it is not forbidden by any law or canon of the Church of England, so far as your petitioners are aware:

That having these facts in mind, in the year of our Lord 1875 your petitioners, being then both unmarried persons and of full age, did solemnly and deliberately together enter into this state of concubinage, in a private

ceremony, which included prayer to Almighty God, and the giving and receiving a ring:

That your petitioner, the said Mercer Davies, did within a short time afterwards, that is to say, in the month of July, 1876, write to the Lord Bishop of London, informing him of these facts, and requesting his opinion thereupon; at the same time declaring his readiness to repent and make reparation, if it should be found that he had committed any error therein:

That the Lord said Bishop replied by letter to your said petitioner, expressing his disapprobation, but not clearly showing that such conduct was contrary to the laws of God or the Church of England; yet nevertheless warning your petitioner not to approach the Lord's Table:

That your said petitioner has since that time earnestly and repeatedly desired from the said Lord Bishop, and from other Ministers having authority within this diocese, further and fuller consideration of this subject; but that they have severally excused themselves from this business, or otherwise neglected it, and that the said Lord Bishop has still continued to forbid your petitioner from the Lord's Table:

That your petitioners, having lived together in faithful concubinage during the space of five years, were lawfully joined together in marriage on the 23rd day of December, 1880; but that the said Lord Bishop still continues his prohibition as before; thereby depriving your petitioner, the said Mercer Davies, both of his rights of Christian fellowship, and also of the means of obtaining any maintenance by the exercise of his sacred calling:

That your petitioner, the said Mercer Davies, has set forth the principal facts of Scripture and of the laws of the Church, on which he relies for his justification in these matters, in a book published by him, entitled

"Hagar; or Scripture Facts Concerning Marriage;" which book he now respectfully submits to the serious consideration of your Right Reverend House; and that he is further ready to produce such letters or other evidence as may be required to substantiate the facts above stated:

That your said petitioners, therefore, having a clear conscience herein, and desiring to act as faithful members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, hereby appeal to your Right Reverend House to do justice between them and the said Lord Bishop, and humbly pray your Lordships to declare—

Firstly—That the state of concubinage, such as they have practised, that is to say, when openly declared and faithfully observed is not condemned or prohibited by the written Word of God, nor by the laws or canons of the Church of England; and therefore ought not to be visited with excommunication or suspension from the rights of Christian communion and fellowship:

And secondly—That the said Lord Bishop of London hath gravely erred in charging your petitioners with wilful sin, and forbidding them from Holy Communion, without sufficiently bearing their defence, either in any Ecclesiastical Court or otherwise, and especially without further conferring with either of them, as requested.

(Signed) MERCER DAVIES, ELLEN DAVIES.

4, Mawson Row, Chiswick, January 26, '82

We do not publish the foregoing for the purpose of endorsing the doings of Mr. and Mrs. Davies, which were undoubtedly inconsistent with the regulations and teachings of the church to which they belong, if not in violation of the text of its written discipline. But we refer to this matter to show what a dilemma that church is placed in by a fair and just consideration of the main question involved in this case. For it is avowed in the articles to which clergymen of that church have to subscribe, that "what is not in accordance with holy scripture and cannot be proven thereby, is not to be required as an article of faith." The Church of England is bound to be guided by the Old and New Testaments in its decisions, and its dignitaries will find it most difficult to deduce anything from the contents of the sacred volume which can be rationally construed against the doctrine of Mr. Davies.

In the preface to "Hagar" he says:

"This, then, is the main point on which I venture to challenge public opinion and public prejudice:—What does the Bible say on these matters? Are these conclusions fairly and honestly arrived at, without perversion or misinterpretation?"

And here are some questions on religion and morality which the author propounds to believers in the Bible:

"Was Abraham guilty of adultery when he took Hagar to wife in the lifetime of Sarah?"

"Was Jacob living in sin with his two wives and two concubines, when God met him at Peniel, and when 'He blessed him there?'"

"Was David living in sin with his several wives and concubines in Hebron; and when 'the Lord God of Hosts was with him?'"

"Some again are offended to hear that the godly fathers had many wives and concubines; although after the phrase of the Scriptures, a concubine is an honest name: for every concubine is a lawful wife, but every wife is not a concubine."—Homilies of the Church of England.

We have not the work before us to quote from, but give these extracts as they appear in a prospectus of the book which is published by Wertheimer, Lea & Co., of London Wall,