

would be lost for ever if Utah were to receive her political rights.

The action of the Conference has had a good effect in counteracting the vile work of the Commissioners. Yet the falsehoods to which they have given their official sanction have been received as though they were told by the Commission, and therefore entitled to weighty consideration. And it takes much longer to remove a false impression than to create it; time and patience will be required to give truth the victory.

The annexed paragraph is taken from the *New York Sun*:

"The Mormons in conference assembled point out a number of lies in the report of the Federal Commission on the condition of their Church. The Mormons must not be impatient. The commissioners will report nothing but what they were sent there to report. The commissioners know what is expected of them, and will not flinch though they should have to tell twice as many more lies to support the first lot. If it would be any satisfaction to the Mormons, the commissioners will cheerfully swear to both."

The *Sun* is rather severe on the Commission, and a little more severe on the authorities that sent it to Utah. The *Philadelphia Bulletin* discusses the matter in a gentler vein. Here is what it says on the subject:

"An issue of fact has arisen between the Utah Commission and the Mormon Church. The latter, at its Conference in Salt Lake, on Tuesday, emphatically denied the assertions of the Commission that the Church dominates its members in political matters, and that polygamous marriages are still celebrated, reasserting that polygamy is no longer taught, and that its practice is strictly forbidden. This is the declaration given to the world. It would be valuable to know whether it is also given in the same form to the membership, or whether they are secretly instructed to disregard it and adhere to the old doctrine. If the former, it constitutes a radical change in Mormon tenets, and places that Church on the same footing as other churches in the United States, a strictly a religious body, with which the State has no concern. The Mormon Church, as a church, has as much right to an unmolested existence in this country as any other church has. It is only when it upholds and practices polygamy that it comes in conflict with the law, and the law must be enforced. If it has in fact, as well as in word, renounced polygamy, its quarrel with the United States is ended. But the assertions of the Utah Commission are not yet disproved."

It is only by such misleading statements as those repeated by the Utah Commission that any doubt is raised as to the declaration of the Church in regard to future plural marriages. Everybody here who knows anything of the facts, except a few untruthful persons who have an interest in keeping up the hue and cry against the Saints, concede the point that there is no attempt at double dealing and that it would be impossible to talk one thing to the public and

carry on another thing in secret, in these times and under existing circumstances, even if there were any disposition to do so, which there is not.

We would remind the *Bulletin* that the assertions of the Commission which it says have not been disproved, have not been in any way substantiated. And would it not be more proper, fair and consistent to require the Commission to prove its charges, than to expect those who are accused to disprove them? The Commission, in an underhand and sneaking way, give voice to anonymous charges, the "Mormon" leaders and people emphatically deny them. What more is needed? Until the Commissioners shall give us the evidence it is they who are under the challenge and upon them lies the burden of proof. Our contemporaries should make a note of this and not expect the "Mormons" to prove a negative.

ANOTHER EASTERN COMPLICATION.

A FEW days ago it was announced that the leading European powers, with one exception, had decided to withdraw their representatives from China. This action was taken because the Chinese government failed to afford foreigners within that country adequate protection. This practical protest against the violent outrages perpetrated upon white people in China was to be expected. But the peculiar part of the situation was the exception. The government which declined to combine with the other powers in taking this step was that of Russia, yet the natives of that country were as much subjected to violence from Chinese mobs as those of any other nation. The Czar evidently had a subtle purpose in holding aloof from the demonstration against the government of China. The evident object now comes to light.

It will be observed by a dispatch which appears in this issue that, through the representations of the British government, China has become alarmed on account of the Russian military movements in the Pamir district, which is on the west border of the Chinese Empire. The Minister of the latter to Russia has been requested to proceed to St. Petersburg and obtain "assurances" regarding the designs of these military expeditions.

There can be no doubt that the Czar anticipated the alarm now felt by China, and as an offset prepared himself to give "assurances" of friendship for the Chinese government, a strong point in that direction being his ability to refer to the fact that he had declined to combine with the other powers in

the withdrawal of representatives. The Czar has been paving the way for an understanding with China, in the hope perhaps that it might ripen into an alliance.

On the other hand, Great Britain is arousing China to a sense of alarm because of Muscovite movements on the Chinese border. England may well be on the alert seeing that Afghan territory has, according to trustworthy information, been also violated by the Russian military expeditions, which have occupied the Pamir table land as a base.

One thing is clear in connection with the Russian encroachments of the last few months—that the affairs of that empire are being manipulated by subtle and able strategists and diplomats.

It is somewhat remarkable that the British government does not make a counter demonstration in the direction of Pamir as it did at Sigri over the affair of the Dardanelles. If Lord Beaconsfield were alive and at the head of the administration, it is fairly certain that action would have been taken before now. Lord Salisbury belongs to the same school of statesmen as Beaconsfield, and was one of the latter's stalwart and capable supporters, but he is less prompt. He probably hesitates because of a recent Russian threat, voiced through a semi-official source, to the effect that interference with the Pamir expeditions would result in the opening of hostilities. Doubtless England hesitates in beginning a war of which the wisest men are unable to see the end after it shall commence.

A STORMY PERIOD.

THE last two months have been characterized by storms at sea of great violence, especially on the Atlantic. Many vessels have been lost and others injured. Even the "ocean greyhounds," which have heretofore been wonderfully exempt from danger, have been barely able to hold their own against howling winds and raging seas, numbers of the crews and passengers of some of the best of them having been killed or maimed.

A notable condition connected with this stormy period is that, with the exception of the brief time when equinoctial gales prevail, it has covered a portion of the season when it is generally calm and serene on the sea. The war of elements began in August, and has continued, with brief intermissions, to date.

The tremendous winds have not, as a rule, been ordinary hurricanes, but have been mostly of a cyclonic character. The action of such currents has the effect of throwing the waves up to