

plainly stated and how clear it is on its face, will be treated with cold neglect.

This Mexican canard is such an old and mouldy story that its revival is really marvelous. It looks as though the whole press of the country had no regard for reliability, when anything about the "Mormons" is concerned, but simply want to print something sensational.

In connection with this Mexican mistake many papers are making this statement, which we now clip from the *St. Louis Chronicle*:

"An old prophecy of Joseph Smith, the Mormon founder, which is still well remembered by many Missouri people who knew the old enthusiast, was that the Mormons would not remain in Utah, but would make their final settlement in Northern Mexico.

"News which has been published little by little at different times shows to those who know something of the determination and perseverance of the Mormons that they intend to fulfil this prophecy."

We would be glad if one of these furnishers of news to the public would bring forth this "old prophecy." We would like to see it. It would be something new to us and to the rest of the folks in Utah. It might give some color to this old yarn about the removal of the "Mormons" to Mexico which has so often turned out to be nothing but threads of imagination. Will some of our contemporaries please produce the prophecy?

THE BEHRING SEA QUESTION.

A SETTLEMENT of the trouble either by the sword or by arbitration will bring Russia into the question. It was by the treaty of 1867 with Russia that we came into possession of what is now called Behring Sea. It is said on our part that said treaty defines the geographical extent over which our jurisdiction extends. We know that our United States Statutes prohibit foreign seal poaching within our possessions as in that Russian treaty. The executive department of our government some time ago, in accordance with authority given it by Congress, issued a proclamation cautioning alien seal poachers of the illegitimacy of entering Behring Sea. In view of these reasons Mr. Blaine's attitude at present cannot be said to be either aggressive or belligerent. On the contrary when he proposes to submit to arbitration it may be said that his attitude on the important issue is conservative and conciliatory. He proposes to settle by arbitration the question of whether United States officials were justified in capturing and detaining foreign seal fishers in Behring Sea, as they did some time ago.

Should it be decided by Arbitration

that the United States were justified in this action, then the matter would be dropped. But if the decision were given against the United States then damages to the government of Great Britain would be the question. If the amount of damage could not be amicably determined by the British Minister at Washington and the American Secretary of State, then the case must be decided by the original arbitrator.

Mr. Blaine's arbitration proposal may be summed up as follows: What were the rights of Russia, and to what extent did Great Britain recognize these rights? Did the treaty of 1825 between Great Britain and Russia include Behring Sea in the phrase, "Pacific Ocean?" Did the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Russia give to the former all the rights of the latter; and, most important of all, what are the present rights of the United States in Behring Sea and how acquired?

Should it be finally agreed upon that Great Britain has rights in Behring Sea, then all that would be necessary would be a joint commission from both countries defining territorial limits and designating the seasons for seal fishing.

The English press looks upon Mr. Blaine's action as being entirely directed from a partisan point of view at home. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says that Mr. Blaine wants to make political capital for his party. The London *Globe* denominates Mr. Blaine's attitude as "bragging sprend eagleism," yet it advocates arbitration. The *Telegraph* sneers at Mr. Blaine's letter, but the *Times*, *Chronicle* and *News* treat it considerably and respectfully.

The *St. James Gazette* asks: "But why is the United States Navy being massed in the Pacific unless it is to make Behring Sea a mare clausum. Officers of the American Navy do not act upon rumors printed in American papers."

But Mr. Blaine says that it is not the intention to pronounce Behring Sea a mare clausum, or closed sea. Then it seems as if the whole matter could be settled amicably by arbitration. The fact that it is admitted on both sides that this Behring Sea is not a closed ocean will help materially.

"EXCEEDINGLY ANXIOUS" FOR A STATE.

THE *Philadelphia Call* has an article on the proposition that the Idaho test oath shall be made applicable to Utah, and among other remarks says:

"The anti-'Mormon' party in Utah is exceedingly anxious to have that Territory admitted as a State, but at the same time they are anxious that their

opponents should not get control after the admission when it would be too late to do anything."

Yes. And this tells the whole story of anti-'Mormon' legislation for Utah. This is the motive that lies behind the present desperate attempts to bring forward the disfranchisement bills that were shelved last session. This has only to be correctly understood to fix the fate of those anti-American measures.

The proposition is, when shorn of its deceptive and hypocritical pretensions, to take away from the large majority of the citizens of Utah the right to a voice in its political affairs, in order that the minority may gain that control which they never can obtain by legitimate means.

The polygamy pretext under which this infamous scheme was urged, no longer has any existence. It never was pertinent to the question at issue. There never was any reason why the very large majority of the "Mormon" people, who did not practice polygamy, should be deprived of the rights and privileges of citizens because of the alleged unlawful doings of others, who had been disfranchised. To urge this was as absurd as it was impudent. But the force of prejudice is so great and its effect is so blinding, that anti-'Mormon' legislators have not perceived either the folly or the wickedness of the unprecedented proposition. Now however, that polygamous marriages in Utah have ceased, the pretext is gone and the plotters have to take another tack in their cruise after spoils.

Whenever Utah applied for admission into the Union as a State, polygamy was the sole objection offered by our national legislators. The practical polygamists were excluded from voting and from holding office. The monogamous "Mormons" then framed a Constitution providing perpetually for the punishment of polygamy. They made a new application for Statehood. But it was feared that these provisions would not be of necessary force while the Church held to the practice. A formal declaration that marriages in violation of law should not in future be entered into, was made by the Church in the most effectual manner known to its discipline. What now?

Why, the anti-'Mormons' are, in their turn, anxious for Utah to be admitted, while the "Mormons" have ceased trying, and most of them feel that they do not care a rap about it at present. They are not asking for admission. They are taking no steps to effect it. They understand the expenses, responsibilities and difficulties that would result from a successful ap-