

article in its columns under the caption of, "The Mormon Question," indicates that its editor is dead to consistency and in a state of somnolency regarding the truth of the subject referred to. Here is one of his blatant utterances:

"Nothing short of extermination of Mormonism as an institution, will reach and cure that hideous plague spot in our land."

If the writer of that unqualified and rash statement were asked to describe or explain "Mormonism," he would be utterly at sea, for he is evidently unacquainted with anything connected with it except the sensational falsehoods of its enemies, for which he has a swallow as large as a Colorado River gorge. A man who pronounces a judgment of extermination against any person or thing without examining the merits of the subject is, according to Solomon, unwise. Our readers can spell his proper title the ordinary way if they choose. "Mormonism" is a system which has truth for its base and superstructure. If the editor of the *Living Church* should be offered his choice between a contract to exterminate "Mormonism" and one to drift a tunnel under the Atlantic we would advise him to prefer the latter as infinitely the more easy of the two.

The *Living Church* writer has read an article on the subject on which he treated, in the *Chicago Tribune*. It has evidently tickled his anti-"Mormon" palate. He gives it endorsement and of course that establishes its status. The *Tribune* writer grasps the solution of the question at one clutch. He would stop "Mormon" immigration from abroad, and thus end the supply. Besides the suggestion being so old as to send out a stale effluvia, it is exceedingly illogical. It is as sensible as boycotting Jones against his obtaining flour from Brown, while the latter is getting continuous supplies from Robinson.

The same writer speaks of the revenue of the Church from the tithing donations of its members, and thus suggests another mouldy solution—robbery. Here is the thievish suggestion:

"Now, if the 'sinews of war' can be attacked or made useless for the purpose for which it is employed, another remedy will be found effective in extirpating the 'evil.'"

Only think of a *Living Church* endorsing a scheme to rob a religious body! However, the facts are ahead of the stern proposition, the process being now in operation.

The sublime height of dense ignorance is reached in this paragraph:

"Still another remedy suggested is the disfranchisement of every Mormon who has practiced polygamy and been convicted under the Edmunds law."

The asinine individual who penned the foregoing was not aware that the disfranchisement of the class to which he refers was accomplished before any conviction, by the Edmunds act, passed nearly eight years ago.

The *Living Church* with the somolent editor concludes by urging that its readers write to Congressmen, draw their attention to existing facts about "Mormonism" and incite them to pass special legislation with a view to having it wiped out. We suggest that if people want existing facts on this subject they should steer clear of such a journalistic conduit for anti-"Mormon" falsehood as the paper whose misstatements have suggested these comments.

#### A HIGH PREMIUM.

THIRTY-THREE per cent above par is a high premium for stock in any regular and legitimate business concern to reach. This is especially true of stock in merchandising establishments, for that is a business in which there are so many risks and so much competition that large profits cannot ordinarily be made, and a mercantile institution whose stock finds ready sale at par is a well managed one.

The fact that a large block of the stock of Z. C. M. I. brought, today, a premium of thirty-three per cent, speaks volumes for the management and reputation of that house. The men who paid that price for the stock are shrewd business men, old residents in the Territory, and thoroughly familiar with the history, methods and management of the house they are buying into, and the bid they made for the stock is praise of a high order, bestowed upon the officers of the Institution.

#### JUDICIAL PARTIALITY.

The recital of the Washburn-Booth fornication case by our Ogden correspondent, in yesterday's *News*, tells its own tale. It affords but another among a multitude of illustrations of the notorious fact that in many particulars "Mormons" placed on trial and on the witness stand are treated with a severity and rigidity which are not applied to non-"Mormons" under similar circumstances.

Birdie Booth had, upon two occasions when the case was under investigation, testified directly concerning the illicit sexual relations with her of Washburn. When the trial came on, the witness having in the meantime been tampered with, as stated by the Assistant District Attorney, she declined to give evidence. Judge Henderson took no steps to compel her to testify. Mr. Evans, who prosecuted, stated that it was claimed on the outside that there was one law for "Mormons" and another for non-"Mormons," meaning of course that the law was construed and applied in relation to the one class differently to what was done in reference to the other.

He never stated a plainer fact, and never drew the attention of the court to more inexcusable judicial proceedings. There can be no doubt that had it been a "Mormon" instead of Washburn who was on trial, the witness would have been decided to be in contempt and sent to jail. The same judge to whose attention this unwarrantable partiality in the administration of the law was directed by Mr. Evans, did that very thing in the case of Mrs. Hendrickson. But in that instance both the accused and the witness were Latter-day Saints. Besides, we have the data of many other instances of tender women, who declined to testify on the ground that they could not do so without criminating themselves. They were "Mormons" and were promptly sent to prison, some of them having young infants in arms who were also, as a matter of life or death, taken to the penitentiary with their mothers.

We would by no means have been gratified to have been compelled to record the fact that Birdie Booth had been so treated. It would have been a matter for regret. She has been deeply wronged already, but it is the marked distinction between the treatment accorded to two distinct classes to which we take exception; a reprehensible business, and a parody on equal treatment before the law.

Yet the "Mormons" are expected to quietly submit to such wrongs without a protest. If they do otherwise they are accused of disloyalty, as if it was a "heinous offense" to express an objection to a glaring inequality of legal administration, when the theory of the institutions of the country is that all the people occupy one plane before the law. To be silent under such treatment is