prisoned, while vice is allowed to flourish and crimes as grave as Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for prevail on every hand without receiving anything more than a passing notice.

The people of Utah are being called upon continually to fall into line and be like those of other communities. What does that mean? That they should lay aside their self-respect and regard for virtue and the laws of God, and foster and encourage the same evils in their midst which prevail in other places.

Butte City, Montana, as described by a gentleman who recently paid a visit to that region presents a picture which the would-be reformers of Utah would doubtless like to see her citizens imitate. Only 12,000 to 15,000 inhabitants, and among them 4,000 gamblers and 1,000 prostitutes, with drinking saloons, gambling dens, hurdy-gurdies and houses of ill-fame flourishing unchecked on every hand. Heaven preserve the Latter-day Saints from any such fate!

A DECIDED DISCREPANCY.

The claim set up in the Federal Courts of Utah and Idaho in relation to the purpose of the Edmunds Act is stretched. That the chief idea which pervaded the minds of the legislators was the destruction of the "Mormon" marriage institution must be admitted. But it was exclusively hurled at it is questionable. It was pushed through Congress on the plea of morality, and a case had to be made of carrying out that idea. If the law had been enacted solely with a view to have it applied exclusively to "Mormons," its operations would have been confined to localities where there is some show of reason for supposing that the Saints would settle and practice their religious convictions. Nobody has the remotest anticipation that they will ever flock into Alaska, Indian Territory, or that region of centralized purity, the District of Columbia. Yet the law includes these places within its scope. If the act which is now being so vigorously pushed against "Mormons" had been intended to jeopardize them exclusively, why should Congress bring under it localities in which there is no human probability of their settling and practicing the peculiar feature of their faith which is being made the cover under which their liberties are being relentlessly assailed.

Reasoning upon the breadth, so far as region is concerned, that the law was intended to apply to, it does not appear consistent to infer that the unlawful cohabitation aimed at was only of that character which the latter-day Saints practice—the living with, caring for, honoring and supporting more than one wife. It is presumed that nothing of that kind is done in the more remote Territories we have named, and in applying to them the law it must have been intended to relate to the offense of cohabitation by one man with more than one woman in a general sense. While the leading aim of the law was to jeopardize "Mormons," the general act, as exhibited on the face of the reasons for the framing and passage of the enactment, was to suppress immorality. Under no pretense should the professions of the legislative champions of the measure, and Congress as a whole, be presumed to be hypocritical, and that they acted on the assumption that the administrators of the law would be imbued with the same despicable spirit of deceit.

The Utah Courts claim that their interpretation and application of the Edmunds Act is in keeping with the intention of the Congress which passed it. It is interesting to note to what extent this theory agrees with the facts.

The National Legislature gave the law a scope over vast regions where *no* "Mormons" are known to live, to say nothing about practicing plural marriage. When the measure was passed it was claimed by its champions that it was aimed against immorality. Whether these claims were sincere or not cannot enter into the matter of the law's administration. It must be presumed that the legislators were acting in good faith, were not hypocrites, and were not calculating on a class application of the law while they gave it a broad scope.

The courts of Utah, on the contrary, limit the application of the law to one class of the population alone. They also ignore the morality theory of Congress and define unlawful cohabition to have no reference to sexual commerce, but merely to the recognition by one man of more than one woman as wives. To make the focus still more narrow they claim that the law was enacted specially to catch the "leaders of the 'Mormon' Church." Thus it is centralized upon a class within a class. If this is not persecution, and a partial administration of the law, by what title can it be appropriately designated? It differs most decidedly from the proposed scope given to the statute by Congress.

We observe that a writer in the Washington *Post* takes up the subject from a similar point of view. We here present some of his pointed expressions:

"Your report in yesterday's issue of a delegation of 'Mormons' calling upon the President and protesting against the partiality shown by the Republican the Edmunds law has caused me to examine a little into the question. Upon investigation I find these 'Mormons' have all the arguments on their side.

"Without doubt the law was passed in the interests of morality.

"Its provisions apply to the District of Columbia and every Territory in the United States. It provides that 'unlawful cohabitation' shall be punished in this District as well as in Utah; that in Dakota, in Washington Territory, in Wyoming, in Montana, and all other lands where the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, 'unlawful cohabitation' shall be a crime.

"Now it is reasonable to presume that in those wild western, mining Territories there would be considerable 'unlawful cohabitation;' but we hear of no prosecutions outside of Mormondom. In this District—not in this city, you know, for such a thing could not be done in this city, but in this District—I have known of one or perhaps two cases of 'unlawful cohabitation' in the years I have lived here. These Mormons say in effect: 'Mr. President, this law is most 'faithfully executed' in Utah, but is a dead letter in the District of Columbia; there is no attempt to enforce it in any Territory except where Mormons are the victims.' This, it seems to me, is unfair. If I were a Mormon, I too would protest against this partiality. As I said, they have all the arguments on their side.

"Are not those high-toned, moral, Republican reformers a little too zealous just now? They have run the Government for twenty-four years and no extra effort in the interests of morality has been made until after November, 1884. There are some good offices in Utah, filled by Republican reformers. There are five commissioners appointed under the Edmunds law who draw a salary of $5,000 each per annum; also attorney, marshal, judges, governor, secretary, and others, all of whom have been very active, for the last few months, in putting down immorality among the Mormons.

"Of course these Republicans do not care to keep their offices; their only desire is to exercise a moral influence.

"The President will do well to select some good Democrats for those offices, for from high moral Republicans I pray, good Lord, deliver me."

PAYMENT OF FINES UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

In the case of John Aird, who pleaded guilty to the charge of unlawful cohabitation, the accused was sentenced to pay a fine of $300. It was incidentally stated during the proceedings that imprisonment for thirty days compensated for the non-payment of any fine inflicted under the laws of the United States. Some people have probably, because of this statement, obtained the idea that the legal provision referred to is unconditional. In order to disabuse any erroneous impression that may exist on the point, we here insert the particular section on the subject, from the Revised Statutes of the United States:

SEC. 1042. When a poor convict, sentenced by any court of the United States to pay a fine, or fine and cost, whether with or without imprisonment, has been confined in prison thirty days, solely for the non-payment of such fine, or fine and cost, he may make application in writing to any commissioner of the United States court in the district where he is imprisoned, setting forth his inability to pay such fine, or fine and cost, and after notice to the district attorney of the United States, who may appear, offer evidence, and be heard, the commissioner shall proceed to hear and determine the matter; and if on examination it shall appear to him that such convict is unable to pay such fine, or fine and cost, and that he has not any property exceeding twenty dollars in value, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on execution for debt, the commissioner shall administer to him the following oath: "I do solemnly swear that I have not any property, real or personal, to the amount of twenty dollars, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on civil precept for debt by the laws of [State where oath is administered]; and that I have no property in any way conveyed or concealed, or in any way disposed of, for my future use or benefit. So help me God." And thereupon such convict shall be discharged, the commissioner giving to the jailer or keeper of the jail a certificate setting forth the facts.

The matter of exemption is regulated by the Territorial Statutes, and the law on the subject will be found comprised on pages 256 to 258 inclusive, of the laws of Utah passed in 1884. The classes exempted are two numerous to be stated here, and include necessary household, table and kitchen furniture, certain means or implements necessary to make a livelihood, etc. The following are the more important considerations:

"If the debtor be the head of a family, there shall be a further exemption of a homestead, to be selected by the debtor, consisting of lands, together with the appurtenances and improvements thereon, not exceeding in value the sum of one thousand dollars, for the judgment debtor, and the further wife and two hundred and fifty dollars for each other member of the family."

A RIGHT TO EVEN JUSTICE.

It is refreshing to find a few papers who, in the face of unpopular prejudice, favor the application of impartial justice to "Mormons" as well as all other citizens. Among these is the Lancaster (Pa.) *Intelligencer*, which concludes an article upon the recent "Declaration of grievances and protest" from the Saints, in this fashion:

"Granted therefore the right of the federal government to prohibit and punish polygamy, the Mormons have an equal right to demand that the justice measured out to them be meted to all other citizens, and that like social offenses in the other Territories and among the Gentiles of their own be prosecuted with the same vigor. They have a right to demand that clean men be sent there to administer the laws and honest juries be selected to try their cases; and that none of their fellowship shall be the victims of the *ex post facto* laws condemned by the Constitution.

Nay, more; the Mormons have a right to demand that those who outcry against them in the East shall be consistent and speak with as fiery tongue and seek the law's enforcement with as much vigor here against the same crimes that they say make Utah a plague spot and Mormonism a "twin relic" of barbarism.

It will hardly be contended that it is more noxious to have two wives in Utah than to have a wife and a mistress in Connecticut; or that polygamy in Salt Lake City is more destructive of good morals than prostitution in Washington. One wrong does not excuse or palliate the other: but it was the voice of divine wisdom, as well as of divine justice that pronounced them 'blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.' It was the Master who bade the physician heal himself, and who rebuked the canting Pharisees, so quick to see the mote in another's eye and so dull to see the beam in their own. 'Law for the Mormons'—but law for all other offenders. Justice in Utah—but justice in every other jurisdiction."

MORE TENNESSEE INIQUITY.

The cup of the iniquity of the degenerate State of Tennessee has of late been rapidly filling up. Its foul contents may now be correctly said to be running over. The revolting tragedy enacted on Cane Creek on Sunday, the 10th day of last August is yet fresh in the minds of the public. A masked mob of blood-thirsty ruffians—religious fanatics—burst in upon a peaceful assembly of people preparing to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, and ruthlessly slew four of them, besides wounding a lady so badly as to make her a cripple for life. The popular sentiment, evinced by press and pulpit, especially the latter, condoned the terrible crime, and no effort was made to bring the perpetrators to justice that outraged law and humanity might be satisfied. The only step in the direction of pursuing the assassins was a miserable sham, being the offering, by Governor Bate, of the paltry reward of $1,000 for the arrest and conviction of the men who committed the murder.

That foul deed in the history of Tennessee remains a dark blemish upon the escutcheon of the State. Not only has there been no effort to wipe it out, but developments in the same line increase the dimensions of the disfigurement. The consistent reader can satisfy himself upon that point by a perusal of a graphic letter in this issue. It tells a mournful tale of baseness on the one hand and of noble fortitude and fidelity to duty and conviction on the other.

The law incorporated in the body of the communication is in keeping with other special anti-"Mormon" measures, being so framed as to entangle within its meshes those who are innocent of any real violation of its provisions. In this respect it appropriately incorporates the subtle and sinister genius of the Edmunds Act. It is so framed that in the hands of unscrupulous legal and judicial functionaries, a man who never utters a word in relation to polygamy can be placed in jeopardy under it. If he preaches faith in God, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, the laying on of hands for imparting the Holy Ghost, and the gathering of the Saints he can be condemned under it. In such a case it would doubtless be held by a corrupt court that all that it is necessary to show is that somebody has been persuaded to immigrate to a place where a body of the Church is, that the body-religious inculcates the doctrine of plural marriage as a tenet of faith, and that the person believing the preaching was intending to go somewhere to adopt or embrace it.

The measure is not only grossly subversive of the right of free speech and religious liberty, but is highly and ridiculously absurd. It makes it an offense within the borders of the state to say something that would have the effect of causing somebody else to go to some other State or Territory, and probably or possibly commit an alleged offense, outside of the jurisdiction of Tennessee.

The scope of this law is given by the peculiarity of its formation, being made purposely open, so as to admit of strained construction and application. As before intimated, this feature of anti-"Mormon" special legislative enactments has been strikingly illustrated in the enforcement of the Edmunds act. In the first place the courts here—notably that of the Third District—conducted cases under it on the hypothesis that in order to prove unlawful cohabitation it was necessary to show that there had been sexual commerce. It was found that this theory, which is consistent with the law, had two objectionable phases. The first was that it would strike at the non-"Mormons" guilty of sexual sins. The second was that cases of accused "Mormons" were brought up in which no sexual commerce could be shown. Conviction of "Mormons" and the letting of non-"Mormons" go scot free being the chief objects of the raid, the sexual intercourse element was ruled to be not necessary to prove a case of unlawful cohabitation. As regards flexibility, the Tennessee act of April 6th seems to be of a similar texture.

The story told by our correspondent is a thrilling one. The Saints who read it will be filled with sympathy for the unfortunate victims of a set of corrupt and merciless men who are filled with the narrow and bitter spirit of religious persecution. If there is any extenuating condition whatever for the Tennessee outrages it lies in the bad examples of the anti-"Mormon" fanatics in Utah. They include Federal officials, journalists, clergy and laymen. The shameful falsehoods regarding the Saints with which they have flooded the country incited the demoniacal deeds of blood done in Tennessee and elsewhere, and the taint of murder most foul clings to their skirts. Their evil example in trampling under foot the principles of the Constitution and of human liberty has been infectious and spread to localities where the virtues of the Saints were unknown.

In view of the different and extreme phases which the crusade is taking here and elsewhere, one is led to ask what new development will next be brought to light?

DEAF MUTE EDUCATION.

As an indication of the interest which is now being taken in this nation in the education of deaf mutes, we may mention that on the occasion of a recent celebration and presentation day of the deaf mute college of Washington, D. C., the following-named distinguished persons occupied seats on the stand: President Cleveland, Chief Justice Waite, W. W. Corcoran, Judge Arthur MacArthur, Secretary Bayard, Congressman W. M. Springer, Judge W. A. Niblack, Gen. John Eaton, J. C. McGuire, R. C. Fox, Rev. Wm. A. Bartlett, Dr. A. W. Pitzer, President Gallaudet, President J. C. Welling, of Columbian University, Prof. Simon Newcomb and Professors Fay, Porter, Chickering, Gordon, Hotchkiss and Draper, Principal Dennison, of the Primary Department, and Rev. Thomas Gallaudet. Among the important personages in the reserved seats were the Japanese Minister and his interpreter, the Sandwich Island Minister, General Carman, and many others.

During the exercises it was mentioned that of those who had graduated at this college, "Some have entered the service of the church and are ministering to the spiritual needs of their own class. Some have risen to high and responsible positions under the government. One is a prominent patent attorney. Several are editors of influential newspapers. A number are teaching in the State institutions for the deaf. Two are among the members of our own faculty. In short, they have demonstrated their ability to make their way in all the walks of life." At the close of the other exercises four persons were announced as candidates for the degree of bachelor of arts and one for that of bachelor of science.

A QUESTION OF TAXATION.

A CORRESPONDENT asks this question: "Suppose I am assessed $10,000 and I am indebted to the bank $2,000, how much should I be assessed? Should not the $2,000 be taken off the $10,000 assessed?"

As we understand the matter it depends upon the character of the property. The statute, which is found on page 12, laws of 1878, says: "From credits taxable under this act, debts due and owing by the party to be assessed shall be deducted in listing and assessing." Taxable credits are held to be of the nature of book accounts, and that the debts, due and owing must be of the same character to render them deductable. Negotiable instruments, such as notes, mortages, etc., are held not to come under that head, or subject to that particular provision.