sed otthe superior delights of what the New Testament somewhat harshly characterizes alladultery, in comparison with Christian wedlock, is a gospel sure of making converts, even from the lips of a less enthusiastic preacher. The carnal mind has no enmity to it whatever. The friends of progress, in the direction in which progress is now tending in New England, may count with confidence on the future. The time is not far distant when the ratio will be not, as now in some parts of New England, two bigamy permits to every eight marriages, but a much higher ratio. Progress in this direction is so rapid as naturally to alarm timid minds. But a calm faith in evolution, a well-grounded confidence in the perceptibility of human nature, a serene and abiding trust in Stuart Mill can witness unappalled the change that shall make polygamy the rule in New England and Christian wedlock the exception.

Even minds unfriendly to the change may comfort themselves in view of the incidental resulting benefits. Whether it result happily or disastrously to New England, the experiment will be one of great value to social science, and the conservative and theological folk who are shocked at it as both sinful and ruinous ought to be able to find comfort for themselves in the favorite New England dogma concerning "willingness to be damned for the glory of God."

May we not hope, also, as the result of the progress before us, that "in the good time coming" the "envy shall depart" which has been unnecessarily stirred up between New England and Utah, between the Puritan and the Mormon? Already perspicacious minds can see that the difference between these antagonized parties is not really one of principle; that the question between the simultaneous polygamy and the consecutive polygamy' if it is worth disputing about at all, is one on which there is something to be said on both sides, and that really our only serious contention with our Mormon brethren is on the ground of their prematurity that they have usurped in their nonage privileges of legislation that belong only to a sovereign State. Let them wait their turn, avoid in the phraseology of their statutes any needlessly offensive expressions, and it will soon become obvious to all but fierce polemics on either side that there is really no moral question at issue between the two sections, When that happy day shall arrive, Judah and Ephraim shall cease their mutual vexations, apostolic delegates from the church of the Latter-day Saints shall be welcomed with fraternal greetings in the national council of Congregationalists, and Methodist bishops from New England shall communicate in the peculiar Eucharist of the Deseret temple.

It has been no part of the plan of this article to enter into any discussion, either pro or contra, of the merits of the New England system of polygamy, considered from a moral, religious, or economical point of view. That debate, with its inevitable acrimony, is gladly remitted to such writers as by their tastes or talents for controversy are qualified for it. It is a humbler but not altogether useless function dispassionately to depict the matrimonial laws, institutions, and usages of a remarkable people who are not always rightly judged nor understood by their fellow-citizens of other States, and who have many claims to the thoughtful attention of mankind, and especially to the critical observation of all students of social science.

Mr. Brown. Again, in the same Review of November, 1883, the same writer says:

The disgraceful laws of the New England States that fall so far below the standard of good secular legislation have become the canons of church fellowship. Adulterers and adultresses, the only mitigation of whose crime is that it is licensed by the State, which ought to punish it, sit down together unrebuked at the table of the Lord's Supper. And in one notorious instance at least a man who has put away his wife and given her a writing of divorcement is maintained without so much as the institution of an inquiry in the fellowship of the Congregationalist ministry.

It does not sppear that there is often any serious difficulty either in New England or out of it to find a respectable minister of any desired denomination who for a ten-dollar bill will stand up before an adulterous couple and declare them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to be husband and wife.

If there has ever been an instance in which this transaction has brought the culprit under any formal censure from his brethren, or his superiors, the fact is not generally known to the public.

I desire in this connection to read a few sentences from the valuable book entitled "Divorce and Divorce Legislation," written by Theodore D. Wolsey, D. D., L. L. D., the president of Yale College. On page 60 he says:

To claim for an adulterer and adulteress the protection of law in a Christian State, so that when free through their crimes from former obligations they may legally perpetuate a union begun in sin, is truly to put a premium on adultery. A Herod on that plan after sinning with his brother's wife would need only to wait for legal separation to convert incest into legitimate wedlock.

Again, on page 232, this able author says:

And are not all the churches, all-right-minded people, all Protestants and Catholics, called upon to unite in a demand that there be some check on so great and threatening an evil.

On page 242 Dr. Woolsey says:

The minister, if his celebration of the marriage be not a farce, can no more join in marriage two persons who in his view have no right to form such a union than he can aid in any other immoral proceeding. Suppose the parties intending such a union be a woman put away for other cause than that of adultery, and a man, whoever he be, to whom our Savior's words would have application, "that he who marrieth her that is put away committeth adultery," how can the the fact that such a union is legal in the least degree justify a minister of Christ in giving a religious sanction to an act which he believes to be an adulterous one? Ought he not to say in solemnizing such a union, "Whom God hath not joined together let no man put asunder."

On page 270 he says:

But any one, lawyer or not, must be aware of the miserable state of things now existing in some of the States, and no one who will compare the careful, thorough law of the code civil with most of our statutes relating divorce will feel any great respect for ...ican legislation.

...king of the ratio of divorce to ...le number of marriages, Dr. Woolsey agrees with Dr. Bacon and others from whom I shall quote in substance as to the state of things in Connecticut. He says on page 223, speaking of marriages between persons of foreign birth:

Now of these it is safe to say two-thirds, say eight hundred, were Catholics, who rarely petition for divorce in this State. Deducting them. we have the ratio of one divorce to less than eight and a half so-called Protestant, or rather non-Catholic marriages.

To show the alarming extent to which this practice of bigamy has gone in New England, I beg leave also to refer to an article in the *North American Review*, entitled Divorces in New England, written by Rev. Dr. Nathan Allen, of Massachusetts. He gives the statistics of divorce from 1870 to 1878 in Massachusetts, Vermont and Connecticut. In Massachusetts the whole number during that period was 7,238, in Vermont 2,775, Connecticut 7,781.

And in Rhode Island, from 1869 to 1878 inclusive, or for ten years, the statistics not having been kept prior to 1869, the whole number for the ten years was 1,866, making an aggregate of 19,655 divorces for the period of eighteen years in the three first-namcd States and ten years in Rhode Island. If we had the statistics of Rhode Island for the other eight years it would doubtless increase the number to considerably over 20,000. The author says:

It is well known that the laws in Maine and New Hampshire are liberal, the causes alleged numerous, and divorces are of frequent occurrence, probably as much so as in any of the other New England States.

It would seem to be very safe then to put down the number in these two States for the period of 18 years at not less than 7,000 in the aggregate, which is less than the number in Connecticut alone, making over 27,000 divorces granted in the six New England States within 18 years. And as there are two parties to each divorce, this turns loose over 54,000 divorced persons upon the community to contract other marriages or to engage in the practice of polygamy.

The author goes on to add:

On an examination of the above tables, two things are obvious: first, the steady increase of divorces in each State since 1860; secondly, the remarkable uniformity of this increase. If five years are taken as the commencement and closing of each table, it makes a fairer comparison than one year. In Vermont the first five years averaged 1 divorce to 22 marriages; the last five years, 1 to 15, omitting fractions. In Connecticut, the first five years, 1 to 13; the last five years, 1 to 10. In Massachusetts, first five years, 1 to 50; the last five years, 1 to 22. In Rhode Island, the first five years, 1 to 13; the last five, 1 to 12. Thus in Vermont and Connecticut the increase has been nearly one third. In Massachusetts the increase is more than double, while in Rhode Island the increase has been less than in either of these states.

In a note the author adds:

The Catholic marriages should be deducted in each State.

And the true ratio of divorces to marriages stands thus (omitting fractions): In Massachusetts, 1 to 15; in Rhode Island, 1 to 9; in Connecticut, 1 to 8; and in Vermont, 1 to 13. The author adds, on page 560:

What a strange spectacle does it present in social life that in twenty years more than 20,000 divorces should have been granted in four New England States; that in this period the marital relations should be severed between 40,000 persons. If we include the divorces granted in Maine and New Hampshire with those in the other four States, it makes 2,000 families broken up every year and 4,000 persons at the same time divorced. And it should be remembered that this destruction of the family does not apply to the foreign population. but is confined to the strictly native New Englanders.

Again he adds:

Among no Christian or civilized people at the present day do we find divorces sought and obtained to such an extent as in New England, and in only three instances in the history of nations can we find such a breaking up of the family by this means. The first indication of decline in Greece and Rome, were disturbances in the family.

In 1790, when the flood-gates of the French revolution were open, the frequency of divorces became alarming. Within a year and a half more than 20,000 divorces were granted. But even these in proportion to the whole population of France at that time are not equal to the ratio of divorces to marriages as now found in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

It is well known that the charge of fœticide and of the use of means to prevent conception has often been made against the people of the New England States. This matter has not escaped the attention of the New England author, from whom I am quoting. He says:

From the same reports it appears that the birth-rate of the foreign class is more than twice as large as the American, and the marriage rate of the foreign is also considerably larger. It also appears that the birth-rate and the marriage rate of the strictly American have for a long time been decreasing; so much so that the increase of numbers in this class is very small and in some places even doubtful.

It is a noted fact that the Irish and other foreign population which have settled in New England, and do not indulge in the practices above mentioned have a birth-rate double the native American. At this ratio another century will change New England into New Ireland, or convert her into the home of the Irish and other foreign population.

In view of this state of things the timely warning by a well-known lady is worthy the serious consideration of the people of New England. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton is reported to have said in substance "that if this crime agai... the family, fœticide, continues as it has begun, the descendants of the Celt will soon trample upon the graves of the Puritans." I believe the Mormons have never been charged with the practice of fœticide or the use of means to prevent conception. They are an exceedingly prolific people. So that in this respect at least the polygamy of Utah has decidedly the advantage of the polygamy of New England.

An able writer in the *Catholic World* sets forth in substance the same facts that are so forciby stated by Drs. Woolsey, Bacon, and Allen, corroborating them in almost every particular. But as I do not know whether the author was a New England man I shall not trouble the Senate with the quotations. As New England is the prosecutor of Utah, I prefer to learn from the pen of New England authors and divines the true condition of society in New England and the alarming increase of polygamy in that section.

Rev. Samuel W. Dike, of Vermont, in a carefully prepared article in the New York *Independent*, Feb. 16, 1882, on certain crimes in Massachusetts, gives the statistics of convictions for crimes against chastity in that State for the period running from 1866 to 1869, and from 1876 to 1879. The column from 1866 to 1869, inclusive, foots up 1,960 convictions; the like period from 1876 to 1879, inclusive, 2,274 convictions. The author says:

The increase is pretty evenly distributed through the State, * * * Take for example adultery, which is perhaps as good a test as any. The increase from 100 sentences to 300 is found very evenly distributed,

He then says:

But when we come to the crimes against chastity, only 34 per cent. were by foreign born, while natives of this country were guilty of 63 per cent., and 3 per cent. unknown. About two-thirds of those convicted for prostitution were natives, though more likely to escape the police than foreigners.

He adds:

There is also a remarkable parallel between several evils that may be regarded as kindred:

Crimes against chastity in Massachusetts, 1866 to 1869, 683; 1876 to 1879, 1,537.

Illegitimate births, 1866 to 1869, 1,625; 1876 to 1879, 2,766.

Divorces, 1866 to 1869, 1,352; 1876 to 1879, 2,255.

Marriages, from 1866 to 1869, 57,551; 1876 to 1879, 52,202.

This shows a constant increase in crime and a falling off in the number of marriages.

The sentences for crime against chastity as a whole, with the exception of Suffolk county, increased in Massachusetts in ten years 125 per cent. The five of these classed under "felony and aggravated crimes" show an increase in the whole State from 150 to 378, or 157 per cent. In the same period all crimes classed under that head increased 52 per cent, while all minor crimes and misdemeanors, including so called "liquor offenses," increased 14 per cent. The population meanwhile gained about 22 per cent. Again, he says, a polished officer in Massachusetts, one especially competent to give an opinion of this sort, lately declared that in his judgment licentiousness is the cause of more crimes than intemperance.

Another, whose official duties give him the best facilities for forming an opinion, believes that the direct or indirect murder of illegitimate children after birth is frightfully prevalent, and the author adds, "The Christian and the citizen, the man of business and the practical economists, have some work to do in the direction of these crimes and vices."

Mr. Dike, who has probably given more attention to statistics in New England on these questions than any other person, and who has at great pains gotten statistics in Maine and Vermont, in a circular lately issued gives the following statistics of divorce in New England, showing that in 1878 Maine granted 478 divorces, New Hampshire 241, Vermont 197, Massachusetts 600, Connecticut 401, Rhode Island 196, making a total of divorces granted in New England in a single year of 2,113, thus turning loose 4,226 persons to marry again, probably three-fourths of them divorced for causes other than adultery, which provides for an increase of nearly 3,000 cases of legalized bigamy in New England in a single year.

The following quotations are from a lecture delivered by Mr. Dike as one of the Boston Monday lectures of 1880 and 1881:

New Hampshire prints no statistics, either of divorse or marriage, but it has been found that there were 159 divorces in the entire State in 1870, 240 in 1875, and 241 in 1878. Three counties that had only 18 in 1840 and 21 in 1850 granted 40 in 1860 and 96 in 1878. In Connecticut we find that Benjamin Trumbull, in 1785, mourned that 439 divorces had taken place in that place in that State within a century, and that all but 50 had occurred within the last 50 years. About 20 years later President Dwight was alarmed that there was one divorce to every 100 marriages. Not one-fourth of these divorce cases are for adultery. Desertion and severity are the chief causes. The courts are crowded with unhappy couples, and often the cases are dispatched with unseemly haste. There is a daughter of a prosperous farmer, still a young woman, who has been divorced from three husbands, each of whom is living and married to another wife, while she has been lately married to the fourth husband. Nor is this the only one or the worst case of the kind reported in the State of Connecticut."

Two Vermonters deliberately swapped wives by aid of the courts. Young people coolly reckon on divorce in contracting marriage. A Vermont couple married on trial for six months, agreeing to get a divorce if either party did not like. While, then, crime generally has increased 20 per cent., this class of crimes has increased 174 per cent., or eight times as fast as crime in general, and more than three times faster than the population, and with accelerating rate. Add to this the fact that the children born out of wedlock in the State have risen in the same period from 8 in 1,000 to 17 in 1.000, and the most rapid increase has been in the last six years, while in those years England has as rapidly improved. In three-fourths of the localities reporting on this point licentiousness is said to be increasing. In nearly as many the destruction of unborn life goes on as fast, or faster than ever.

The family of Massachusetts, including both native and foreign, fell from an average of 4.69 in 1865 to 4.60 in 1875.

The marriage rate, that is, the ratio of persons married annually to the population, has fallen in twenty years lrom a higher figure than reported in any European country to the level of Austria, and lower than in any other country except Sweden.

The number of children under five years of age in Vermont was 150 in every 1,000 inhabitants in 1830, and 113 in 1870, having fallen to 100 in 1860, and rising chiefly because of the foreign element.

The birth rate in New England is probably as low as in any country in Europe; among the native stock far lower.

Look at one more class of facts: In the Western Reserve, comprising the twelve northeastern counties of Ohio, settled mainly by emigrants who went from Connecticut long before that State made its new departure in divorces, and containing, it is said, a purer New England stock than can be found in the entire country, unless it be in parts of Maine, the ratio of divorce to marriage was 1 to 11.8 for the two years 1878 and 1879, while in the rest of the State it is 1 to 19.9. Nor is the worst of the ratio in the cities. The ratio in Ashtabula county, among a farming people originally from New England, is 1 to 8.5, and in Lake county the proportion of divorce suits to marriages is 1 to 6.2, and the divorces granted 1 to 7·4. Unless there are like counties in Maine, this is the worst county for divorce in the United States, except for a few years Toland county, Connecticut. So this wretched business goes on apparently wherever New England people are found.

But if you will go down to Gallia county, peopled with Welshmen and Southerners, the ratio is 1 to 50.

Professor Phelps, of Andover College, wrote a year ago:

We are not half awake to the fact that by our laws of divorce and our toleration of the "social evil," we are doing more to corrupt the nation's heart than Mormonism tenfold. Vice avowed and blatant, aud organized to a large extent, nullifies itself so far as self-diffusion is concerned. But vice lurking and still trickles into all the crevices of society. A nation of Mormons is impossible—not so a nation of libertines.

I make but one more quotation from this able lecture:

Mormonism and the late Oneida system of life are are in no small degree other forms of the evils under consideration. They are both largely Yankee notions in their origin and leaders. Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, add J. R. Noyes were all born in Vermont.

I will now refer to a few facts contained in the official registration report of Massachusetts for 1882. I find on page 122 of that volume a statistical table showing the divorces granted by years, and the statute causes, for 20 years in the State of Massachusetts. It embraces the period from 1863 to 1882, inclusive, and shows the divorces granted under each provision of the statute, as adultery, desertion, intoxication, etc., and foots up the aggregate at 8,610. This is a larger aggregate, as shown by the official figures of Massachusetts, than the aggregate reported by Rev. Dr. Allen or either of the other distinguished gentlemen from whose productions I have read. This shows officially, so far as Massachusetts is concerned, a larger aggregate of divorces than I have seen claimed by any one of the New England writers on this subject. They have palliated the practice by understating it.

I take it for granted, therefore, that the figures which have been given above are substantially correct. On page 139 of the same official volume I find a table showing the increase in, the ratio of divorces, and increase of marriages from 1864 to 1882, inclusive, and the ratio of increase of population as shown by the census of 1860 and 1880.

The table shows the increase under each head, in each county in Massachusetts. At the top of the page the aggregate is given for the whole State, and it shows an increase in the ratio of divorces, omitting fractions, of 147 per cent., an increase in the ratio of marriages of 62 per cent., and an increase in the ratio of population of 44 per cent.

I Presume the correctness of these figures will not be doubted, as they are published by the authority of the State of Massachusetts. And they show a most alarming increase of divorces in that State. I am happy to say in this connection that Mr. Dike, as secretary of the New England divorce reform league, reports some diminution in divorces within the last year or two.

This league is composed of able, earnest, good men, who are justly alarmed at the terrible strides of the social evil in New England, and they have gone earnestly and actively to work to try to check the evil. I think they deserve the sympathy and best wishes of all good men who are cognizant of the facts as they exist.

In an article which I find in the *North American Review* of April, 1883, written by Judge John A. Jameson, of Chicago, referring to our lax laws of divorce and their bad influence on society, the learned judged says:

Cook County, in which is Chicago, had a population in 1880 of 607,468. In the year 1882 divorces were granted in 714 cases in that county. Of these 565 were cases in which no defense was interposed by the party accused, and 49 cases in which there was an issue tried by a jury or by the courts. Of the 714 divorces granted 318, or 44 per cent., were for desertion; 142, or 18.8 per cent., for adultery; 141, or 19.7 per cent., for cruelty; 93, or 13 per cent., for drunkenness. These figures—

Says the author—

are undoubtedly painful ones, but as intimated they are below those exhibited by some of the older States. Thus in Maine in 1878 there is said to have been 1 divorce to every 819 inhabitants; and in Penobscot County, the seat of a theological seminary, 1 to every 820 inhabitants.

When it is considered that Vermont is an old State with a fixed population, of nearly pure American descent, the ratio of 1 divorce to every 13 marriages in 1878 indicates a much greater laxity in its divorce laws than prevails in Illinois, even if no credit be given to the assertion, made by citizens familiar with the facts, that in a certain county in Vermont, out of 22 divorces granted at one term of the court, 21 were believed to be collusive.

If the truth could be ascertained, at least two-thirds, perhaps four-fifths of the 714 cases divorced during the past year in Chicago, either were fraudulent in fact or with a reasonably conciliatory temper on the part of the couples divorced, and under sufficiently stringent legal conditions were avoidable or preventable. There is beyond question frand in the inception of many cases.

These figures and statements are from a gentleman of character as I understand, and are worthy of careful consideration.

While they reiterate what so many others have said in reference to the practices in New England, they give us meagre statistics of the practice in other States, and while the judge condemns the loose practice in his own State, he is somewhat consoled with the reflection that it is not so bad as it is in the New England States.

But, Mr. President, it may be said that this outrageous system of legalized polygamy by illegal divorce grows out of the practice of the States, and that Congress has no jurisdiction of the question in the States, and that we are not therefore responsible. This may be true as to the State Legislatures and the practice within the States. But we are equally guilty with the States, as our legislation is equally unjustifiable. Take the District of Columbia over which the Government of the United States has exclusive jurisdiction, and under the act of Congress there are seven causes of divorce from the bond of marriage, The three last are in the following language:

Fifth. For habitual drunkenness for a period of three years of the party complained against.

Sixth. For cruelty of treatment endangering the life or health of the party complaining.

Seventh. For wilful desertion and abandonment by the party complained of against the party complaining for the full interrupted space of two years. (See acts Forty-third Congress, Statutes at Large, 1873,18...

In other words, in the District of Columbia, under the legislation of Congress, habitual drunkenness, cruelty, and abandonment, which are the most prolific sources of divorce in the States, are causes of divorce under which a great many divorces are granted, in the teeth of the divine law; and adulterous marriages follow, and thus polygamy is legalized as well by Congress as by the State Legislatures. While we are providing a remedy for this great evil in the Territory of Utah let us remove the cause that produces it in the other Territories and in the District of Columbia. This is the object of my amendment, and I trust the Senate will adopt it.

To be continued.

BY TELEGRAPH

PER WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE

AMERICAN.

CONWAY, N. H., 12.—The California delegatos arrived here to-day and left for Boston to-morrow, where they separate to meet in Chicago on the 25th. McClure goes to Bangor.

Stockton. Cal., 12.—An Associated Press representative interviewed this morning a great number of delegates to the Democratic State convention, now in session. on the effect Tilden's declination would have on their deliberations and on the party throughout the State. All expressed surprise and regret, but unanimously declared That man is now their man, as he represents the popular sentiment of the entire coast.

Wm. Dunphy, Gen. T. J. Clunie, M. Larus, and State Senator Fox were elected delegates at large to the Democratic National Convention. All are pledged for Tilden first choice, Thurman second. The following resolution was adopted: "Notwithstanding the declination of Mr. Tilden, it is the sense of this convention that he should be nominated, not so much as a reward for his services as to rebuke the fraud of 1876." The convention adjourned sine die.

Galveston, 12.—*News* Fort Worth The Democratic State convention assembled at 10 o'clock this morning. The delegates had not recovered from the depressing effect of the Tilden letter, A motion to consider yesterday's vote instructing the delegates for Tilden and Hendricks was tabled by a vote of 391 to 182. Notwithstanding the defeat of this motion, a resolution was immediately adopted requesting and directing the delegates to use their own judgment in the selection of candidates for President and Vice-President, leaving the delegation untrammelled with instructions. The following delegates to the National Convention will be elected at large: Ex-Governor R. B. Hubbard, of Tyler City; Ex-Congressman D. C. Giddings, of Brenham; Judge P. J. Brown, of Sherman; Peter Smith, Mayor of Fort Worth: also twenty-two district delegates. Adjourned.

The Senators and Democratic Representatives in Congress from Texas, recently united in a request to their constituents that their names be not considered in the matter of selecting delegates for Chicago. The absence of