

EDITORIALS.

THE FEE INCENTIVE.

OUR able and esteemed cotemporary the *Herald* has been giving some of the Utah Federal officials a raking over for having persisted in running a fee factory in their personal interest. The ground is well taken, and if the agitation upon which it is entered does not lead to a searching investigation by the powers that be, it ought to. There is good ground for urging its necessity.

There is one detail to which our cotemporary alluded on Sunday morning regarding which it was somewhat inaccurate, although not intentionally so. It ventured the statement in the issue of that day, that as a number of persons were taken before Commissioner McKay to give bonds to appear for trial on the charge of unlawful cohabitation, that the functionary named had one of his lucrative days. This was based on the supposition that the Commissioner charged his usual fee for making out the bond, because he had formerly done so in such cases, the sum taken being five dollars. On Saturday, however, Commissioner McKay, so far as we can learn, did not make this charge. One of the persons who gave bonds tendered the amount to him, not knowing that Mr. McKay had turned over a new leaf. The official returned it with a statement to the effect that he believed he was entitled to, but would not accept it. He had referred the matter to the Comptroller, and was awaiting his answer. The person addressed told the Commissioner that should the answer of the Comptroller be favorable to him he should take pleasure in paying the amount in due season.

There is a question involved in this matter that is worth noting. Mr. McKay is necessarily touched by the journalistic allusions to the fee industry, and notwithstanding his expressed belief about his being entitled to the fee in question, there is a doubt in his mind regarding it. Were it not so the necessity for reference to the Comptroller would not exist. He has therefore in the past given himself the benefit of the doubt.

The conduct of the Commissioner leaves him open to the suspicion that his refusal to accept of the fee in the cases cited is more the result of fearful anticipation of a probable inquiry into the entire industry of burdening the government and individuals with superfluous expense in order to line the pockets of the officials concerned, than the quivering protestations of a tender conscience. There seems no room for doubt that the fire of our cotemporary is scorching the flanks of some of the Federal officials on the fee and expense question.

WHERE MR. SMITH STANDS.

It will be observed by the following letter, that Mr. Joseph Smith purposes making a tour of the settlements in the interest of his Reorganized Church:

PLEASANT GROVE,
June 29, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

Last Friday the presiding Elder of the "Josephite" church asked me for the meeting house here for Joseph Smith to preach in. I did not consent. He is to be here this week, and I believe he is to have the use of a school house.

My mind ran back to a speech he made in an anti-"Mormon" meeting in Chicago two or three years ago, which was published in the *Tribune* of that city and copied by you. Sunday morning (yesterday), one of the brethren brought me the copy containing the speech and your comments on the same. I had it read to the congregation, that the Saints might know how Joseph Smith talks about us two thousand miles away. A member of the High Council of this State happened to be with us and made some timely remarks on the statements of "Bishop Smith," which had a good effect. One person had consented to let the Elder have the use of an apple orchard for Smith to preach in, but in the afternoon (Sunday) sent him a polite note withdrawing the use or privilege of the orchard for Mr. Smith. I think it would be wise to publish that speech at this time, as I understand that Mr. Smith is intending to visit the settlements and preach to all who will hear him.

Your brother in the Gospel,
JOHN BROWN."

Since Mr. Smith's advent our attention has been several times directed to his Chicago speech. No longer since than yesterday a gentleman showed us a letter he had received from a young man in Arizona who had been in conversation with a "Josephite" Elder. The writer, it appears, spoke to him of Mr. Smith's Chicago statements, when the Elder frankly admitted that if it were so that he made such base and lying assertions he was unworthy of respect, or expressions to that effect. The writer of the aforesaid letter also suggested the advisability of reproducing the notorious Chicago speech, and we are induced to comply with a desire that is doubtless more or less general.

The speech referred to was delivered at one of the anti-"Mormon" meetings held in Chicago during the crusade agitation prior to the passage of the Edmunds act. It was published in the *Chicago Tribune* of February 23d, 1882.

It clearly defines Mr. Smith's position as an ally of the enemies of his father and of the Church which he was instrumental in organizing. He is among those who have counseled violence in the settlement of the "Mormon" question. In the spirit of perversion and against the spirit of a gospel teacher he persists in claiming that his father neither taught nor practiced plural marriage, but that the doctrine was subsequently introduced by Brigham Young. He assumes and defends this position in the face of overwhelming proof to the contrary easy of access. In this course he is evidently and pronouncedly a wilful deceiver.

But the most perfidious part of his remarks consists of the horrible statement in relation to the destruction of female chastity by "Mormon" Bishops. If he was correctly reported he stands branded as a liar before the whole people of Utah, including even the anti-"Mormon" portion of the community, who know that among no other people is female chastity regarded with more sacredness. And even in the courts during the present raid it was openly proclaimed by District Attorney Dickson that with the Latter-day Saints the associations of the sexes were confined within the marriage relation, and that they unqualifiedly condemned all sexual sins.

In the Chicago anti-"Mormon" meeting Mr. Smith was introduced as Bishop Smith, and as "a man who had suffered more in the cause to be discussed than any other man on the face of the earth." But what he has suffered in that connection would puzzle the most penetrating mind to discover. The following is the report of the speech:

"With a few introductory remarks, Bishop Smith said the question whether Congress may or may not pass such laws for the suppression of polygamy as will have effect and be equal to the emergency which seems to exist, is one that is engrossing the earnest thought of the nation. One reason why Congress has not taken hold of the question before is doubtless through fear of antagonizing that principle in the Constitution which guarantees to every citizen the liberty of religious thought and action. There has been a well defined reluctance to interfere with polygamy on that account. The question is now being more clearly understood of late, however, and the lawmakers and people are looking at the problem in a different light. The Constitution provides that the State shall not establish a religion, and gives to the people the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, but it never was designed that this provision should be used by any sect to protect its members from the consequences of a violation of laws that have been framed for the protection of public morals and the social fabric. Congress has dealt with polygamists with excessive tenderness.

It is quite true that Congress should not be permitted to prescribe or proscribe any form of religion, but law-breakers should not be given immunity from punishment for the commission of crimes under the assumption that the criminal conduct is a form of religion. The development of our country and the advance of civilization have brought about several very important changes in what were esteemed for a long time to be principles sacred from popular interference or change. The first of these was the question of state rights; the second was the right of secession, and the third was the right to own slaves. These questions have one after another met the arbitrament of time. Polygamy will follow.

There is one very important feature in this question it might be well for Congress to consider, and that is the fact that polygamy is not a tenet of the Mormon religion. Polygamy was no part of the Book of Mormon, and had no place in the creed of the Saints until after the departure of the Mormons from Illinois. It was not until 1852 that polygamy was attempted to be introduced in the teachings of the church. Its introduction was a shameless trick of wicked men, who were obliged to find an excuse to cover up their crimes. In 1854, in *The Democrat*, of this city, there were published in full the tenets of the faith of the Church of Mormon, taken from the records of the Church, and there was in that record no mention of polygamy—not one word being said on the subject. It was not defended by the confession of faith until after the removal of the Mormons to Utah. The men who were in control at that time knew themselves to be criminals, and like other criminals they felt the necessity of establishing a defense. Polygamy was then made a part of the religion of the Utah Mormons.

Congress should deal with this question with a firm purpose. The republican form of government under which we live should make America an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, and the home of liberty, but the principle of liberty should not be a protection for criminals. A sect should not be permitted to enter any territory and there practice customs that would not be tolerated in Illinois, Ohio, or New York. Congress must assuredly have a perfect right to interfere to prevent the prostitution of the public domain to base purposes. No sect should be given to introduce into any territory practices that would not be protected and shielded in older communities. In their impudent demands upon Congress, in the sacred name of religion and the rights of man, Cannon and Taylor are asking for exceptions in

favor of polygamous Mormons that are not made for other classes of criminals.

The trial and conviction of the assassin Guileau has made unpopular the theory of a divine inspiration for the perpetration of crime. In 1855 I began a crusade on my own hook, and in 1860, when I entered public life, it was with the avowed determination to oppose polygamy evermore. I have been outspoken in my denunciation of the custom from that day to this. I believe there is a vast amount of inspiration in good, hard, common sense. [Laughter]. A Mormon Saint once told me that if an angel were to come down from heaven and tell him polygamy was wrong he would not believe the angel. He then asked me: "If an angel were to reveal to you the divine inspiration of the doctrine of polygamy would you believe?" I told him I would, but that I would tell the angel to go to some one else, for I would not preach the doctrine. There is absolutely nothing in the revealed doctrine of the Mormon Church to support the polygamous teachings of the Utah Mormons. I have a deep personal interest in this question, for I want to lift the cloud from the hearts and brains of thousands of the believers in the Book of Mormon, and convince them that they have been imposed upon by lustful men, who have used the Church as a cloak to cover their crimes. I have been accused of being an apostate, but I have always been true to the faith taught by my father. I have eagerly sought for a proof of the divine inspiration of polygamy, but I cannot find it, and believe the doctrine to be false and infamous, root and branch. Again, I say that Congress should compel obedience to the laws in Utah as well as elsewhere; it is necessary for the protection of the genius of a free government. It is a wonder that other criminals besides the polygamists do not invoke the aid of the Almighty to protect them in their nefarious calling. It is a wonder the house-breakers, robbers, and murderers do not enter the plea that they are practicing their religion and say: "Please let us alone." [Laughter].

The question of how we can suppress polygamy without injury to the innocent is the phase that is giving Congress considerable uneasiness. There is a popular fallacy on this point. It may perhaps astonish you to know that there are not to exceed two thousand polygamists in Utah. There are hundreds and thousands of Mormons in Utah who will not marry wives, because they do not know where to get wives that have not been contaminated. They do not know what houses have escaped the invasion of lecherous bishops who have robbed hundreds of women of their purity. The men cannot afford to take the risk that marriage means. I am not in favor of a persecution, but there is a great difference between persecution and honest demand for honest obedience to law, and it is that demand that all good people want to see made and enforced in polygamous Utah. Congress has the right to do this, and it should insist on that right."

The foregoing places Mr. Smith in the attitude of a pronounced, unqualified and bitter enemy of the Latter-day Saints and their religion. It also shows him up in the light of an unscrupulous villifier of their character. It is a position we greatly regret that he should assume, and would be glad to see him retrace his steps and walk in conformity with truth and consistency. As the matter stands we cannot but endorse, without qualification, the course of our old friend Bishop John Brown, as the only consistent one that could be taken under the circumstances.

A GREAT MAN AMONG US.

WITHIN the last few days an important event has occurred in this city. It is no less than the appearance of George E. Moran. In order to save the awestricken inhabitants of this town the trouble of rushing around with bated breath and asking, Who is he? we venture to state that he claims to be a journalistic giant. Upon his professional card are the words: "Special Correspondent of the *Pioneer Press* St. Paul, Minn." But he states besides that he represents a large cluster of other leading papers of the country.

This faber-driver has come to write up the town, and if his demands are not promptly acceded to he threatens to write it down. He has called upon members of the City Council and stated that he got a good round sum for writing up Denver. He also ventured the statement to a member of the finance committee that he had "been offered \$500 by the other side of the fence"—whatever that may mean—to give his description of Salt Lake City a bias from that standpoint, but he would take \$300 to do up the town from the point of view that would be agreeable to the fathers of the municipality.

To another gentleman connected with the same committee he telephoned this morning that the "other side" had offered him \$300, but he would take \$200 from the party addressed. This statement was coupled with the threat that unless the lucre was forth-

coming by noon today he would raise the hair on the heads of those who refused his modest request. The response was that the hirsute growth would have to gravitate upwards as his prospect of getting at dollar from the city treasury on the line the correspondent had struck was exceedingly delicious.

"The pen is indeed mightier than the sword," for with the sharpest Damascus blade the head may be severed from the body, but with the writing implement of this remarkable man he purposes to raise in perpendicular erection the capillary substance upon the capits of an entire City Council and about four-fifths of the population of this hapless town. Let this important personage be taken, like Gopal Vinayak Joshee, to the "other side of the fence," which may find some use for him. The right side of the railing wouldn't have him at any price.

MORE MOBOCRACY IN THE SOUTH.

By a private letter from W. N. Gordon, Alamosa, Colorado, we learn of his having received news of a recent case of mobbing in South Carolina, of which two "Mormon" Elders were the victims. Here is what he says about it: "I have had bad news from the Elders that are laboring in the South Carolina Conference. Brother Cragun wrote to me that a mob got after him and the new Elder who had just come in to labor with him. They had gone down to Rockhill to visit the folks there, when the mob came upon them and caught the new Elder and gave him forty lashes. Brother Cragun made his escape to the woods, and they fired four shots at him, striking him on the chin and jaw, and inflicting a slight wound. They made their way up to my place again, and my wife said she was never so sorry for any person in her life as she was for them. They went over into Spartanburg and I have not heard from them since. I wrote to them, but have had no answer, so I don't know whether they have been run from that part or not. My wife is very uneasy for fear they will run them out of the country."

A TYPICAL ELDER.

THE remarks made by Brother Francis A. Brown, of Ogden, in the First District Court, published in the *News* of yesterday, have created a profound sensation. His position, and his reasons for the hope that is within him are clearly defined. His attitude receives the hearty endorsement of every true, manly Latter-day Saint, the approving sentiment being expressed on every side, and copies of the communication are eagerly sought, and sent to friends at a distance.

If any one supposes that Brother Brown is isolated in the stand he takes, such a person is egregiously in error. He but represents a determination that is general if not universal among the Saints. The chief difference between him and others is that perhaps his attitude has found vent in a more than ordinary copious explanation. He is a true type of a genuine "Mormon" Elder.

People read and admire the imaginary heroes of romance, and the highly colored portrayals of religious devotion exhibited by historic characters. Perhaps these ideals serve to create, in the minds of those who aspire to reach a high standard of excellence, a grasping after the attainment of that which is great and good. We venture the suggestion, however, that there can be found within the pale of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints equals in point of heroic adherence to honest conviction of any of the most revered characters of the past. The circumstances through which the Church is now passing are of a nature to bring to the surface those whose very souls are embedded in a love for principle, and the end is not yet. It also tends to exhibit the baser qualities of those whose minds belong to the lower planes of morality and intelligence. This community are making history with greater rapidity than any other people, and the ground upon which men elect to stand will determine the light in which they will be viewed by unborn generations, who will point to the existing epoch as one of the most peculiar chapters in the record of human affairs.

The very nature of the organization comprising the Latter-day Saints as a body, develops the highest form of devotion and heroism. The sons of the Church are nurtured in the midst of circumstances that require self-denial, unflinching bravery, and while exercising those characteristics, in enduring hardships and facing dangers in traversing land and sea, while confronted on every side by determined and inhospitable opposition, they gain an experience that places them in the front rank of practical civilization.

Men of such an independent stamp, with deep-seated convictions, cannot be conquered by coercion. Such a process of subjugation is an impossibility. And when men show the strength of their love of religion and freedom as does Brother Brown, respect for them is not confined to their co-religionists. Deep down in the hearts of the most determined anti-"Mormons" is a feeling of regard which the position demands. Hence, even in the journal

in this city which occupies the position of organ for the crusade against the Saints, is found, in the issue of yesterday morning, the following comment:

"F. A. Brown, the Mormon Saint convicted in Ogden on Tuesday last by his own testimony, had the courage of his convictions. However much one may deplore such wrong-headedness, the admission must be made that here is a man; one who does not quibble and lie, and who scorns to show the white feather."

This sentiment would probably have had more force had it not been preceded, some months since, by a most fulsome laudation of a man who took precisely an opposite course to that pursued by Brother Brown. But we still give the writer of the article the credit of penning his views regarding the former case merely for an ulterior purpose, which we perfectly understand. They were not, neither could they, express his genuine sentiment, because in the heart of every human being, no matter how lost to the calls of conscience, is an intuitive respect for honesty of purpose and courage in maintaining conviction. If there be instances where this feeling does not find a lodgment, then the individual thus deficient of so universal and natural a recognition of nobility, must be well nigh beyond the pale of redemption. The later enunciation may be taken as the real sentiment which inspired the writer. The most hateful prejudice will not altogether blind the man encrusted by it so that he will not be able to discover the difference between gold and dross, even though he refuse to acknowledge the discrepancy between the spurious and genuine.

The heroic spirit of the martyr in the trying hour is by no means confined to the men of the Church. If there is any difference in point of self-abnegation and religious devotion, the balance falls in favor of the women. The man who deserts a true woman in the hour of adversity intermingles with his cowardice the most exquisite and reprehensible cruelty.

We have expressed the situation heretofore, and it will bear a repetition. The position of a true Latter-day Saint in the present conflict does not involve a debatable question, so far as he is concerned.

AN EXPLANATION AND TACIT ADMISSION.

TO-DAY we give space to a communication from Mr. Joseph Smith. In it he claims to have been reported incorrectly by the *Chicago Tribune* in the last paragraph of his anti-"Mormon" speech, delivered in that city. The second hand story substituted for the statement of the *Chicago* paper is a thin one. It sounds like an attenuated tale told by an imbecile, and while it does small credit to the originator of it—the alleged 39-year-old—its repetition is a sorry commentary on Mr. Smith's good taste and judgment. If he really believed what that weakly individual told him he must be very susceptible to imposition. Perhaps it would not be amiss for Mr. Smith to trust a little more to facts obtained by personal observation than to the mouthings of a silly fellow whose enforced bachelorhood must have been the result of other causes than that to which he attributed it.

Seeing that Mr. Smith repudiates only the last paragraph of his speech, and says nothing about the bulk of it, he tacitly admits that he was otherwise correctly represented. We could wish, for his own sake, even though he uttered the unfriendly, unjust and inconsistent expressions and views it contains, that he now stood ready to renounce the unwarranted, not to say cruel, attitude he then assumed. Probably no other man living stands in a position so utterly incongruous as that occupied by him.

GOVERNOR BUNN.

GOVERNOR BUNN, of Idaho, passed through Ogden day before yesterday, and was interviewed by a representative of the *Ogden Herald*. In reply to the question: "What do you think of the Mormon question, as it appears in Idaho?" he said: "Oh, I am opposed to the Mormons all the time—that is, to their practices in certain directions. I am particularly opposed to them for their practice of polygamy and paying tithing. Otherwise I have nothing against them."

Governor Bunn, the publisher of the *Philadelphia Sunday Transcript*, which is denounced as one of the most foul, obscene and generally pernicious periodicals in existence, is about the kind of man the Latter-day Saints naturally expect to be opposed to their system of marriage. People are not apt to attribute to others higher or purer motives than they themselves are actuated by, and it would be strange if the prurient mind that could supply the public with such reading matter as the *Transcript* contains could conceive of anything commendable in any system which is calculated to promote virtue and provide a way for women to answer the purposes of their being legiti-