

opinion as to the character of the scribe that wrote them and the sheet that published them.

As to the belief of the "Mormons:" What right has any one to place that at bar in a case purely political? What that belief may or may not be is wholly irrelevant. But suppose the "Mormons," or a large number of them, still think that polygamy in the absence of any law against it would not be morally wrong. Does not the fact that they have yielded submission to the law and shown deference to the expressed will of the majority in the nation, count in their favor as American citizens? If they are willing to forego a practice which they have believed to be right, out of respect to the laws of the land and the decisions of competent courts, is that to be cited against them?

Has it not been declared, times without number, that what the "Mormons" believe or disbelieve would be a matter of entire indifference if they would but "come within the law?" And is there a paper in the United States that has said this as frequently as the "Liberal" organ, which now makes the alleged belief of the "Mormons" the chief cause of its opposition to their union with the great political parties?

But, day after day, the same organ has endeavored to make it appear that the polygamy question is really of no importance. This is its plea, when the decisive action of the Church in regard to that question is pointed out. And yet in the same columns the falsehood we have quoted at the head of this article is uttered, repeatedly, as though the question it involves is still the one living and overshadowing issue.

The polygamy question has been so long the one perpetual subject of the scribe's disordered brain, that it still looms up as a gigantic reality, disturbing his digestion and provoking his temper. He can write nothing that does not relate to polygamy. When its death and burial are accepted facts in the community, he still pursues it into the thoughts, the inner consciousness, the belief of the people who have parted with it, and he watches for signs of sorrow over its departure, that he may find excuses for further ravings and denunciations.

Let it be clearly understood that it is the abstract belief, or rather the alleged belief, of the "Mormon" people that is now the great grievance of the "Liberal" faction. Men's actions do not count with these "moral reformers." While the "Liberal" organ thinks the "Mormon" belief is not exactly right, there must be no organization of national

parties in Utah. Until the "Liberal" organ concedes the belief of the "Mormons" to be "Liberal" orthodox, neither Democrats nor Republicans must receive them into their ranks, but must combine against them and strive to strip them of every political right and privilege.

If no "Mormon" has been "made to say that he believes polygamy wrong," who has the right to try to make him say anything on the subject? Is this the kind of liberty that the "Liberal" faction desire to set up in Utah? Are people to be "made to say" what they believe, and obtain a certificate of approval from the "Liberal" organ, before they can act as citizens or join a political party? If the decent people of Utah are not tired of such a faction and such an organ, when will they find out that they have had enough of both?

WHERE IT MAY STRIKE.

THE Los Angeles *Express* has the following to say in regard to the late decision of the Arizona Chief Justice in regard to the application of the Edmunds-Tucker act to other Territories besides Utah. We are afraid the *Express* editor will be considered heterodox on the "Mormon" question by the bigots and know-nothings of the American press. He says:

"The decision of Chief Justice Gooding, that the Edmunds act applies in Arizona as well as Utah, is of much interest. The act imposes penalties for unlawful cohabitation and adultery, and there are in Arizona a considerable number of citizens not Mormons who are liable to prosecution under the terms of the law. It is scarcely likely, however, that the measure will be invoked against them. It was rather the teaching of polygamy by the Mormons, than the sporadic and secret practice of it by some Gentiles, that aroused the national indignation which found expression in the Edmunds act."

ADVICE TO THE PRINCE OF WALES

In the opinion of *Harper's Weekly*, the proper thing for the Prince of Wales to do, to strengthen his prospects of becoming king of England, is to go on playing baccarat, and let no opportunity escape in demonstrating to the English people that he is a thoughtless, shiftless, characterless, mincompoop.

Back of this rather original advice to the Prince is the theory based upon what seems to be first-class evidence, that this is precisely the sort of a person most fitted for the English throne, and that any other would be so highly unsatisfactory as to endanger the perpetuity of the British crown.

Along with the seeming foolishness of this estimate of England's loyalty there is a prodigious amount of fact and good sense. In view of the place which royalty at present occupies in

English politics we do not see why horse racing, baccarat and fast women would not make as appropriate attendants of the throne as any. According to the testimony of Lord Chief Justice Coleridge the life of the prince would be a dreadful bore unless seasoned with some such innocent diversions as the gambling party at Tranby Croft. His duties being a perpetual succession of "uninteresting ceremonies" it was only common charity to allow him a little choice as to how and with whom he should entertain himself.

This is the sort of occupation which the English people have conceded to their prince, and according to the best authorities from the English point of view it is the most appropriate occupation of a king. There is no evidence that the theoretical sovereign of that mighty realm has had any other, that could be called official, for nearly a century.

It does not seem unfair to presume that if the English people really desired anything but a nincompoop for a king they would have left something more than "uninteresting ceremonies" for his share of the government. All things considered, we are persuaded that the advice of *Harper's Weekly* to the prince to go on playing baccarat, is well enough, if it is his wish to enjoy the happy and exclusive indolence of an undisturbed reign.

THE CANADIAN QUESTION.

DISPATCHES from Ottawa, Canada, state that the Governor-General transmitted on the 22nd inst., to the Canadian Senate a number of documents relating to reciprocity between the United States and Canada. They consist principally of correspondence between Lord Salisbury, the British Minister at Washington, Lord Knutsford and Lord Stanley.

Though this correspondence is voluminous, yet it shows that nothing conclusive has been accomplished. At the present time, however, the publication and discussion of these documents will give a new impetus, not only to the scheme of reciprocity, but to the question of annexation. Sir John Macdonald's personality will no longer calm the troubled waters. His successor is already drifting on shoals, and the old national Conservative party of Canada is showing signs of demoralization and decay.

Inauspicious as the situation is in Eastern Canada, it is much worse in the West. British Columbia is raising such a storm of indignation over the recent Bering sea agreement that its wail will soon be heard even in distant Albion. Petitions are being forwarded