

must actually have a plurality of wives to be a polygamist. The fact of cohabitation is not a feature in determining the meaning of the term. A man ceases to be a polygamist when he fully and finally terminates the relationship; the way to accomplish this is not pointed out, so the question is, what is necessary to cause a cessation of the polygamous relation? Can the relation exist where the parties have not only ceased to cohabit, but have separated in good faith? That is, does it exist because of the former relationship? To maintain a relationship requires some act of the mind to continue the condition—that is, consenting to recognize more than one woman as a wife. Does a man recognize a woman as his wife, when she is not, and they have separated in good faith? The Supreme Court holds to the idea that there must be a recognition—that is, that a man must recognize plural wives as wives. If the parties publicly say they separate, and their conduct shows they are acting in good faith, that it is an effective separation. The question as to good faith will be for the jury to determine. The section regarding amnesty or pardon does not seem to have any connection with this question. These parties might obtain amnesty, and yet continue the polygamous relation. The evidence on that point will be admitted. The question is whether these parties have separated and in good faith dissolved the relationship.

Now, under this ruling and these definitions, how can a man who now has but one wife, or no wife at all, be lawfully treated as a polygamist? What more effectual manner than by death or divorce can a man be released from former plural family relations? Yet men who are now widowers or have but one wife living have been stricken from the registration lists under the pretense that they once had more wives than one and are therefore polygamists, and excluded by the Edmunds law.

A Church divorce showed that Mr. Bennett and his plural wife had separated in good faith. The point was made that as the plural marriage was not recognized in law it needed no legal divorce to dissolve it, the defendant was acquitted, and the law as interpreted by the courts was established in this Territory that once a polygamist is NOT always a polygamist, and that no citizen is disfranchised by the law for polygamy who, at the time of his offering to register, is not then a man having more than one wife living and undivorced or who cohabits with more than one woman.

Now, then, registration or any other election officers who prevent a lawful voter from being registered or casting his ballot at the polls may be prosecuted and sued for damages. We hope some present monogamist but former polygamist will test this in the courts in his own behalf and in behalf of hundred

of his friends who have been robbed of the sacred right of franchise by officers who should work impartially for the public good but have worked instead for partizan purposes with the hope of party reward in the shape of official laurels and fishes. Put them through!

NEITHER DIGNITY NOR DISCRETION

WE REGRET to observe that whatever of personal or professional dignity or sound discretion may have been formerly possessed by the Rev. Dr. Iliff, they are now rapidly becoming invisible quantities. Those who peruse the following letter which has appeared in a local contemporary, must surely share this view of the gentleman's status:

SALT LAKE CITY, July 31, 1890.

My Dear Judge Powers:

"I need not so much as intimate to you my great interest in the result of our county election, August 4, 1890. For eighteen years I have been working along lines that might aid in the solution of this inter-mountain problem. The church I represent has cheerfully given hundreds of thousands of dollars to plant churches and schools, support preachers and teachers that Christian Americanism might triumph from British Possessions to Old Mexico. Methodism, the world round, shouts *all hail!* at the daydawn of Utah, after the long midnight of nearly a half century. Our rejoicing is not in the desire or hope that Methodism ought, or is, to control all matters political, temporal, spiritual. True to her history, she desires here and elsewhere that *Christian American Liberty*—disenthralled from all assumed ecclesiastical prerogatives and dictations—may be enthroned in the mind and on the conscience of all who now dwell or the millions who may hereafter abide in the possible paradise of God and man.

"With a prayer and hope, and belief that every true American will have wisdom to see and courage to do his supreme duty next Monday, I remain
Yours anxiously, but truly,
THOMAS CORWIN ILIFF."

Of course Dr. Iliff expected this epistle to Powers to get into the "Liberal" papers, otherwise it is doubtful if it would ever have been penned. He at one time pursued what had the appearance of a consistent course, and for that he is deserving of credit. He declined acting in the capacity of an enemy of the Saints. As a result of his consistent conservatism he was scored by the chief "Liberal" organ. The vilest abuse was heaped upon him by that journal. The News defended him from these unwarrantable assaults. For a while he refused to surrender to the anti-"Mormon" lash, but ultimately the poor man presented a humiliating spectacle, crouching before his calumniators until he now licks the foot that kicked him.

"My DEAR Judge Powers," with the emphasis on the dear. Thus the doctor addresses the political trickster whose record in Michigan was so unsavory that the Senate refused to confirm his nomination for associate justice for Utah, and the President of the United States was not slow to withdraw his name when informed of the facts. His record here has been a logical continuation of that which he made in the State from which he hailed. For the trickery and fraud he inaugurated, and which he operated by his "Liberal" tools, and by means of which he ruthlessly wrested the government of this city from the majority, he received a reward of \$10,000.

Poor Dr. Iliff was present at the jollification when the payment of the amount was made. His devotion to political jobbery, combined perhaps with other influences unnecessary to mention, so operated upon his memory, or intellectual and spiritual perceptions, that he was unable to tell the difference between Saturday night and Sunday morning. As a consequence he continued his speechifying, &c., an hour and a half into the sacred day.

There is a Ministers' Association in this city of which Dr. Iliff is a member. These gentlemen very properly protested against the era of Sabbath whisky selling, gambling and public amusements with a charge for admission, inaugurated soon after the advent of "Liberal" rule. The representative of the clergymen appeared before the City Council on the question, and the Association was treated in a manner approaching contempt.

"My dear Judge Powers," with the emphasis on the dear, at a public meeting, made a speech in relation to the attitude of the Association, to which poor Dr. Iliff belongs, with regard to Sunday morality. His remarks were to the effect that it was well enough for the city "to be good, but not too good." Before the February municipal election he had, so he declared, consulted with the clergymen, but he had also consulted with the "gamblers and saloon keepers." His speech was in the line of apologizing for whisky-selling, gambling and sabbath breaking, and a plea for leniency in treating their lawless shortcomings. It was also a snub to the clergy, and now comes a member of the Ministers' Association who, in affectionate and endearing terms, endorses the man, his methods and the era of loose morals which has characterized the career of the "Liberal" party during their brief sway in this city.

It appears that the evils against which the Ministers' Association protested, and of which Dr. Iliff is a member, is what the latter longs for. Seeing that he in common with others, was compelled to protest against the inauguration of an immoral regime in this city, that must be what the gentleman calls "Christian Americanism," for "by their fruits shall ye know them." Hence the utter and humiliating inconsistency as well as imprudence of the Epistle to Powers.