

things can be done where there is one?

"It seems to me that you had better rectify some of these discrepancies in your own country. In the meantime I will have to inform you that I shall prefer to see you later."

FATAL OBJECTIONS TO THE IDAHO CONSTITUTION.

IN this issue appears a portion of the argument made by Hon. John T. Caine in the House of Representatives, in opposition to the admission of Idaho with the un-American, un-republican constitution proposed for her. One of the points made by the speaker ought alone to have decided adversely the fate of the proposed constitution. Unaccompanied and unsupported by an additional fact or argument, that one point ought to have impelled Congress to take such action as would have finally and forever disposed of the proposition to admit to the American Union any State with an organic law containing a like clause.

The one argument we refer to is based upon the fact so clearly shown by Mr. Caine, that the proposed constitution for Idaho, in express terms, disfranchises every man that believes in a God who is a Supreme Ruler. It is no quibble, no strained construction which makes this seem to be the meaning of the clause referred to. Under its literal sense, its evident purpose, its significance when construed in the light of the ordinary meaning of its terms as other laws are, that clause excludes from the privileges of citizenship, any man who believes that the laws of God are superior to those of man.

That the American Congress should ever hesitate in the disposition to be made of such a proposition, is a matter of astonishment. It should have been instantly and unanimously voted down. It is an assault upon the Christian religion, Catholic and Protestant, of a more sweeping and dangerous character than even Ingersoll has ever had the effrontery to suggest.

Mr. Caine makes other telling points against the proposed charter of the new state which are unanswerable. There exists no method of meeting them. His argument as a whole is remarkably cogent and able, and if it shall fail in its purpose it will be because religious intolerance and political expediency have combined to subvert the principles upon which our national structure rests.

ANOTHER POINT.

SHOULD he wish to use it the Emperor of all the Russias can make another point against the American petitioners who desire the abolition of the barbarities practiced upon the political prisoners of the Czar's domain. It consists of the statement, as originally published in the *Ogden Standard* and which is reproduced in this issue of the *News*, of a raid made by two deputy U. S. Marshals upon the home of Thomas B. Helm, of Pleasant View, Weber County.

Mr. Helm is probably about sixty years old, and somewhat lame from having his leg injured several years since. At the time the Edmunds law was passed he had more wives than one and he has served two terms in the penitentiary for the offense of unlawful cohabitation—which simply consists of practically acknowledging both families.

We have no reason to question the details given by the *Standard*, as that paper is generally correct as to matters of fact. But be that as it may, there seems no room for doubt that Mrs. Helm's sudden death was the direct result of the visit of the deputies. It is but another fatality added to the long list that has been made by the cruel anti-"Mormon" crusade, and for which the framers, enactors and operators of the measures which produce such effects will sooner or later be held to answer.

If the cases pursued under the anti-"Mormon" legislation passed and enforced since the opening of 1882 involved instances of polygamy entered into subsequent to that time, there would be little room for complaint. But such is not the condition. The laws were passed and found numerous families established as far back as half a century, and all the way along the intermediary period. Those are the domestic domains that have been ruthlessly invaded, their heads seized and carried into court, while wives and children have been compelled to testify against those whom they loved better than life. Men have been herded into prison by scores. And what has it all accomplished? Mr. Varian unwittingly answered this question yesterday, in a case in which the accused, like a contemptible craven, sought to escape incarceration in prison by disclaiming the paternity of his child, thus, to save himself, casting odium upon his plural wife. The prosecuting attorney said:

"This case presented new and peculiar features. I have had considerable experience in 'Mormon' cases, and never saw where one repudiated a

child. This is the first instance where a man has denied the paternity of his plural wife's child. It is the first case in the history of these prosecutions where a man, holding a membership in the Church, repudiated his plural wife, and her child. It is the first time when such a man has endeavored to strike down the character of his plural wife, and it is the first time where a plural wife, in these prosecutions, has ever been accused of unfaithfulness.

These people were married, properly as they believed, and they lived together for many years. Now comes this man with this infamy. I say he has been living a lie for the past seven years.

"This plural wife, with the years of an honest life behind her, comes here and says to this defendant, 'How dare you disown this little baby?' I say that there are thousands of men here who, rather than do such a thing, would suffer the extreme penalty of the law, before intimating such a disgrace. I ask this jury to take a common sense view of the case, and have no doubt of the result."

Mr. Hamilton, who had been appointed by the court counsel for the defendant said:

"I admit that it is true that this is the first time where, when it came to court, a father has deserted his polygamous children."

The argument of the District Attorney throughout was a scathing, scorching rebuke to the defendant, and yet he could not excite the slightest controversy with us upon the severest points of it. But the admissions of counsel on both sides are suggestive. What is the use of seeking to force men to repudiate the relationship into which they entered previous to 1882, and thus brand wives and children with shame, if it is impossible of accomplishment?

Some people do not appear to be aware of the fact, but it is nevertheless true, that there is a growing sentiment throughout the country in favor of leaving families which were formed before 1882 undisturbed. There is no element of magnanimity in inflicting suffering and distress upon men and helpless women and children, when every result of such a course is impolitic and unprofitable, to say nothing of its inhumanity.

A letter from Port Spain, Trinidad, speaks of the recently discovered curative qualities of a plant locally known as the Cousin Mahoe, whose botanic name is the *triumfetta semitriloba*. In cases of dyspepsia, indigestion and liver complaints the therapeutic effects of this plant have been simply wonderful. The doctors on the island prescribe it largely, knowing its valuable properties.—*Chicago Times*.