

Mormons, he finds that he is a member of no church.

Ten years ago, before his reformation, Mr. Small joined Trinity Methodist Church during a revival. He became a backslider and led a wild life until converted by the preaching of Sam Jones. No action was ever taken against Mr. Small by Trinity Church when he strayed away. When he came back into the fold he still kept his membership at Trinity. But when he entered the Episcopal Church with a view of preaching for that denomination the stewards and members of Trinity took it for granted that he had voluntarily withdrawn and he was no longer considered a member.

"When he announced his candidacy for the Legislature the Episcopal Church thought he could not consistently preach and legislate at the same time. Before election, however, and matters so far as Small was concerned, were in *statu quo*, he went to Utah and was offered the presidency of a new university of learning at Ogden belonging to the Methodists. The offer was too tempting to refuse, and Small accepted it, although an Episcopalian. This action severed his connection from that church.

"A letter from Small to the stewards of Trinity Methodist Church revealed the fact that he was considered by the members as an Episcopalian. He can get no letter from Bishop Beckwith of the Episcopal diocese on account of his treatment of the Episcopals, who had made every preparation to ordain him in that church when they heard of his return to Methodism, and his change for a college presidency estranged his friends in that denomination."

### THE SUFFRAGE "A FARCE."

THE St. Louis *Republic* has the subjoined sarcastic paragraph anent the rights of "Mormons" under the present course pursued towards them.

"The defeat of the Mormons in the Salt Lake elections is a matter of course. They have no chance of holding their own under the Federal laws that have been enacted to suppress them. As far as they are concerned, the suffrage is a farce. They have no rights that will be respected, as against the westward movement of immigration, and if they are not willing to accept suppression, they will have to find some freer county than the United States."

The fault is not so much in the laws as in the administration of the laws. If they were fairly executed and all citizens submissive to the laws and legally qualified were permitted to cast their ballots freely, there would be no defeat of the "Mormons" at the polls. And the fact that political robbery is permitted and winked at, if not condoned, for the purpose of downing the "Mormons" at the polls, does not reflect great honor upon those who are charged with the administration of the Federal laws, be they just or unjust. This country is good enough for the "Mormons," but some changes in its government will be found essential to the liberties of all good citizens before long.

### PUT IT TO A FINAL TEST.

As published in our issue of last Saturday, the Board of Canvassers on reaching the Juab returns received the annexed protest from the "Rev." W. N. P. Dailey, one of the "Liberal" judges of election:

NEPHI, Juab County, Utah,  
August 5, 1890.

Utah Commission:

Dear Sirs—We beg leave, as judges of election, to call your attention to the nominee for county surveyor in Juab County, on the People's ticket, Charles Pricc, who has been in polygamy since '82, tho' is not known now to be in such state, has never received amnesty from the President, nor had barrier, to our knowledge, effectually removed.

Very truly,  
W. N. P. DAILEY,  
Presiding Judge.

The Board of Canvassers ruled that they had no jurisdiction in the matter. They have no power to pass upon the qualifications for office. If the "Rev." "Judge" Dailey were not blinded by "Liberal" zeal and personal vanity he would, perhaps, be able to see this point, and also the fact that he has been quite as assumptive and foolish as he wanted the Board of Canvassers to be.

This notion that the status of a polygamist can only be removed by amnesty from the President, is the most transparent nonsense. If a man is not now the husband of more than one living wife, it requires no presidential or other edict to announce or affirm the fact, and if he maintains polygamous relations with more than one woman he is a polygamist though the President should give him the fullest amnesty that could be issued. The pardon or amnesty which the President is authorized to give under the Edmunds act, has nothing whatever to do with the status of a polygamist.

How can a man be a polygamist when he has but one wife or no wife at all? The notion that a monogamist is a polygamist and that a widower without a wife is a polygamist comports with other "Liberal" vagaries and bears on its body its own refutation. The very statement is a contradiction and an absurdity.

This is obvious on its face and has been judicially decided in the Third District Court of this Territory. The stupid idea, gravely echoed by Dailey, is a "Liberal" invention put forth as an excuse for cheating a number of People's Party voters out of their right of franchise. It succeeded for the time and for the purpose designed, and was one of the elements of fraud of which the People's Party have complained.

And now there is a good opportunity to have this thing tested. If the "Rev." W. N. P. Dailey is in earnest, and is not merely trying to get the Board of Canvassers to join in the "Liberal" schemes to defeat the will of the majority of the voters; let legal action be taken against the gentleman elected as Surveyor, and let the matter be settled "as construed by the courts."

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Murphy case, and the Third District Court of Utah in the Bennett case, have already passed on this point. But these decisions are not sufficient for the Utah "Liberals," and they prefer the opinion of a petty Registrar who defied all law, precedent and common sense, because it dovetailed into their plot to steal the election.

How many times have these same "Liberals" howled at those "Mormons" who held that the Edmunds law was being perverted, "You must obey the laws as construed by the courts!" Convicted men were told that their only escape from punishment was to promise they would "obey the law as construed by the courts." And when the meaning of the law was shown to have been perverted the cry was, the law must be maintained "as construed by the courts."

Now why do not these so-called "Liberals" follow their own rule? The courts have ruled that when a man has been a polygamist and has severed his polygamous relations by some effectual means, he is not any longer a polygamist and is not barred by the statute from voting and holding office, on the ground of polygamy. Yet these sticklers for the law "as construed by the courts" defy the construction of the courts and the rules of common sense, in order to effect their own nefarious ends.

It is time that something was done to make the rulings of the courts on this point effectual. And if the enemy will not test it so as to make it an established and final conclusion, to govern those extraordinary and majestic officials, the deputy registrars—petty appointees to a petty office for a petty period—as well as common folk, then let the People's Party take action, either by prosecuting the bumptious defiers of the law, or by a civil suit, or both, that law abiding citizens may have their franchise and that the right of suffrage may be guarded against the political thieves who have robbed so many legal voters.