

goods and should take life easy but didn't know exactly how to do it. I imagine that he would enjoy guiding a plow through one of his fields, and that the odor from the rich, sweet soil would be most agreeable and appetizing.

When I stated my business and informed the venerable President that the *Times* would be glad to give his views on what had recently taken place, he asked: "What do they want me to say?"

"Anything that you want to say, President Woodruff. The *Times* has always been fair in its treatment of the Mormons. It has ever manifested an intelligent interest in the problem which presented itself here, has discussed what has been done understandingly, and, now that a new phase has been put upon the "Mormon question," the *Times* wants to let its readers know all about it, and it comes direct to headquarters for its information."

I went on to assure him that anything he might desire to say would be published just as he said it, and that at least one great newspaper in the United States had the courage to print the exact words of the Mormon President.

The old gentleman was not ignorant of the *Times'* fairness in the past, nor was he unappreciative of it. But President Woodruff didn't want to be interviewed on the subject of the recent manifesto, insisting that there was nothing to be said. The thing had been done, the decree had gone forth, the people had accepted and approved, and that ended the matter. There was nothing to discuss, no probabilities to take into account, no possibilities to be considered.

I suggested that some public men and not a few newspapers doubted the sincerity of the manifesto.

"I know it," said he, "but can not help it. The world has always distrusted us, but has always found us true. It has said we were not honest, though it has never been able to point to a dishonest act on our part. It has denied our sincerity, and has never intimated an instance of insincerity. If editors and statesmen will not believe the manifesto, which was adopted by the body of the Church in solemn conference, they will not believe what I or any individual here may say. I presume that in this matter, as in other things, we will have to trust to time for our vindication. We know that we are honest and sincere in this, as we have been in everything we have done, and while we are sorry that others do not trust us, in time they all acknowledge that we were never deceiving."

Your correspondent did not doubt the venerable president's sincerity, nor does he doubt that polygamous marriages have come to an end. The decree will be obeyed. Indeed, it cannot be disobeyed, as I understand it, except the authority be given or the manifesto be nullified by the Presidency of the Church, and there is no likelihood of this being done. I questioned the President as to what had brought about

this action, and he replied that he could not make the matter clearer than had been done in the great Tabernacle when the Conference had voted on the manifesto which had been previously issued by him, and he handed me printed verbatim reports of what he and George Q. Cannon, who is second in authority, said on that occasion. At the risk of being prolix I will quote from these sermons or statements, which are both authoritative and explanatory.

Here are annexed copious extracts from the discourses of President George Q. Cannon and President Wilford Woodruff at the General Conference. The letter concludes in this way:

"And now, President Woodruff," I asked, "what will be the policy of the Church, or what will be your advice as to the men who are already in polygamy?"

The venerable patriarch said that he didn't know that the Church would have any policy in this matter or that he would assume to give any advice. That matter was individual and he presumed that each person would decide for himself as to what he would do. The president went on to say that he thought it would be humane and just if Congress were to make a law by which husbands and fathers could care for their plural wives and properly look after and train their children without running the risk of being sent to the penitentiary on the charge of unlawful cohabitation. However, this was a matter for others to consider and not for him, and he didn't care to talk about it. His manifesto went only to the matter of future polygamous marriages; it stopped there, but did not say that a man already in that relation should turn adrift and abandon his extra families, nor did it command him to live with those families in defiance of law until the penitentiary separated them.

My own opinion is that in the cases of all but a few of the polygamists who have not yet been caught and convicted, the parties when arraigned will signify their willingness to discontinue the unlawful relations and to abide by the statutes. Not many will abandon their plural wives in the sense of casting them off to do for themselves. They will continue to care for the women, but will not live with them. Polygamy is a thing of the past. It is dead, and I cannot believe that any attempt will ever be made to revive it. Of course there will be polygamists, in a technical sense, until this generation has passed away, for while men and their plural wives may not live together they will continue to the end of their days polygamous husbands and wives in name, but the country need not fear other polygamous marriages among the Mormons than those already existing and which will gradually decrease in number. My knowledge of the Mormon people lends me to this conclusion, and the conversation with President Woodruff here detailed confirms me in the opinion.

THE ELECTION CONTEST.

On Saturday, Nov. 8th, Richard Howe, the last witness for plaintiff, testified that the charges made against him in the protest served upon him were untrue, and that he was in every way qualified to vote.

In making the opening argument for the contestant, Mr. Brown said that the canvass made by the board showed that Allen had received fifteen more votes than Ferguson and the certificate was accordingly issued to Allen. The evidence adduced in this trial shows to a demonstration that a number of fraudulent votes were cast and counted for Allen; also, that more than enough legal votes for Ferguson were rejected than were necessary to overcome Allen's majority.

Judge Loofborough's doctrine that there is no power on earth that can interfere with, or review the adjudication of a registration officer, is monstrous and untrue. To say that such an officer is a supreme court all in himself, independent of any other court, is a libel upon justice and American institutions, and I shall not waste time arguing upon it. This officer, when asked why he struck the names of legal voters from the registry lists said they would not inform him whether or not they had contributed to the defense fund. That was their business, not his. Had that man belonged to the People's Party, the United States Attorney would have taken up the matter long since and he would have been sent to the penitentiary. If the one vote cast for Ferguson at Bluff Dale, that was counted for Allen, and the seventeen votes that were rejected at South Cottonwood are counted for Ferguson, and the thirteen illegal votes cast at Bingham for Allen are thrown out, as they ought to be, this will give Ferguson a majority over Allen of sixteen votes.

On Nov. 10th when the court met Mr. Rawlins delivered a pointed argument. He quoted numerous authorities in support of his assertions that the actions of a registration officer are not final or conclusive, his authority being like that of an election judge, *prima facie* only. Where fraud or irregularities are charged the matter must be determined by the courts. The will of the majority of the qualified electors must decide who shall fill the office. An unscrupulous officer must not be permitted to thwart the will of the majority of the people.

Judge Loofborough made a long and somewhat fruitless argument for the contested, in which he endeavored to justify the illegal and fraudulent conduct of the election officers at Bingham and South Cottonwood.

November 11th Judge Anderson delivered judgment in the Ferguson-Allen county election case, which has occupied the court for some days past.

His Honor, in the outset, expressed his regret that he had not