

une logic, would have pleased it very much. The only theory by which we can understand Mr. Goodwin's reasoning, is that he thinks none but angels should vote the Republican ticket and the Mormons are so wicked that the gates of the Republican paradise should be closed against them. He should remember, however, that that the world is a mixture of good and evil and that absolute perfection has not yet been reached even by the Liberal party in Utah."

Respectful the "Liberal" candidate for Delegate in Congress, the *Sun* has this graphic description:

"We have great respect for Mr. Goodwin's talents. As an editorial writer he is without a rival in the west, but on the subject of Mormonism, he is a fanatic pure and simple. His best friends admit that he is a crank upon that subject, and gravely doubt the wisdom of his editorial freaks, even in Utah. He may be a sincere and earnest man but the political sanity of a Republican who wishes to see a Democratic victory in Wyoming, because some of the Mormons voted the Republican ticket, may well be doubted. It is evident that Mr. Goodwin's mission should be confined to Utah. A reform may be needed there, and reformers are generally fanatics. He judges everything from his own environment. His intense, narrow, partisan zeal may be a power needed there, though many good men have doubts on that point. But when our brave and chivalrous redresser of wrongs in the Mormon capital, as a modern Don Quixote, mounts his Rosinante and ambles into Wyoming to fight windmills, he gets a long way beyond his jurisdiction, and some kind friend should take the romantic knight in charge.

A PECULIAR PARAGRAPH.

SEVERAL papers quote from the *DESERET NEWS* in reference to the action of the Latter-day Saints on the Declaration of President Woodruff. They do so recognizing that what the *NEWS* says can be relied upon as expressing the "Mormon" sentiment. But the *Inter-Ocean*, which is under baleful influences from this city and is rarely right on anything relating to the "Mormons," has this choice paragraph:

"The *Deseret News*, of Salt Lake, official organ of the Mormon Church, does not indorse President Woodruff's manifesto against plural marriages. The editor of the *News* served two years in the penitentiary to atone for his plural marriages, while President Woodruff and George Q. Cannon left the Territory. He can not be expected to enthuse over a manifesto which does not affect him or save him from the 'persecution' endured for the chnroh."

If there is any portion of the precious morsel that has any approach to the truth, we fail to discern it. If there is a paper that has more fully indorsed and written up the manifesto than the *DESERET NEWS*, we would like to see a copy of it. The editor of this paper has not served either "two years" or any time "in the penitentiary to

atone for plural marriages." And the manifesto which forbids such marriages in future, affects him in common with all other members of the Church though it may not save him or any one from the "persecutions" which anti-"Mormon" fanatics and perpetual defamers of the "Mormon" people, like the *Inter Ocean*, appear desirous of heaping upon them.

Will the Chicago echo of the "Liberal" organ of this city please try again. For utter absence of an element of fact, however, we doubt if it can ever succeed in equaling the paragraph we have clipped from its columns.

RIBALDRY BY TELEGRAPH.

A GREAT many American journals are discoursing on the alleged "blasphemous statement" of President George Q. Cannon at the General Conference, that "President Woodruff had been holding an executive session with God."

They appear to be very much shocked at this, and base their opinions of the Declaration on plural marriage upon this purported expression.

For the benefit of our pained cotemporaries, we state, most emphatically, that neither President Cannon nor any other speaker at the Conference made use of that expression or anything like it.

The truth is, it was a LIE made out of whole cloth by a reporter of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, published in that receptacle of filth and blasphemy, and snapped up by the Associated Press agent, a member of the staff, who never misses a chance to disseminate a falsehood about the "Mormons," and so circulated by telegraph throughout the country.

What President Cannon said about this matter was, that

"On the 24th of September President Woodruff made up his mind that he would write something, and he had the spirit of it. He had prayed about it and had besought God repeatedly to show him what to do. At that time the Spirit came upon him, and the document that has been read in your hearing was the result."

Will the good "Christians" of the United States object to this? In a matter of so grave importance was there anything wrong in fervent prayer for divine direction? Is President Woodruff to be blamed for waiting until he was satisfied that he was guided by the Holy Spirit? When convinced that he

was doing right is he to be assailed for going ahead? And is President Cannon to be lampooned and berated for making this plain statement?

He also told the Conference that the document, when written, was submitted to the Twelve Apostles, and, said he,

"We sustained it, for we had made it a subject of prayer also, that God would direct us."

Was this improper, or is prayer in these United States simply a "form of godliness without the power thereof," a species of lip-worship without force, a hollow and impious mockery?

It seems that nothing of importance a leading "Mormon" can do or say can pass without deliberate misrepresentation. The false and blasphemous stuff purporting to be "Mormon" remarks that is manufactured for the columns of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, and devoured with avidity by professing "Christians" in this city and other places, would not be tolerated in the rankest infidel paper in any decent community outside of Utah. Yet no "Christian" minister here raises his voice against what he knows to be as false as it is ribald and debasing. And such utterances as the press of the country have caught up and repeated can be commented upon as facts and no "Christian" preacher has the grace or courage to attempt to correct the wrong and stand up for the simple truth.

Will any of the papers that have commented upon this expression that was never made in the Tabernacle be fair enough to contradict the untruthful rumor? Or will they continue to ring the changes upon it because it suits their purpose and catches the popular ear and the vulgar spirit of the times?

ADMISSION AND UNBELIEF.

ON Wednesday, Oct. 15 the *NEWS* showed, beyond the possibility of successful dispute, that the "Liberal" city council had—in killing, by vote, the ordinance providing that public work should be done by contract awarded to the lowest bidder—repudiated the plank of the platform of the party devoted to that subject. That public work should be done in the way indicated by the assassinated ordinance was an election war-cry, the "Liberal" campaigners asserting that any other method meant corruption and jobbery, of which, according to their logic, the council now stands convicted.

Although the "corn" is not acknowledged in a whole-souled, but