

will say, "while these persons hold such opinions they are disobeying the law in question." Stop a minute. This dispute arose over the replies of some gentlemen to questions in court as to their belief. The evidence was that they had always obeyed the law. They so testified under oath, and the *Tribune* says "they would not perjure themselves to save the Church from going to the dogs." Yet their belief was made the ground of the argument for the disfranchisement of all persons who, like them, have not disobeyed the law, would not disobey it, and who think it legally and morally wrong to violate it.

So this element of disobedience, which the dishonest sophist now seeks to bring in, does not count. The falsehood of his assertion about the Saints does not matter. It cuts no figure in this funeral. His argument is dead and cold, and if he had any sense he would bury it out of sight and smell.

Disfranchisement of good, true, honest, capable, law-obeying citizens because they believe that, in the absence of law and gospel forbidding it, a certain practice might not be a crime, is so contrary to every principle of republican government, and so hostile to every sentiment of justice and liberty, that its advocates ought to be despised by every lover of his country and every friend of freedom.

WEEKLY FINANCIAL REVIEW.

HENRY CLEWS, for the week ending Feb. 21, 1891, reports a moderate decline in stocks. The quarterly dividend of the C. B. & Q. fell of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Louisville, New Albany & Chicago Railroad went into the hands of a receiver. The American Loan and Trust Company suspended payments, and wild rumors of other suspensions also prevailed during the week. In addition to all this \$500,000 in gold was shipped to Europe. These were the causes for last week's depressed stock markets.

Mr. Cleveland's silver letter is looked on by merchants and business men, as an assurance that the craze for free silver has passed its most dangerous crisis, and that in a few years it will pass away entirely. It begins to be understood that the Western silver craze was only superficial and frothy; that only sensational newspapers and wild-cat reformers generally advocated free coinage; that the better thought of the West and South, did not really contemplate anything so radical as free and unlimited silver coinage into "stubtail" dollars. Henry Clews further says of the silver issue:

"It thus seems that a point has been reached in this important struggle at which further apprehension may be indefinitely postponed. This fact has not yet had an effect upon the investment market at all commensurate with its actual significance, simply because it is not yet fully or generally apprehended, and also because there is a disposition to wait until the defeat becomes a fully accomplished fact. It seems reasonable to expect, however, that so soon as the completeness of the failure of the silver faction is fully understood in Europe, a marked change will come over the disposition of English and Continental investors towards American securities, and it would not be surprising should we witness an important re-purchase of the bonds and stocks which have been returned here in such large amounts during the last five months.

Those securities were sent home principally under the pressure and apprehension arising from the Barings' troubles. After that, came the very serious distrust excited among English bankers and investors by the seemingly formidable chances that this country might be irrevocably committed to an exclusively silver basis; and that fear has no doubt very largely proved London from taking back the securities it returned under the apprehension of panic. It hardly seems doubtful what will be the effect when this distrust is dispelled by the signal defeat of the silver schemes. In contrast with the sorry experience of British investors with a large mass of Argentine stocks and many other new undertakings similarly unfortunate, American securities will stand out as the most secure and remunerative of external investments, and the demand for them may be expected to revive accordingly. Moreover, at the present range of prices, the London speculative interest associated especially with American stocks are not likely to be slow to encourage operations in them—the more so as the present ease in the London money market would conduce to favorable results."

"TRIBUNE" LOGIC UPSET.

The Salt Lake *Tribune* has said many times that the Mormons are aliens, and should be disfranchised. Here is its language: "By birth, by training, by natural instincts they are aliens under the government of the United States." What does this mean? The ordinary charge is that the Mormons are "shrewd Yankees" who started a "scheme" for money and power. It is true that most of the men who have attained eminence as Mormons were born in the United States. How can a man born in the United States of parents who were citizens be aliens by birth? The *Tribune* explains thusly: "The Mormon Church, as constituted, is not an American institution, it is not governed by American rules or laws, or by the spirit that controls the Republic of the United States."

If this is true of the Mormons it must be equally true of every other sect founded upon the Bible as the revealed word and will of God.

The *Tribune* says: "The foreigner is not permitted to vote when he arrives in this country until he has remained a certain length of time and has made an absolute renunciation of his allegiance to every government." Can the *Tribune* name any Mormon naturalized in the United States who has not made such "renunciation."

But the *Tribune* says the Mormon

does not renounce his church. Neither, says I, does the Catholic. Every Catholic in the world is sworn to obey the church rather than the government under which he lives. The Catholics claim 14,000,000 church members in the United States. That would give at least two million voters. According to the *Tribune's* position every one of them should be disfranchised. If such an un-American thing were done, the man who pays the *Tribune* editor to write against the Mormons would no longer be a voter.

The *Tribune* says: "In case of a collision between the government and the Mormon kingdom, the authority of the United States would be nothing to the Mormon in comparison with the authority of the priests to whom he has given his fealty."

Had this been said of the Catholics it would have been true, because the Catholics have sworn an oath to obey the voice of the Pope first, and the Pope believes he is temporal as well as spiritual ruler. The Mormons believe that God will make the change from "man-made" to "divine" government, and that they will have nothing more to do with it than to enter in, as the people of God, after the change is made. They do not contemplate any resistance. God, in His own way and time, is to "shake" the governments of the earth to pieces and set up His own. But that belief runs in some form through all Christian sects. They all believe in a "Kingdom of God" and a "New Jerusalem" on earth, in one form or other, in which God is to be supreme. Will the *Tribune* iconoclast disfranchise them all? No! He will not even admit the logical outcome of his own false premises. It follows, therefore, that he is not governed by reason, but by hate.

In order to make a showing for his case against the Mormons he says about once a week that it was their hostility to the government that "caused the Mormons to be driven from State to State and finally to be flung out upon the wilderness to make homes beyond civilization."

There the editor has made another careless statement. The Mormons were not driven "beyond civilization," because they carried civilization with them. They were driven beyond popular christianity; they were driven until so-called "ministers of the gospel" could no longer incite mobs to follow through fear of "Injuns and snakes, but the ministers and their mobs had no thought of the power of the Mormon Priesthood. As a rule they did not know enough to grasp a thought as large as the relation of the Mormons to the government. What, then, was the secret of their hate and hostility?

The Mormons were "Infidels" in their eyes. The idea of a live God who could reveal Himself to men in this century was "a most damnable heresy" to "Christians" who believed that God had neither "body, parts nor passions" and that even what there was of Him had been virtually dead ever since John closed his work of Revelations on Patmos' lonely isle. But that was not all. The Mormons believed that angels came and conversed with them, and that Peter, James and John had come and established among them the Christian religion as it was in the days