THE EVENING PAPER IS THE PAPER OF TODAY, THE MORNING PAPER IS THE PAPER OF YESTERDAY.

Deseret Evening News.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY

5 O'CLOCK EDITION.

NO. 32 THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1898, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. VOL. XXXII.

HAVE CEASED

So Says President Snow of Polygamous Marriages.

STATEMENT TO THE "WORLD."

Declares Solemnly That There Have Been No Such Unions Since 1890.

LANGUAGE STRONG AND UNMISTAKABLE

Refuses from Tracing Present Agitation to Its Unworthy Source—Pledges to Wait for Safer Second Thought of the American People.

Amest the Roberts-Congressional episode, the New York World, which announces its desire to be absolutely fair and to hear both sides of the question, has telegraphed its local representative, asking him to secure, if possible, from President Snow, a signed statement, to be published by that paper in answer to the charge officially circulated by the Presbyterian board of missions to the effect that the Mormon Church of today, continuances, excises and recognizes polygamy. The World further alleges that the Presbyterian church is circulating hundreds of thousands of letters and petitions against Congressman-elect Roberts, with the hope of having him unseated. Therefore, the World applied direct to President Snow for his views of the case.

PRESIDENT LORENZO SNOW'S STATEMENT.

President Snow's reply, which was wired to the World today is as follows:

In answer to your inquiries I declare most solemnly and emphatically that the statements which are being published to the effect that the Mormon Church is encouraging and teaching polygamy are wholly untrue. Ever since the issuance of the manifesto on this subject by President Wilford Woodruff, which received its official endorsement at a general conference, polygamous or plural marriages have entirely ceased in Utah. Since my accession to the Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints I have repeatedly asserted my intention to stand by that manifesto, and my determination not to permit any marriage to take place under the sanction of the Church which is contrary to the law of the State, and I now reaffirm that statement. Holding the keys of this authority in the Church over which I am called to preside, no such ceremony can be performed and recognized without my consent. I wish this to be clearly understood. I make this declaration unequivocally and without any mental reservation. Polygamous marriages in the Mormon Church have entirely ceased. The implied understanding with the nation when Utah entered the Union as a State has been sacredly observed. There is no intention or disposition on the part of the Church to violate or depart from it in the future. The enabling act required a provision in the Constitution of the State of Utah that polygamous or plural marriages should be forever prohibited. In accordance with that provision, the State Constitution contains this clause: "Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited." Laws have been framed in support of this constitutional enactment. Heavy penalties are provided for in case of their violation. Thus "the Church and the State are against the further contracting of polygamous associations, and there is absolutely no ground for the position taken by those who are attempting to influence public opinion against the Latter-day Saints.

The election of Mr. B. H. Roberts to the office of Representative in Congress from Utah was an entirely secular affair. The Church had nothing to do with it. Church and State in Utah are entirely distinct and separate. Non-Mormons participated in his nomination in the regular convention of his party. Non-Mormons also aided in his election. Many Mormons not being of his party, voted for his opponent. He was not a church candidate in any sense of the word. The Church had no candidate. He was elected as an American citizen by American citizens and the question of religion did not enter into the purely political contest. The Church has nothing to do with the action of Congress in relation to his seat. If, however, notice is to be taken of the wild statements and anti-Mormon fulminations from the pulpit and the press to the effect that Mr. Roberts has violated the State Constitution and the requirements of the enabling act, it is proper for me to state as I do most positively that the charge which incidentally affects the Church of which we both are members, is entirely without foundation in fact. And further, if Mr. Roberts takes the seat to which he has been elected, it will not in any sense affect the question of polygamy. If he should be unseated, the result as to polygamy would be no different. Polygamous marriages having ceased, the action of Congress in reference to the Representative-elect would have no bearing upon the matter one way or the other.

The situation in Utah at present is this: There have been no polygamous marriages since 1890. There is no movement in the Church for the revival of such unions. I am personally opposed to any such change. Mr. assumes to the leadership of the Church in which I am, in the determination that there is nothing in the law against it. Where Utah became a State with the full understanding that polygamous marriages should be forever prohibited, a number of men found themselves in this position: They had two or more wives, one had been married to them before the most sacred covenants and obligations that people could enter into, by command of all the powers temporal. What were those men to do with their plural families? Cast them off? Repudiate their wives? Bastardize their children? Make them a common prey to the world? Or take care of them, provide for them, maintain the sacred compact and educate the children? Is it possible that the Christian ladies of the United States, who have been wrought upon by fanatical or deceiving persons to make such a demand on the Mormon people, desire their men to turn their backs upon the wives and children who are as true and devoted as any in the world, should it be the Christian people of the United States consider the circumstances that surrounded those families, with a view to establishing which is our responsibility to people far off? Can they find one who, with the complete knowledge of plural marriages as it is, or a question of a little time when the conditions have grown out of the system will pass away, the system itself, and the feeling against it, be in favor of the plural family? Whatever