

into further plural marriages, through a desire to conform to the laws. Have they "renounced a sacred tenet of their religion" by doing this? Have they "denied their religion" in order to practice it? If so, when did they take such an attitude? Is it not the truth that they have determined not to practice something that the law forbids, without denying or renouncing any belief? And is not this Rev. deliberately falsifying the facts?

As to Apostle Snow, Gillespie has certainly uttered a wilful falsehood and a very transparent one at that. The Edmunds-Tucker act prescribes no oath that renders it necessary for any one to deny membership in the Church in order to vote. The very Reverend piece of Presbyterian mediocrity does not seem able even to invent an ingenious fabrication. It is a clumsy and palpable lie, worthy of its author and his former course and reputation.

The *Independent*, while giving place to his communication, appears to take no stock in his argument. If it had known the person it would have treated him with the silence that his insignificance and mendacity deserve. As it is the *Independent* says it cannot expect him "to believe that a revolution has occurred even when he sees it with his own eyes." That sizes him up, fairly.

There are no bitterer or more unchristian anti-"Mormons" in the world than those tenth-rate sectarian hirelings. They view with anger the action taken by the Saints, because they think it will save the objects of their wrath, whom they can neither convert nor controvert, from some sufferings and public odium. And the idea that "Mormons" who believe on the same Christ as these persons profess to preach shall be treated as other American citizens, fills them with a rage that can scarcely be expressed. It is difficult to regard such creatures with that charity that should be exercised toward all men, and one is more inclined to repeat the remarks of the Savior to their prototypes, the hypocritical Pharisees, and ask "How can they escape the damnation of hell?"

AN OUTRAGEOUS PROPOSAL.

THE public is aware of the outrageous course pursued by the present municipal government in the matter of public burdens. There appears to be no abatement of the determination shown by the officials

to scrape in the people's money from every source that can be reached by the official rake. Yet every seizure that is made is accompanied by a pretense that it is all done for the public good. The imposition has now reached the city cemetery. It is not exactly a scheme to rob the dead that is now afoot, but the next approach to it—to fleece their surviving relatives and friends. It will not be difficult to prove this point.

As evidence of what has been stated in the foregoing we refer the reader to the report of the committee on cemetery presented to the Council Tuesday, Nov. 11th. It related to a recommendation embodied in a communication from the city sexton, asking that the main avenue, running north and south in the occupied portion of the cemetery be cut into for the purpose of affording him an opportunity to sell some choice lots. That is, to take off a strip 16½ feet wide from the avenue along its whole length, and thus create from the street, 60 new lots. Also to increase the maximum price of lots. The committee reported that they had had "this matter under advisement for several months" and after "careful examination" concluded that these lots would sell from \$50 to \$125 each. It was therefore recommended that the avenue in question be cut down and that the price of lots hereafter range from \$12 to \$125. The old rate was from \$12 to \$20.

In connection with their report the committee on cemetery, Councilmen Cohn and Karrick, presented an ordinance in conformity with their recommendation. It amends section 3 of the existing ordinance, the only change being that the maximum price of lots is placed at \$125 instead of \$20, the existing figure. It should be observed that the committee on municipal laws has never had the matter in hand, the cemetery committee performing its functions in the matter.

The following extract from the report is interesting in view of the facts connected with the subject:

"Your committee desires to be understood that we do not by any means advocate a general advancement in the prices of cemetery lots. The minimum of \$12 per lot remains as it was and there will be no scarcity of cheap lots for years to come. Considerable sums of money must be expended annually to beautify the cemetery. With the steady growth of the city, expenses naturally increase in this as well as other departments, and it is but right to look after the revenue. All of which is respectfully submitted."

The committee state that they do

not advocate "a general advancement in the prices of cemetery lots," etc. No. These gentlemen would hardly do such a thing, as such an advocacy would be wrong. They, however, in their report and by means of the ordinance presented by them would make it possible for the sexton to charge more than six times the highest price paid for any lot in the cemetery since its establishment, namely \$125, the existing maximum being \$20. The placing of the price upon these lots is left discretionary with the Sexton, subject to the approval of the Council. The approval business is a nominal matter and is no protection under existing circumstances.

The pretended reason for this proposed outrage is that "considerable sums of money must be expended annually to beautify the cemetery." Now look at the transaction in its relation to this statement! In order to beautify the cemetery it is necessary to mar and mutilate it to get the necessary money for its improvement. This is indeed a complex proposition.

The avenue into which it is proposed to cut is one of the most attractive features of the cemetery. It was the intention of the old council to run a grass plat up the entire length of its centre, and on it plant trees of every obtainable variety. Now it is proposed, for grasping and sordid purposes, to reduce its width from three to two rods. Besides being susceptible of being transformed into the most attractive feature of the city burial grounds, this main avenue is a public convenience, because of the facility with which teams can pass each other on it as they enter it from the narrower thoroughfares.

The committee say: "it is right to look after the revenue." We might here be allowed to suggest that that seems to occupy the attention of the city government more than any other subject. There is not much danger of the increase of revenue resources and the lavish expenditure of the people's money being to any extent neglected.

The Council minutes of last Tuesday show that a motion was made to suspend the rules and pass the ordinance amending the one existing on city burying grounds, forthwith. This brought Councilman Louis Cohn—one of the committeemen who recommended the measure—to his feet at once. He stated that hereafter he would oppose the passage of any and all measures at the same session they were intro-