

more to him, of more binding force we mean, than any law that Congress has passed, the President approved and the Supreme Court affirmed. By this we do not mean anything that pertains to the religious discipline, beliefs or practices of Mormons, but to temporal matters entirely. No good Saint will dispute the correctness of this."

"There is not a Mormon in Utah who understands and is true to his faith" who holds anything of the kind. It is pure invention, if the word "pure" is not prostituted by association with such a vile untruth and its author. There is not a "Mormon" nor an anti-Mormon who can cite any "command" of President Woodruff, either as a "sovereign," which he does not assume to be, nor in any other capacity, spiritual or temporal. There is no excuse for such falsehoods as the foregoing extract contains, and the effrontery which accompanies their utterance is amazing. So with this, a further extract:

"We are aware that great stress is laid upon Mormon devotion to the Constitution, but when we examine into that closely, we find that even it is sacred to them only as it happens to be interpreted by their chiefs, and that laws enacted under the Constitution are held of no binding effect if these same chiefs so decree."

This is of the same character as the other quotations. Where is there a line in the recognized standards of "Mormon" doctrine which makes any "chief" an interpreter of constitutional law? Where is there a line which intimates that no law is binding except what the "chiefs" decree? We assert that it cannot be found. If it can, let it be produced. If not, let the author of the falsehood again be branded with the name that is fitting, if a spot can be found on his anatomy leaving room enough for another mark of his mendacity.

We have claimed the right and so have other "Mormons," to criticize and review some rulings of the Supreme Court on "Mormon" questions. But none of our friends, whether "chiefs" or subalterns, that we know of, have ever claimed any such authority as stated in the foregoing extract. A decision of the court of last resort is the end of legal controversy. Any one can dissent from its opinion, however, and give reasons for that dissent. That august tribunal has more than once reversed its own decisions and enunciated at one time the very opposite of its rulings at another time. It is final in law but not infallible in principle. Any one may disagree with its interpretation of law,

but if he carries his dissent into action he has to take the consequences. That is all we have claimed, that is all we have ever heard claimed by any "chief" or member of the "Mormon" Church.

But why do all these wilful falsehoods appear just now, revamped, in the organ of slander? Just to try to hinder the naturalization of some "Mormons" of foreign birth, who have resided here the statutory time and desire to swear allegiance to the government and Constitution and laws of the United States, but are likely to vote a different ticket from that which the daily libeller will dictate. Is not this a noble motive? To prevent such men from becoming citizens, this "American" paper, published by self-styled "American gentlemen," endorses proceedings that are utterly at variance with American republicanism, that are repugnant to the spirit of American freedom, and that breathe of intolerance and medieval bigotry; and it supplements them with bare-faced falsehoods to prejudice the courts and provoke further hostility to "Mormon" applicants. There is no language that will do justice to such diabolical infamy.

Comparison might be invited between the candidates for citizenship who are thus maligned, and many who have been passed without much examination when it was learned they were not "Mormons." But we forbear. However, we think any fair man will admit that one who has kept the law and intends to do so, who is sober, industrious, truthful, religious and peaceable, even if he has opinions on the marriage question at variance with orthodoxy, is at least of as "good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same," as a profane, in-chaste and infidel inebriate, whose chief qualification, apart from his five years' residence, is that he will support the "Liberal" ticket and so will have his naturalization expenses charged to the "Liberal Committee."

We repeat what we have had occasion to say many times before. These attacks on the "Mormon" creed are corroborative evidences of its truth. If its enemies could find facts and verities wherewith to assail it they would be glad to do so, because they would have some force. Failing this they resort to falsehoods as the only missiles

within their reach. But perhaps we are mistaken even in that. The indications are that the love of lies is so ingrained in the nature of some persons, they prefer falsehood to everything else, and as their appetite grows with its use, they "roll it under their tongues as a sweet morsel" and make it their daily diet. They are greatly to be pitied, while their work is to be deeply depised.

A SENSIBLE COURSE.

THE Rev. Dr. Henry Truro Bray, of Booneville, Mo., appears in refreshing contrast to most of the clergymen of the times who entertain views and preach doctrines at variance with those of the church which they were engaged to represent.

Usually, "advanced" ministers who claim to have outgrown their creeds and expanded into broader and more liberal theological conditions, pose as martyrs to their convictions and victims of orthodox bigotry when deposed from clerical authority. But this gentleman, having changed his opinions as to the thirty-nine articles to which all Episcopal priests have to subscribe, and having published a book against the deity of Christ as an essential part of faith, denying eternal punishment and disputing the resurrection of the dead, wrote to the Bishop of Missouri, calling attention to his book and asking to be deposed from the ministry. He was very soon accommodated, and his superior in the church complimented him for his manliness.

There was some sense in that sort of proceeding. Every man has the right to freedom of belief, whether he is a priest or layman. But churches have rights as well as individuals connected therewith. And if a member does not endorse or will not comply with its doctrines or its discipline, he should go out or be expelled if he continues in that condition. And no clergyman should attempt to retain his place as a representative of a system or organization which he cannot conscientiously defend and support.

The right to secede belongs to both clergy and laity. And when dissent becomes marked in mind and act, withdrawal is the only consistent course. The preacher who struts as an oppressed and injured pastor because he is expelled from a society whose tenets he opposes, becomes a disgusting spectacle to thinking people, and his course