

tears; nor was it the spirit of peace which kept telling men an injustice had been done them and that they could be brought and sold like fat oxen. He made explanations of how the ticket was brought about and ceased. Remarks were made by Peter Maughan and Sheriff Cookston, and the assembly quietly adjourned.

On Wednesday afternoon the following ticket was seen floating about the town. It is but just to state to those of the People's party whose names are on the ticket that it is being vended by persons not at all times responsible for what they do.

THE PEOPLE'S CHOICE:

For Mayor—George Barber.
For Councilors—F. F. Riter, L. C. Farr, James W. Quayle, Geo. Cole, Hyrum Hayball, W. G. Reese, and N. M. Hansen.
For Justices of the Peace—Robt. Jenks, W. T. Owens.
For City Recorder—E. R. Nielsen.

For Marshal—David Crookston.
For Assessor and Collector—J. M. Wilson.

For Treasurer—S. A. Langton.
It is said that because of the dissatisfaction of persons at the ticket, the Liberals have revived hope and propose to strike a number of names off the registration list, and to aid, as they have been doing, (with the unwise help of members of the party) in fomenting further and stronger dislikes and get still other tickets in the field. They also hope to get many young men accounted People's Party men to vote their ticket. It is also charged that a sub-committee from the Territorial Central Committee of the Liberal Party will visit Logan, look the field over and furnish such money as may be needed to bring about a Liberal victory if possible. By quiet and effective work, and by taking advantage of the discontent that has arisen, it is the hope of the Liberals that they may be able to crowd in.

OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

At last the "Mormon" question begins to grow interesting. The treatment of it in the newspapers is assuming the character of discussion. But the unique feature of the discussion is the immense ignorance of the situation as it really is which prevails. I cannot do better than submit in full a few articles or editorials from various journals. First we have from Michigan this view:

THE MORMONS AND U. S. CITIZENSHIP.
A Vermont member of Congress has introduced a bill into the House of Representatives to exclude Mormons from voting at any elections and from citizenship. Such a bill can be passed into law only on the legal presumption that all Mormons are polygamists. But it appears that some members of the Mormon sect are not polygamists. Would it not be better to confine the operations of the proposed law to such members of the sect as are polygamists? In other words, exclude from the rights and privileges of citizenship only such Mormons as live in violation of the laws regarding marriage. The non-polygamous Mormons might be discovered, for the purpose of the act, either by conviction on trial by the ordinary forms of law, or by interrogatories

on application to vote or for naturalization. The United States should be careful not to appear to persecute even the Mormons for mere religious opinion.

Evidently this Michigan man thinks polygamists are still voting and holding offices in Utah. The second is an editorial from the *Catholic Home* of Chicago, February 15, 1890. Here it is:

LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The crime of polygamy which the Mormons sought to shelter under the cover of a religious tenet is described in the late decision of the Supreme Court as "a crime pernicious to the best interests of Society," "tending to destroy the purity of the marriage relation, to disturb the peace of families, to degrade woman and to debase man." To call such a crime "a tenet of religion" says the Supreme Court, "is to offend the common sense of mankind." How could a "crime" against civilization, a "crime" pernicious to the best interests of society, be made a tenet of religion? The pretext is, of course, transparent; and the chief value of the Supreme Court decision consists in "stripping this 'crime' of its disguise and exposing its true character. To declare that this 'crime' deserves punishment and that no cloak of so-called religion can exempt it from the penalty of the law is no interference with religious liberty. To see in this decision of our highest court a 'limit of religious liberty,' as an anti-Catholic journal of this city does, is to see what has no existence. Where no 'religious rights' are involved there can, of course, be no limit or restriction of 'religious liberty.' This is precisely what the Supreme Court decides, that there is no question of 'religious liberty' at all. 'To call the advocacy of such a crime a tenet of religion,' says the court, 'is to offend the common sense of mankind.' Not content with distorting this decision into a 'limit of religious liberty,' the anti-Catholic *Tribune* rejoices at what it is pleased to regard as a blow at 'religious rights,' 'scruples of conscience' and 'religious liberty.' It rejoices because it sees in this righteous decision of the Supreme Court, in condemnation of a 'crime,' a weapon which in the hands of illogical and unscrupulous partisans like itself may be turned against the 'parental rights,' 'the scruples of conscience' and the 'religious rights' of the Lutherans and indeed of all those who send their children to parochial or private schools. In its blind hatred of religious equality and the claim of parents to give their children a 'religious' education, it would hail any law, no matter how unjust and tyrannical, that would declare such 'parental rights' a crime against the State. Happily for the civil and religious rights of the community, the *Tribune* sophist must wait a long time before the American public will see in the decision of the Supreme Court a 'limit of religious liberty,' or admit that the 'right' of Christian parents to give their children a Christian education is a crime pernicious to the best interests of society."

The *Tribune* wants to know what explanation the editor of the *Catholic Home* will make "when he appears before Peter, to answer for his lies and false accusations." Neither the editor of the *Home* brother *Tribune*, nor any other Catholic, expects that it is St. Peter who will be his judge. Sectarian Sabbath school books are a poor guide in regard to the tenets of Catholicism.

The third clipping is an editorial from the *Chicago Tribune* of Feb. 17, 1890, in reply partly to the above and to similar other editorials which appeared in the *Catholic Home* in recent issues. The *Home* and the *Tribune* are mortal foes, and the *Tribune* has come out openly as an anti-Roman organ. Here is the editorial referred to:

A DANGEROUS CONCESSION.

"The *Catholic Home* of this city, a paper which claims to be an exponent of sound Roman Catholic doctrines, approves of the decision of the Supreme Court sustaining the Mormon test oath. In this there is nothing surprising, for no religious journal could even indirectly array itself on the side of polygamy. But it goes further than might be expected, further perhaps than its spiritual teachers, pastors, and masters may approve of when it heartily endorses the sentiment of the court that 'To call the advocacy of such a crime as polygamy a

tenet of religion is to offend the common sense of mankind.'"

Not that this is untrue, but it makes "the common sense of mankind" the arbiter of the soundness of a religious dogma. So it is, though it is strange to hear a Roman Catholic "organ" saying so. Polygamy is a part of the Mormon religion or imposture. It is a part of the religion of the prophet or impostor Mohammed. Yet the Supreme Court says it cannot be tolerated because "the common sense of mankind" has condemned it. That same judge has decreed that some of the tenets of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith must go. The "common sense of mankind" rather than logic denies that non-elect infants can suffer in hell through the unending years. It also denies that Roman Catholics are idolaters or that the Pope, whose virtues far outnumber his faults, is antichrist.

Were there ever to come before the Supreme Court a case which involved the question of papal infallibility it would say that the doctrine "offended the common sense of mankind." The Pope says in his latest encyclical:

"If the laws of the State are in open contradiction of the Divine law [of which he is the judge], if they contain anything prejudicial to the church, or are hostile to the duties imposed by religion, or violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, the authority of Jesus Christ, then, indeed, it is a duty to resist them and a crime to obey them."

If an American citizen were to resist the enforcement of one of the laws of this country on the ground that the Pope has said it must not be obeyed, and the Pope was infallible, the Supreme Court or any other court would make short work of him and his reasoning, even though the defendant might protest that religious liberty was being assailed.

If a parent under the cloak of any religion tries to have his child grow up in ignorance or to rear it so that it will be a stranger to the language, laws and traditions of this country, making the boy a bad citizen and a mentally crippled man, the courts will say, "To call the advocacy of such a crime a tenet of religion is to offend the common sense of mankind."

It appears to me that the main point in this Idaho case has been entirely lost sight of both by the Supreme Court and by the newspapers. I have an idea that this Idaho man was an ex-member of the "Mormon" Church, but that sincerity was questioned by the Idaho judges. The *DESERET NEWS* should give a clear synopsis of this case as it first appeared in the Idaho courts, and send a marked copy of the paper to these newspapers here mentioned.

If polygamy is the odious crime that the Supreme Court specifies it is, surely that august body ought not to dignify it into a religious tenet by disfranchising a man who entertains only a hazy religious opinion about it. Polygamy as it did exist in Utah was no more the polygamy that is interpreted by the courts and the newspapers than is the transubstantiation of the Catholic cannibalism.

As to common sense being made an arbiter, it is rather unsafe in some cases. Prohibition is not a bad thing, yet the *Tribune* maintains that the common sense of mankind is against it. There has not been an improvement in mechanics or in art or in science that the common sense of the period did not pronounce absurd and criminal. Properly speaking polygamy should have no place in the "Mormon" question of today. There are laws enacted against practical polygamists, and these laws are rigorously enforced. If it is a crime, apply the legitimate criminal procedure to it; this is common sense; but to hunt me and brand me as criminal because I entertain beliefs or opinions not in harmony with my neighbors or part of them, is common diabolism. JUNIUS.