

METHODIST "RESOLUTIONS."

A METHODIST Conference in Utah would not be complete without some reference of a hostile character to the "Mormon" Church, by which it designates the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Omitting this would be like playing "Hamlet" with the Prince of Denmark left out. So of course some resolutions were passed at the recent convocation in this city, denunciatory of the "Mormons" and calling their Church such pet names as to hell-preaching itinerant Methodist exhorters are familiar.

We do not care to reproduce them. There is nothing new therein. They were prepared and presented by a conscienceless creature who cadges collections in Ogden, and who signalized his coming to that "liberal" city by palming off upon the people, as his own, the rhetoric of a religious mountebank in the East, who had favored the "Mormons" with some of his brimstone verbiage. This person was thoroughly exposed in the *Ogden Standard*, but with the "cheek" of his tribe was nothing daunted at the revelation of his religious theft.

The "soul-blinding errors and conscience-searing superstitions, the priestly despotisms and stipendiaried subserviency"—terms flung at "Mormonism" by this self-sufficient little plagiarist, might be returned to the source from whence they came with telling effect, if we cared to retaliate. For if these "Christian" assailants of other believers in Christ were not "stipendiaries," they never would have had sufficient interest in the "soul-blinding," in Utah or elsewhere, to lift a finger or raise a voice or steal a sermon for their enlightenment. And as to "conscience-searing superstitions," there is none in the history of the world equal, in nonsense and error and terrible effects, to the "only believe" heresy by which Methodism has helped to fortify sin and add old Satan in deceiving mankind. But we will not waste words on such vituperative exponents of "Christian" piety.

However, we will just draw attention to another essential to a Utah Methodist Conference, which always goes hand in hand with its mud throwing at the "Mormons." It is embodied in the following which we take from the "resolutions."

"We can but be grieved at the paucity of our collections when compared with our strength as a church."

"We recommend that at every point where we have work, the missionary claims be fearlessly presented and collections taken accordingly."

How pathetic! This "paucity of collections" is grievous. Let us save! "Collections must be taken accordingly. Pass round the plate!" "Stipendiaries subserviency," coupled with "fearlessly taken collections" and added to invectives against "Mormonism," ought to be powerful and satisfactory in the promulgation of Utah Methodism. "Let us pray!"

ANTI-"MORMON" TRIAL BY JURY.

The *Sioux City Journal* of the 23rd ult. contains a long account of an interview with J. P. Wilson, U. S. marshal of Idaho, who had arrived at that place with four "Mormons," sentenced for infraction of the Edmunds act to various terms of imprisonment of from fifteen to twenty-four months.

According to the *Journal* he told some pretty tall stories of "Mormon" life in Idaho, such as newspaper reporters love. These we do not propose to retail. They are of the usual style of romances on this hackneyed subject and are a mixture of a modicum of truth with a mass of fiction.

But the marshal informed the newspaper representative in regard to the manner in which "Mormons" are convicted in Idaho, and one item is worthy of notice. Said Marshal Wilson:

"I find the only sure way to convict a polygamist on such evidence as we can usually get, is to pick a jury from among the apostates, who hate the Mormons very bitterly."

That this is a choice bit of "open confession" which the advocates of the beauties of "trial by jury" should copy and send forth to an admiring world. Is this the sort of thing which the fathers of our country embodied in "the supreme law of the land" as a guaranty of protection to persons accused of crime?

"In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed," etc.

So says the Constitution of the United States. Trial by jury implies impartiality. The very object and intent of it are to secure fairness to the accused. The court, with all its functionaries, is organized for the enforcement of the law. The jury is empaneled to protect the defendant from the undue zeal of the prosecution, and at the same time deal out justice according to the facts in evi-

dence and the law as expounded by the Judge.

A person charged with crime is entitled to "a jury of his peers." They should be as nearly as possible from the class to which he belongs. Under the old English law, a foreigner on trial was entitled to have at least half of a jury composed of his own countrymen. Challenges are allowed for the express purpose of eliminating from a jury all persons who have any bias for or against the accused. They should be entirely without prejudice.

Courts often go to the extreme of excluding men who have become familiar with the case to be tried through reading the newspapers or discussing its hearings. This is sometimes carried to the length of absurdity and so as to shut out from the jury box every person of ordinary intelligence and judgment. This is an improper extreme in one direction.

To place men on the jury who are known to have feelings against the defendant or the class to which he belongs, is an equally improper extreme in the other direction. Indeed it is a greater violation of the principles that underlie the system of trial by jury. For, if it is better that two guilty men escape than one innocent man be convicted, then the greater guard should be placed against the presence on the panel of jurors biased against the accused.

Whether in Idaho or in Utah, trial by jury, according to the long established theory and the arguments in its favor, has almost ceased to exist. An impartial jury of the district is well nigh an impossibility, when a "Mormon" is in peril under the anti-polygamy laws. Men have been convicted against whom no real evidence has been adduced. Suspicious circumstances—as depicted by a vehement and prejudiced prosecuting officer, have been made to answer for absent evidence, and the jury being always composed of persons picked out because of their antipathy to the class or creed to which the accused is attached, the odds are all the time against the defendant, and he is practically without "a friend in court" and deprived of that protection which he would have in "a jury of his peers." His attorney may be ever so able and earnest, but that counts for little or nothing with a court and its officers and a jury all eager to convict.

It may be claimed that it is rare that a really innocent person is