

console them: They are no worse off than before the passage of this crystallization of bigotry and folly. They may still occupy the soil and till it, pay taxes and breathe the air till they die. And they may have the felicity of the prospect of being buried on Idaho soil, endeared to them by the memory of such eminently republican and liberty-laden legislation as the measure just enacted. They haven't lost anything by it.

If the time does not soon come when decent people of all parties are ashamed of such schemes as this, it will argue very poorly for the progress of Idaho. We do not think the promoters of this plot against the "Mormons" expect it will stand the crucial test of the highest judicial opinion. They expect to crowd the "Mormons" away from the polls and make them endure "taxation without representation" while the contest as to its constitutionality goes on, trusting that the law's delays will accomplish the desired purpose, no matter what may be the final result.

One thing is sure: The sectarian and other intolerants who hope by such measures as this to destroy the "Mormon" Church, will utterly fail in their desire and purpose. These unjust and tricky schemes serve to fasten the conviction upon "Mormon" minds that they are being persecuted for religion's sake, and their religion is made thereby all the more bright and beautiful and precious to their souls. Political fetters, no better than iron gyves, will serve the purpose of religious persecution.

### AN ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE.

THE incorrigible morning "Liberal" organ announces that the DESERET NEWS is improving. That is what everybody says. And that is one of the radical differences between the DESERET NEWS and the organ aforesaid, which never improves. Like the boys had cold, "it gets no better very fast." When the words can be truthfully uttered that it is improving, even to the extent of frankly acknowledging an error, or ceasing to misquote an opponent, or refraining from the use of ruffian language, or publishing indecent paragraphs, we will be delighted to return the compliment. The present indications are that it will die as it has lived, without repentance as it is without principle, and without reform as it is without honor.

Queen Victoria fixed her first drawing room for a Wednesday in Lent, and Romanists and high churchmen are incensed. They expect her Majesty is turning Presbyterian.

### THE SILVER QUESTION.

THE House Committee on Coinage has at last taken action on the Senate Silver bill. By a vote of 8 to 4, on the 20th inst., it was reported on, adversely, with a recommendation that it should not pass. The minority four consists of two Democrats and two Republicans; the majority eight of five Republicans and three Democrats. The bill goes now to the foot of the calendar, and that probably means perpetual rest. It is not likely that it will appear again before the present Congress.

"Jerry" Simpson, the Congressman elect from Kansas, gave his views in support of free silver before the committee. He favored an influx of foreign silver, saying that it would make more money, and bring better times to the farmers.

One noticeable feature of the silver question agitation is, that it is gradually assuming a distinct issue irrespective of old party ties. The cry that Cleveland has forfeited his chances of a nomination for the presidency in 1892, by his recent letter, is a silly one. He is blamed both by Democrats and Republicans alike, who advocate free silver, that he had not selfishness enough to see that he was jeopardizing his own interests. By this time, the country ought to be well acquainted with Grover Cleveland. It ought to know that he would not steal into office on any pretext, or under any circumstances, outside of these grounded on honest conviction. He says:

"If we have developed an unexpected capacity for the assimilation of a largely increased volume of the currency, and even if we have demonstrated the usefulness of such an increase, the conditions fall far short of insuring us against disaster if in the present situation we enter upon the dangerous and reckless experiment of free, unlimited and independent silver coinage."

There is no equivocation about this language. It is plain, direct, and clear. Whether right or wrong, it shows that he is today the most independent figure in American politics. In direct language he promulgates his belief, let the people judge for themselves.

The Sacramento Record Union claims that excessive tariff rates, under the name of protection, enriched manufacturers and merchants, while it impoverished farmers and small traders. To these latter classes, now bankrupt, any scheme which promises relief is welcome. They would grasp at fiat money, at greenback theories, or any other financial absurdity, as they do now at free coinage of silver, in the hope of a betterment. The wealth accumulated by manufacturers, and the poverty of the farmer at the present time cannot be attributed to the finan-

cial system which prevailed for the past ten years.

The circulating medium in use today is greater per capita than ever before. There has been no overissue of irredeemable currency. It further says:

If the friends of free coinage were entirely honest, they would recognize a new parity between gold and silver, but the silver-producing States are unwilling to do this. They do not propose to put an additional amount of bullion in the dollar. What they are determined to do is to raise the price of metal by legislation, to fix the value of a mineral product by statutory enactment, to make it the equivalent of a crime to recognize the new relative product of silver and gold—and they do all this on the plea of benefiting the farmer of the west. The whole device simply means the debasement of the coin. The silver bullion of which it is proposed to make a dollar is worth from 72 to 75 cents. This amount is to be coined into round discs and stamped upon the coin, "one dollar," not with any promise to redeem in value equal to a dollar, but it is to be circulated at the fiat of the government at that valuation.

It goes on to state that only debtors and silver producers would be benefited, while the general welfare of the country would be sacrificed.

### WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

WHAT is the difference between belief that the silver law is "infamous," and the opinion that another law is not essential to morality? If this opinion, entertained by some estimable men, should disqualify them from exercising any political right or privilege, should not that belief work in the same way? We think disfranchisement for opinion is so outrageous that its advocacy is akin to a crime. But we see no difference between the guilt, if any, involved in opinion as to one law and belief as to another, no matter how different the two laws may be. The "Liberal" urger of "Mormon" disfranchisement for belief now says:

The difference is this: The silver men are working for a repeal of that law, and in the meantime they are claiming that until repealed it is entitled to the full obedience of the American people. The other law the Saints are not trying to have repealed, but they are disobeying it all the same.

Then it is all right to call a law "infamous" if you are working for its repeal; but all wrong to express the opinion that another law is unnecessary if you are not working for its repeal. You may say what you like about a law that you try to get repealed and you are "truly loil;" but if you have an opinion as to another law that you are not trying to repeal you are disloyal and unfit to wield the ballot or hold office under this Government. Lovely logic, is it not? But that is common Tribune argument.

"Ah, but," this profound reasoner