

for Harris, and Major Rathbone, who was at that time, or afterwards became, her affianced husband. Booth, who fired the fatal shot, leaped from the box to the stage, breaking his leg; but he managed to elude pursuit and made his escape to the stage door near which his horse stood in readiness. He mounted the animal and fled, but eleven days later was run down in a barn in which he and Herold, a fellow conspirator, had taken refuge. Herold came out of the building and surrendered, but Booth refused to do so, and it was fired. It was night, and in the glare of the flames that were about to consume him, Booth was shot in the back of the neck by Sergeant Boston Corbett, and died three hours later.

Mrs. Lincoln passed the remainder of her life in melancholy and madness. Major Rathbone slew his affianced bride, Miss Harris, and ended his own life, a raving maniac. John Surratt, always believed to be one of the conspirators, fled to Europe where, for two years, he led a roaming and miserable existence. In 1867 he was brought back to Washington and tried, but the jury disagreed. Of the other conspirators, Mrs. Surratt, Payne, Herold and Atzerodt, were hanged on July 7th, following the tragedy, and Mudd, Arnold and McLaughlin were sentenced to life imprisonment, though the term was afterwards shortened. Spangler, a scene shifter, was sentenced to six years in jail. Corbett, who shot Booth, is now confined in an insane asylum in Kansas.

It would seem as if the agencies from the infernal pit, which instigated this historic crime, had also planned a background of death and misery as a fitting environment for it, and that the whole picture was executed with remarkable and graphic completeness.

"RELIGIOUS FREEDOM."

In these days of contemptuous disregard of the basic principles upon which this Republic was founded, it refreshes a patriot to read such an article as the following, which lately appeared under the above heading in the *Chicago Times*:

"A frequent recurrence, says the constitution of Illinois, to the fundamental principle of civil government is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.

"When Virginia, having jurisdiction by its charter in the vast domain beyond the Ohio River, ceded the same

to the United States as it did in 1784, the Congress sitting under the articles of confederation passed an ordinance for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio River. It was the work mainly of Thomas Jefferson, a statesman whose fertile mind grasped the great continental possibilities of the republic, and its provisions have become the guide for the government of all the Territories, and for their admission, and one by one they have been gathered to the Union. It has not been an arbitrary standard; indeed, Congress has had authority from the Supreme Court to disregard it, but in the main it has been followed. In 1787, it must be remembered, the United States had no jurisdiction on the far bank of the Mississippi or its delta. It did not own Florida. Louisiana, owned by the French, was a Territory extending with vague boundaries far into the northwest, even to the source of the Missouri. We had, of course, none of the territory since gained from Mexico. The ordinance of 1787 applied only to the unorganized territory then fully possessed, and out of which have risen some of the great States of the republic. But this ordinance, not by reason of any validity beyond its time and place, but because of the sagacity and justice of its provisions, has become the common law governing the admission of States.

One of the wisest provisions of this ordinance was the following: 'No person demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments.' And so far as enactment of law could assure that end no citizen in the vast territory or the States growing out of it has been deprived of any right by reason of his religious belief, however at variance with the prevalent opinion. Every constitution of every new State has contained a clause assuring religious liberty to the people. Illinois will serve as an example. The constitution of 1818 declares solemnly 'that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; that no human authority can in any case whatever control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and that no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship.'

"That no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this State."

A new constitution was adopted in Illinois in 1848, and contained, as matter of course, a restatement of this wholesome fundamental law regarding religious liberty. In the constitution of 1870 the same general principle was declared anew with some modification: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall be forever guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege, or capacity on account of his religious opinions, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship."

"We have held, it will be seen, scrupulously to the principle of religious liberty, which is the most useful of our distinguishing principles of government.

"The ordinance quoted provided regarding the admission of States that the State constitution and government shall be republican 'and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles.' One of these articles has been quoted, the principle, namely, of perfect religious freedom.

Idaho was no part of the northwestern territory. It was formed out of the Louisiana purchase. The line of proceeding marked out in the ordinance of 1887 is not binding on the Congress today, but the principle of religious liberty is so firmly ingrafted upon our national life that its integrity ought to be preserved under all circumstances. A Republican Congress proposes that Idaho shall enter the union with the first formal attack upon that liberty. The Mormon under its proposed constitution is disfranchised, not because he may be a polygamist, which would be withholding the privilege of an elector upon tenable ground, but because he is a Mormon, and wholly without reference to his domestic status. Not 10 percent of Mormons are polygamists, but all Mormons because they are Mormons are discriminated against, rendered class apart, denied civil and political rights, ostracised. Religious liberty thus assailed in the person of a Mormon may be further attacked at the demand of a party if craft or fanaticism, policy or bigotry shall conclude to persecute the Jew or the Lutheran, the Catholic or the Presbyterian. It is the first small break in the dam that leads to the flood. Let us not incur the danger. The law is ample to deal with polygamy. Let not the law open the way to religious tyranny.

SHOULD BE CLEARED UP.

It is currently reported and widely believed here that Caleb W. West is operating secretly in Washington in the furtherance of pending Congressional legislation for the disfranchisement of all members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The statement to that effect has very naturally created a stiff breeze of indignation. This effect was natural, on the ground that Mr. West, who is a salaried officer of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, was sent east by that organization, which pays the expenses of his trip, to labor in behalf of a government building for this city.

The names of Governor Thomas and ex-Governor West have been coupled with that of R. N. Baskin as working for the disfranchisement scheme. In commenting upon this fact we omitted to introduce the name of Mr. West, because justice requires that he should be given the benefit of the doubt until positive proof is produced. Notwithstanding the ground for the belief in his guilt furnished by his infamous