

position assumed a wonderful amalgamation of conflicting elements—a fusion of an extraordinary character. Who would have presumed that, for any purpose, the great Catholic ecclesiastical organization would have tendered the olive branch to the sects which apostatized from her, and make them an offer of co-operation for the attainment of certain specific objects?

This portion of the subject naturally causes the mind to revert to another—the union of Church and State. The accusation of blending the two in one has been improperly made against the Latter-day Saints. Allegations have also been made in the same direction regarding the Catholic Church. We claim that there is no reason why any citizen should be debarred from participation in State affairs on the ground that he belongs to a particular religion, no matter what it may be, whether Catholic or otherwise. The objection seems to be, however, when an ecclesiastical organization as a whole engages in State matters. Will not many of the American people feel that the position assumed and now alluded to will emphasize that idea regarding the Catholics as a body? But they are powerful, claiming to number about one-sixth of the population of this country. They constitute a great political factor, capable perhaps of turning the scales in a general election. In this connection the presence of the President of the Republic and the Secretary of State at the religious ceremony of the dedication of a Catholic university is suggestive.

There is a marked expression in relation to the Pope, which shows that Catholics are not disposed to conciliate, in one particular, the class who charge them with not being good citizens because of certain peculiarities of their religion:

"We cannot conclude without recording our solemn conviction that absolute freedom of the Holy See is equally indispensable to the church and the welfare of humanity. We demand, in the name of humanity and justice, that this freedom be scrupulously respected by all secular governments. We protest against the assumption by any such government of the right to affect the interests or control the acts of our Holy Father by any form of legislation or any other public act to which his full approbation has not been previously given."

The lifting of the ban of the Church from secret societies, so long as their objects are work and beneficent, is a new departure on the part of the Catholics as a

body. Heretofore a member who would identify himself with one of those organizations was not regarded as a sound Catholic. In this respect the strings have been loosened. The step means a more powerful foothold of the Church in this country. Good Catholics will doubtless flock into these secret bodies and permeate their ramifications. The influence resultant cannot well be overestimated.

The attitude of Cardinal Gibbons and the Catholic Congress in relation to Anarchism, Nihilism and kindred destructive agencies cannot but be admired. All well-wishers of the race will take and maintain a similar position on this important subject.

We regret, however, that a representative body of Catholics should so far forget the obligation of religious tolerance as to take a belligerent stand against a people who heretofore esteemed them for their fairness. At the opening of the Congress, the brilliant and eloquent Daniel Dougherty paid a glowing tribute to Catholicism, in the course of which he vividly alluded to the persecutions to which the Church had been subjected. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has also a record of wrongs endured, wonderful and pitiful in its character, considering the limited age of the organization. How then can the Catholics consistently exhibit toward another Church a spirit partaking of the same genius as that of which they so strongly complain?

This article may be properly concluded by the dropping of a word of advice to the Saints, to the effect that they should consider the signs of the times, which are multiplying and ripening on every hand. They should not be discouraged, but rather rejoice because of the nearness of their redemption. The sun is shining brightly behind the gathering clouds.

"MORMONS" AND CITIZENSHIP.

Thursday, November 14th, Judge Anderson called up the application of John Moore, for naturalization, which had been objected to because he had been through the Endowment House, it being alleged that all who received the Endowment ceremony took an oath that is incompatible with the duties of a citizen.

The large Federal court room was filled with a multitude, mostly non-"Mormons," eager to hear the anticipated exposure of the Endowment ceremonies. Baskin and Dickson had seats in front, alongside of Lipman, and it was seen that

they were the chosen ones to lead in the desperate assault on the "Mormon" Church. For Mr. Moore, the applicant, Messrs. LeGrand Young, J. H. Moyle and R. W. Young appeared. Among the interested listeners were Apostle J. H. Smith, M. W. Merrill and A. H. Lund. During the proceedings, whenever any of the witnesses made a particularly pointed assertion against the Church, a loud guffaw would arise from the throats of the non-"Mormons" both within and outside of the railing.

R. N. Baskin announced that Wm. H. Dickson and himself had been engaged to appear on behalf of the "Liberals," or those objecting to the naturalization of "Mormons."

Mr. Dickson said they were ready to go on, but might not be completed today, as some of the witnesses had not yet been reached.

Court—This investigation is rather a novel one, and a reasonable time will be given; but it must not be delayed too long.

JOHN BOND

was the first witness: He testified—I have been a "Mormon;" left the church in 1869; have been through the Endowment House; this was January 25, 1886; I took an oath or obligation there; they gave a grip of the hand (described by the witness) which was a token of the Aaronic Priesthood.

Mr. Moyle—The court said this examination should be confined to an oath against the government.

Court—Anything that does not tend to establish that will be irrelevant. I understand the counsel here is ignorant of the *modus operandi* of initiating members into the Church, and must let the witness state what was done, and the court will determine if there is anything that is incompatible with citizenship. If it is shown that anything is immaterial we will not allow it.

Mr. Moyle—We have no objection to the obligation referred to, but we do object to any obligation that does not relate to the government.

R. W. Young objected to any ceremony or obligation but that alleged to be in relation to the government.

Mr. Dickson said there were several obligations that were antagonistic to the government.

Court—Let the witness state what transpired, but not unnecessarily expose the procedure, except in regard to this oath.

LeGrand Young inquired whether all the minutia of the Endowment ceremony was to be testified to. This man, Moore, was accused of taking an oath against the government, and the court had stated that the inquiry would be confined to the alleged oath.

Court—Let the witness state what transpired.

The witness Bond testified—I went through several rooms; in room 5 I took what I call an obligation, named the Aaronic Priesthood, which confined me to obey every doctrine of the Church, especially against the government of the United States. The penalty was tha