

mands obedience, and receives it implicitly from his people, in virtue of what he assures them to be authority derived from revelations received by him from Heaven.

"Whenever he finds it convenient to exercise any special command, these opportune revelations of a higher law come to his aid. From his decree there is no appeal; against his will there is no resistance.

"From the first hour they fixed themselves in the remote and almost inaccessible region of our territory from which they are now sending defiance to the sovereign power, their whole plan has been to prepare for a successful secession from the authority of the United States and a permanent establishment of their own."

On the 13th of February, 1863, Senator Wade, in a report submitted to the Senate of the United States in reference to Utah affairs, used the following language:

"The customs which have prevailed in all our Territories in the government of public affairs have had but little toleration in the Territory of Utah; but in their stead there appears to be, overriding all other influences, a sort of Jewish theocracy, graduated to the condition of that Territory. This theocracy having a supreme head who governs and guides every affair of importance in the Church, and practically in the Territory, is the only real power acknowledged here, and to the extension of whose interests every person in the Territory must directly or indirectly conduce. We have here the first exhibition, within the limits of the United States, of a church ruling the state." (Thirty-seventh Congress, third session, Rep. Com., No. 87.)

In January, 1863, certain resolutions were referred to the committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives, instructing them to "Inquire and ascertain what means, civil or military, might lawfully be resorted to to effectually eradicate the evil of polygamy from the land, what legislation was needed for that purpose, and why the law against polygamy was not enforced;" also a resolution instructing the same committee to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill providing for the repeal of the law organizing the Territory of Utah, and for dividing said Territory and attaching a portion thereof to the State of Nevada, and the residue to the Territories contiguous to Utah.

That committee, through Hon. J. M. Ashley, chairman, reported July 23, 1863, that they were unable to agree upon any plan which seemed to them to promise a practical solution of the abuses and evils complained of, and which were admitted to exist. They postponed the further consideration of the matter and reported the testimony.

The committee state that "the testimony discloses the fact that the laws of the United States are openly and defiantly violated throughout the Territory, and that an armed force is necessary to preserve the peace and give security to the lives and property of citizens of the United States residing therein." (H. Rep. No. 83, Thirty-ninth Congress, first session.)

Express statute passed July, 1862, (12 Stat. at L. 501, 502), provides suitable penalties for the violation of the law against polygamy. Have the people of Utah obeyed this statute.

Did this community then submit to that law and obey it? Or have they since persistently lived in its open violation? Polygamy has alarmingly increased since the passage of the law. Brigham Young himself was one of the first to violate it, publicly espousing another wife on the 29th of January, 1843.

In the summer of 1863 Judge Drake, upon the hearing of a *habeas corpus* case, ordered that a girl who had been inveigled into a "plural" marriage with a Mormon bishop should be returned to the custody of her mother, and the marshal was ordered to execute the decree. But the people seized the girl as she was passing out of the court-house, bore her off in triumph, and delivered her to her bishop.

Judge Drake tells us that "since the commencement of 1865 polygamy has increased at least 100 per cent. throughout the Territory. Previous to the year 1863 this doctrine or practice was not generally held to be a religious necessity, but merely a tolerance to be indulged in by those who desired it. It is now held to be a cardinal point. That and the shedding of the blood of apostates to save their souls are the two soul-saving doctrines of the Mormon faith." (Statement of Hon. Thomas J. Drake, H. Mis. Doc. No. 35, second session Fortieth Congress, pages 9, 10.)

The question then arises, shall a community be represented in the Congress of the United States who are thus living in open violation of a law passed for the protection of the highest interests of society and of the state?

We have thus considered the question in reference to polygamy generally, without referring specially to those obscene and disgusting practices which are in this case concomitants. Incest in its various forms and under various names is practiced and encouraged.

The marriage of a man with the mother and her daughters indiscriminately and marriage with a half sister are permitted. William Hepworth Dixon says that Brigham Young admitted to him in conversation that he saw no objection to the marriage of brother and sister. But he spoke for himself only, as he thought the Church was not prepared for so strong a doctrine. (New America, by William Hepworth Dixon, page 215.)

By reference to a sermon preached by Young, April 8, 1853, and reported in the DESERT NEWS, volume 3, No. 12, it will be seen that he thought it (the Church) prepared for another doctrine equally strong—the marriage of a mother with her own son.

Such are the doctrines and practices which are sought to be established and incorporated into the frame-work of society in the heart of this continent. Is it not time that the representative of this corrupt, licentious, this tyrannical, traitorous, and bloody priesthood shall be sent back to his constituents with instructions to abandon their unwarrantable assumptions of temporal power, obey the laws, and remodel their government so that it shall conform to the spirit of our free institutions?

Mr. Moulton, who makes the minority report in this case, testifies to the same effect in his speech on polygamy, wherein he says:

The teachings and practice of polygamy are unnatural and in conflict with the physical and moral laws. Its effect upon the community in which it exists is its worst commentary. It dwarfs, separates, and isolates its devotees practically from the rest of the world.

A creed, political or religious, that necessarily causes its followers to separate themselves from the rest of the community, to set up institutions inimical to the laws and Constitution under which they live, will always, sooner or later, produce conflict and disastrous consequences to the whole country.

The people on the American continent should be as near one people as possible. The real government of Utah is a sort of religious hierarchy.

(To be continued.)

EDITORIALS.

HEROIC SPIRIT IN THE MINISTRY.

THE New York Herald eulogizes the "heroic spirit in the ministry" of the Methodist Church, which, it says, has "no parallel in religious tradition except among the Jesuits and some other order in the Roman Catholic Church." In what does this extraordinary "heroism" consist? Just this:

"Within the past few weeks a score or more conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church have held their annual session and more than six thousand Methodist ministers have changed stations, yet throughout the denomination there were not six men who failed or refused to go were they were sent."

Wonderful, is it not? What admirable heroism, to perform labors for which they are paid and which in many instances form their only chances to make a living! Men who have taken up the profession of the Methodist ministry, in the same way that other men follow the business of carpentering, or brick-laying or any other calling for which they consider themselves adapted, depending for their food and clothing and other necessities and comforts upon their trade or profession, and who in entering upon it understand their liability to be shifted from place to place as circumstances may require, are lauded to the skies for "heroism," and the great New York journal considers their "heroic spirit" without a parallel except among the Jesuits!

And yet in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints there are thousands of men who work for their own living, who "at the drop of the hat" start out to any part of the world whither they may be sent, without salary, without any provision for their support, subject to change of location not merely once a year but at any time, and not merely in the country of their home but to any part of the globe where their services may be required, and whose ready obedience is so marked that it is thought by many that they dare not refuse, and yet their heroism and unselfish zeal counts for nothing in the mind of the Herald writer, compared to the discipline of the Methodist Church, under which men comply with orders, disobedience to which would deprive them of their regular means of livelihood!

But those real heroes are "Mormons" and the others are Methodists; that marks the difference. What is called heroism in the latter, is not recognized as such in the former, although shining forth in a thousand fold degree of glory. Well, no matter. The hired itinerant Methodist has his pay in this world and his praise among men; the self-sacrificing and heroic "Mormon" Elder lays up for himself treasures in heaven, and his works will crown him with honor in the grand gathering of the world's redeemers, when Jesus, the Chief, numbers up His jewels to shine like the stars for ever.

THE "MORMON" PROPAGANDA.

THE London correspondent of the Chicago Times writes a long letter in relation to the preaching and proselyting by "Mormon" missionaries in England and closes with the following:

"It would be a great matter for the United States if the Mormon propaganda could be stopped at its fountain head here in England, but of this there seems very little chance at present. The World, edited by Edmund Yates, has lately published one of its cynical and sneering articles on this subject. The writer thinks that all legislation against polygamy is 'absurd,' and says there are just as many polygamous married men 'on the quiet' in London as elsewhere. He abuses the Mormons roundly, but feels little sympathy with women who are satisfied with the moiety of a husband. These views, however, are not those of the vast majority of the leading journals in this country, all of which recognize, as it were with gratitude, the importance of the measure which is now being enacted by the United States against the Mormon doctrine of marriage. There is, however, in England perhaps scarcely a sufficient appreciation of the im-

mense difficulties, legal and political, which hedge round legislation on this subject. Few untraveled Englishmen can realize the immense size of the United States, and unconsciously compare your vast States and Territories with their own small counties. They wonder, therefore, why a polygamous Mormon cannot be as easily snuffed out as a man could here who has married two wives, say in Yorkshire or Scotland."

The "Mormon propaganda cannot be stopped in England because it violates no law of the land or rule of morality recognized in the United Kingdom. It simply presents the gospel as revealed through Joseph Smith the Prophet and believed by the Latter-day Saints, for the consideration of those who choose to listen. In embracing it no law is broken or local regulation infringed upon. And in emigrating to America the baptized believer in "Mormonism" has the same rights of expatriation and freedom of travel as an infidel or the member of any other religious body. Plural marriage is not permitted by this Church to its converts abroad, and they are required to obey the laws of every country in which they may reside. The "Mormon" propaganda troubles sectarian preachers and bigots of all kinds very much, but it will go on all the same under the guidance and inspiration of the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

SCENES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE EDMUNDS BILL—THE UTAH ELECTION CASE—HON. GEO. Q. CANNON'S SPEECH—THE VOTE—THE FRAUD CONSUMMATED.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21, 1882.

After several unsuccessful attempts on the part of the chairman of the committee on elections, (Mr. Calkins, of Indiana) to reach the Cannon-Campbell, or Utah contested election case, the House of Representatives, on Tuesday last, by a majority vote decided that the case should be brought up and disposed of without further delay. It had generally been expected, from the peculiarity of the case, and the many constitutional points it involved, that whenever the case did come up, there would be considerable discussion on both sides of the House. It was therefore agreed, as soon as the case was reached that eight hours be allowed for debate—four hours on each side—and that at the expiration of that time the previous question would be called and a vote taken.

As is always the case with the members of the House, the "Mormon question" whenever it is sprung, no matter in what shape, generally creates a furore of excitement that is very observable, and a stranger in the gallery of the House, noticing the excitement, and seeing perhaps a dozen of men all trying to catch the eye of the Speaker, instinctively receives the impression that something of importance is about to transpire. Especially has this been the case this session, during which the affairs of Utah have received considerable attention. On every occasion when the "Mormon question" has been under consideration, this session, it had only to be given out a day or two beforehand that something in connection with Utah and polygamy would be discussed by the House, to ensure a large attendance by both ladies and gentlemen in the galleries allotted to strangers. In this respect, Tuesday and Wednesday last, were no exceptions to the rule. Strangers were present in full force to hear the discussion on the Utah case, and though at times some of the speeches may have been considered "dry"—confined as they were to the legal bearings of the questions,—still at no time did the interest on the part of the public seem to slacken in the slightest degree.

But before proceeding to describe in this article the last act performed on the floor of the House in connection with the Utah election case—namely the refusal of the House, by a majority of 44, to allow Mr. Cannon because of his being a polygamist, to take his seat—I may briefly state that I had the opportunity of being present in the House during the discussion (or rather the absence of it) on the Edmunds bill, and am, therefore, fully conversant with the spirit which, on that occasion, prevailed on the Republican side, in

which spirit the bill was passed and has since become a law of the land. The scene in the House on that day will not easily be effaced from my memory. I never had been led to believe that the House of Representatives was the most sedate legislative body on earth, nor that it was the most noisy; but somehow or other I had come to the conclusion that the members of the House of Representatives were men possessed of some exceptional abilities, and above all that they were men who would at least uphold the Constitution of the United States. But from the manner in which the anti-polygamy (Edmunds) bill was reached; the absolute refusal of the majority to have it discussed, except under the operation of the previous question, and by which "gag-law" only fifteen minutes were obtained for those opposed to the bill to discuss it; the determination on the part of a section of politicians to strike the people of Utah a blow, without regard to constitution, law, precedent or anything else; the confusion, noise and clamor that prevailed in what should be the most orderly body in the land—I say, all this caused me to reflect, as I sat in my seat in the gallery, as to whether I had not been mistaken in the estimation I had formed in regard to this branch of the Congress of the United States.

I do not wish it, however, to be understood—and far be it from me to assert—that all the members of this great legislative body are "fools," or even that this is the "fool Congress;" for I know full well that there are men of eminent ability both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, it appeared to me, to say the least, that I had expected too much; that is, that all the members of that House, no matter what shade of politics they represented, would at least conduct themselves like gentlemen, and that they would not allow party feeling to override every well-established rule, every well-defined law, and every principle of justice, to gain an end which, right or wrong, they had made up their minds to accomplish. This, however, seemed to be the spirit which prevailed on the part of the Republicans in regard to the passing of the Edmunds bill. I could not help but draw a contrast. I remembered having been in the House of Lords and House of Commons in England; I remembered also having been in the French Chambers, at Versailles; yet I am compelled to confess that, notwithstanding the many spirited debates that take place in both Houses of Parliament in England—and party feeling there sometimes runs very high—notwithstanding the many boisterous scenes in the chief legislative assemblies in France—where party feeling also occasionally gets to fever heat—the House of Representatives, the Lower House of the Congress of the United States, during the rushing through of the Edmunds bill, beat anything I had ever witnessed. The Republican party on that occasion descended, in my opinion, to the level of a mob, or of a bear-garden, where order is simply conspicuous by its absence.

The friends of constitutional law, precedent and justice, being in the minority, were powerless, and to all intents and purposes had to bow their heads and submit, in the passage of the bill, to the perpetration of one of the most infamous wrongs that could be inflicted upon any people. Those opposed to the measure were not necessarily in favor of polygamy. They simply desired that the bill should be properly discussed; that an opportunity should be given [to amend the bill in certain particulars; that, in fact, in so important a measure, nothing should be done in haste, but that due regard should be paid to the rights of the people of Utah, as well as all other citizens under the jurisdiction of the United States. But, no; the enemies of the people of Utah would not listen to reason. Rightfully or wrongfully, they were determined the measure should pass at once. Several amendments were offered, but when the Speaker would call the "yeas" and "nays" upon these amendments some of the republicans would yell—absolutely yell—"No" with such vehemence as almost to shake the glass in the roof of the building, and forcibly remind one of the voting of a murderous mob. In this manner, then, and in this spirit, the Edmunds bill passed the House of Representatives, and very shortly afterwards, by the signature of President Arthur, became a law of the land.

After the passage of the Edmunds bill, a lull took place in regard to

Utah and her affairs. Petitions, which had been pouring in from all parts of the country urging Congress to take some steps to suppress polygamy, became fewer and fewer. The country seemed satisfied. A corrupt press, and quite as corrupt a pulpit, gloated over the blow which had been stricken at polygamy and the people of Utah generally. So they rested from their labors. Congress has yielded to the pressure, and it could now proceed with the regular business of the session.

But there was still another act to be performed before the curtain could go down upon this disgraceful drama. The Territory of Utah, with its 150,000 inhabitants, was still without representation on the floor of the House. The duly elected delegate, the Hon. George Q. Cannon, by reason of a conspiracy now well known, was not allowed to take the seat to which he was so justly entitled at the organization of the House. But the infamous history of the whole affair is too thoroughly understood to require repetition in this letter. Suffice it to say, that the man who allowed himself to be used as the tool of the conspirators, is to-day a poorer if not a wiser man than he was when he started out to seek a seat in the Congress of the United States. He has spent the whole of the winter in Washington, and it is actually asserted by those who know him that he has really entertained the idea that when the Utah election contest did come before the House he would be seated! Poor man. I don't know where he has been living; it's none of my business; but he boarded regularly—very regularly—at the Riggs House. He always breakfasted, lunched and dined alone. Even at the beginning of the session, when his legal adviser (McBride) and other members of the well known clique were in Washington City, he was always to be found eating by himself; which fact naturally suggested the idea that he did not care for the society of his friends (?) at meal hours, at all events, and whether he enjoyed their society between meals, when the situation of affairs was canvassed, is best known to himself.

As soon as the discussion on the case commenced, I scanned the floor of the House to know if this would-be congressman had arrived. I could see lots of bald heads; but where was the man with the bald head and long beard from Utah who aspired to a seat in Congress—"Being a citizen of the United States?" Ah! yonder he is. He has obtained a seat already; but it belongs to somebody else. He has contrived to find one among the republicans. But so far as that is concerned I don't think it makes much matter what political company he is found in, as I have heard it asserted that he knows as much about politics as a cow knows about astronomy.

The debate was opened by Mr. Hazleton, of Wisconsin, who spoke in support of the majority report of the elections committee, declaring that neither Cannon nor Campbell is entitled to a seat as Delegate from Utah Territory. Mr. Davis of Missouri advocated the claims of Mr. Cannon to a seat, contending that the House alone had no authority to declare what should be the disqualification of a delegate, but that that power rested in Congress. Mr. Thompson, of Iowa, argued in support of his "lonely position," that Mr. Campbell is entitled to the seat, basing his argument on the fact that there was nothing in Governor Murray's certificate to show that Mr. Campbell was a minority candidate, and contended that he should be admitted on a *prima facie* case. It is needless to say that Campbell listened very attentively to this speech. It doubtless raised his hopes considerably.

Mr. House, of Tennessee, combated the position taken in the majority report as violating all law and disregarding all precedents in claiming the right arbitrarily to exclude a Territory from representation. This was a very powerful effort in support of seating Mr. Cannon. Possessed of a full voice, Mr. House made himself heard in every part of the building, and although he read his speech from manuscript, still it was delivered with great oratorical effect. At the conclusion of this speech the matter went over for the day.

On Wednesday the debate was resumed: As on the previous day there was a large attendance of strangers in the galleries, the fair sex being well represented. Mr. Beltzover presented an argumen