

Address all business communications
THE DESERT NEWS,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

NEW YORK REPRESENTATIVE

E. A. Craig, - - - 41 Times Building.

CHICAGO REPRESENTATIVE

Craig & Woodward, - - 87 Washington St.

SALT LAKE CITY, - - JAN. 8, 1900.

POLYGAMY AND UNLAWFUL COHABITATION.

From the reading of the various editorials and articles of the public press it is evident that there is much misconception and misunderstanding as to the present attitude of our Church respecting the subjects of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation; and, believing that many good and conscientious people have been misled and much adverse criticism occasioned thereby, I feel it but just to both "Mormons" and non-"Mormons" to state that, in accordance with the manifesto of the late President Wilford Woodruff, dated September 24th, 1890, which was presented to and unanimously accepted by our General Conference on the 6th of October, 1890, the Church has positively abandoned the practice of polygamy, or the cohabitation of plural marriages, in Utah and every other State, and that no member or officer thereof has any authority whatever to perform a plural marriage or enter into such a relation. The Church does not advise or encourage unlawful cohabitation on the part of any of its members. If, therefore, any member disobeys the law, either as to polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, he must bear his own burden; or in other words, be answerable to the tribunals of the land for his own action pertaining thereto.

With a sincere desire that the position of our Church as to polygamy and unlawful cohabitation may be better understood, and with best wishes for the welfare and happiness of all, this statement is made, and is respectfully recommended to the careful consideration of the public generally.

LORENZO SNOW.

President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Salt Lake City, Jan. 8, 1900.

LORENZO SNOW'S DECLARATION.

See also announcement from the

wish to direct attention to the course taken by the Board of Education in this city. The schools are to be closed for one week—the regularly appointed vacation having ceased, in order to "allay the panicky feeling of a smallpox epidemic," as one member put it. It was also decided to exclude from the schools all children who cannot show "signs of recent, successful vaccination."

The wisdom and the logic in those resolutions may be perceptible with a mental microscopic examination, but even then a pronounced bias will be a necessary adjunct. If the closing of the schools because of an alleged smallpox epidemic will not add to the "panicky feeling," and to the public advertisement of the exaggerated rumor, then natural causes will have acquired a reverse action. The notion is only equalled by the dictum, that all healthy children should be excluded from the public schools, and only those showing "signs of recent" disease shall be admitted!

Vaccination produces disease; to-wit, cow-pox. Diseased children and they only may be admitted. Children whose blood is in such a pure condition that even vaccination will not poison it and produce inflamed pustules as evidence of disease, are to be kept out of school. What for? Because they will infect the diseased children? How can they injure anybody if healthy themselves? And why should there be any danger from the healthy children to the diseased ones, if vaccination is a certain preventive?

It seems as though some of our excited and despotic city would-be masters have lost their common sense. The legislature of the State after discussing this question, decided against compulsory vaccination. But a body that has no legislative powers decides to enforce it by a trick. The law requires children of given ages to attend school. The board of education (by a majority of one only) decides to prevent the operation of that law to a considerable extent, by making an unlawful requirement as a condition-precedent to admission. That is the position of the five members who voted for the lawless and arbitrary resolution.

We shall see how it works. Will the sagacious five take legal action to compel the attendance of the children who do not conform to their tyrannical rule? We do not believe they will attempt it, or if they do that they will meet with anything but failure. And we are of the opinion that if they pursue the present ridiculous policy, the election for the borrowing of \$20,000 for school purposes will not secure an overwhelming majority. People who are compelled to pay school taxes want some of the school benefits, and they have rights which they will take proper steps to maintain.

Following is the letter on the merits of vaccination: