

HE OPENED HIS MOUTH WITH THE USUAL EFFECT.

The New York Mail and Express has published an endorsement by Eli H. Murray of the Edmunds-Hoar bill which has passed the Senate. Of course our Gotham contemporary supposed that the Governor of Utah was an authority on Utah affairs, and that his opinion was worth something, while the fact is that his acquaintance with the Territory of which he is the Executive is extremely limited, and his opinions, because of his lack of knowledge, to say nothing of his disposition to pervert and deceive, are of the smallest possible weight or value.

The first answer to questions put to him showed the whole drift of what little mind he has on this subject. He considered the bill, "legislation in the right direction because it is unfriendly towards the 'Mormon' power, and seeks to divest the Church of its temporal power." Thus, in his view, anything that is unfriendly to the "Mormon" Church is "in the right direction." The right or the wrong of it, the constitutionality or legality of it, the injustice or dishonesty of it are not to be considered. So long as it is hostile to the "Mormon" religion and its temporal power, it is to be commended. That is about as much as might be expected of the ex-Marshall of Kentucky and echo of the Utah conspirators.

His next remark was, that "He had never thought that the territorial statute giving the right of suffrage to women, was very good law." Very profound indeed. Why didn't the President give this great judicial authority the position of Chief Justice, and thus remove one of the Utah officials who is obnoxious to his Mathematical Excellency? He has tried with his associate conspirators, by numerous hints and turns of law, to make the courts of his opinion on this matter, but in vain. The law remains so valid and impregnable that it is recognized, as such not only by the courts but by Congress.

The value of his opinions is still further exhibited by another remark. He told the Mail and Express reporter that "The annulment of the territorial law which now permits prosecution for adultery only on the complaint of the husband or wife, is a good provision also." Very good indeed. Seeing that there is no such provision in the territorial law, the astonishing goodness of the provision to annul it is apparent. And his wonderful acquaintance with the laws of a Territory of which Mr. Murray has been nominally the Governor for over four years, is prominently exhibited in this profound opinion. But hear him further:

"I think, however, that the clause prohibiting the General Assembly of Utah from changing the laws respecting the corporation [of the Church] without the approval of Congress is proper." A very "proper" clause indeed and of powerful utility! But as there is a provision in the Organic Act that no law of the Assembly shall be valid without the approval of Congress, and that has been in force for thirty-four years, the propriety of this clause in the Edmunds-Hoar bill does not appear in a very striking light to those who know anything about Utah affairs. Senator Hoar and his associates may claim some excuse for not understanding more than they do about Utah, because of the distance and their multifarious duties in regard to greater matters nearer home. But the Executive of the Territory, re-appointed after serving more than a full term, ought to have some little acquaintance with things that are familiar to schoolboys.

This brilliant genius thinks also the attempt to rob the Perpetual Emigration Fund under cover of law, is "a wise and proper step, for the reason that no church or corporation should be allowed to control the emigration of the country as has been the case in Utah for a long time." We can hardly bring our mind to believe that on this point it was ignorance that produced such unmitigated nonsense. It is more likely that Eli H. was resorting to one of his well known tricks of falsification. He certainly must know that the P. E. Fund company does not "control the emigration of the country," nor even of this Territory. It simply regulates the emigration of the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with which Congress has no right to interfere, and which the dissolution of the corporation that manages it will not prevent. In fact the attempt to put the property of a private corporation into the hands of officials appointed by the President of the United States, with the pretended object of hindering emigration of "Mormons" to this country, is one of the most nonsensical measures ever proposed, and at the same time a high-handed outrage that cannot be defended on any honest ground. Of course Eli H. Murray endorses it, because it seems to be "unfriendly towards the Mormon power," and we are well aware that any scheme of rascality and political infamy which looks in that direction suits him to a dot.

He complained to the reporter that "mining interests in Utah had not been advanced as they would have been under a different condition of affairs," and blamed this to "the policy of Brigham Young" and the "indifference of the church." He did not count over to the reporter the number of wildcat schemes to which he had lent his official name and influence, nor show what effect such things have on the

mining interests of Utah. Neither did he touch on the influence produced upon capital seeking investment, of an Executive who joins with adventurers in tiring up strife and in prejudicing the country against this Territory, creating the impression that its people are lawless and that it is an unsafe place for the establishment of any enterprise. But it is a fact that the falsehoods and misrepresentations of ignorant and malicious persons like Eli H. Murray have frightened away capital, and prevented investment, and hindered the development of mining and other interests in Utah more than anything else that has worked in that direction. President Young has been away from the sphere of mining interests for many years. And we fail to see why the "indifference of the Church" should be a bar in the way of mining or other such interests. But these stupid and stale remarks of Mr. Murray were on a par with the rest of the "interview." The reporter who manages to get into print anything either wise or reliable as coming from our absent Governor, will have to draw strongly on his own ingenuity; he will find in that head little but empty sound.

A TARDY TILDEN BOOM.

WITHIN the last few hours, some new ideas have begun to dawn upon Democratic minds, and some issues which were considered almost sure of maintaining a slumbering condition are all at once found to be assuming a decidedly different one. Two days ago no one would have thought of Ex-Governor Samuel J. Tilden, of New York, as a possible candidate in the presidential contest; yet the wire now brings the startling news that he is by no means out of the race, and some are even quoted as saying he is sure of the nomination. For the first time since the publication of his manly letter some weeks ago in which he declined to be a candidate and gave good reasons for his action, there is prominent and influential mention of the sage of Grammercy Park as the standard bearer of the Democratic party at the polls in November. Mr. Tilden has in truth made no public announcement of his change of mind, but there is good reason for believing that some Democratic managers who have within the past few days given utterance to their opinions, are in possession of his true feelings, and know what they are talking about. It is now stated that he would not decline the nomination if it were offered him by acclamation, and this indeed has been the feeling from the first. As it was scarcely to be expected, however, that his popularity as a candidate would be so overwhelming as to secure this, it was deemed the proper and patriotic course in him to put himself on record in positive terms, so as to remove any possibility of a panic in the convention which an unexpected announcement of his determination would have been sure to cause there. Hence his letter, which, subjected to a careful re-perusal in connection with the rumors now afloat, is found really to contain no emphatic or determined assertion whatever that he would under no circumstances consent to lead the party in the election. If it can be represented to the aged statesman that the use of his name at the head of the ticket is the one thing necessary to defeat Blaine and the Republican party, his patriotism, to say nothing of his ambition, would, we think, scarcely be able to resist the temptation to come out and enter the lists for a second time. As to his mental and physical qualifications, there is no further doubt. His mind and memory are unimpaired, while his vitality and bodily vigor, though not so perfect perhaps as eight years ago, are nevertheless all-sufficient, his friends declare, to weather the blasts and troubles of a campaign and hold the helm of state. His brilliant record as Governor of New York in uncovering and stamping out fraud at a time when corruption of the vilest kind flourished in city and state made him the idol of his party, and the champion of those who desired thorough reform and a return to pure administration of public affairs. He would be a most popular candidate and would make a shrewd and desperate yet honorable and straightforward fight. But the field is full of good candidates and the uncertainties of politics were never more perplexing.

THE UTAH AND SALT LAKE COUNTIES DISPUTE.

MALAD CITY, Idaho,
June 26, 1874,

To the Members of the Utah Lake Commission and persons owning land injured by waters of said Lake.

Gentlemen—I cannot take time to answer all individual questions at the present time, but take this public means of advising you of my position. I think I am pretty well informed as to the present situation from the information sent me, and will say that I am directly opposed to any attempt to forcibly remove any obstruction in the Jordan River or even to discuss any proposition of that character at the present time, as any hasty change of the waters of Utah Lake might do more injury in Salt Lake County than benefit in Utah County, and this we cannot afford to do.

I cannot advise the commencing of

any suit either for damages or for an injunction at present, for many reasons. We are not in a position at present to definitely determine the extent of the injury caused by the hasty and ill-advised actions of a very few persons, who may be willing when we can determine the amount of injury they have done—to compensate us, and if so, they should have the opportunity, without suit at law.

Again there are a great many gentlemen who tacitly endorse the policy of the Jordan River Canal companies controlling Utah Lake as they please, who if they were truly advised of the injury to others would change their views, and it would be unjust to them to sue them when they would probably prefer to pay the portion of damage they have caused without a suit.

I cannot favorably consider, and do not wish to call a meeting to act upon, the resignation of any member or members of the commission, as the present situation is one which calls for the best endeavors of those who best understand the matter, to perfect a just and peaceable solution of the whole difficulty.

To the parties interested in Utah county I advise that as the waters of the lake have now about reached the maximum height of this season, each person interested should establish fixed marks at the edge of the water on his own land, at such points as will show definitely, when the water recedes, the area of each piece of land now submerged; and to establish permanent marks at different points on the lake to show hereafter how much the water has raised this season! and I think the commission for Utah county should meet and arrange for doing this forthwith, and adopt such other means for ascertaining the extent of the injury caused, by violation of our agreement as their best judgment can devise.

To the parties interested in Salt Lake County I desire to suggest the propriety of their causing as much as practicable of the water of the lake to flow down the Jordan, so as to allow the people in Utah County to save as much of their crops as can be done, thus reducing the amount of damages to be paid for the unnecessary violation of our just agreement.

I am strongly and emphatically in favor of a peaceful and permanent settlement of this question without litigation if possible, and heartily commend the efforts of many in both counties for a fair settlement; but we must hold somebody responsible for the wrongs of the few who have done the injury, so that they also will respect their neighbor's rights, and yet at the same time continue our labors in the securing of peace and justice in the future.

I see Mr. Israel Evans, of Lehi, advocates the buying of land in Utah County for a reservoir. My land is not for sale. I do not believe gentlemen in Salt Lake County will want to buy land when they become fully posted on the situation, and I do not acknowledge the right of any one to covet my property, except when reasonably necessary for a great public good, and then only by paying a reasonable price therefor.

In conclusion allow me to say that we should calmly and dispassionately look at this matter squarely from both sides, and if we do, we can easily settle it, as there is an overwhelming majority on both sides who want to be right. The great misfortune is, Utah underestimates the needs of Salt Lake, and Salt Lake underestimates the injury to Utah, and we all need to learn more facts, before taking any hasty action.

Very respectfully,

JOHN B. MILNER,

Chairman Utah Lake and Jordan Dam Commission.

A REVIEW OF THAT "FINAL REPLY."

By request of R. G. McNiece, we give him space once more to defend himself from himself. His letter will be found in another column. It will be observed that he now assumes an attitude of injured innocence and complains of our "abuse and misrepresentation," while everything we have said in regard to him was in reply to his wilful falsehoods about the "Mormons" and his malicious endeavors to do them all the injury in his power. And there is this wide difference between our course and his: We have quoted his exact language; he garbles and misquotes ours. We tell him plainly what we think of him and his course; he pretends friendship for the "Mormons" and at the same time tries to bring upon them the wrath of the public and the extreme form of political punishment. His attempt to pose as the goodnatured, mild-mannered and soft-spoken sucking dove would be laughable if it were not so disgusting in its velvet-lipped hypocrisy.

For a long time Mr. McNiece has hurled the fiercest invectives against the "Mormons," and particularly their leaders, both by tongue and pen, and has aided and abetted, in his small and feeble way, every scheme devised by their enemies for their destruction. We have met his abuse with the silence that comes from contempt. But in his answer to six questions from Joseph Cook, of Boston, he made, in a widely-circulated religious journal, statements so foul and false in support of arguments for the political

destruction of the "Mormons," that we thought proper to denounce him and refute them. He wrote a response containing a covert personal threat, which he did not seem to expect to see published, and by particularizing the charges which he only made general in the Independent, gave us the opportunity of disproving them by evidence that could not be overturned. The description of his character does not appear to please him. We did not intend it for his delectation. But the words of which he complains are weak in comparison to his own epithets continually applied to men whose shoes he is not worthy to clean.

He now wants "the main question at issue kept clearly in view." But instead of stating it fairly he narrows it down to an incomplete explanation of but one item in his dastardly article in the Independent, and then imputes to us a reply which we never uttered. It is vain to look for anything straightforward in R. G. McNiece. The "main question at issue" is not the alleged stoning and firing of Presbyterian buildings in Utah, but the destruction of every remnant of popular government in this Territory, and the forfeiture of all "Mormon" political and property rights. These are what he advocated in the Independent. And in justification of this wholesale punishment of a community whose great crime is that they are unorthodox, he told the story that we subsequently nailed and clinched as a LIE. The affidavits we produced not only proved the falsity of his assertion, but the Satanic corruption of a heart that turned the efforts of "Mormons" to save Presbyterian property, into the "repeated firing of churches and schoolhouses" by the very hands stretched out in friendship and salvation.

The facts elicited show that in only one building belonging to the Presbyterians in Utah—that at Juab—a conflagration actually occurred; that it was clearly the result of accident and that it was extinguished by "Mormon" promptness and exertions. There has been no other. The Logan incident was not a fire. A drunken "Gentile" made a paltry attempt which was abortive; the building was not fired at all. Yet this man McNiece still attempts to justify himself in proclaiming to the world the unfriendliness of the "Mormons" for political freedom, evidenced by the danger to life and property in Utah from the "diabolical spirit of the Priesthood," and "Presbyterian churches and meeting houses being repeatedly set on fire"! And also in stating that "the only protection to life and property to Americans here which they can rely on, grows out of the fact that the Governor and Secretary, and higher judges are Americans" this term "Americans" being used by him in contradistinction to "Mormons."

In the array of facts which we produced to rebut his false assertions, he pretends to discover that we have "given our case away." Let us see. He charged:

"With a brave and efficient Governor and with American courts, we have not been able in the rural towns to prevent the midnight stoning of the windows in the houses occupied by our teachers and ministers. Life has been thus endangered again and again. Our school-houses and churches have been repeatedly injured and set on fire. What would we do if the Governor and Judges were Mormons, under the control of the priesthood, as they would be if Utah were a State?"

When the falsity of this whole paragraph was demonstrated, he cited two cases of firing buildings and two of midnight stoning. They were all mere assertions, but stated as facts well known in the places where they occurred. We, in rebuttal, proved the falsity of the Logan and Nephi "firing of buildings," and also of the alleged "midnight stoning" at Brigham City and Spanish Fork. A boy interrupted the Presbyterian meeting at Brigham City by holding on to the door, and a "Mormon" justice fined him \$20. The Spanish Fork affair turned out to be a myth. We produced affidavits that cannot be impeached, he simply repeated stories without any proof whatever. And it appears also from the affidavits that buildings alleged to have suffered from midnight stoning were not Presbyterian property but "Mormon" property. Our proofs demonstrated beyond the possibility of disproof that the accusations made in the paragraph quoted above from Mr. McNiece's article in the Independent are totally and maliciously false. And this is what the Presbyterian pastor calls "giving our case away." And he wants to know if he has not as much right to accuse us of hypocrisy and lying as we have to accuse him, when we "profess to believe that the 'Mormons' had nothing to do with these acts of lawlessness." Why, this is not a matter of belief. We have completely disproved his false assertions. There is no "professing" about it. There is no room left for doubt. We do not think for a moment that he believes his own statement.

We accuse him of lying when he states that Presbyterian life and property are in danger here from the "Mormons." He cannot produce a single instance of such danger. He knows that he and others of his tribe have assailed the "Mormon" leaders here with vile and villainous accusations and have never been interfered with for a moment. And the instances which he in a pettyfogging manner and without a solitary scrap of proof pretended to cite in support of his

falsehoods in the Independent, turn out to be baseless, and become strong evidence against his side of the question. We accuse him of hypocrisy in pretending to believe that which he knows to be false, and in professing friendship to the "Mormons" while he is trying to injure them by every means in his power. We accuse him of hypocrisy in assuming that alleged acts of lawlessness, of which there is no proof whatever advanced, are the "natural fruit of the vindictive teachings and example" of "prominent members of the Priesthood." He cannot produce a sentence nor cite an act of those "prominent members" to justify his calumny. He has no reason for his malicious and canting hypocrisy.

On the other hand, he knows that the teachings and example of the leading members of the Priesthood have been in favor of the utmost toleration and non-interference with sectarian preachers and teachers. There are no other terms but liar and hypocrite that will apply to a man like McNiece, who, with the plainest proofs before his eyes and in his own experience for seven years, that the "Mormon" leaders accord to all sects the utmost freedom of belief, speech and action, and aid in promoting this as a universal right, will yet, in order to justify his own attempt to deprive those leaders of political and property rights, pretend to believe that they by "teaching and example" uphold the outrages which he has assumed to have occurred in some distant villages, and some of which never had an existence.

Hear this canting plotter against the liberties of the "Mormons," and then say if he is not a hypocrite:

"I have towards them feelings of the utmost kindness and good will. I think the majority of them honest, kind-hearted and hospitable."

That is from his letter that appears to-day. Now let us quote from his article in the Independent.

"For my part, although thoroughly disgusted with the superficial and trivial legislation for Utah heretofore, and in favor of radical measures, yet I do not wish to see Congress adopt any measures which cannot be defended on a basis of justice, and I would not know how to defend this measure proposed by Senator Hoar, unless he puts it upon the ground that the Mormon people, by continued hostility to the Government, have forfeited all political rights of every kind, the right of property included."

"As to legal measures, I think all agree that radical legislation is the only kind worth attempting. And while a very few are doubtful, I think nine out of ten who have really studied the subject agree that the most efficient and satisfactory measure yet proposed for the speedy settlement of the whole Mormon question is the one recently introduced into the Senate by Senator Cullom, of Illinois. It is concise, simple, and comprehensive. It provides for a Legislative Council of nine men, appointed by the President."

A nice friend to the "honest, kind-hearted and hospitable 'Mormon' people," is he not? He can find a reason for the confiscation of their Church property and the robbery, contemplated in the Hoar bill and also in the Cullom bill, on the ground that they have "forfeited all political rights of every kind, the right of property included." These "kind-hearted and hospitable Mormons" are the very people he has been accusing of being a standing threat to life and property. He says it is in the "rural towns" that are "entirely Mormon" that danger to life and property is apprehended. And he shows his friendship for them by trying to aid in depriving them of every political right, "including the right of property." He would rescue them from an imaginary bondage to the priesthood, of which, by the by, they are perfectly unconscious, and put them and their lives and property under the control of nine persons utterly irresponsible to them for any official act. This he calls "establishing republican government" in Utah.

As to our work among the "Mormon" people, they know that we have labored from boyhood to break down the chains of "priestly despotism" and make men and women truly free. He is a representative of a bogus priesthood whose power for centuries has been exercised to keep the human mind in thralldom to dogmas of men's invention. "Mormonism," which we proclaim and advocate, is the foe to every kind of despotism, and those who live in the spirit of it are the freest people that breathe the atmosphere of this lower world. It interferes with no human rights. It is the friend of constitutional government. It will secure to us unprincipled an enemy and slanderer as R. G. McNiece every right, civil, social, political and religious as far as it has the power. And its priesthood are the friends of all humanity but foes to all kinds of bondage, falsehood and hypocrisy.

Mr. McNiece's attempt to make the priesthood responsible for our exposure of his villainy, and for the taxes which he pays, is worthy of the author of the article in the Independent. We alone are responsible for our utterances. We are ready to meet that responsibility in any way he pleases. The priesthood have nothing whatever to do with the taxes. He says he pays taxes without representation. He knows that he lies. He has the same vote and voice as any other citizen. If the clique that he trains with and whose villainous schemes he endorses have not votes enough to gain contro