

tillers of the soil and raisers of stock. That the co-operation of the "Mormons" is merely union of interests, labor and capital, for mutual benefit and the distribution of wealth, and that it can in no wise be injurious to other people. That no considerable number of their co-religionists are swelling the number of "Mormons" in Canada.

Such an investigation as will reach the facts ought to be ordered. And meanwhile the Canadian authorities ought to prevent any such lawlessness as certain designing persons seem determined, if possible, to provoke. While the "Mormons" obey the laws they should be protected by the laws. And we are confident that proper official inquiry will demonstrate the fact, that there is not the slightest ground for any alarm among the Canadian people, and that the "Mormon" settlers are to be classed with the best citizens that dwell within the boundaries of the Dominion.

NO "BLIGHT" ABOUT IT.

THE New York *Mail and Express*, the editor of which is a religious fanatic, commenting upon the furore which some excited people are trying to raise over the "Mormon" colony in Canada, says: "Mormonism blights whatever it touches."

Now, does the pious *Mail and Express* man really believe that? If so, he must be too densely ignorant of the history of the times to figure as a public journalist. It is well known that wherever "Mormonism" has held sway, if for ever so brief a period, improvement, development, progress have marked its presence. In Missouri, in Illinois, in Utah, its influence has been to build up, to cause the wilderness and the solitary place to be glad, the desert to blossom like the rose, and quickened nature to rejoice and praise the Great Creator while it yields its treasures unto man.

What has "Mormonism" blighted? What has it not vivified and made to bud and teem with beauty that it has touched with its magnetic hand? It awakens faith, it quickens energy, it promotes industry, union, persistence and brotherhood. It utilizes, beautifies, adorns and glorifies whatever it enters and controls. It is a living force which various powers have tried to blight but could not. And it has outlived and will triumph over every element and person that seeks its destruction.

The editor of the *Wail and Distress* couldn't tell for the life of him what "Mormonism" is. He is wildly shrieking against a figment of his own imagination, running a tilt against a windmill of his own disordered and sectarian mind. If

he would heed the Bible texts with which he heads his columns while the body of the paper is a standing contradiction to those scriptural precepts, he would hear a matter before he decides it, he would examine both sides of the "Mormon" controversy before he condemns "Mormonism," and he would exercise a little more charity and Christian truth. And before he says more about blighting, he should at least learn from current events what "Mormonism" has done towards the growth, progress and grandeur of the nation, and the opening up and development of the once unknown vales of the Rocky Mountains.

THE BULLISS CASE.

The following special is from the *Herald*. Marshal Parsons was asked today about the reference to Utah Territory, and he says that Turner has no authority to act as an officer, and the Territory is in no way responsible for his actions. He applied for means to bring Bulliss here, but the marshal refused, as he saw no reason to advance it.

Washington, Aug. 19.—This morning at 10 o'clock, contrary to the expectations of those connected with the case, Robert G. Bulliss appeared in chambers before Judge Bradley in answer to the habeas corpus sued out before Justice Bingham. Hugh Turner of Salt Lake and his man Friday, who have been attempting to discover Bulliss' hiding place since his escape at Dockville, heard last night that Bulliss would present himself at the city hall this morning and declared that they would mob him before he got there. At an early hour this morning they had all the approaches to the court guarded but Bulliss and his attorney, Mr. Barker, ran the gauntlet. After getting to Justice Bradley's door Turner made an attempt to take the man but did not succeed. He had received advice from his counsel, Mr. Maurice S. Smith. That if he secured Bulliss on the street he could hold him. At 10:30 o'clock Judge Bradley took up the arguments upon the habeas corpus. He stated that so far as the sufficiency of the papers was concerned, they had already been passed upon by Justice Bingham, but he would listen to arguments upon the facts set forth in the affidavit filed with the habeas corpus.

Mr. Barker took up the arguments and forcibly presented the facts which have heretofore been quite fully given in these dispatches in regard to the conduct of Mr. Turner since taking Bulliss into custody. He also demonstrated that there was a conspiracy existing between Hugh Turner and Messrs. Francis and Holliday, of Salt Lake, who entered into a co-partnership with Bulliss in his chemical motor. They were all anxious to have him back in Utah and would resort to any desperate means to get him back and Mr. Barker laid considerable stress upon the point that after the case against

Bulliss had been dismissed by Judge Hills, Turner had openly threatened to see that Bulliss, after once in Utah, would not see his eastern friends again. The process of habeas corpus had been properly issued, served and a return made. And this had been ignored by Hugh Turner. Mr. Barker held further that he had a perfect right to serve the papers himself, as he had first thoroughly well satisfied himself on this point legally.

Mr. T. Maurice Smith, in opening in behalf of Mr. Turner, said there was not much use in wasting time on the matter, as the habeas corpus was not, under the statute, in proper form, in so much as it had not been served by the United States marshal, but by Mr. Barker, Bulliss' attorney.

Judge Bradley here interrupted and stated that he did think this was necessary; there was a rule which required service to be made by a United States marshal, but the law did not so consider. So far as the writ was concerned, he held that it had been properly returned. Mr. Turner had deliberately ignored the dignity of the writ issued by Justice Bingham directing that he be immediately taken to Utah as required by the requisition papers. Mr. Turner had no right to take possession of and hold the prisoner in custody. From the representations made Mr. Turner was not exactly the proper agent to have the custody of the prisoner. He has no right to impose in this manner on the rights of any American citizen; it was a gross outrage whether it was the want of money or not. In cases of this description any State or Territory like Utah ought to be presupplied with funds to carry them out.

The arguments then turned on what disposition should be made of the prisoner. Mr. Barker asked that Bulliss be not turned over to the custody of Turner. "Can he give bail?" asked the judge. "No, sir," replied Mr. Barker. "I will be here, your honor," said Bulliss. Mr. Smith asked for three days in which to allow Mr. Turner to make his return of the habeas corpus. "That is the usual time," replied the judge, "and in the meantime Mr. Bulliss can be on his personal bond." Mr. Barker volunteered that his client would certainly be here, for last night he reached Baltimore on his way to New York and had returned on receiving his telegram. "Can't I have an officer to protect me from this man Turner?" asked Bulliss. "We will see that he does not interfere with you," replied Mr. Smith. Bulliss walked out of the court room with his attorney and passed directly by Mr. Turner, standing on the steps of the City Hall. The latter did not show up in the court room.

Some interesting developments will be brought out at the hearing on Friday. Turner's treatment of Bulliss is simply infamous. The general impression is that his deportment is that of a ruffian and his conduct is a shame and a reproach to the name of the Territory of Utah.