

plish this uniformly and perfectly but the hair. The custom of shingling off the hair from the back of the neck is unphysiological, and it should in both sexes be allowed to fall low enough to cover the nape, or meet the usual dress."

SKIRTS.

"Dress reformers attacked the length of the skirt. Among the art-features of the stage, none is so beautiful as the train. The artist is delighted to introduce it in his pictures of woman. I wish it could be made common on all dress occasions. For the drawing-room it is superb.

For dry streets and social calls skirts which nearly touch the ground, seem to me in good taste; but for wet, snowy or muddy streets, for the active duties of housekeeping, with its stairs, for mountain trips, etc., the skirt should fall just below the knee, certainly not lower than the ankle. If Miss Fastidious suggests that such a costume would expose the legs, you have but to point to the street exhibitions in wet weather. The attempt to lift long skirts out of the mud displays the lower extremities much more than the short skirts would. Nothing is more pitiable than this street exhibition, except, perhaps, a woman's attempt to go up stairs with a candle in one hand, a baby in the other, a bowl of catnip-tea in the other, and a mass of long skirts in the other."

Nearly all the foregoing items are taken from Dr. Dio Lewis' writings.

25 tracts on Health topics, for 10 cts. Books about "Tobacco," "Strong Drinks," "Tea and Coffee," for 25 cts. each. Mailed by D. M. McAlister, 66 Centre Street, Salt Lake City.

OGDEN DEPARTMENT.

TRIAL OF LORIN FARR.

The Court met Tuesday morning at 9:30. Mark Lindsay was arraigned on a three count indictment charging him with violating the Edmunds law, in associating himself with Emma Munn as an alleged plural wife, his "legal wife" being yet living, and not divorced. He demanded a copy of the indictment, which was given him, and he took the statutory time to plead.

The following jurors were then sworn to try the case of the

UNITED STATES VS. LORIN FARR,

indicted under the 3rd section of the Edmunds law relating to bigamy and polygamy; the charge against Mr. Farr is unlawful cohabitation:

John Standing, Mark Fletcher, John Allen, Jesse Vanderhoof, Thos. O'Connor, Wm. Benton, Temple Short, C. A. Eklund, Wm. Studer, John Jay, Jos. Wood, Jonathan Pallam.

Mr. Bierbower stated the case to the jury, in which he said there were five counts in the indictment, that is, he said there was one count for each wife, as the defendant is said to have held them all out to the world as his wives. The attorney said, however, that the first count might possibly be thrown out as there seems to be an error in the time. The error was an oversight in Mr. Hiles in drawing up the indictment.

Mr. J. N. Kimball, for the defense, moved the court to throw out the first count. His Honor took it under advisement. Counsel then moved that as there is only one punishment provided for the crime of unlawful cohabitation that the prosecution elect which count they will proceed with, and thus all, except that one, be thrown out, so as to prevent "segregation." After some discussion the motion was overruled, and the trial was proceeded with. The court and counsel considered this a very important case, and all the witnesses, except the one on the stand, were excluded from the court room.

The counsel for the defense were Jas. N. Kimball, Esq., and Hous. P. H. Emerson and S. R. Thurman. The latter gentleman volunteered his services.

THE FIRST WITNESS

sworn was Nancy C. Farr. She being the legal wife, the defense objected to her being sworn, but it was overruled. She said she was married to the defendant January 1st, 1845, and that her husband had not been previously married. That was all.

Ann Jones Farr was the next witness. She knew defendant and was married to him 35 years ago; he was married to Nancy C. Farr previous to his marriage to witness, at least she supposed he was, but could not say of her own knowledge. Mary Bingham and Nicholine Farr were reported to be his wives also. She understood they were all married to him at Salt Lake City, but could not tell when. Defendant had provided for her support, but they had not lived together as husband and wife for a long time past, but there had been no divorce between them. A great deal of time was here taken up in discussions by the prosecution propounding numerous apparently irrelevant questions, as to time of living together, etc., and the defense interposing objections.

Witness had seven children by defendant, the oldest of which was 33 and the youngest nearly 21 years of age. She now resided on a farm about two miles from this city. She knew nothing

Mr. Farr lived with his wives prior to 1880. They each had children. Witness had seven, Nancy C. 11, Sarah mine, Mary 3, Nicholine 6; making 36 in all. They all lived near to each other by the old homestead. Nancy still lives there, but the others live at different distances, and

SEPARATELY FROM EACH OTHER.

Defendant had visited the farm where witness lives several times on business since the 24th of June last, but did not stay but a short time; has never remained there over night. Sometimes when about meal hour, if he was there, the boys would invite him to go into the house and eat with them. Sometimes he complied. Counsel asked witness if she recognized the defendant as her husband now.

Defense objected and was sustained by the court. Witness said the youngest child of defendant was about 18 years old. It was the daughter of Nicholine. Mr. Farr addresses witness by her given name, and not as Mrs. Farr. They never go out together, nor do they meet each other at any given place. In 1883 she went east to visit some of her friends. Mr. Farr also went on the same train to visit some of his friends and on business. His daughter was with her at the time. She stayed with her friends and defendant stayed with his. She was gone about five weeks.

Mr. Kimball moved to strike out the statement in relation to this visit on the ground that it was over three years ago. Overruled.

Her friends, the witness said lived in Connecticut, and defendant's friends lived in Vermont. She paid her own expenses on the trip, and on arriving at her destination Mr. Farr and daughter left her and went forward to his destination. He did not visit her friends during their absence.

On cross-examination she said for a number of years she had maintained her own household, and her boys worked for defendant; just previous to the passage of the Edmunds law, the defendant told her they would, in the event of its passage, have to alter their mode of living—and that it must be in consonance with that law, and that they agreed to do so. In fact, the witness and defendant had

CEASED TO LIVE TOGETHER

as husband and wife for some years previous to the passage of the law. Witness further stated that Mr. Farr is reputed to have lived exclusively with the first or legal wife as such, since the passage of the Edmunds law till the present time.

This witness was kept on the stand all morning and underwent a searching examination by the prosecution, but her first statements were not shaken. She said her claim to be a wife of Mr. Farr is founded on the fact that she was married to him many years ago, and she supposed the claims of the other ladies are similarly founded. He has never repudiated witness as his wife, but at the time of the passage of the Edmunds law he arranged to not live with her in the future as his wife, and with none others except the first or legal wife. The examination continued till 12:40 p. m. when recess was taken until 2 o'clock.

At the hour appointed court was again opened and the grand jury filed into court, and through their foreman presented several indictments which, however, did not reach the reporters. The inquisitors then returned to their quarters and the petit jury again took their seats.

OTHER MATTERS.

Robert Stenett, after being put through a catechism and answering satisfactorily, and promising without any "secret reservation" to obey all the laws, and, if necessary, to fight for his new country, was made a full fledged citizen of the United States.

Timothy Parkinson, who had been convicted on his own confession of unlawful cohabitation, was called on to "stand up." In reply to the questions of the Court he said he had no promises to make for the future. He was sentenced to six months in the penitentiary, and pay a fine of one hundred dollars, and stand committed until the fine is paid.

THE FARR TRIAL

was then proceeded with. Nicholine Erickson Farr was called to the witness stand. She said she was married to defendant at Salt Lake City in 1857. Prior to 1880 she lived where she does now, in Ogden City, and Mr. Farr lived at the old homestead. Some five or six years ago the relations of husband and wife ceased between herself and defendant, but they had never been divorced—when they were married in 1857 it was forever. Her youngest child is 18 years of age. Defendant had not lived under the same roof with witness for about 6 years, although he has sometimes called to see the children, and to see their son on business. They are on friendly terms and he helps to provide for her children, but he never makes a special visit to see witness. When they meet she treats him as a friend. He had not made her a visit in 1884. Her son's name is Elijah, and he has charge of a store in this city, which belongs to defendant, and when he called at her house it was to see Elijah and give him instructions relative to the conduct of the business.

On cross-examination she said prior to the passage of the Edmunds law defendant frequently occupied a room in her house and slept there. But at and since its passage they each consented to

CEASE TO LIVE TOGETHER

as husband and wife, and they have kept their agreement ever since that time. The reputation has been and is that a similar agreement has been made and kept with his other alleged plural wives. Further direct examination elicited nothing materially new.

Mrs. Nora Pardoe was the next witness. Her husband's name is Thomas Pardoe. They live at Salt Lake City. Defendant is her father and Sarah Farr is her mother. She has been married over three years ago. Thought she had seen her father at the house of her mother during 1884, but was not sure. If she did, she could not say what part of the year it was. She was not sure that she saw him there at all during that year. She supposed that her mother was defendant's wife—it was so reputed in 1884. He dropped into the house of witness prior to June, 1886. Witness has lived in Salt Lake City five months or more. Her mother has for a considerable time lived with her and with some of her other children. Witness is 20 years of age and proved herself a lively, bright and intelligent witness. She made her statements with much simplicity and clearness and seemed quite an enigma for the prosecuting and defending lawyers to solve. She did not know who provides mainly for the support of her mother. Could not say defendant did.

J. P. Emmertson was the next to occupy the witness stand. He has known the defendant for about four years. He came to live in this city in 1882. Since that time he had had various business relations with him; had sometimes done carpenter work for him. He knew Amy Farr. His wife had at some time done some washing for her. Witness called at her house some time in the latter part of 1884 or 1885 to fetch his wife, and for some clothes to wash. He saw defendant at the house; he came in while witness was there, put on a coat and went out again; he knew Nicholine Farr; had seen the defendant at her house a great many times, but could not tell dates. Saw him go there a number of times this year—it was before the 24th of June last. He took particular notice of the fact of defendant going into Nicholine's house by reading the newspaper of some persons being sent to the penitentiary from Idaho, for the offense of cohabitation. This was before the 24th of June. Witness said he is a member of the "Mormon" Church. He was asked if he had ever been threatened

WITH VIOLENCE

by any of the officers of the Church if he should testify in this case.

The question was objected to by the defense, and the objection was sustained.

On cross-examination he said the houses in which Ann Farr and Nicholine Farr lived are joined together. He is not familiar with the interior arrangements of either house. He also said he only saw defendant in the house of Ann once. His statements were "muchly mixed" and it was hard to understand the meaning he intended to convey to the jury or the reporters. All seemed puzzled by him.

At the time of mailing this—5 p. m. the trial was still in progress.

MINOR MENTION.

THE STORM continued nearly all of Tuesday. Travel is very difficult in consequence of the snow fall, and there are not many people in from the country.

THE TRAINS from the several points arrive here very irregularly lately, being detained by the weather. The Central Pacific was one hour and twenty minutes late. The D. & R. G. waited for it.

A LARGE number of turkeys, geese, ducks and other poultry are being disposed of at the various marts in this city for the holidays which are at hand.

THANKSGIVING will be generally observed and religious services will be held in the several places of worship in the morning, and at night there will be amusements of different kinds including dancing, etc.

THE ROCKAWAY HOME will provide a sumptuous supper for the Pleasant Home Club on Thursday night, when it is expected an immense shoal of oysters will be entombed in the chests of the epicures.

THE UNITED STATES COURT room was crowded all day to-day with persons anxious to witness the trial of Hon. Lorin Farr, which excites much interest and is likely to be of several days' continuation.

A LARGE number of potatoes remain in the ground and will in all probability lay there and rot, as the owners were unable to take them up before the storms came on. One man had about three hundred bushels under. Some others will in all probability lose considerable tubers in consequence of the early storms.

THE PRICE of grain has lately advanced a little—that is, five cents on the bushel. It is now sixty cents, and may still go up if the farmers are the "children of light" and are wise in their day.

THE SAN FRANCISCO Customs officers to-day seized \$35,000 worth of opium at the residence of Charles R. Bronson at Alameda. It is believed the drug was brought from China to this city on the steamer City of Sydney and removed to Alameda to facilitate its disposal.

THE INDUSTRIAL HOME.

A VIGOROUS WRITER MAKES IT BETTER KNOWN.

AMANDA, West Virginia,
November 8, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

The devil does not always show an iron fist: sometimes he holds out a velvet glove. The Latter-day Saints must learn not only to bid defiance to the former, but to detect the hand giving shape to the latter.

In a letter to the News of the 15th ult., descriptive of the aim and object of the proposed Industrial Home, there are certain suspicious forms and lineaments partly hidden under such a glove, which we wish to make bare. This we undertake for the same purpose that actuated the writer of that letter, viz.: to bring the Home

OUT OF THE SHADOW

"of being unknown, or what is worse, being misknown," though we shall probably come to different conclusions.

For instance, here is the glove: "In the outset, such industries will be started as will enable people to enter the home with perfect self respect."

Here is the hand beneath:

Section 221. "To aid in the establishment of an Industrial Home in the Territory of Utah, to provide employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who renounce polygamy * * * and to aid in the suppression of polygamy therein, forty thousand dollars."

Here is the glove again:

"I am the more willing to do this work because of the oath of obedience to the law does not enter into the question of belief, but practice."

But here is the hand:

" * * * Said sum to be expended upon the requisition of and under the management of a Board of Control to consist of the Governor and Justices of the Supreme Court and the District Attorney of said Territory."

"It is something to emancipate a soul from civil bondage. It is more to emancipate a soul from the deathless bondage of a false faith."—Mrs. Angie F. Newman.

Is it possible that among the Latter-day Saints are women so blind as not to see the

BARB BENEATH THE BAIT

in the foregoing? Suppose this immaculate Board of Control should even formulate an oath of renunciation not trenching upon belief—which, in view of their record in the courts, would require the charity that believeth all things—what will be the character of the influence to be brought to bear upon them when once they are safely within this so-called Home?

Mrs. Newman foreshadows not only the nature of this influence, but the spirit in which it will be used, viz.: "to emancipate their souls from the deathless bondage of a false faith."

Can any Latter-day Saint who has made sacred covenants with God enter such a Home (?) with perfect self-respect?

"Come into my parlor,"

Said the spider to the fly."

The glove:
"Having lived here for many years and been intimately associated with my father [Judge Z. Snow we infer] during his official career, I have a profound knowledge of the economic condition of the Territory."

The hand:

But I am not alone in this noble work of regeneration. Behind me are the whole host of Federal officials, who have been most falsely accused of hounding for the spoils of the Territory, the Tribune ring, those spotless champions of pure morals, and the anti-"Mormon" female blather-skites, all of whom unitedly sustain me in seeking to raise my fallen sisters to the comforts of a Christian home. Besides, have I not been commissioned by the honorable Board of Control? Surely no one can doubt the uprightness nor impartiality of the Federal Judges and the affability and gentlemanly character of the District Attorney. Some have even thought that, on account of my influence, these people were using me as a cat's paw; but to dispel such an erroneous view, let me ask, where is the woman, seeking the elevation of her sex, that would not unite, for so laudable a purpose, with men and women whose sympathies and interests are so ostensibly enlisted in the welfare of the "Mormon" people?

Without calling in question the sincerity of Miss Snow's desire to do good and alleviate distress, we take the liberty of

POINTING OUT

some ill-concealed anti-"Mormon" sentiments with which we think her zeal imbued.

"I heartily endorse the sentiment I find rapidly growing, that a man's duty to those whose lives are dependent upon him for protection and support, requires 'that he should order his life so as to be able to secure the only condition upon which that freedom depends.'"

Now, what does this mean? Whatever may appear as surface dressing, this is the bone and sinew of it: Miss Snow heartily endorses the sentiment that it is a man's duty so to order his life as to secure his freedom. In other words, promise to obey the law, "As construed by the courts," which means that he must not only renounce sacred

covenants of time and eternity, made before God, but he must publicly repudiate—treat as a contaminating leprosy—part of his family; in short, buy a few years of conscience-stricken freedom, at the price of eternity; for does any one dream that the devil, his oppressor, will let his bones rest short of such a sacrifice?

This is how the lady desires her sisters to meet their husbands halfway in renouncing their religion at the

DICTATES OF SATAN:

"I also believe in the true, loving, womanly hearts of 'Mormon' women, and that when they once fully realize the gravity of the situation, they will be able to rise to the heroism of helping their husbands to do their duty to their families and arrange their family in obedience to that law from which there is no appeal, as the court of last resort under our government has decided it to be constitutional."

"They will be able to rise" from the low, groveling pastures where "Mormonism" herds them—"to the heroism"—save the mark!—"of helping their husbands to arrange their families in obedience to that law from which there is no appeal!" Alas! how are the jewels of our language stolen to adorn infamy! Whatever Miss Snow may know of the economic condition of the Territory it is evident she knows nothing of the moral courage and exalted heroism uniformly displayed by Zion's mothers and daughters, when she appeals to them to rise to the condition of mistresses, and then as wards of a so-called Home, which receives them as the slaves of a false faith. As well bid Nebo rise to the level of the plateau upon which it stands. Then follows this

PARADOXICAL CONCLUSION:

"So far from thinking lightly of the tie which binds families together, I believe it is to that love which women will appear [in their desire to have their husbands do their 'duty' i. e. renounce polygamy] and ask to be cherished and protected as he has sworn to do," substitute "cast off and repudiated, for cherished and protected," and we shall have the legitimate and inevitable consequence of her own argument.

It is, however, rather an anomaly to see one so well versed in the economics of the Territory exerting herself to persuade "Mormon" women to avail themselves of governmental pecuniary aid at the sacrifice of a vital principle of their religion. She must certainly know that it is a cardinal virtue of "Mormonism" to alleviate distress and supply the wants of the needy, wherever found in their midst. In view of this fact, with which she must be perfectly familiar, her conduct is rather inexplicable.

The fact is "Mormons" have no more need of this Industrial Home with the mission assigned to it, than they have of the Edmunds law. Both are equally reprehensible: one is the iron fist, the other the velvet glove, but both are the limbs of the adversary of truth.

The Home may now rest under the shadow of being unknown or misknown, but it gains nothing by being better known. Latter-day Saints should hold their noses when they pass it by, for these reasons:

First. It was conceived in falsehood.

Second. It was born of prejudice.

Third. It is being reared and fondled by their bitterest enemies.

Fourth. The devil's benediction rests upon it.

N. L. N.

SUMMONS.

In the Probate Court, in and for Salt Lake County, Utah Territory.

Harriet Lee, Plaintiff,

vs.
James Lee, Defendant.

The People of the Territory of Utah send Greeting:

To James Lee, Defendant.

YOU ARE HEREBY REQUIRED TO appear in an action brought against you by the above-named plaintiff, in the Probate Court of the county of Salt Lake, Territory of Utah, and to answer the complaint filed therein within ten days (exclusive of the day of service) after the service on you of summons—if served within this county; or, if served out of this county, but in this district, within twenty days; otherwise within forty days.

The said action is brought to obtain a decree from this court dissolving the marriage contract existing between said plaintiff and you, on the ground of failure of defendant to provide plaintiff with the common necessities of life and desertion since March, A. D. 1882.

And you are hereby notified that if you fail to appear and answer the said complaint as above required, the said plaintiff will apply to this court for the relief prayed for and cost of suit.

Witness, the Hon. Elias A. Smith, Judge, and the Seal of the Probate Court of Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah, this 2nd day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six.

JOHN O. CUTLER, Clerk.

w5w

CONSUMPTION.

I have a positive remedy for the above disease, by its use thousands of cases of the worst kind and of long standing have been cured. Indeed, so strong is my faith in its efficacy, that I will send TWO BOTTLES FREE, together with a VALUABLE TREATISE on this disease, to any sufferer. Give Express and P. O. address.

DR. T. A. BLOOM, 161 Pearl St., New York.