

EDITORIALS.

WHY McMURRIN WAS REMOVED.

The disappearance of young McMurrin, as we expected, has caused a great many surmises and considerable discussion. But the general opinion appears to be that he has done a wise thing in heeding the advice of his personal friends. Our observation of the matter was taken with a view to the public good. We thought more of the community than of the individual. We still take the same position. But there is a great deal to be said in support of the side his friends have taken on this question.

It is very evident that the intention was and is, if possible, to make McMurrin bear the brunt of the legal consequences of that encounter in the dark alley which resulted in his being shot nearly to death. The protection, encouragement and applause accorded to Collin for shooting him down, and the stories set on foot to prejudice the public against him, indicate beyond question the purpose to acquit Collin of crime and fasten the blame upon his victim.

How much chance has McMurrin at present for a fair investigation and adjudication of the case? The lessons of the past year are not calculated to give any "Mormon" accused of an offense against the law an assurance of anything but conviction, no matter what the evidence. When grand jurors are discharged, and their places filled with more pliant persons, because they will not indict to order. When trial juries are carefully picked from one class of the community and with a view to the exclusion of all who are of the same class as the accused. When the strongest evidence for the defense is ignored or abused and the flimsiest testimony for the prosecution is counted as sufficient to convict. When the anti-"Mormon" animus of every official connected with the courts is so palpably exhibited, and verdicts can be predicted with unerring certainty before any evidence is adduced if the creed of the defendant is known, what encouragement has an accused "Mormon" to submit himself to the tender mercies of the law? And who can blame him severely if he avoids legal jeopardy while it is within his power to do so?

Notwithstanding the dangerous condition of young McMurrin, as certified to by the surgeon and testified to by his friends, there appears to have been a determination to bring him out of his sick room by legal process and force the issue contemplated, before he was in fit condition to meet it. All the agencies to make him the offender in place of the creature who shot him twice through the bowels, were in the hands of those who have manifested a disposition to do so.

His friends thought the risk of removing him from his home to a quiet retreat until convalescence, was less than the danger of repeated intrusions of deputy marshals with the probabilities already described. They considered that whatever might be the effect of this course on the community, the community could take care of itself, and would not be in the position of danger to which the individual was exposed. So they urged his removal and he reluctantly consented.

We hope he will be able to remain in privacy, undisturbed, until he is physically able to meet the issue squarely, with some probability of a fair and full investigation. In this desire we believe we shall be joined by nine-tenths of the people of this Territory.

MINERAL OUTPUT FOR THE YEAR.

The mineral output of Utah for the year 1885 was encouraging to those engaged in that branch of human industry that goes by the name of mining. The chief profits are reaped of course by the capitalist and speculator. But the laborer gets a share of the benefits, and the producer of food to sustain the workmen, and the merchant who furnishes the various needed supplies, each obtains no small part of the profits which accrue from successful mining enterprise.

According to the carefully prepared report of Wells, Fargo & Co., of whose business in this city Mr. J. E. Dooly is the efficient manager, the total output for the year was, 54,318,776 lbs. of refined lead, at an export value of \$1,222,172.46; fine silver 5,972,689 ozs., export value \$6,211,596.56; fine gold 8,903 ozs., export value \$178,060.00; total value \$7,611,829.02. Taking the mint valuation of the precious metals, and others at their seaboard value, the total value of the product for 1885 will reach \$10,078,865.65. This is an increase over previous years and shows that the reputation of Utah as a mining region is not ill-founded.

The capabilities of this Territory have only commenced to be understood, and there are resources in these grand old mountains yet to be developed of which the world has not dreamed. Not only in the metals called precious will Utah yet be found to excel, but in mineral wealth of great

value to commerce and manufactures of such richness and diversity that the world will wonder at their vastness and variety. The developments of the near future will show that the resources of Utah like her people, though widely talked about, have been little comprehended.

HOW "MORMONISM" IS "TREMBLING."

The Cincinnati Times-Star of December 24th, says:

"A dispatch from Salt Lake to-day brings the information that Mormonism trembles on the verge of a bottomless pit. The Saints realize the situation and are in despair."

Dispatches from Salt Lake to the eastern press are about as reliable as "news" clipped from "Gulliver's Travels." If the Times-Star editor had been in this city on Christmas eve when that dispatch was sent, he would have thought the only "despair" the "Mormons" were in was how to get home with all the goodies with which they were loaded down for Christmas. And if there was any "trembling" in Mormonism it was with joyful anticipation "on the verge" of as prosperous and pleasant a Christmas day as was ever spent in the old world or the new. "Mormonism" is all right, thank you, and is being extensively advertised as a preparation for the great change to the "verge" of which the whole world is pressing. If there is any trembling in "Mormonism" it is the thrill of aroused vitality with which it is animated, kindled into fresh vigor by the assaults of its enemies. "Mormonism" will give a good account of itself when that "bottomless pit" engulfs its "despairing" maligners.

EXILE HEARD FROM.

ENGLISH ELECTION AFFAIRS—DIS-
ESTABLISHMENT—CHURCH ABUSES—
BRADLAUGH IN PARLIAMENT—HY-
DROPHOBIA—SKATING—GLADSTONE
REPLIED TO, ETC.

LIVERPOOL, England,
Dec. 12, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

The chief topic in "th'owd countree" for some weeks past has been

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

There has been more excitement over it than has stirred the British public out of its habitual complacency for many years. The addition of so much new element into the active portion of the body politic made the issue quite doubtful. Over two millions exercised for the first time the elective franchise. Naturally it might have been expected that the newly enfranchised voters would support the party that endowed them with the suffrage. But the average agricultural laborer has not much of a head for politics, and

THE PARSON AND "THE MASTER" wield a potent influence over the bucolic mind—what little there is of it above bacon, 'bacca and beer. This power was exercised to the largest extent. One of the loudest cries of the campaign was "The church is in danger." The Conservatives raised this to the highest notes. The utterances of the Liberal leaders on "disestablishment" were quoted and misquoted, wrested and distorted and worked over in a way that would have delighted the soul of the "Liberal" organ of Salt Lake City, if it has such a thing within its anatomy. Gladstone was pictured as a church-smashing monster. Even high church dignitaries resorted to abuse of the G. O. M. for the purpose of gaining votes for the Tories. The Archdeacon of Taunton told the people of Somersetshire, "If you are content to chide a man who prefers political and party ends to his duty, to his country and his God, you may as well cheer the devil." Where such words as these would not answer the purpose, and where employers could not coerce the laborers,

BRIBERY

was employed. Of course that could not be done openly. This is how the thing was worked: A clergyman of the Church of England calls on the wife of a voter. He remarks in a soothing syrupy tone: "How ill your child is looking, Mrs.—; it requires two or three months in the country." The reply is "I know that, but cannot afford it." The response is "Oh, I can arrange that for you; and if I had known it before would have been pleased to do it; but I will take the first opportunity to see that the child goes." The poor mother is impressed with the kindness of the clergyman, and thanks him with great warmth. The clergyman seizes his opportunity, adding, "One good turn deserves another. Now, I want you to do me a favor. I am interested in Mr.—, the Conservative candidate. Has your husband voted? If not, I want him to vote for my friend." Of course the end is accomplished and the Conservatives count another plumper. If this is not bribery in law, it is in spirit and is only a sample of

DODGES

to which churchmen have resorted. The "blanket season" set in prematurely. That is the gift of blankets to the poor, usual in many parishes at Christmas, was "advanced" to No-

vember, and Tory votes were notoriously exchanged for bed-coverings. In some places the rustics were made to believe that if the Liberals were elected the communion plate in the churches would be melted down and the churchyards where the dead are interred be ploughed up. Pulpits were turned into political stumps and sermons were preached against Liberal candidates.

There is

CAUSE FOR FEAR

among the clerical advocates of Toryism. The shameful traffic in church livings, the cruel imposition of enforced tithes, the sinecures which enable lazy parsons to live luxuriously as a reward for doing nothing, the injustice of State support of a church from which hosts of the citizens dissent, and other

FLAGRANT ABUSES

render disestablishment so probable that its approaching shadow terrifies the hiring clergy. As a sample of these tithe impositions there is the case of St. Helen's parish, Bishopgate, London, where a vestry meeting was had to protest against the "scandalous rate." The parish had to pay to the rector, the Rev. J. B. Deane, an annual tax of £2,300, although there was only one service weekly in the parish church—on the Sunday morning. The rector lived at Bath, and during the many years of his incumbency had never done any kind of duty in the church. It was urged, in excuse, that the venerable rector was blind.

Take the case of a church living at Wimlish in Essex. Three years ago it was put up at auction, but as only £5000 was bid for it, and more was wanted, it was withdrawn. At the auction it was announced that "there is no rectory house, no residence is required, nor any duty whatever on the part of the holder of the living." The same has been true of it for 400 years, and the law regulating these matters is such that any buyer of the rectory of Wimlish could institute any clergyman—however disreputable his character might be—in spite of and in defiance of all the bishops in the realm. The living is worth £650 a year, net.

Another is the church living of Bayfield in the county of Norfolk where there is no church, no house or glebe, no services performed, and only about forty souls to be taken care of. The curate of an adjoining parish is paid £20 a year to do the visiting. The average net income is £150 a year. The upset price is £700.

No wonder that the supporters of this state of things exclaim,

"ANYTHING TO BEAT GLADSTONE."

But the Liberal chief was elected in Midlothian by a rousing majority. His vote was 7,879 against 3,245 for Mr. Chas. Dalrymple his Tory opponent. His election was greeted with uproarious exultation in the metropolis. The newspaper offices in Fleet Street and the Strand were besieged by thousands eager to read the bulletins. The announcement of the victory, nearly two hours after midnight on Nov. 28th, was the signal for the wildest enthusiasm. The effects of the clerical canvass, however, and of the work of high-born ladies who engaged in the work, were evident in the result. The Liberal majority is

NOT SUFFICIENT

to run the House without the support of the Parnellites, and this gives that small faction the long-looked-for Irish chance to make up the balance of power and turn the scale for either party that will offer the best terms for Irish liberation. Until Parliament meets, the eleventh under Queen Victoria, no one can say with certainty which party will rule the roost. It is understood that Mr. Gladstone favors a measure for a certain amount of Irish independence, while Lord Salisbury is vacillating between a bold stroke to outdo the liberality of the Liberals, or a decided stand to sustain the integrity of the Empire and coerce Ireland into submission, in support of landlordism and in opposition to Parnellism, teeth and toe-nails. Gladstone certainly desires to vault again into power, and he can do so with the aid of

PARNELL

and his party, if the Liberals will only unite with their chief on some plan that will placate Parnell. But there are many men in the Liberal ranks who cannot swallow an Irish parliament, and others who, while favorable to a mild measure, will not endorse the policy that will alone satisfy the Irish party in the Commons. Altogether it is a very pretty fight and the odds are not very great on either side. But some measure of justice to down-trodden Erin seems probable, and all friends of the oppressed will rejoice at her deliverance.

Among the incidents of the opening of Parliament will be another attempt of

MR. BRADLAUGH

to obtain his seat. He announces his expectation of representing his constituents, the borough of Northampton famous for its shoe making operatives and free-thinking doctrines, and expresses his determination to introduce measures of reform in the land laws, the full enfranchisement of women, and the abolition of religious oaths.

The present oath system is certainly a farce, and a simple affirmation would be just as binding and much more consistent in a mixed assembly of Christians of different sects, Jews, and not a few actual though unprofessed infidels.

From the House of Commons to

MAD DOGS

may seem a wide leap, but those who have seen the former when country members are hooting at an opposition speaker, will not think them so widely removed from the latter. There appears to be a general dog scare on both sides of the Atlantic. London is almost crazy on hydrophobia, and the same furore is reported in American cities. Probably Pasteur's inoculation remedy for hydrophobia has had something to do with the epidemic of fear which rages here and on the other side of "the pond."

The subject of

HYDROPHOBIA

is horrible, but it fascinates a great many people, and it is being discussed in lively style by the medical sages. One school of physicians declare that rabies, which is the proper name for the disease that afflicts an insane canine, cannot be communicated except by biting, and that a genuine case was never known to occur in any other way. They advocate muzzling as a preventive. Another school affirm that rabies is a disease that may and often does generate in the blood—others say in the brain—from natural causes. They want to know, very naturally, if rabies never comes but by biting, how the first mad dog got rabies. These repudiate the muzzle, and say that by preventing dogs from drinking when they want to, it promotes the condition that is favorable to the disease, and prevents them from defending themselves against dogs which have escaped from their kennels without a muzzle, and can thus bite the muzzled animals at will. Whatever may be the cause, it appears that there has been an increase in cases of hydrophobia in London. But the number of deaths is not enough to create the panic which has set in. During the past eleven months nineteen deaths have occurred in the metropolis from that cause, which is not a great number in a population of over four millions. Still it is larger than in any year for a decade, the average during that time being six per annum.

THE WEATHER.

one would think is not very favorable to rabies, for King Winter has been ruling with severity in this tight little island for sometime. In Liverpool the weather is fine, thermometer at 3.30 p. m. 37 deg. In most parts of the country skating is the prevalent pastime. Heavy rains previous to a severe frost have formed ice ponds and made the marshes pleasure grounds for those who indulge in this healthy sport. Skating parties are conveyed on excursion trains to favorite spots, clubs are formed, contests are in vogue, and skating champions figure in the local papers like cricket competitors here or base ball contestants in the States and Territories of the glorious Union.

GLADSTONE'S DEFENSE OF GENESIS, referred to in a former communication, has stirred up the scientists of the unbelieving school to a lively rejoinder. Max Muller assails him on his Hellenic mythology, and Huxley denies the identity of certain periods of evolution with the stages of creation in the Mosaic account. Huxley does not repudiate religion while he rejects theology, between which he draws a nice distinction. He says:

In the eighth century before Christ, in the heart of a world of idolatrous polytheists, the Hebrew prophets put forth a conception of religion which appears to me to be as wonderful an inspiration of genius as the art of Pheidias or the science of Aristotle. "And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" If any so-called religion takes away from this great saying of Micah I think it wantonly mutilates, while if it adds thereto I think it obscures the perfect ideal of religion."

This is quite as much religion as many theologians can boast of, and takes the learned Professor out of the ranks of the so-called "infidels." To "walk humbly with thy God" implies more perhaps than the scientist imagines, for it comprehends perfect obedience to every revelation of the Almighty and here comes in true theology which is an essential part of true religion.

THE WORK OF THE LORD

goes on in Old England and additions are being made to the Church. That crazy rascal Jarman makes a great noise in some places and threats of disturbance are made, but no real trouble ensues, and many persons are led to investigate who perhaps but for his rant would never be excited on the "Mormon" question. The clouds seem to settle thicker upon Zion in the mountains, but the righteous must not be discouraged. The test had to come. He only that endureth to the end will be saved. Thank God that so few have faltered! May the approaching year bring peace and comfort to the true and faithful. That it may be to them a happy new year is the sincere desire of

EXILE.

CHARGE OF JUDGE POWERS.

We are indebted to the courtesy of F. S. Richards, Esq., for the following copy of the charge delivered by Judge Powers on Thursday evening last:

TERRITORY OF UTAH,
First Judicial District Court.

THE UNITED STATES,
vs.
LORENZO SNOW.

Gentlemen of the Jury:

This is a simple case. It is not one of grave importance, but is simply a prosecution for an alleged misde-

meanor. You will decide this case as you would any other, simply upon the law and the evidence. The law governing the case is well settled. You are not judges of the law and you will be governed by the charge of the court, which is final.

The indictment charges that the defendant, on the first day of January in the year of our Lord 1885, at the county of Box Elder, in this District and Territory, and on divers other days between said first day of January, A. D. 1885, and the first day of December, A. D. 1885, did then and there unlawfully live and cohabit with more than one woman to wit: with Adeline Snow, Sarah Snow, Harriet Snow, Eleanor Snow, Mary H. Snow, Phoebe W. Snow, and Minnie Jensen Snow; and during all the period aforesaid, at the county aforesaid, he, the said Lorenzo Snow, did live and cohabit with all of said women as his wives. If you believe from the evidence, gentlemen of the jury, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant cohabited with the women named, or any two of them, as wives, and that he held the women, or any two of them, out to the world as wives, by his language, or his conduct, or both, you should find him guilty.

It is not necessary that the evidence should show that the defendant and these women, or either of them, occupied the same bed, slept in the same room or dwelt under the same roof; neither is it necessary that the evidence should show that within the time mentioned in the indictment the defendant had sexual intercourse with either of them. The question is, were they living in the habit and repute of marriage? The offense of cohabitation is complete when a man, to all outward appearances, is living or associating with two or more women as wives. If the conduct of the defendant has been such as to lead to the belief that the parties were living as a husband and wife lives, then the defendant is guilty.

Of course the defendant might visit his children by the various women; he may make directions regarding their welfare; he may meet the women on terms of social equality, but if he associates with them as a husband with his wife, he is guilty. The Edmunds law says there must be an end to the relationship previously existing between polygamists. It says that relationship must cease.

Before you can find the defendant guilty you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that he has cohabited with two or more of the women named during the time, or portion of the time named in the indictment, to wit, between the first day of January, 1885, and the first day of December, 1885. The evidence introduced as to what occurred prior to the time named in the indictment, is before you for your consideration, as tending to throw light upon the relations of the parties within the time charged. If there is evidence that the defendant had married the women, had been living with them as his wives before the offense, it may be considered by the jury as adding weight to many circumstances proven, pointing to unlawful cohabitation during the time the offense is charged.

The law presumes the defendant innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt which has some reason for its basis; it does [not] mean a doubt from mere caprice or groundless conjecture; it is such a doubt as a jury are able to give a reason for. If, after a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case, you can say and feel that you have an abiding conviction of the guilt of the defendant, and are fully satisfied of the truth of the charge, then you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses, the weight of the evidence and of the facts. If you find the defendant guilty, you will say in your verdict: "We the jury find the defendant guilty, in the manner and form charged in the indictment." If you find the defendant not guilty, you will say: "We the jury find the defendant not guilty."

IMPARTIAL JURIES IN UTAH.

The Salt Lake Tribune has a new dress, of which it appears to be very vain, declaring that its own appearance is "admirable throughout." We do not think the public will endorse that self-admiration. The staring garb has a countrified and patent bowels appearance and is more ugly than elegant. It will render the daily libels of that execrable sheet more hideous than before.

Commenting on some remarks of the Democrat, to the effect that when local questions are involved an impartial jury cannot be had in Utah, the Tribune denies that there has ever been a judgment or a conviction obtained against a Mormon except upon the most ample and conclusive testimony. Of course it goes on to fling personal abuse at the editor of the Democrat for stating to the contrary, and it winds up the scurrilous article as follows:

We brand the statement that a Gentile jury has ever yet in Utah convicted any Mormon of crime, without the most ample evidence, as a causeless and most unwarranted falsehood and insult, and one particularly freighted with mischief at this time.

Not to go farther back than the