

DESERET NEWS.

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1883.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

To the Officers and Members of the
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints:

Meetings will be held in the Large Tabernacle in this city, on Thursday, April 5th, 1883, at 10 o'clock in the morning and 2 o'clock in the afternoon, preparatory to the Annual Conference, which will commence on Friday, April 6th, at 10 o'clock in the morning, as per previous adjournment.

JOHN TAYLOR,

GEORGE Q. CANNON,

JOSEPH F. SMITH,

First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.
Salt Lake City,

March 20th, 1883.

THE DYNAMITE AND DAGGER FIENDS.

THE explosion at the Government buildings in London, the attempt to blow up the Times office, particulars of which have appeared in our columns, and the cowardly and brutal attack upon Lady Dixie, as related in our dispatches to-day, have stirred up an intense feeling of indignation against the Irish revolutionists. Although there is no direct evidence that the Fenians or any other organization of the so-called friends of Ireland were the authors of these outrages or either of them, it is taken for granted that they were the work of Irish agitators.

The reason for this general conclusion is that such dastardly deeds are in the exact style of the wild Irish conspirators. Such things are advocated on this side of the water by the firebrands who inflame the passions of the sons and daughters of Erin, and by their mercenary companions who gather up the contributions of patriotic laborers and servant girls for the freedom of the "ould sod." And these indefensible acts are but repetitions of similar villainies known to have been perpetrated by members of Irish secret societies. Therefore, although there is no definite proof of the fact, there is little or no doubt in the public mind that the murderous attempts were the work of Irish desperadoes.

Granting all that is claimed by Hibernian declaimers upon the wrongs of their native land, and the need of radical reforms in the policy of England to Erin, the methods advocated in this hemisphere and practiced where possible in the other, for the liberation of the Celt, from the dominion of the Saxon, are such as to turn the sympathies felt by the public for Ireland and her woes, into anger and detestation at the murderous and ruffianly course pursued by her pretended patriots. England is not likely to relinquish her hold upon the island so close to her borders nor the restless race who continually threaten her repose. And while we would rejoice to see a better system of government established for suffering Ireland, we cannot expect that liberty will be very greatly extended to her people, while they exhibit such unmistakable evidence of their unfitness for the control of their own affairs and such significant tokens of their probable course of freed from present restraint. No people in the civilized world will countenance or excuse such

villainies as the Phoenix Park tragedy, the dynamite outrage in London or the attempted assassination at Windsor, except the red-handed and black-hearted conspirators composing those secret organizations which threaten the peace of all society and are inspired by the foulest spirit from the realms of Satan.

AN ABSURD ENGLISH STATUTE.

We have received a letter from the Earl of Dalhousie, dated London, Feb. 23rd, asking for the publication of some correspondence enclosed, a copy of which has been addressed to the Governor of each State in the Union. It will be found in another part of this paper. We presume that a similar letter has been sent to most of the leading journals of this country. Accompanying it are the annexed remarks:

"It is evident," writes an American clergyman, "to those of us who are old enough to remember the state of things previous to these innovations, that a change for the worse has been brought about. I can well recollect when ladies in the lifetime of their husbands used to feel as if their brothers-in-law were their own brothers, and to treat them accordingly, in all the unreserved domestic intercourse; when a brother-in-law, after an absence would kiss his brother's wife in all purity as his own sister, and she would confide in him without a thought of evil, or a feeling of embarrassment; and when, too, in case of a wife dying, her sister would remain in charge of her family, or would remove to the bereaved home, to live with the widower, and take care of his children as a thing of course, without a whisper of slander, or any occasion for it; when the children, too, knowing that their aunt could never be in any nearer relation to them, loved and revered her, and confided in her, and yielded readily a most wholesome influence to her.

"But since such increased nearness of connection has been deemed not improper and even desirable, there has grown up in families a perceptible and painful constraint; the children learning to look with apprehension on their mother's sisters, and the wives becoming jealous of their influence with their husbands, while familiarities which formerly were thought to be, and really were, innocent, have come to possess a consciousness of evil tendency which itself is of the nature of sin.

"I know of a wife whose health was gradually declining, a woman of the world, with a husband as worldly as herself, and in their house was a young and attractive sister of theirs, between whom and her husband there had grown up gradually a degree of affectionate intercourse which in the days of the wife's health had been thought only natural. But as the end drew near, it became on his part more pointed, and drew to it her attention so agonizingly that it became the one engrossing feeling of her soul for the last few weeks of her life, exciting in her an undisguised dread of what she foresaw would, as it did, take place, and so absorbed her as to shut out all thought of religion, and make her miserable to her very death."

As our views in relation to this subject are desired we will state them. We do not know who is the "American clergyman" that writes such stuff as the foregoing, but suppose that he must have moved within the limits of a very small social circle, or that his observations have been confined to cases of extreme jealousy, chronic suspicion and morbid anticipation of death. We see no reason why the bare possibility of a wife's decease before that of an unmarried sister, and the groundless assumption that if the wife died first the husband would marry the sister, should cause the apprehension, distrust and constraint described, and do not believe that such things are general or common. Some isolated instance of this kind may have come to the notice of the "American clergyman," and he has leaped to the conclusion that it is a type of an extensive class.

We have read of instances of similar and even worse suspicions on the part of invalid ladies in England, where it is unlawful for a man to wed his deceased wife's sister, and the cause is, of course, not to be at-

tributed to the source named by the "American clergyman," but either to the undue familiarity of the husband with his sister-in-law, or the extreme sensitiveness and jealousy of the nervous and debilitated wife.

We have always regarded the English law forbidding marriage with a deceased wife's sister as foolish, unnecessary and unscriptural. The repeal of the law has been chiefly opposed by the churchmen. And yet they cannot cite any acknowledged authority for their objections to such marriages. The quotations usually made by them from the Mosaic law have no bearing whatever upon the subject. One of the most frequent citations is the passage made famous in Utah by the notorious Dr. Newman, formerly of the Methodist denomination and pastor of the Church with the chimneys in Washington, D. C., but now of New York, and another sect which has secured his services by larger emoluments. In his discussion with Prof. Orson Pratt on the question of polygamy, he referred so often to Leviticus xviii, 18; that he is commonly called by that title in this city.

Examination of that text will show that it is even less appropriate in an argument against marriage with a deceased wife's sister than in a dispute upon polygamy.

"Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister to vex her, beside the other during her lifetime."

What is there in this which forbids marriage with a wife's sister after the wife's death? Nothing at all. The inference is that the widower may take the sister-in-law if he does not do so during the wife's lifetime. But when we analyze the language we shall find that the only condition imposed against the marriage of the wife's sister during the lifetime of the wife, is the wife's aversion to the plural marriage. If it "vex her" the union is forbidden, if not, not. The marriage of a man with two sisters was not forbidden in the Mosaic code. Jacob's union with two sisters was not condemned, and his example was frequently followed in Israel. There is no natural consanguinity between the husband and his wife's sister, therefore there is no natural barrier to his marriage with her, either during the wife's life or after her death.

The text we have cited is sometimes rendered, "Thou shalt not take one wife unto another," etc. This was the version sprung by Dr. Newman upon Prof. Pratt. But his Hebrew roots, with which he expected to smite polygamy hip and thigh, merely struck against other Hebrew roots in the hands of his opponent, and the result was the demolition of his argument. He was not prepared for erudition in a defender of the "Mormon" faith, and his discomfiture was overwhelming. But granting, for argument's sake, the correctness of this rendering of the passage, the same condition which we have pointed out applies. If the wife agrees there is no prohibition, whether it relates to the wife's sister or another woman. "Thou shalt not take one wife to another," or "a wife to her sister, to vex her, during her lifetime."

The Earl of Dalhousie will find, when he collates the responses to his letter, that there have been many cases where the invalid wife, expecting to die and leave her little ones without a mother, has entreated the husband to marry her sister, who has cared for the children during her sickness and would in all probability be nearer like a second mother to them than any one else. We are of the opinion that such instances are much commoner than those imagined or exaggerated by the "American clergyman." And if it would not shock him too much, we would like to whisper to him that there are not unfrequent cases of a married woman desiring her husband to wed her sister during her lifetime, and of two sisters devoted to each other, who determine, if possible, to marry the same man, that they may remain together in married life as they had lived in spinsterhood. This, too, with the purest of motives and the most unselfish affection. But, of course, this is under the "Mormon" system of marital relations, and would be startling to the nerves of one trammelled by the bonds of perverted "Christian" traditions. And yet it is strictly in accord with Biblical doctrine, and there is nothing against it but the statutes which men have made unguided by the law of God and uninspired by the Spirit which flows from His presence.

We have to say to the gentleman who makes the inquiry that we

know of nothing either in the scriptures, which are accepted as the Christian standard, and which lay down the principle that marriage is ordained of God, nor in a somewhat extensive human experience in two hemispheres, which can be legitimately urged against marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

IS IT NOT TIME TO BEGIN?

At the election held last November a large number of citizens were unable to vote because their names had been stricken off the registration lists. The expunging of their names was the work of registrars appointed by the Commissioners sent here to supervise election affairs, and was done under the rules and regulations formulated and promulgated by that body. One of them required every citizen to take an oath concerning his or her marital relations, and failure to subscribe to it was taken as an admission that he or she was disqualified by law to exercise the franchise.

There was no law authorizing the Commissioners to legislate for this Territory in any manner. Their duties were clearly defined by the Act which created their office, and it is specifically stated therein that they should "be performed under the existing laws of the United States and of said Territory." This clearly debarred them from making new laws, even if such a stretch of authority as legislative powers could be in any way construed as belonging to their office.

The "existing laws" of this Territory prescribed the form of an oath to be taken by applicants for registration. The Commissioners added to that an oath of their own devising, thus assuming legislative functions which, as we have shown, in no wise belonged to them. The oath they required was therefore void in law, and the striking of the names of registered voters from the existing lists was an illegal act, and those citizens who were thus deprived of a sacred and vested right were illegally disfranchised. They submitted to the wrong for the sake of peace, and in order that nothing might stand in the way of an election which their enemies desired to prevent. But they by no means conceded the validity of the registrars' doings by which they were robbed of the ballot.

There are many questions growing out of this summary punishment inflicted upon citizens unconvicted and without a trial, which we need not enter upon just now; such as the disfranchisement of persons who had broken no law of Congress or of the Territory, or who, if they had broken any such law, were freed from legal consequences by the Act of limitation, etc. But the chief thing to be considered is, what is to be done about this? Are these men and women unlawfully prevented from exercising a right dear to every citizen, to be always thus debarred from voting? Is the illegal act to be permitted to stand as though it were good law and sound practice? Or shall an effort be made in the interest of justice and liberty, to restore to them that which has been wrested from them by glaring usurpation and amazing assumption of arbitrary power?

We are in favor of contesting this wholesale invasion of political rights, inch by inch and to the last extremity; lawfully of course, but without hesitation and regardless of cost. And we would have it done without needless delay. Time is a very essential element in legal proceedings. They consume more than their due share of our ever rolling years. The sooner the preliminary steps are taken in the direction of a movement for the recovery of our rights, in our opinion, the better. There may be continuances; there may be dilatory motions requiring long consideration; there may be appeals. When a lawsuit is entered upon it is difficult to foretell when it will end. We have right upon our side, and we have the law to sustain us and there is no necessity for holding back. The propositions to be debated, the principles in question are so plain and so well established that however desirous our local judiciary might be to sustain the course of the appointees of the Government, we do not think they can forbear decisions that will restore many who are now practically disfranchised to the exercise of their lawful

and invaluable political rights. At any rate the trial should be made, for if we tamely submit to such indignities we shall fully deserve to suffer their full consequences. If our rights are not worth defending they are not worth having.

This is a matter that concerns not only the thousands of men and women who have been defrauded, but the upholders of human liberty everywhere. The struggle will be in behalf of freedom in general, for the maintenance of constitutional guarantees, and for the supremacy of properly enacted laws over the dicta of official individuals. It is of more than local moment and will be far-reaching in its influence and effects.

LOCAL AND OTHER MATTERS.

FROM FRIDAY'S DAILY, MAR. 23.

Coming Home.—Bishop John Sharp has started for home and expects to reach this city on Tuesday night. He has almost entirely recovered from the effects of the operation he had recently undergone.

Just Right.—We learn the Unity Club have determined to give the Conference visitors a treat in the shape of their admirable tableaux entertainment varied with other attractions and with many new features that cannot fail to draw and please a very large audience. Look out for the Unity Club's greatest effort.

Insecticide.—James Vick gives a substance the following methods: Take a tablespoonful of oil, mix it with half a cupful of milk and then dilute the mixture with two gallons of water. Apply the liquid with a syringe and afterwards rinse with clear water. Used in this manner kerosene destroys the insects without injury, it is believed, to the most delicate plants.

Mated.—With pleasure we record the marriage of our young friends John L. Hetzler and Martha A. Hadfield, which took place in this city yesterday. Brother Hetzler has started in the dental business, in which he is proficient, in Ogden City. The bride was formerly employed in the News office, where she was generally esteemed for her many good qualities. We wish the young couple all the happiness that falls to the lot of wedded mortals.

An Ogden Liquor Case.—At Ogden, yesterday morning, Robert Burns, proprietor of the bar room of the Broom hotel, was tried before Alderman Tanner, for selling liquor outside of the hours prescribed by city ordinance. His counsel, Mr. S. W. Darke, of this city, entered a demurrer to the complaint, on the ground that the city had no jurisdiction. The demurrer was overruled and the defendant fined \$99 and costs. Notice was given of an appeal to the District Court.

Coking Qualities.—The coking qualities of the Bituminous coal from the Castle Valley mines, recently described by the News, have been tested at the City Gas Works. The result is that it is declared fully equal to the Pleasant Valley coal. The coke in turn is to be soon put to a practical test at the Germania smelter, when the value of the article will be fully determined.

The gas producing qualities of the shale have not yet been tried, but probably will be within a few days. Specimens of the coke can be seen at this office.

Sacred to the Memory.—To-day we saw on the premises of Messrs. Watson Brothers, a handsome monument in the course of construction to the order of President George Q. Cannon, to be placed at the grave of the late Mrs. Elizabeth Cannon. It is eight feet high and of proportionate width, and is of local granite, similar to that of which the Temple is built. On each of the four sides, a panel of Tennessee marble will be set in, on which to cut the family inscriptions. The color of the marble makes a pleasing contrast with that of the granite.

A Tight Squeeze.—On the way home from California Mr. Robert Dye had a narrow escape from being crushed to death. A large pile of heavy baggage was piled near the edge of the platform at one of the stations, and as Mr. Dye was about to mount the train he was crushed between a moving car and the heap. The incident caused considerable shouting and alarm among those who were eye-witnesses, but the train was promptly