

bell was rung for a good hour in the hope that the boys might hear it and by its sound be guided home. The streets were full of people, and men started out on horseback in every direction to aid the missing ones if possible.

About 9 o'clock a shout was heard, "huzzah! stop the bell! The boys will be here in a few minutes!" They were traveling for home as they supposed, and did not discover their mistake till they landed at the foot of the west mountains just in the very opposite direction from home and six or seven miles from Parowau. They started back with horses tired out and all hands had to take it afoot. Then they got lost again, but they trudged on through sage brush and deep snow till they struck Summit Creek, followed it up to the settlement, got a fresh team from one of Bishop S. C. Hulet's sons and arrived safe as above stated.

Through the suggestion of Bishop Adams, a large number of young men and boys started out on horseback on

ANOTHER RABBIT-HUNT

yesterday, without guns this time, but armed each with a number of short, heavy clubs that they could throw. The rabbits could not run in the fresh snow and the boys returned in a few hours, having done much better execution among the rabbits than they did with guns on the 16th, each man and boy killing from 18 to 37 rabbits, and one man killed 48.

The valley is still swarming with rodents. Last year they destroyed thousands of bushels of grain, and as we greatly fear their ravages the coming season, we will be compelled to continue the destruction.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY

of the entrance of the pioneers to this place was held on the 13th inst. Flags were hoisted and cannon (anvils) fired in the morning to announce the ushering in of the day. A grand party commenced at 2 p. m., with very little dancing—mostly singing and short speeches. Bishop Lunt, of Cedar City, who was assistant clerk of the pioneer company, read a list of the names of the pioneers, number of teams, cattle, horses, farming implements, provisions, etc. I overheard a little group of pioneers discuss and decide that President A. M. Cannon of the Salt Lake Stake made the first adobies that were made in Iron County. He was then a boy about 16 or 17 years of age. The whole proceedings went off most pleasantly.

A few weeks ago Bishop Charles Adams consulted with the Relief Society and it was decided that if the young men would turn out and haul wood for the widows, the poor, and a supply for the meeting house, the Sisters would get them up a supper and dance for themselves and partners. This call was responded to most heartily. The wood rolled in and was distributed among the poor and needy, and about two hundred sat down to supper at the house of Brother C. Y. Webb. The party was one of the most enjoyable I have attended. Everybody seemed glad and happy, as people always feel when they do good. Thanks to our kind and energetic Sisters.

Very respectfully,
Wm. C. Mcgregor.

IMPORTANT TO SETTLERS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

NEW REGULATIONS.

As new regulations are being instituted every few days by the Hon. Commissioner Sparks, of the General Land Office at Washington, D. C., we deem it proper to post the public through your widely-circulated paper from time to time, as to the nature and effect of these regulations on our Territory.

Following are the rules contained in a circular addressed to Registers and Receivers and officers authorized to take affidavits and proofs in public land cases, which was lately received at the local office:

1. In cases of final proofs and of entry applications the parties, whether applicants, claimants, or witnesses, must be properly identified before you. Attesting officers (including Registers and Receivers) must certify that the parties appearing are personally known to them or that their identity is satisfactorily established. The names of persons vouching to identity must be stated. Identifying affidavits should be required in all cases where necessary.

2. Each question in final proofs must be orally asked and answered in the presence of the attesting officer. Applications, affidavits and final proof questions must be thoroughly explained, so that there can be no possibility that the parties will misunderstand the purport of their affidavits or the full meaning of the questions asked or the effect of their answers. Ready-made proofs merely for pro forma acknowledgment without verification, cross-examination, or evidence of identity will not be considered such proofs as are required by law.

3. Officers taking affidavits and proofs must test the accuracy and reliability of the statements of applicants and claimants and the credibility and means of information of witnesses by a thorough cross-examination. Questions and answers in such cross-examinations will be reduced to writing, and the costs thereof included in the costs of writing out the proofs.

4. Cross-examinations should be di-

rected to a verification of the material facts alleged in the case, and especially to the actual facts of residence and other requirements, the use of the land and purpose of the entry, and whether the entry is made or sought to be perfected for claimant's own use and occupation or for the use and benefit of others.

5. Registers and Receivers, and other officers must carefully see that parties and witnesses are swearing to actual facts and not to constructions of law as to what constitutes facts. This requirement will be particularly observed in respect to fact of alleged residence.

6. Proofs must be taken on the day and before the officer named in the advertisement, and at his office, and between the hours of eight A. M. and six P. M. Proofs taken privately or in secret, or otherwise in substance irregularly, will not be accepted.

7. Proofs must in all cases be made to the satisfaction of Registers and Receivers. Proofs that are not satisfactory must be rejected. Registers and Receivers are authorized to avail themselves of all means of information in respect to the validity of entries and the interests in which they are made, and will not allow entries which they have good reason to believe collusive, speculative, or otherwise fraudulent.

8. Registers and Receivers must thoroughly scrutinize all proofs taken before officers other than themselves. They will not accept proofs so taken that are defective and insufficient, and they must see that all papers are complete and perfect before an entry is allowed on the papers transmitted to this office. This rule will be imperatively insisted upon.

9. Registers and Receivers will promptly call to the attention of special agents, and report to this office, all cases which in their opinion need investigation.

10. Should officers (other than Registers and Receivers) taking affidavits or proofs know or have occasion to suspect the existence of fraud in connection with any case, they should at once report all the facts to the Register and Receiver.

11. Officers taking affidavits and testimony should call the attention of parties and witnesses to the laws respecting false swearing and the penalties therefor, and inform them of the purpose of the Government to hold all persons to a strict accountability for any statements made by them.

In no case are papers authorized to be executed in blank. Papers so signed or falsely authenticated will be treated as fraudulent, and the acts of an officer misusing his official signature and seal will not be respected by this office, but the attention of the proper authorities will be called to his misconduct.

12. Officers taking applications, affidavits or final proofs, will not be permitted to act as attorneys in the case.

13. Attorneys at Law appearing in land office proceedings at local offices must file an appearance stating specifically whom they represent. Attorneys in fact must file the written authority of their principals.

It will be seen by the foregoing regulations that the greatest care should be taken in relation to making final proofs. Settlers must see that they are not persuaded into signing and swearing to papers without first learning their contents, and ascertaining that they specify the facts, and that the sworn statements do not misrepresent anything.

Another important feature is that county clerks and other officers who are authorized by law to swear settlers and their witnesses must not act as attorneys for claimants. Any such officer misusing his official power will be in danger of prosecution by the Department.

Respectfully,
STAYNER & SIMMONS,
Land Attorneys, Salt Lake City.

OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

CLERICAL "CHARITY" — GOVERNOR MURRAY'S MESSAGE — ANTI-"MORMON" LIBELLERS — SOCIALISTS IN CHICAGO.

CHICAGO, Jan. 18th, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

Governor Murray's message has been read here, and, fortunately, with no fatal results. The suicide of the Rev. Mr. Jardine, of Kansas City, was not owing to a perusal of the message, as has been erroneously stated. The Rev. gentleman was driven to the desperate deed by his fellow clergymen, who persecuted and annoyed him, until the mind lost its balance. Those clergymen are very charitable, tender hearted persons. Their souls go out in sympathy for all the heathen world, but among themselves they resemble monkeys; one poor fellow gets a scratch and all the others gather around, and pull the whole hide off. This is what occurred to Mr. Jardine, according to what Father Betts of St. Louis says. The Rev. Betts spoke his mind openly, and told his brother clergies that they were actual murderers. Mr. Betts has the courage of speaking his mind, but then he is not a native parson. He is one of those ignorant foreigners not yet indoctrinated in Yankee religious systems.

Our newspapers have wasted very little space on your

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

The only notice designed to it was that the Assembly listened to it because they had to; like patients in a hydro-

pathic establishment, they must submit to the Doctor's regimen whether they like it or not. This ought not to have been so. The message is a remarkable document, and is proof of a versatile mind. It opens with a kind of secular prayer, mixed with the spiritual, which shows that your Legislature does not need a chaplain while such a Governor exists. His allusion to military matters bespeaks the soldier. He says there were no lives lost in the Mexican expedition. This shows the usefulness of having a soldier at the head of military expeditions. General Kearney was a soldier and understood his business, but if Pope or Burnside were there now different results would be. The latter was a tailor, the former a riding master, and of course were not very well calculated for bringing armies unscathed through hostile countries.

However, the Governor is slightly in error. If he will read Lieut. Emery's account of the main body of the expedition he will find that one life was lost, where Dorsey's ranch is now located. A party of scouts captured some Mexican cavalry and brought them into camp. All hands turned out to see the prisoners of war. A United States soldier named Fitzpatrick was so struck with the oddity of the war prisoners that he literally "split his sides" with laughter. The prisoners were six forlorn looking individuals mounted on six more forlorn-looking burros, and the spectacle cost poor Fitz his life. It is a pity the Governor did not post himself and get acquainted with all the facts of the expedition before he committed such an error.

Again, he says no Utah lives were lost in our late war. He ought to know that if any Utah lives were lost at this time it would be contrary to all social and economic laws. The Utah citizen was at this time raising agricultural products, and also the raw material for future crimes, and future Gen. Kearneys; then why should he be diverted from these useful pursuits when there were plenty of Irish and Dutch to be had as food for powder, and plenty of Yanks for recruiting sergeants, army sutlers, and regimental chaplains. The Governor also says that Government helped the Utah pioneers. That was commendable, but the Governor now wants the Government to clean them out again. The old Romans used to feed prisoners of war for gladiatorial combats. According to your Governor this was what the American Government is wanted to do; first plant colonies in distant Territories, and when they have grown into something important, wipe them out again "to make a Yankee holiday." Truly your Governor is like Pope's heroic dunce:

"In the course of one revolving moon
He's jester, statesman, preacher and
buffoon."

Your Governor is also credited with saying in an official paper that there were

NO DEMOCRATS AMONG THE "MORMONS."

This is getting matters down to a fine point. Even if this were true, it surely is not criminal to be outside the democratic party. It is true there are many outside of it; who ought to be inside of the penitentiary, but as the Governor has turned democrat this does not apply to him. Since he is so conversant with the religious and political condition of Utah, why not give us a little about the physical. He might tell us how many toes in a "Mormon" pedal, and if there are any corns on them. He might tell us the average length of a "Mormon" nose, and whether it resembles the Duke of Wellington's. In this respect the Governor falls behind R. H. Beadle, the famous ethnological "mule skinner" of Utah. Mr. Beadle described the peculiarity of the "Mormon" face, and says there was something in it distinct from the rest of humanity. It is a pity Mr. Beadle did not prosecute his investigations to the extremity of the "Mormon" corpus; it would be of infinite worth to future Huxleys and Spencers.

Beadle published a book about Utah away back in 1872. It was a great work. He went to Utah as a "mule skinner." This does not mean a cat's meat man, though the book makes good reading for "cats." Later he published another edition of this work, assisted by O. J. Hollister. Judging by the name of the latter, Mr. Beadle must have taken a wife, but why she should retain her own name, is only explained by the fact that Baroness Burdette Coultis also retained her, and

OLD JEZEBEL HOLLISTER

is just as historic and as ancient a name as any Coultis or Boodles of them all.

We have had some visitors of note, or rather of notoriety, here lately. Though it is waste of time to be dwelling on these creatures, while there is much higher game to strike at, yet one can get in a thump as he passes along, without delaying himself. Of course it is foolish to waste time on skunks and jackals while one has lions and eagles in his path, and what use is it quarrelling with D. L. Leonard or Kate Field when one has Senators Edmunds and Cullom, Governors Murray and Bunn to deal with.

MR. LEONARD

has spent some time here endeavoring to publish a lot of rubbish he had written out, as interviews. He could succeed only in getting in a small paragraph or two. He wanted an ironclad penal code just as they had in Spain and in Ireland some time ago. His

manuscript contained such startling and contradictory tales that one city editor, who is a little of a wit, wanted to know what D. L. stood for. Mr. Leonard was for once very near having his name printed in full as the Rev. D—d Liar Leonard, Superintendent of Utah Missions, and now away from Salt Lake, not for any complicity in the recent scandals.

KATE FIELD

is in town, but has not "unbosomed" herself as yet; therefore, she has all her padding both in and around her so far. Of course she is here for a purpose, and some startling intelligence may be looked for in a short time. Chicago has now become the established headquarters for all operations against Utah. In fact, this has been published by all the societies which are waging war on the defenseless Utonians.

The question with us here in Chicago at present is

HOW TO GET BACK THAT ARMY

again from Salt Lake. The Socialists are raising old Cain. They are threatening to blow up everything, and editors and merchants are discussing the feasibility of planting a regular military camp here, with a standing army of ten to fifteen thousand men. It is claimed that the men could be used for all the cities between Pittsburgh and Salt Lake, and also for the whole Mississippi river region. The papers say that troops could be transported to any of the large cities in the valleys of the Ohio and the Mississippi in 10 or 12 hours, and to Salt Lake in 36. But if danger is apprehended from dynamitards, how are troops to be transported over broken bridges and collapsed viaducts? What avail are troops anyhow against dynamite? A woman with a little package under her cloak was near blowing up the British House of Commons. Taking a broad and sensible view of matters,

THE BEST PLACE

for a man or woman who wants to die a natural death, and to take their bodies entire to the happy hunting grounds, would be to repair to Utah, and find out some little cave or shanty there. Dwellers in mansions don't sleep sound now-a-days. Horace says that pale death knocks with undiscerning sandal at the cottage of the poor and the mansion of the rich, but in our day he is likely to blow up the mansion, and envelope the cottage with the flying fragments of granite and marble which darken the air. Truly we are living in a great age.

JUNIOR.

THE NEW EDMUNDS BILL.

SPEECH OF SENATOR VAN WYCK.

NEBRASKA VINDICATED.

In the United States Senate, January 8th, Mr. Van Wyck, of Nebraska, showed that Mr. Edmunds had misrepresented Nebraska, on the rights of married persons, in the following remarks:

Mr. Van Wyck. I ask the Senate to indulge me only a moment in explanation of what certainly seems to be a very remarkable construction placed upon the statute of Nebraska by the Senator from Vermont. I suppose it is not necessary to offer an apology or to ask anybody's pardon for objecting to what seems to be an obnoxious principle inserted in a meritorious bill. I will say to the Senator that I am willing to go as far as and farther than himself in uprooting the system of polygamy in Utah. I would very much prefer to vote for such a measure as was suggested by the Senator from Illinois to take away political power from the Territory entirely and place it in the hands of the commission which we have there with nothing to do, and give them something to do by placing the political power of the Territory in their hands. I would very much prefer to do that, and I apprehend that is going further than the Senator from Vermont would be willing to go in this matter. Then I think we should reach this difficulty. As I said yesterday, we have been doing this for four years, practically, with no forward movement, and under the act of 1882 and this bill we shall probably progress four years more with no other results than we have to-day.

The lawmakers of Nebraska supposed that the statute read by the Senator from Vermont was plain, and yet my friend seems to give it all a forced construction by propounding an inquiry and himself giving the answer. I understand the theory of the deviation from the common law to be that it is in the interest of society—so the Senator from Vermont says—and that in some cases in the interest of society the husband and wife are allowed to testify one against the other. I apprehend the Senator gives the wrong reason for it. It is not in the interest of society specially, because if that were so, why stop? Is it not in the interest of society that a person should swear to the commission of murder as much as to the fact of a marriage solemnization? If in the interest of society, is not the testimony in cases of robbery and arson and all other crimes known from that to murder as much to be protected? If in the interest of society the wife can disclose the matter of a grave crime committed by her husband against the public peace and society, why should it stop?

But then I think the Senator confutes his own idea by saying that in Nebraska

ka and other States they are allowed to testify because it is to reach the personal injury, and he propounded the question to the Senator from Georgia, is not bigamy a personal injury? If the allowance of the testimony of the husband or wife be put upon the ground of the personal injury from the one to the other, then certainly it is not upon the broad ground of public policy or the interest of society. The latter suggestion of the Senator from Vermont is evidently correct, because in no instance probably where it is detailed in any statute is it applied except where the husband and wife can only redress themselves by being allowed to be witnesses in their own behalf, and that is borne out in the statute of Nebraska itself.

So also in the statute of the State of New York, which expressly provides that it can only be in the case of bigamy, and then the Senator asks, is not bigamy a personal injury to the wife or husband? It may be so in the case of bigamy, but then the statute provides that only one fact can be proven by the testimony of the accused's marriage partner, only the fact of marriage. So in the case of divorce on the ground of adultery, the wife may be a witness or the husband may be a witness, but not a general witness. The statute of the State of New York says such witnesses can only testify to the fact of marriage—nothing more—not in the interest of society, as the Senator says, because, if so, why confine it there? The wife may know the fact of the bigamy, but she can only swear to her own marriage. Why stop there? Society is not protected if the husband or wife knows the true fact which would convict the other, and the statute says that only one fact is to be proven.

So, too, in the case of divorce for adultery, the wife may know the fact that would convict the husband of he *gravamen*, of the main charge, but the statute keeps her lips sealed, and says in such a case you can only prove the fact of marriage by her testimony, and then the statute provides no further. Her lips are sealed, and yet the Senator says that the break is made in the interest of society, although the witness is stopped by the Legislature right there.

The other point is right, as my friend suggests. It is, undoubtedly, where the personal injury is to the husband or wife. Now mark:

The husband can in no case—

I am reading now from the Nebraska statute to which the Senator referred—

The husband can in no case be a witness against the wife, nor the wife against the husband, except in a criminal proceeding for a crime committed by the one against the other.

"In a criminal proceeding for a crime committed by the one against the other," and my friend says that bigamy is a personal injury. But that is not the statute of Nebraska. I asked my friend if the statute said "compel," and then he rebuked me for my impatience by desiring that I should wait until he could give a construction which I think the statute nowhere can bear.

The lips of the wife are sealed. The husband can in no case be a witness against the wife or the wife against the husband except in a criminal proceeding by the one against the other. I submit to the Senator if the language is not plain, that it is permissive and not compellable. If the wife comes into court to arraign her husband for assault and battery upon her and she begins the prosecution, if the proceeding is commenced by her, she may be allowed to follow that by her own testimony. It is perfectly plain. She must be the moving instrument in the prosecution against him, in the criminal proceeding, and in such a case only can she be a witness. If society arraigns her husband, if the public authority arraigns her husband for an assault upon herself, then she can not be a witness even if she desires to be. It is only where she is the author, the mover of the criminal proceeding against him that she is allowed to be a witness.

But they may in all criminal prosecutions be witnesses for each other.

Yet the Senator would claim that the novel, the startling doctrine introduced in this bill is sustained by the statute of Nebraska, which provides, as I have stated, distinctly that in all criminal prosecutions husband and wife may be witnesses against each other. Will the Senator put that language in this bill instead of that which the committee has placed there? That will settle this matter. Will he take the language from the statute of New York and put it in his bill instead of what is there? If he does that, I might be willing to vote for his proposition. Put it upon the ground that it is a new departure, and that the departure is justified by the exigencies of the peculiar situation of things in that Territory; but I protest here that the legislation of every State in this Union, the well-known and recognized principles of the law in every civilized nation under the sun, shall not be stigmatized by a proposition coupling it with the doctrine here enunciated upon the ground that this new doctrine is only the reproduction of that which exists in a majority of the States of this Union.

The Truth.

Constipation is undermining and destroying the health of more people than all other diseases combined. One teaspoonful of "Syrup of Prunes," three times a day, will cure this dread disease; large bottles, 75 cents. For sale by Z. C. M. I. Drug Store.