

THE DESERET WEEKLY,

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY,
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, \$2.50
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

Saturday, . . . December 26, 1891.

THE SCANDALOUS PARSON CASE.

THE long and disgusting case against Marshal Parsons is ended, and Commissioner Pratt has discharged the defendant. There are very few persons who will not endorse the action of the court. They are limited to the press gang that opened the mess of nastiness, and two or three officials who have joined in the endeavor to down the Marshal. They have signally failed so far as this prosecution reaches, but they may meet with more success in the main object they had in view.

When such tales are told of a man as those sworn to on the witness stand in this case, a certain amount of stigma is sure to attach to him, no matter how improbable the stories may be or how strong the evidence in rebuttal. And this may influence the Administration in reference to the Marshal. For, an officer of this kind should be above reproach, and the bare suspicion that such acts as those charged against him may probably be committed, is likely to work against him and to furnish suggestion of a change.

It is this, we have no doubt, which has been designed from the first. To oust the Marshal and put in some one who would be more pliant and would better serve the purpose of those who sought his downfall, was the real end in view. The failure of the criminal proceedings will therefore cause but small chagrin to his enemies if they can but procure his removal.

The action of the Commissioner is a vindication of the grand jury. That body heard the stories of the females who were put forward, weighed their character and reputation, saw that their unsupported statements would not convince an impartial jury, perceived that by such testimony any man however innocent would be unsafe if that was sufficient to place him in jeopardy, and so refused to indict. After a patient hearing and a full opportunity to adduce all the evidence possible, the conclusion arrived at by the Commissioner and the public is that no fair jury would on such stories convict the accused.

This whole batch of filth might have been spared the public, but for the eager anxiety of the "Liberal" organ to get the Marshal ejected from his office, and its natural love for that which is prurient and vile. So far it has accomplished nothing of its purpose except to sell a few more papers, regale the scandal-loving with appreciated diet, find vent for malicious and slanderous expressions, and raise an offensive and suspicious odor that taints the very air.

Everybody, however, approves of the course of Chief Justice Zane in this matter. When such prominent officials as the Governor and the District Attorney laid the charges before him, expressed their belief that they were true and informed him that many of the grand jury were in favor of an indictment, he could do no less than order an investigation. The Prosecuting Attorney had it his own way. He selected the commissioner to hear the case. He had an assistant attorney. He had access to every witness he wanted. He had the court with him in restricting the defense on a vital point—the character of the chief witness against the accused; they could bring in evidence against her public reputation but nothing against her personal character. Yet with all these things in his favor, the District Attorney could not make out a case that would stand the test of a jury.

The question may arise, now that the Marshal has been acquitted, what cause has he to sue his original accusers for damages? The damage lies largely in the facts we have related and in the effects we have described. If the stories that have been made public are false, or if there was no good reason why they should be spread abroad, tainting the social atmosphere and arousing distrust among people who may not hear but one side, the victim of malice and spleen is injured greatly and he should have a legal remedy. This will be for a court to decide, and the conclusion should be reached without delay.

The DESERET News has had no more than the general public interest in this matter, except in one particular. The same nasty source from which this whole offensive scandal sprang, brought forth a positive falsehood concerning an alleged agreement with this paper and the Marshal, and managed to inject it into the general mass of libellous matter. We therefore referred to it in self-defense, and our knowledge that the one assertion was absolutely false, led to our doubt of the entire libellous story and to judge of the motives that led to the

recital by the lying purpose that was behind the incidental charge.

We hope this unpleasant matter will soon be brought to a final end. There is nothing left for the Marshal to do now but to carry his suit forward, and, as far as he can, vindicate himself before the community. If there was any disposition on the part of his accusers to retract, it might be different. But now the public look for further proceedings and a settlement of the unsavory question. Let justice be done, whatever may be the result.

UTAH AND STATEHOOD.

THE New York *Advertiser* comments on the article in the *Forum* by Judge Zane, in connection with the remarks of President Harrison, concerning Utah and polygamy. While making some invidious reflections on the "flexible" character of the "Mormon" religion, the *Advertiser* does not regard the objections hinted at by the President as very formidable on the State question. It says:

"As an argument against the admission of Utah this is not without force, but it is not more forcible than others that were employed against the admission of other Territories by the last Congress.

"Much depends on whose political ox is gored."

This is quite significant, and if there were any movement just now on the part of Utah to gain statehood much might be said on the subject. We notice that the people and papers of Wyoming—which was one of those Territories spoken of by the *Advertiser*—are quite friendly to the admission of this Territory. The *Lander Mountaineer* discusses the admission of Arizona and New Mexico and thus alludes to Utah:

"There is no longer room to deny that polygamy has been abandoned in Utah. The Territory ought to be admitted, for it is wholly repugnant to the spirit of American institutions to treat it as a conquered province in which a hostile people is to be subjected and kept subject by imperial force. The other States have a right to dictate the terms of its admission, but only so far as the terms dictated are compatible with the principle of the equality of all States in the Union. When it is admitted this equality of the States must be maintained for it is the principle upon which the Union is based. The proposition of the Mormons to surrender this equality, that Utah may remain in part subject to the government as a province, while entering as a State, is one which cannot be entertained. When Utah comes into the Union it must be on an equality with Missouri or Massachusetts, with Virginia or Vermont, in all that concerns its statehood."

Utah is in no great hurry. She can afford to wait a little longer. And when she does go in, we are of the opinion that it will be as suggested, without any restrictions upon her entire freedom as an equal and sovereign State.