

EDITORIALS.

AS SURE AS FATE.

THE San Francisco Jewish Times has the annexed paragraph:

"Will there be a return to the land of our forefathers, the land made immortal in history and song by the suffering of Israel? Will we again possess the Holy City, a city made immortal by its sieges and its sufferings? These are questions of grave importance. There are Jews who devoutly believe that Israel will again be a nation among the nations of the earth, and there are Jews who think that the mission of Israel is to live amongst the people of the earth and spread the light of true knowledge amongst them."

The questions propounded and the doubts expressed here, indicate either profound ignorance of the prophecies of the ancient Hebrew seers or little reliance upon their predictions. There is no event in the future history of the Jewish race portrayed more clearly in their sacred books than the return of the scattered people to the land of their forefathers. Either Judah will be gathered from every nation under heaven, and the ancient kingdom will be restored with far more than its previous riches, glory and dominion, or the old prophecies were failures and frauds.

The Latter-day Saints, or "Mormons" as they are commonly called, have the highest assurances, apart from the revelations in the Jewish scriptures, that He who scattered Israel will gather them again in these latter times; that the soil of Palestine will again become fertile and "flowing with milk and honey;" that Jerusalem will be rebuilt; that the riches of the great manipulators of the world's wealth will flow unto it; that the Hebraic commonwealth will be established as a separate and independent government; that to it will come the Messiah in the due time of the Great Jehovah, and that he will prove to be the Jesus of Nazareth whom the Jews once delivered to Pontius Pilate.

These events and many details connected therewith are foreshadowed in the Book of Mormon, and have been revealed from heaven in the present age as part of the programme of the "dispensation of the fulness of times." The "Mormons" will be found closely connected with the Jews in the restoration of latter-day Israel. They are by blood chiefly descendants of Joseph, of ancient Egyptian fame, through the loins of Ephraim to whom descended the birthright. Ephraim became mixed among the Gentiles, but "blood will tell," and the posterity of Ephraim and Manasseh will fulfill the blessing pronounced by Jacob and Moses, and will "push the people together from the ends of the earth." Ephraim will not vex Judah nor Judah Ephraim," but in the set time of the Lord they will work together for the redemption of all Israel.

That Judah will yet become a nation, possess the Holy City, rebuild their Temple where now the Moslem mosque rears its domes and minarets above the hills of Zion, and fulfill all the inspired predictions of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, et al., is as sure as the rising of the sun after the going down thereof; for it is written in the archives of heaven, and is declared by Him who cannot lie and who never breaks His word.

WINDMILL IRRIGATION.

THE Carson Appeal publishes the following account of the manner in which a Nevada rancher managed to cultivate one of the dry spots in that locality:

"John Asberry, a man who has a little ranch on the suburbs of Carson, towards Soft Springs, has been unable to secure water to irrigate his land, and has finally solved the problem independent of anybody. He dug a well thirteen feet deep and struck two veins of pure cold water. He then erected a windmill at an expense of \$40, which pumps 7,000 gallons of water upon his land every 24 hours. The windmill is built on an entirely new plan, and a caveat has already been filed preparatory to securing a patent. The windmill consists of four boards about seven feet long, fastened to long arms projecting from an axle. The wind acts on the affair just as water acts on an overshot wheel. The wind only strikes the upper part

of the wheel, the lower part being enclosed by a board fence. In a slight breeze the mill revolves about 20 revolutions per minute, but in a good stiff gale, it flies so fast that a sliding board must be raised to shut off the wind. The wheel is connected with the plunger of the pump, and the water flows in a steady stream. The mill was running briskly yesterday, when some of the big mills, costing \$250, were not moving. The success of this scheme solves the problem of irrigation in Nevada. Any man can sink his well and erect his mill of rough lumber, and have his field irrigated, at an expense of \$50, with his water-flow perpetual."

Mills to raise water have been tried in many places in Utah, but for some reason that we are not aware of do not seem to meet with favor for any great length of time. They have not "solved the problem of irrigation" for the dry places of Utah, whatever they may have done for Nevada.

A "MORMON" EATER'S DISGRACE.

THE name of Christianity first came into public prominence through the connection of the Senator bearing that name with the "Mormon" question. Senator Christianity figured, for awhile as a pious statesman whose chief legislative efforts were directed against the suppression of "Mormon" polygamy. He fathered a bill prepared for him by some Utah adventurers and worked hard for its passage, and for some time his name appeared conspicuously in every congressional anti-"Mormon" movement. He, being quite an old man, made a sensation by marrying a young girl employed as a Treasury clerk. He was subsequently sent as United States minister to Peru. Then came the story of his domestic infelicity; his application for divorce, the exposure of his brutality, folly, duplicity and meanness; and now comes another and more disgusting chapter in the old "Mormon"-eater's unsavory history.

The New York Herald of August 20, gives the following particulars of testimony in the Christianity case sworn to by Mr. A. Foliott, a noted specialist of Washington, D. C., which created quite a commotion in court:

A. Foliott testified that in July, 1876, Senator Christianity called at his drug store and informed him that his wife was in a critical condition and that he had been referred to witness as a careful and competent practitioner in such specialties; witness told him to go to some of the regular physicians of Washington, and gave him the names of several, among them was Dr. Boyle; the Senator said he would not call in a regular physician, "Dr. Boyle or any other;" he wanted counsel more than he did practical service, because he was fairly read upon obstetrics and theoretically posted thereon. He further said that he was too far advanced in years to commence the rearing of a young family and for that reason he had operated upon his wife himself. From the effects of his operation his wife was confined to her bed and suffering great pain. Witness finally, after considerable urging, agreed to call and see the Senator's wife, which he did one evening about the middle of July, 1876; at 10 o'clock. He went to No. 310 Indiana Avenue, south side, and was met by Senator Christianity, who took him into the front room on the lower floor of the house. It appeared to be used as an office and parlor. After a short consultation witness went into a back room, where a lady was confined to her bed. Senator Christianity told him that this was his wife, and introduced him as the doctor who had called to prescribe for her. The patient was very weak, and complained of considerable pain. An examination showed positive indications of malpractice. Witness made out a prescription, went to his drug store, prepared the medicine and delivered it to Senator Christianity. The following day the Senator called on witness and stated that his wife was improving. Two days later he again called witness to his house and said his wife was suffering and complaining. When witness arrived at the house he was informed by Senator Christianity that his wife's mother was in the sick room and nothing could be done until he got rid of her. When witness again saw the patient she appeared much distressed, and es-

pecially when he informed her that a premature birth would soon occur. She said that she had protested against it but it had availed nothing, as her husband insisted upon performing the operation; witness advised her to be on her guard against undue excitement, and that with proper remedies and careful nursing she would soon be well; the following Sunday Senator Christianity called at witness' store and stated that the result of the operation had been very satisfactory, and that his wife was then getting along nicely. He then asked if any further treatment was necessary and witness told him "No." Senator Christianity said "How much do I owe you for your connection with this case?" Witness replied, "Twenty-five dollars." The Senator thereupon took out his pocketbook, paid the money and left the store. At this point the hearing was adjourned. The defence decided not to cross-examine the witness at this time.

The pious old scap-grace was so religious that the thought of a few "Mormons" having more wives than one at the same time, and caring for and educating the offspring of such unions, was too much for him to endure with quietude, so he exerted himself to the utmost to bring down upon them the wrath of the country and the force of the Government. Yet it appears from the above evidence that he would not scruple, for the gratification of his baser passions, to gain possession of a young and trusting woman, and then after disgusting her with his stingy and selfish ways, commit an outrage upon her which in its nature and intent is of the very essence of murder.

If you want to find the most inveterate haters of plural marriage, you must look for them among the lustful, licentious and depraved; and they are not always of the ignorant and uneducated class, but move often in what is called good society, and pose for "Christians" of the most refined type. Among women you will discover them in the number of those who commit the unnatural crimes which are the curse of the country. Who smother their maternal instincts and kill the unborn babes seeking through them the gift of life on earth. Who refuse to fill the measure of their own creation—the reproduction of their species, but not the means devised in nature for procreation. Who accept the pleasure but repudiate the responsibility. Sinners against God and humanity, cherishing the subtle spirit of crime, the genius of destruction in their bosoms, the work of Satan in their hands, they lower themselves beneath the level of the brutes, and then with mincing words and pious wiles, they talk of the terrible wickedness of plural marriage, and call for vengeance upon those whose lives are in accord with nature and in harmony with divine commands.

Now we do not say that all opponents of plural marriage are of these kinds of modern "Christians." We have never made a charge of that character. But we do assert that the vilest of them are active and virulent anti-polygamists. We will go a step further, and maintain that those who are chiefly engaged in stirring up the prejudices and animosities of the public against the "Mormon" family relation, under pretence of shocked piety and aggravated sanctity, will be found on thorough investigation to be corrupt at heart, vicious in habit, saturated with hypocrisy, and villainous in intent. Long experience in watching the career of such violent assailants of "Mormonism" and bombastic champions of monogamic "civilization," has demonstrated to us this fact, and it only requires time and circumstances to develop it in their history.

The name of Christianity will be coupled with infamy in all future generations, so long as it is remembered at all. And the fate of all those who have signalized themselves in unrighteously attacking this great latter-day work which the Almighty has established, has been either sorrow, disgrace, oblivion or speedy death. "So shall it be with the multitude" of men and nations "that fight against Mount Zion."

MUNICIPAL, TERRITORIAL, AND NATIONAL LAW.

THERE are not wanting in this region persons who clamor very loudly for the maintenance of a certain law of Congress, and the punishment of those who are said to vi-

olate it, but who are ready at any time to break local laws and regulations, or encourage their violation, which interfere with their notions or stand in the way of their pecuniary interest. They do not seem to understand that they are just as culpable, if not more so, than the people against whom they make this outcry, even if the latter have done all that is alleged against them.

Some of them will argue that there is a wide difference between mere municipal ordinances or territorial laws, and an Act of Congress. They may do so for the purpose of casting dust in the eyes of the uninformed and of making excuse for their own lawlessness, but this subterfuge is so thin that any one accustomed to using his eyes can easily see through it. It is true that a municipal body, authorized to pass ordinances for the government of a city, derives all its powers from a charter given by legislative enactment. It is also true that in a Territory the Legislature is restricted in its authority by the Organic Act which gave it existence. But at the same time it must be acknowledged that Congress obtains its powers and is limited in its authority by the Constitution of the United States.

Each body has a sphere of its own. The valid acts of either are just as binding within that sphere as are the others in theirs. An Act of Congress if not in accord with the Constitution is void, just as much so as a territorial statute in opposition to the Organic Act, or a municipal ordinance antagonistic to the City Charter. Is it possible that any one pretending to be learned in law, or skilled in logic, will pretend that a municipal ordinance in harmony with the charter is not as binding inside the city limits as an Act of Congress within the sphere of its operations? Or that a territorial statute, compatible with the Organic Act and congressional provisions, is not as authoritative within the Territory as a law of the United States? If so, his pretensions must be greater than his acquirements, or he is arguing for interest and not for truth.

If the Salt Lake City Council passes an ordinance regulating the sale of liquor by a high license fee, and authority is found in the Charter for the passage of such an ordinance, is not that in law a binding regulation? And should it not be observed as closely as a revenue law of the United States? If not, why not? It may be argued that the validity of the ordinance may be contested. Yes, and so may that of the national revenue law, each in the proper court. And those who set at naught the municipal ordinance are just as much law-breakers as persons who wilfully violate an Act of Congress.

The Third District Court of Utah has said that a license rate of \$1,000 per annum is in the nature of a tax. The Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska says in relation to a State law with the same rate that it is not in the nature of a tax. Does the fact that in one case the regulation is by a city ordinance, and the other by a State law affect the principle involved? Is \$1,000 a tax because a municipality imposes it and not a tax if imposed by a State? To hear some people talk one would think that the principle is changed by a change of the place of its enunciation. If the City Council has the right by Charter to pass such an ordinance it is of the same force and effect so far as the City's jurisdiction extends, as any law passed by any body in the world within its proper sphere. Our citation of the Nebraska decision on the Slocumb law was not to draw any parallel between the respective jurisdictions of legislative bodies of differing powers, but to show that a license which was declared in Utah to be a tax was decided in Nebraska not to be a tax; and the logical inference is that if the Nebraska law was not void because of the \$1,000 rate, neither should the Salt Lake ordinance be considered void for the same reason, always supposing, of course, that the Charter of Salt Lake City authorized the passage of the ordinance, but not any more so than that the Nebraska constitution authorized the enactment of the law. If one Judge in this Territory, appointed for political reasons by Government patronage, is supposed of necessity to know more about legal principles and definitions and the bearings of law than a Supreme Bench in a State, each member of which was elected for recognized capabilities for the position, it is quite possible that the latter were wrong and the former was right. But we do not

think many persons will look at it in that light.

The regulation of the liquor traffic is generally recognized as a police measure, and Courts usually sustain either statutes or ordinances in the interest of temperance and public order, so long as they are not in violation of chartered or constitutional restrictions. If Salt Lake city is prohibited by charter, or statute, or Organic Act, or Constitution from imposing a local license fee of \$1,000 per annum on liquor dealers and from requiring saloons to close at 10 o'clock at night, we would like to see the restriction. And if there is any law or logic to establish the principle that a valid regulation is not as binding, within its legitimate sphere, if passed by a municipality as by a legislative body possessing larger powers and a wider field of operations, we would be pleased with an opportunity to gaze upon the extraordinary enunciation.

A BIGAMOUS SCOUNDREL.

EASTERN papers have devoted considerable space lately to a narration of the doings of one Arthur Merritt, alias Gen. A. B. Morton, alias Thos. A. Marvin, alias Daniel Lindsay, etc., etc. He has lived in New Haven for three years or more with his wife and daughter, leaving home occasionally for brief periods and always returning with plenty of cash. He is rather a fine-looking person of 55 years, with gray hair and mustache, is five feet nine inches high, and weighs about 150 pounds.

It appears that the occupation of this individual, who is well educated and gifted with good conversational powers, is bigamy and forgery. How many women and banks he has victimized has not yet been determined, but at least nine of the former and as many of the latter have cases against him.

His plan of operation was to advertise in religious papers for a governess, describing himself as a wealthy widower, with a young daughter, for whom he desired the care of a suitable lady. By this means he managed to entrap several unsuspecting females, obtain money from them, and by forgery on different banks replenished his exchequer freely. The case which led to his apprehension and exposure will serve as a sample for the others.

Last May a Miss Turpin, of Richmond, read the advertisement described, in the *Churchmen*, replied to it and received a response signed Thomas A. Marvin, asking to see her and for her terms and references. She referred him to a judge and a prominent Episcopal clergyman in Richmond. He in turn requested her to write to Judge Cowan, of Germantown, the Rev. W. A. Taylor, of Camden, and the Hon. John Danforth, of Media, Pa. She did so and received from all the persons addressed the most flattering statements respecting Mr. Marvin. In due time Mr. Marvin appeared and negotiated for Miss Turpin's services. He was suddenly called away on business, but before going promised to return for her. He represented himself as very wealthy, and as having recently come from the West. About the middle of July he returned to Richmond for the governess.

In the meantime the young woman had received a letter from Mrs. Taylor, of Camden, who spoke of Mr. Marvin's wealth, accomplishments and social position, and concluded by advising the young woman to accept him should he propose marriage. She could assure the young woman that she would be happy with Mr. Marvin, as his devotion to his first wife "was touchingly beautiful."

When Mr. Marvin arrived the second time he said that he was loath to place one he loved so much in the embarrassing and possibly questionable position of governess. She accepted him and they were married on July 20. Before the marriage Mr. Marvin settled upon his bride \$30,000. Before leaving upon their bridal trip Marvin, upon the identification of friends of his bride, cashed at the First National Bank of Richmond a draft for \$765, purporting to have been drawn by the First National Bank of Chicago, and payable to Baird & Brainerd, who had indorsed it over to Thomas A. Marvin.

He took his "bride" to Washington, thence to Jersey City, Albany, Rochester and Albion. While in the latter place Marvin showed his