

impossible, even it were profitable, to notice a tenth of them. Once in a while we pay a little attention to something of the kind that calls for comment.

A lady who signs herself Mary Grant Major has been writing up her experiences in Utah, and these have been published with illustrations. Among them is an account of the "home for polygamous wives" in this city, which contains a great many inaccuracies, not made intentionally by the writer, perhaps, but resulting from her credulity and the deception practiced by persons who appeared to her to be reliable.

We do not intend to take up the article serially, and once more refute the old false statements it echoes, but will merely refer to one item of information afforded by the writer. She gives the name of a person from whom she obtained many of the points she has presented. It is Mrs. Dykes, daughter of Mrs. S. A. Cooke, whose anti-"Mormon" proclivities are pretty well known in Utah.

Our reason for mentioning this is that Mrs. Dykes is spoken of as having "just returned from a tour through Utah, having gone among the Mormon people to tell as many as she could reach about the Home." We are told that this person has been traveling ostensibly as a business woman to introduce some dressmaking or other improvements, and has been well treated by the Latter-day Saints. That is all right, if she has not been acting with duplicity. If her real purpose was to advocate the beauties of the "Industrial Home," an institution founded and fostered in falsehood and malignity, then this business cloak was simply a cover to the real purpose she had in view. And the misinformation imparted to the writer of the article, indicates the spirit and purpose of the informant to be hostile to the people who have extended to her their courtesies.

There is no objection to the employment of women to go through this Territory and drum up recruits for an institution that has been an ignominious failure from the beginning, except in deceiving Congress and obtaining public funds in large amounts. The empty rooms and mournful echoes of the big and useless building are evidences of the folly and shame of the whole concern. The article to which we refer says:

"The only inmates of the 'Industrial Christian Home,' as the building is called, are an aged grandmother, who sits placidly at her knitting all day; a young woman, who has her three children with her; a Danish woman, who is soon to return to her own country, and three little chil-

dren whose mother was driven insane by polygamy. These, with the maïron, her son, and the Chinese cook, Ah Wing, form the little household."

So that there is really need for agents to go forth and persuade people to come in and keep up some show of life in the affair, that Uncle Sam may be periodically bled still further for its support. But they ought not to do this under false pretences. Let the soliciting be performed in a manner open and above-board. No "brothering" and "sistering" to make believe that they are "Mormons" mingling among "Mormons" for purely business purposes. And no pretensions of friendship and fraternity one day and defamation and hostility the next.

These newspaper contributors, as a rule, collect just such scraps as will probably suit the public taste. Therefore they look for them in the places where they are likely to be found. If they wanted facts they would go where the truth could be obtained. But truth is usually too simple and common place for their purpose. Therefore they accept the idle yarns of the weaver of fiction, and the highly colored utterances of the soured malignant and angered seceder, and spread them before the public still further embellished if not improved.

If other communications from Mary Grant Major prove no more reliable than this, her contributions to journalistic history will be of little value, and will not have even the merit of originality. It is astonishing that the papers as well as the public are not tired of this sort of second hand pabulum.

DEVELOPMENTS AT THE JOHNSON INQUEST.

THE investigation into the mysterious death of Richard M. Johnson, who was found dead in the city jail on Sunday, January 11th, has developed a disgusting state of facts. The deceased was arrested on Friday, Jan. 8th, on a charge of drunkenness. On Saturday, Jan. 10th, he was, by the police justice, adjudged guilty and a fine of five dollars was imposed. He requested Mr. O'Reilly, the desk officer in the City Marshal's office, to notify his brother, Edwin Johnson, that the latter might appear and pay the fine and he be liberated. Mr. O'Reilly claims that he spent some time in an attempt to find Edwin Johnson, and failed.

The next morning Richard M. Johnson was found dead on the floor of his cell. The Marshal was informed of the fact and looked at the body. The Coroner was notified and also gazed on the corpse, but decided that an inquest was not necessary. Dr. Meacham was

sent for and viewed the remains and gave it as his opinion that death had ensued from acute alcoholism. The body was consigned to undertakers Evans & Ross, and by them conveyed to the city cemetery, where it was buried on Monday, Jan. 12. The first intimation that Edwin Johnson had of the death of his brother was through the columns of the Monday issue of a morning paper, which announced the fact.

The feelings of this relative of the deceased may be presumed by those who care, in imagination, to put themselves in his place. At his instance the body was exhumed and an inquiry, which ought to have been made before burial, instituted. At this investigation it was developed that the body had been consigned to the grave in a nude state with the exception of a shirt and a pair of socks, and in a filthy condition; also that there were two cuts or incisions of considerable length in the region of the abdomen.

In a nutshell, here are some of the disgraceful and disgusting features of this affair. The Coroner failed in his duty in not holding an inquest. If anyone needs any more evidence to convince him of this than the facts of the exhumation after burial and the subsequent investigation, he must be hard to satisfy. The genius, and we think the letter of the law, also sustains this view.

The deceased, who was a native born American, had resided in this Territory thirty-five years and had two brothers living in this city. It does not appear that any effort was made to find those relatives and inform them of the death of their brother. In connection with this neglect of a plain duty it should be remembered that it was known at the city hall that the deceased had a brother in town, and Officer O'Reilly tried to find him on the day before the death occurred. The latter has stated also that he informed several of the officials concerned of the fact. Such neglect has not only the aspect of ordinary carelessness, but of downright inhumanity.

The nude and comparatively filthy condition in which the body was interred, reflects no credit upon those to whom it was consigned for burial.

Now comes another striking feature of the case. Marshal Young, Coroner Harris, Dr. Meacham and the undertaker saw the body, as a matter of course. All of them testify that they did not see the cuts in the abdomen, and some of them positively swore that the incisions were not there when they examined the remains. As a matter of course if the cuts were made while deceased was alive it would prove pos-