

OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

MOBOCRACY IN ILLINOIS—GOVERNOR OGLESBY—POLITICAL PROSPECTS—LABOR ORGANIZATIONS—PURITANISM IN POLITICS—IDEAL DEMOCRACY.

CHICAGO, April 12, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

Matters in general do not seem to improve with us here in the East. The labor troubles are growing more and more serious. Illinois still preserves the pain for her superiority in riotous mobocracy, and for the inefficiency and incapacity of her public men. Governor Oglesby has proven himself the first man in America most unqualified to be at the head of a democratic commonwealth. Only a year ago he called out his militia to shoot down a few Polish laborers, and then his party organs raised a shout of glory about the decisive spirit and prompt action of

OUR "EXECUTIVE."

Last week he deprecated calling out his militia, but he suggested to a sheriff the means of raising a local force. Advertisements were inserted in various newspapers requiring "men of grit" to act as deputy sheriffs or marshals, or whatever they might be. These were to get five dollars a day and board. These were the heroes who distinguished themselves a few days ago as licensed murderers—scamps imported from saloons and dives all over the country. And this Governor of ours has senatorial aspirations! He refused to call out his militia in time lest it would damage his prospects of attaining a seat in the Senate.

The April elections have passed over, but not without suggesting

OMINOUS HINTS FOR THE FUTURE

to the sagacious observer. The Republicans claim that a reaction is setting in on their side. Yes, but it is the last flickering before extinction, the last heavy breath before dissolution. It is true they have gained some little advantages locally here and there, such as aldermen, town officers, and a few small affairs, but it is not owing to any change in public sentiment. It is owing to a skillful manipulation of the "soreheads" and "mercenary bands" always to be found in large towns and cities. And there is one other significant fact that politicians of the Democratic party must note; it is the lack of enthusiasm, even of interest manifested by many old line Democrats. Of these, numbers remained away from the polls. The Republican organs claim that this means dislike of the Administration. It is not exactly that, but still it is a doubt about something in the Administration which seems to them mysterious. The conservative course adopted by the President, and his care in selecting men not very prominently identified with local politics to office, has been represented by Republicans still in office, as an indication that the President may one day openly avow himself a Republican. Really many Democrats thought until the recent tilt with the Senate that there was something in the Administration not easily explicable. In our city there were some appointments which did not give satisfaction, to either the office-seeking Democrat or the unofficial one. These men were irreproachable in character, but politically obscure. Their Democracy was known more to the bou-tion of Republicanism than to the rank and file of their own party, hence the color given to the hints of office-holders from the old regime. Such appointments don't improve the politics of a country, nor advance the interests, nor elevate the sentiments of a party. It is supposed that by such appointments decent Republicans are converted. There are no decent Republicans, hence none are converted, but decent Democrats are driven into socialism, and dirty Democrats are bought over by Republicans as was the case in several of our wards in this city. Old officeholders were retained, and by this means the old political clubs are still intact. These Republican clubs are composed of ex-soldiers, pensioners, officeholders and G. A. R. men, and the safety of the country demands the breaking up of these clubs. They constitute

A HUGE FEDERAL CONSPIRACY.

every means of diverting money out of the National Treasury from these clubs ought to be rigorously adopted. The Knights of Labor as an organization bid fair to wield no little power in future politics. In several small towns they have elected their own men to office against coalitions of Democrats and Republicans. As this order prevails mostly, if not entirely, in Republican States, that party must shout "Labor" or lose its grip. Senator Logan must throw aside the sword, and resume the cow-wattle, Edmunds must renounce Jay Gould and drink cold tea with Barney Biglin, Cullom must adopt some role wherein he can play the friend of the working-man. And poor old Hoar will have the satisfaction of seeing Ben Butler Senator from Massachusetts. There is every probability that a new party will be in existence for the next Presidential election. And this means the demise of the Republican party. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan and Minnesota can be controlled by Knights of Labor. So to keep these States the Republican party must re-organize. The Democratic party has always been the friend of labor, and besides it can do without these States, so in any

event its perpetuation is certain. It will be funny to see Jay Gould's attorney turning K. of L.

Many persons think that great changes, if not actual revolutions, are about to occur. No doubt we are

ON THE EVE OF A CRITICAL EPOCH,

but then perhaps it may be all for the better. This organization of labor will tend to produce a homogeneity of race that must in the end be beneficial to the country. It will also abolish the growing feelings of caste and class which were taking root. It will divert the minds of politicians from subjects which were calculated to dwarf and pervert. For instance, anti-"Mormon" legislation will have to be suspended. If that were indulged in, the next would be anti-Romanist or anti-Methodist. According as the mind dwells on narrow views, it gets more and more contracted. By harping on such themes as the above the mind of Edmund Burke would soon be on the same plane with that of Kater Field. Of course, we will have a large sprinkling of the Puritan with us for many a day yet, and while we have such we must expect to see puritanical doings. The Puritan is not entirely an evil. We owe many good things to him, just as we owe good sewers and clean drainage to cholera and plague.

One thing is to be feared from the present troubles in this country, and that is that democracy in Europe will receive a severe check. Its opponents in England always maintained that democracy carried out in the shape it has been for the last 25 years would result in anarchy. And there was much reason for this prediction. Here we had a newspaper enlarging on the horrors of stealing human beings and selling them. This was all very just, but then that same paper contained an article or an essay, stolen from the brain of a Frenchman or Englishman, and most unblushingly sold on the public street. Any man would rather sell negro flesh than British brains any time. It was the same way with Communism. This same paper dubbed the Communist a foreign pauper while it prospered by selling foreign grains. This paper claimed to have abolished slavery, yet it has helped to establish Coolie labor from China and contract labor from Europe, which are but milder and more economic forms of the old system. This is all the result of

THE PURITAN IN OUR POLITICS.

The Puritan cannot conceive anything grand, or large in a national sense; hence in our time he is matter misplaced.

Matthew Arnold says in his essay on

DEMOCRACY:

"Nations are not truly great solely because the individuals composing them are numerous, free and active; but they are great when these numbers, this freedom, and this activity are employed in the service of an ideal higher than that of an ordinary man, taken by himself." The question is, who can set this high tone in a democracy such as ours professes to be? One would naturally answer, the Upper House in Washington ought to be one agency; and that instinctive spirit of mental activity and progressive expansion said to be characteristic of democracy ought to develop an intellectual aristocracy which would be the other most potent agency. Is the Senate doing its duty? Hear Logan dragging up detestable war memories on every occasion, hear Ingalls analyzing Barney Coroy; hear Edmunds growling about a Maine postmaster; hear Cullom with his school-boy platitudes on inter-State commerce; hear Hoar and his Puritan anti-"Mormon" ideas; then ask is the Senate setting a high ideal? Where is our intellect? Echo answers, where? Mr. Lamb of Salt Lake is an illustration, and his erudite patron Marshal Murray. We have not to-day one really educating and instructive book in our literature tending to produce a high national ideal. Miss Cleveland's book is the nearest to such that has been published within the last twenty-five years.

Mr. Arnold thinks the fathers of the Republic intended

THIS IDEAL

to be found in the "dignity and authority of the State," and in a strong and vigorous executive. At the present time we have an Executive that commands popular reverence, but the action of the Senate is truly despicable. This howl about soldiers and pensions reminds one of a gang of "Yankee notion" peddlers, each blowing his own horn. An "illustrations" Senator grasps at some unsavory name, the same as a hoodlum in a barber shop would grasp the Police News, and dwells on it with nauseous salaciousness. It is probable that Barney Coroy is a scoundrel; but if so why not adopt the proper course, refuse to confirm, or prove tangibly his unworthiness for any place of trust. Wretches will come to the surface in every walk of life, why not in quest of an office? What an edifying and dignifying national ideal Edmunds and his crowd presents to the nation! This silly Puritan element in our politics is a curse to our country. It is bad enough in England, but it is worse here. Mr. Arnold says of it in England: "Our Puritan middle class presents a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners." But it applies 100 per cent. more forcibly to our Yankee Puritan. And yet it is in deference to this class

anti-"Mormon" laws are enacted, confiscation bills are passed, and from that class a national ideal expected. JUNIUS.

ANOTHER TESTIMONY.

ON THE REVOLUTION AND PRACTICE OF THE DOCTRINE OF PATRIARCHAL MARRIAGE.

SALT LAKE CITY,

April 10, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

By some oversight the accompanying statement by Brother Howard Coray on the absorbing question of Celestial Marriage being preached and practiced by the illustrious patrons Joseph and Hyrum Smith, has been kept from the public.

Please give it a place in the News and oblige all concerned, including

A. M. M.

HOWARD CORAY'S AFFIDAVIT.

TERRITORY OF UTAH,
County of Salt Lake. } ss.

As many false statements have been made in relation to the authorship of the revelation on Celestial Marriage, I deem it but justice to all lovers of truth for me to express what I know concerning this very important matter:

On the 22d day of July, A. D. 1843, Hyrum Smith, the martyred patriarch, came in a carriage to my house in Nauvoo; he invited me and my wife to take a ride with him; accordingly, as soon as we could make ourselves ready, we got into his carriage and he set off in the direction of Carthage. Having gone a short distance, he observed to us that his brother, Joseph Smith, the Prophet, had received a revelation on marriage, that was not for the public yet, which he would rehearse to us, as he had taken pains to commit it to memory. He then commenced rehearsing the revelation on celestial marriage, not stopping till he had gone quite through with the matter. After which he reviewed that part pertaining to plurality of wives, dwelling at some length upon the same in order that we might clearly understand the principle. And on the same day (July 22d, 1843) he sealed my wife, formerly Martha Jane Kwoiltoz, to me; and when I heard the revelation on celestial marriage read on the stand in Salt Lake City in 1852, I recognized it, as the same as that repeated to me by Brother Hyrum Smith. Not long after this I was present when Brother David Fullmer and wife were sealed by Brother Hyrum Smith, the martyred patriarch, according to the law of celestial marriage. And, besides the foregoing, there was quite enough came within the compass of my observation to have fully satisfied my mind that plural marriage was practiced in the city of Nauvoo.

HOWARD CORAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of June, A. D., 1882.

JAMES JACK,

Notary Public for Salt Lake County, U. T.

FRIENDLY WORDS FROM A NON-"MORMON."

CRANSTON, R. I.,

April, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

The copies of the Deseret News which I receive get well read, for after I read them I pass them around among my friends and neighbors, many of whom are surprised to find out that they don't know all about "Mormonism." They thought the papers here printed the Utah news as it is, but they find that there is one side of the question that they knew nothing about. This raid of persecution is advertising "Mormonism" more than your Elders can do, and there are many honest people who will be incited by it to look at the other side and find there are two sides to every story. No one but a fool and a bigot will condemn on hearing one side.

It is hard on the men who have to endure the persecution heaped upon the "Mormons." Is there no way you can stop the raid? Why don't you boycott all connected with it. I don't see how your government can be made much worse than it is. If more than the usual number of thieves are appointed to rule over you, there may be hope of their falling out when they come to divide the spoil, and when rogues fall out, honest men stand a show. Your Church seems to be the first Church in the land the President in his message to Congress always speaks of. In fact, he does not so much as mention any other, and now Congress is going to honor him by making him the President or presiding Elder of it. It will then become the established Church of the United States. I cannot say that I want to see a State church, but if we must have one, yours will do as well as any of them.

I think you make a mistake in one thing, and that is, you don't pay your Elders anything for preaching. If you were to give them a good fat salary, all the preachers in the country would want to come in and be "Mormon" Elders. You know the loudest call is where there is the most money.

I read the tirade delivered by the Judge in sentencing S. H. B. Smith; he says that Mahomet claimed to have inspiration from the Almighty, and sought to establish himself by the sword, but time proved him to be

wrong. Could the Judge not be induced to tell how time proved him to be wrong? I can't see how time proved him wrong or right. He appeared in this world's history 600 years after Christ, and there are millions more Mahomedans than Christians to day, so if number counts, he was right. The judges evidently think that the preponderance of numbers decide such questions, for they tell you people that there are fifty millions against you and you must be wrong. Numbers count when they are wanted, but when they are not wanted, they do not, especially when they are votes for Delegate to Congress.

Respectfully,
CALVIN TRUESDELL.

SCHOOL TAX QUESTIONS.

CROYDEN, April 10, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

We want your opinion upon the following items, if you please: Last night we had our usual school tax meeting. The Trustees' notice for said meeting was dated 6th of April, and the meeting set for the 15th. When the tax-payers met some said it was not a legal meeting, it should have been the 16th.

Next, some of the boys under age voted, saying they paid a property tax.

Next we had several women voters whose husbands were present and voted also, making two voters in one family, and the women held no real estate except what they had entered on the assessor's book, say a cow or two, perhaps a horse, and the same with the boys. Will you be kind enough to settle this matter in your next issue and oblige your

SUBSCRIBERS.

It is our opinion that the ten days' notice required by law was given by the Trustees. The day that the notice was posted counts one, and there were nine other days before the meeting, making ten days in all. If the law required notice by the town crier, the crying of the notice would count for each day that it was cried. In the same way the posting or publication of the notice counts from and including the first day. The object of the law is to give the tax-payers ample time to learn of the proposed meeting, that they may not be deprived of a voice in the assessment of the tax through ignorance of the meeting. However it would be better, in our opinion, to give a day or two extra time than to let it down so close as to cause disputes.

The law permits all property tax-payers resident in the district who are present at the meeting, to vote for or against the school tax. This is quite right. It is not a political matter, and the voting is not governed by the rules of politics. It is a matter of money. Any person, male or female, who is on the regular tax list and is liable to pay the tax assessed for school purposes, should of right have a voice in its assessment. An alien owning property in the school district is liable to pay the school tax, and has therefore a right to vote on it. In the same way all other persons, even though unable to vote at a political election, or even for the election of trustees, if liable for the tax are eligible to vote on the tax. But they must be bona fide owners of the property, not merely persons to whom something has been entrusted for the purpose of swelling the number of voters.

As to more than one person voting in a family, there can be no valid objection. Every young man and woman over twenty-one years of age who have the legal qualifications, may vote at any election, even though they may belong to the same family, and the parents each have a vote.

So far as we can judge from the letter of our correspondent there was nothing illegal in the meeting he refers to, but not knowing all the circumstances we do not pretend to give a definite opinion. In these school matters it should be the aim of the people, without regard to differences of private opinion on any point religious or political, to unite for the general welfare. This must be enhanced by the erection and furnishing of good school buildings and the conduct of public schools. Little technicalities ought to be discarded and the good of the community be made the principal object in view.

CIVIL CALENDAR.

The following settling of civil cases, for trial at the April term of the Third District Court, was made to-day:

MONDAY, MAY 10.

38—Louis Reich vs. Rebellion Silver Mining Company. 82 to 88—Arthur Brown et al. vs. Truman Schenck et al.

TUESDAY, MAY 11.

80—J. C. Bowring vs. W. C. Bowring. 100—Charles Oak Life Insurance Company vs. M. T. Gibson et al. 108—Thomas H. Morton et al. vs. Emeline Fulton. 209—James A. McKnight vs. John Masters et al. 243—Rhoda Murphy, executrix, vs. James Payne et al.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12.

115—M. H. Pape et al. vs. J. W. Mason et al. 135—Bergen De Mott vs. Salt Lake Foundry and Machine Company. 159—E. J. Travis vs. Ann Brown et al. 202—Louisa M. Graham vs. John D. Graham.

THURSDAY, MAY 13.

66—A. W. Street, trustee, vs. W. J. McCornick et al. 79—J. F. Wilcox vs. J. T. Workman. 247—Lulu S. Horrocks vs. John W. Horrocks.

FRIDAY, MAY 14.

63—George I. Bowron vs. Benjamin Hampton et al. 106—Giovanni Cereghino vs. Antonio Cereghino. 245—Thomas B. Shaw vs. Jane Shaw.

MONDAY, MAY 17.

3—Samuel G. Sheldon vs. James Ellison. 30—James M. Kennelly vs. John J. Daly. 158—E. A. Ireland et al. vs. John J. Daly.

TUESDAY, MAY 18.

10—F. Hoffman et al. vs. Northern Chief Mining Co. 31—James M. Kennelly vs. John J. Daly. 34 and 35—Frank Hoffman et al. vs. Thomas B. Francis et al.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19.

70—Sarah Ann Hall vs. Wm. B. Hull. 161 to 165—Morgan Mining Company vs. John J. Daly. 169 to 176—Geo. A. Mearns vs. John J. Daly.

THURSDAY, MAY 20TH.

116—Otto Horwitz et al. vs. Thomas Cupit et al. 181—Utah Coal Mining and Coke Co. vs. Job Lawrence. 207—Waiter Wilcox et al. vs. J. M. Kennelly. 211—D. C. McLaughlin vs. E. A. Ireland et al. 212—M. Shaughnessy et al. vs. E. A. Ireland et al.

FRIDAY, MAY 23D.

73—George F. Adkins vs. John Holmberg.

MONDAY, MAY 24.

14 and 15—George M. Scott vs. Silas Reed. 134—Caroline Krebs vs. John Krebs. 149—Bertha Bamberger vs. James Williamson et al.

TUESDAY, MAY 25.

181—John A. Groesbeck vs. George A. Mearns. 189—George A. Mearns vs. John A. Groesbeck. 190 and 191—J. M. Kennelly et al. vs. John A. Groesbeck, trustee. 192 to 194—J. M. Kennelly vs. George A. Mearns.

WEDNESDAY, May 26.

213 to 217—George A. Mearns, trustee, vs. Alfred Thompson et al. 240—J. Bamberger et al. vs. Joseph Marion et al.

THURSDAY, MAY 27.

218 to 221—D. C. McLaughlin vs. George A. Mearns, trustee. 236—James M. Kennelly, et al. vs. George A. Mearns.

FRIDAY, MAY 28.

130—Daisy Allen vs. John S. Barnes, administrator.

MONDAY, MAY 31.

60—John E. Dooley et al., trustees, vs. Utah Eastern Railroad Co et al. 238—County of Salt Lake vs. Ann Carrigan.

TUESDAY, JUNE 1.

155—Sarah J. Williams vs. Edward Austin.

CRIMINAL CALENDAR.

APRIL TERM, 1886.

The following criminal cases were to-day set for trial on the dates named, in the Third District Court:

MONDAY, APRIL 26.

The United States vs. Andrew Jensen; unlawful cohabitation.
The United States vs. John Berg; unlawful cohabitation; four cases.

The United States vs. Stanley Taylor; unlawful cohabitation; four cases.

TUESDAY, APRIL 27.

The People vs. Fanny Davenport; keeping a house of ill-fame.
The People vs. Geo. W. Barr and Arthur Smith.

The United States vs. Geo. Wood; unlawful cohabitation.

The United States vs. Jos. H. Deap; unlawful cohabitation.

The United States vs. Jos. H. Ridge; unlawful cohabitation.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28.

The United States vs. Jens Hanson; unlawful cohabitation.

The United States vs. Geo. Bailey; unlawful cohabitation.

The United States vs. Geo. Berg; unlawful cohabitation.

THURSDAY, APRIL 29.

The People vs. Frank Cannon et al.; conspiracy.

The People vs. Frank Cannon et al.; battery.

FRIDAY, APRIL 30.

The United States vs. George Lambert; unlawful cohabitation.

The United States vs. Henry Nabbitt; unlawful cohabitation; three cases.

The United States vs. Royal Young; polygamy and unlawful cohabitation.

SATURDAY, MAY 1.

The United States vs. Agnes McMillan; perjury.

The United States vs. Milford Shipp; unlawful cohabitation; three cases.

The United States vs. N. V. Jones; bribery.

The United States vs. Edward Brain; resisting officers.