

and do one that we have heard of just
tides him in the assault.
The young man who has been ar-
rested for conspiracy and other
charges, charged with the assault,
nothing to do with the assault
in the boy's company when the
offense was committed. No one else,
it appears, made any attempt at a
breach of the law. Mr. Dickson
saw the assault, but he did not
intervene, but a particular necessity
as where, for instance, the wife would
otherwise be exposed without remedy
to personal injury."

In the references to support this
principle it is shown that the admissi-
bility of such evidence is only in cases
of personal injuries committed by the
husband or wife against each other.
It is said that Mr. Justice Holtbyrd
said that even in such cases, "the wife
could only be admitted to prove facts,
which could not be proved by other
witnesses." In the case of the State
vs. Welch, quoted by Greenleaf, it was
held that:

"On the trial of a man for the crime
of adultery, the wife of the man with
whom the crime was alleged to have
been committed has been held not to
be admissible as a witness for the
prosecution, as her testimony would
go directly to charge the crime upon
her husband."

He refers to another case in point,
which also shows clearly that the
crime or wrong committed by the hus-
band against the wife, to permit her
testimony, must be one of injury to her
person and not such an injury as that
inferred by Judge Zane.

"The wife is not a competent witness
against the husband in an indictment
against him for subornation of perjury
to wrong her in a judicial proceeding."
But we will come now to the ruling
of the highest court in the land on this
very important question. In the case
of Stein vs. Bowman in error to the
District Court of the United States for
the Eastern District of Louisiana, the
Court reversed the decision of the
court below and one of the chief rea-
sons was the admission of evidence by
the wife against the husband. The
court ruled that:

"It is a general rule that neither a
husband nor wife can be a witness
nor against the other."
"This rule is subject to some excep-
tions, as where the husband commits
an offense against the person of his
wife."

"In the case of the King vs. Chugler
(21 Term 288) the Court held that a
wife should not be called in any case
to give evidence even tending to crim-
inate her husband."
"It is sound doctrine that trust and
confidence between man and wife shall
not be betrayed."

"It is, however, admitted in all the
cases that the wife is not competent,
except in cases of violence upon the
husband; or to impeach the husband's
testimony, or to impeach the husband's
testimony in a criminal case."

"Can the wife under such circum-
stances, either voluntarily be permitted
to give evidence, or is she to be called
in evidence which renders infamous the
character of her husband? We think
most clearly that she cannot be. Public
policy and established principle for-
bid it."

"The rule is founded upon the deep-
est and soundest principles of our
nature. Principles which have grown
out of those domestic relations that
constitute the basis of civil society,
and which are essential to the en-
joyment of that confidence which
should exist between those who are
connected by the nearest and dearest
relations of life. To break down or
impair the great principles which pro-
tect the sanctities of husband and
wife, would be to destroy the best
source of human happiness."

"We think that the court erred in
overruling the objections to this wit-
ness." (Peters vol. 13, p. 135, 136.)
We have not quoted all that the
Court said on this subject, nor the
reasons which were referred to in the
decision, but have given copious quo-
tations because they bear so squarely
upon the question which this commu-
nity has to meet. When the authori-
ties go to show that a legal wife is
not permitted to give evidence in a
criminal case, to testify against her
husband, what must be thought of proceedings
which compel her against her will as
well as the protest of the defendant, to
give evidence for the purpose of con-
victing her husband of crime? particu-
larly when she has no personal griev-
ance against him?

It will be seen from the citations we
have made, that the ruling of Judge
Zane is not only at variance with the
laws of the Territory on which he has
protested to decide, but with the prin-
ciples of the common law, which have
prevailed from time immemorial, and
with the decision of the Supreme
Court of the United States, all of
which are in accord with each other
and with that common sense which
is the basis of all law and order in
the administration of all measures for
the public welfare.

In their eager anxiety to push ex-
tremes the unprecedented proceedings
against the "Mormons," Attorney
Dickson and Justice Zane have made
a serious blunder, as we have per-
petrated a flagrant legal outrage against
the home, the family and the sacred
rights of wifehood which they have
hypocritically pretended to desire to
protect.

THE ASSAULT ON THE ATTORNEY.

Tux assault against District Attorney
Dickson is a most unfortunate affair.
It is deprecated as much by the "Mor-
mons" as by any one who is opposed
to them in principle or practice. In
the first place it is wrong. In the next
place it is bad policy. Private ven-
geance is against the secular law, the
repeated special exhortations and coun-
sels of its leaders. It is also injurious
to the community when some rash
and hasty person commits an act of
lawlessness to avenge upon a "Gen-
tle," because every possible ad-
vantage is sure to be taken to exagger-
ate it and use it to further inflame
the public mind against the "Mormons."

When such individuals "take the law
into their own hands" they may gratify
some personal feeling for the moment,
but they inflict a wrong upon the
whole community, who have to suffer
for the folly. Already most villain-
ously colored accounts of the affair
have been made up, and an importance
has been given to it otherwise that
would be ludicrous if it were not
fringed with so much predictiveness,
backed by judicial power.

The facts are that a boy of sixteen
years, who does not weigh more than
a hundred pounds, struck Attorney
Dickson a blow with his fist, in front
of the Continental Hotel, his grievance
being that Dickson had piled the boy's
name as an enforced witness with
questions about her expected mat-
rimony and its cause, which he resented
with all the fervor and rashness of
youth. It was natural that his blood
should boil at the indignity. We be-
lieve his feelings in that respect
were shared by every decent man
and woman in the community.
But he had no right to break the law.

and do one that we have heard of just
tides him in the assault.
The young man who has been ar-
rested for conspiracy and other
charges, charged with the assault,
nothing to do with the assault
in the boy's company when the
offense was committed. No one else,
it appears, made any attempt at a
breach of the law. Mr. Dickson
saw the assault, but he did not
intervene, but a particular necessity
as where, for instance, the wife would
otherwise be exposed without remedy
to personal injury."

In the references to support this
principle it is shown that the admissi-
bility of such evidence is only in cases
of personal injuries committed by the
husband or wife against each other.
It is said that Mr. Justice Holtbyrd
said that even in such cases, "the wife
could only be admitted to prove facts,
which could not be proved by other
witnesses." In the case of the State
vs. Welch, quoted by Greenleaf, it was
held that:

"On the trial of a man for the crime
of adultery, the wife of the man with
whom the crime was alleged to have
been committed has been held not to
be admissible as a witness for the
prosecution, as her testimony would
go directly to charge the crime upon
her husband."

He refers to another case in point,
which also shows clearly that the
crime or wrong committed by the hus-
band against the wife, to permit her
testimony, must be one of injury to her
person and not such an injury as that
inferred by Judge Zane.

"The wife is not a competent witness
against the husband in an indictment
against him for subornation of perjury
to wrong her in a judicial proceeding."
But we will come now to the ruling
of the highest court in the land on this
very important question. In the case
of Stein vs. Bowman in error to the
District Court of the United States for
the Eastern District of Louisiana, the
Court reversed the decision of the
court below and one of the chief rea-
sons was the admission of evidence by
the wife against the husband. The
court ruled that:

"It is a general rule that neither a
husband nor wife can be a witness
nor against the other."
"This rule is subject to some excep-
tions, as where the husband commits
an offense against the person of his
wife."

"In the case of the King vs. Chugler
(21 Term 288) the Court held that a
wife should not be called in any case
to give evidence even tending to crim-
inate her husband."
"It is sound doctrine that trust and
confidence between man and wife shall
not be betrayed."

"It is, however, admitted in all the
cases that the wife is not competent,
except in cases of violence upon the
husband; or to impeach the husband's
testimony, or to impeach the husband's
testimony in a criminal case."

"Can the wife under such circum-
stances, either voluntarily be permitted
to give evidence, or is she to be called
in evidence which renders infamous the
character of her husband? We think
most clearly that she cannot be. Public
policy and established principle for-
bid it."

"The rule is founded upon the deep-
est and soundest principles of our
nature. Principles which have grown
out of those domestic relations that
constitute the basis of civil society,
and which are essential to the en-
joyment of that confidence which
should exist between those who are
connected by the nearest and dearest
relations of life. To break down or
impair the great principles which pro-
tect the sanctities of husband and
wife, would be to destroy the best
source of human happiness."

"We think that the court erred in
overruling the objections to this wit-
ness." (Peters vol. 13, p. 135, 136.)
We have not quoted all that the
Court said on this subject, nor the
reasons which were referred to in the
decision, but have given copious quo-
tations because they bear so squarely
upon the question which this commu-
nity has to meet. When the authori-
ties go to show that a legal wife is
not permitted to give evidence in a
criminal case, to testify against her
husband, what must be thought of proceedings
which compel her against her will as
well as the protest of the defendant, to
give evidence for the purpose of con-
victing her husband of crime? particu-
larly when she has no personal griev-
ance against him?

It will be seen from the citations we
have made, that the ruling of Judge
Zane is not only at variance with the
laws of the Territory on which he has
protested to decide, but with the prin-
ciples of the common law, which have
prevailed from time immemorial, and
with the decision of the Supreme
Court of the United States, all of
which are in accord with each other
and with that common sense which
is the basis of all law and order in
the administration of all measures for
the public welfare.

In their eager anxiety to push ex-
tremes the unprecedented proceedings
against the "Mormons," Attorney
Dickson and Justice Zane have made
a serious blunder, as we have per-
petrated a flagrant legal outrage against
the home, the family and the sacred
rights of wifehood which they have
hypocritically pretended to desire to
protect.

THE ASSAULT ON THE ATTORNEY.

Tux assault against District Attorney
Dickson is a most unfortunate affair.
It is deprecated as much by the "Mor-
mons" as by any one who is opposed
to them in principle or practice. In
the first place it is wrong. In the next
place it is bad policy. Private ven-
geance is against the secular law, the
repeated special exhortations and coun-
sels of its leaders. It is also injurious
to the community when some rash
and hasty person commits an act of
lawlessness to avenge upon a "Gen-
tle," because every possible ad-
vantage is sure to be taken to exagger-
ate it and use it to further inflame
the public mind against the "Mormons."

When such individuals "take the law
into their own hands" they may gratify
some personal feeling for the moment,
but they inflict a wrong upon the
whole community, who have to suffer
for the folly. Already most villain-
ously colored accounts of the affair
have been made up, and an importance
has been given to it otherwise that
would be ludicrous if it were not
fringed with so much predictiveness,
backed by judicial power.

The facts are that a boy of sixteen
years, who does not weigh more than
a hundred pounds, struck Attorney
Dickson a blow with his fist, in front
of the Continental Hotel, his grievance
being that Dickson had piled the boy's
name as an enforced witness with
questions about her expected mat-
rimony and its cause, which he resented
with all the fervor and rashness of
youth. It was natural that his blood
should boil at the indignity. We be-
lieve his feelings in that respect
were shared by every decent man
and woman in the community.
But he had no right to break the law.

and do one that we have heard of just
tides him in the assault.
The young man who has been ar-
rested for conspiracy and other
charges, charged with the assault,
nothing to do with the assault
in the boy's company when the
offense was committed. No one else,
it appears, made any attempt at a
breach of the law. Mr. Dickson
saw the assault, but he did not
intervene, but a particular necessity
as where, for instance, the wife would
otherwise be exposed without remedy
to personal injury."

In the references to support this
principle it is shown that the admissi-
bility of such evidence is only in cases
of personal injuries committed by the
husband or wife against each other.
It is said that Mr. Justice Holtbyrd
said that even in such cases, "the wife
could only be admitted to prove facts,
which could not be proved by other
witnesses." In the case of the State
vs. Welch, quoted by Greenleaf, it was
held that:

"On the trial of a man for the crime
of adultery, the wife of the man with
whom the crime was alleged to have
been committed has been held not to
be admissible as a witness for the
prosecution, as her testimony would
go directly to charge the crime upon
her husband."

He refers to another case in point,
which also shows clearly that the
crime or wrong committed by the hus-
band against the wife, to permit her
testimony, must be one of injury to her
person and not such an injury as that
inferred by Judge Zane.

"The wife is not a competent witness
against the husband in an indictment
against him for subornation of perjury
to wrong her in a judicial proceeding."
But we will come now to the ruling
of the highest court in the land on this
very important question. In the case
of Stein vs. Bowman in error to the
District Court of the United States for
the Eastern District of Louisiana, the
Court reversed the decision of the
court below and one of the chief rea-
sons was the admission of evidence by
the wife against the husband. The
court ruled that:

"It is a general rule that neither a
husband nor wife can be a witness
nor against the other."
"This rule is subject to some excep-
tions, as where the husband commits
an offense against the person of his
wife."

"In the case of the King vs. Chugler
(21 Term 288) the Court held that a
wife should not be called in any case
to give evidence even tending to crim-
inate her husband."
"It is sound doctrine that trust and
confidence between man and wife shall
not be betrayed."

"It is, however, admitted in all the
cases that the wife is not competent,
except in cases of violence upon the
husband; or to impeach the husband's
testimony, or to impeach the husband's
testimony in a criminal case."

"Can the wife under such circum-
stances, either voluntarily be permitted
to give evidence, or is she to be called
in evidence which renders infamous the
character of her husband? We think
most clearly that she cannot be. Public
policy and established principle for-
bid it."

"The rule is founded upon the deep-
est and soundest principles of our
nature. Principles which have grown
out of those domestic relations that
constitute the basis of civil society,
and which are essential to the en-
joyment of that confidence which
should exist between those who are
connected by the nearest and dearest
relations of life. To break down or
impair the great principles which pro-
tect the sanctities of husband and
wife, would be to destroy the best
source of human happiness."

"We think that the court erred in
overruling the objections to this wit-
ness." (Peters vol. 13, p. 135, 136.)
We have not quoted all that the
Court said on this subject, nor the
reasons which were referred to in the
decision, but have given copious quo-
tations because they bear so squarely
upon the question which this commu-
nity has to meet. When the authori-
ties go to show that a legal wife is
not permitted to give evidence in a
criminal case, to testify against her
husband, what must be thought of proceedings
which compel her against her will as
well as the protest of the defendant, to
give evidence for the purpose of con-
victing her husband of crime? particu-
larly when she has no personal griev-
ance against him?

It will be seen from the citations we
have made, that the ruling of Judge
Zane is not only at variance with the
laws of the Territory on which he has
protested to decide, but with the prin-
ciples of the common law, which have
prevailed from time immemorial, and
with the decision of the Supreme
Court of the United States, all of
which are in accord with each other
and with that common sense which
is the basis of all law and order in
the administration of all measures for
the public welfare.

In their eager anxiety to push ex-
tremes the unprecedented proceedings
against the "Mormons," Attorney
Dickson and Justice Zane have made
a serious blunder, as we have per-
petrated a flagrant legal outrage against
the home, the family and the sacred
rights of wifehood which they have
hypocritically pretended to desire to
protect.

THE ASSAULT ON THE ATTORNEY.

Tux assault against District Attorney
Dickson is a most unfortunate affair.
It is deprecated as much by the "Mor-
mons" as by any one who is opposed
to them in principle or practice. In
the first place it is wrong. In the next
place it is bad policy. Private ven-
geance is against the secular law, the
repeated special exhortations and coun-
sels of its leaders. It is also injurious
to the community when some rash
and hasty person commits an act of
lawlessness to avenge upon a "Gen-
tle," because every possible ad-
vantage is sure to be taken to exagger-
ate it and use it to further inflame
the public mind against the "Mormons."

When such individuals "take the law
into their own hands" they may gratify
some personal feeling for the moment,
but they inflict a wrong upon the
whole community, who have to suffer
for the folly. Already most villain-
ously colored accounts of the affair
have been made up, and an importance
has been given to it otherwise that
would be ludicrous if it were not
fringed with so much predictiveness,
backed by judicial power.

The facts are that a boy of sixteen
years, who does not weigh more than
a hundred pounds, struck Attorney
Dickson a blow with his fist, in front
of the Continental Hotel, his grievance
being that Dickson had piled the boy's
name as an enforced witness with
questions about her expected mat-
rimony and its cause, which he resented
with all the fervor and rashness of
youth. It was natural that his blood
should boil at the indignity. We be-
lieve his feelings in that respect
were shared by every decent man
and woman in the community.
But he had no right to break the law.

and do one that we have heard of just
tides him in the assault.
The young man who has been ar-
rested for conspiracy and other
charges, charged with the assault,
nothing to do with the assault
in the boy's company when the
offense was committed. No one else,
it appears, made any attempt at a
breach of the law. Mr. Dickson
saw the assault, but he did not
intervene, but a particular necessity
as where, for instance, the wife would
otherwise be exposed without remedy
to personal injury."

In the references to support this
principle it is shown that the admissi-
bility of such evidence is only in cases
of personal injuries committed by the
husband or wife against each other.
It is said that Mr. Justice Holtbyrd
said that even in such cases, "the wife
could only be admitted to prove facts,
which could not be proved by other
witnesses." In the case of the State
vs. Welch, quoted by Greenleaf, it was
held that:

"On the trial of a man for the crime
of adultery, the wife of the man with
whom the crime was alleged to have
been committed has been held not to
be admissible as a witness for the
prosecution, as her testimony would
go directly to charge the crime upon
her husband."

He refers to another case in point,
which also shows clearly that the
crime or wrong committed by the hus-
band against the wife, to permit her
testimony, must be one of injury to her
person and not such an injury as that
inferred by Judge Zane.

"The wife is not a competent witness
against the husband in an indictment
against him for subornation of perjury
to wrong her in a judicial proceeding."
But we will come now to the ruling
of the highest court in the land on this
very important question. In the case
of Stein vs. Bowman in error to the
District Court of the United States for
the Eastern District of Louisiana, the
Court reversed the decision of the
court below and one of the chief rea-
sons was the admission of evidence by
the wife against the husband. The
court ruled that:

"It is a general rule that neither a
husband nor wife can be a witness
nor against the other."
"This rule is subject to some excep-
tions, as where the husband commits
an offense against the person of his
wife."

"In the case of the King vs. Chugler
(21 Term 288) the Court held that a
wife should not be called in any case
to give evidence even tending to crim-
inate her husband."
"It is sound doctrine that trust and
confidence between man and wife shall
not be betrayed."

"It is, however, admitted in all the
cases that the wife is not competent,
except in cases of violence upon the
husband; or to impeach the husband's
testimony, or to impeach the husband's
testimony in a criminal case."

"Can the wife under such circum-
stances, either voluntarily be permitted
to give evidence, or is she to be called
in evidence which renders infamous the
character of her husband? We think
most clearly that she cannot be. Public
policy and established principle for-
bid it."

"The rule is founded upon the deep-
est and soundest principles of our
nature. Principles which have grown
out of those domestic relations that
constitute the basis of civil