

his speech? And why need he be "against" all the delegation? Here was the animus. He meant to "roast" him and he did. He wired to the *Tribune* comments, reported him as saying things that he did not say if the correspondent's own stenographic report afterwards is to be believed. Now, he either did not confine himself to reporting facts—or else "his paper" supplied the "comments," and thus the dispatches were "doctored" in the *Tribune* office.

The correspondent virtually admits that he telegraphed words that were not in the speech made by Kentucky Smith, for he quotes what Smith said and what he wired, and shows that in one instance another word was substituted for that which he telegraphed.

A correspondent who avows himself as "against" a delegation of speakers, reporting for a paper which was also "against" them and who telegraphs expressions as coming from them which are not to be found in his own full report, and who fills up his dispatches with attacks on the speakers, does not carry out his own programme of confining himself to the facts, but indulges in the common tactics of the sensational penny-a-liner. And the *Tribune* correspondent has done all this or else the *Tribune* doctored his dispatches and in any case is responsible for the wrong.

We are indifferent as to which is the culprit in this case. We have proven beyond denial the essential discrepancy between the telegraphed and written reports purporting to come from the same hand, and if the *Tribune* wants to flounder over this miserable business any more it is welcome to say what it pleases.

FALSE DISPATCHES AGAIN.

A SALT Lake dispatch to the eastern press pretends to give an account of the examination which has been conducted in this city in regard to the legal ownership of the Temple lot in Independence, Jackson County. It is an Associated Press telegram, and the responsibility for it rests upon the agent here. The only point in it we care to notice now—though the whole account is terribly mixed as it appears in the New York papers—is this sentence, referring to testimony in relation to the practice of polygamy in Nauvoo:

"Elder John Bates Noble swore yesterday that the brethren were 'playing for women and got 'em;' that the principle was taught privately."

This statement is a shameful falsehood. It is like many other dispatches emanating from the same source. Mr. Noble is an aged man, past 83 years old, who was badgered and browbeaten and tormented by the "Josephite" alleged lawyer, until his head ached so that he sometimes could scarcely collect his thoughts. But in this particular instance he was not answering in reference to plural marriage. The irritating cross-examiner was prying into his personal history and endeavoring to tangle him up on doctrine and practice in the early years of the Church.

From the stenographer who took the testimony in full we have obtained the exact language of the colloquy, and

here produce as much of it as relates directly to this point:

Q.—"When did you go to Caldwell County?"

A.—"I had to go back and get a woman and marry her."

Q.—"Where were you married?"

A.—"I went back to my old place where I resided so long, by the hill Cumrah."

Q.—"You were married in New York?"

A.—"I was."

Q.—"Who married you?"

A.—"Well, a Presbyterian preacher, I forget his name."

Q.—"Now, when you was married was there any other minister present except the Presbyterian preacher that married you?"

A.—"Only the minister."

Q.—"Was it according to the law of the Church?"

A.—"It was out of the Church; that was, I stepped over the boundary and took one that was out of the Church."

Q.—"You married a woman that was out of the Church?"

A.—"I did. The family was all out of the Church."

Q.—"Was it according to the law of the Church that any minister could perform the ceremony?"

A.—"I was only on the threshold of the Church."

Here the interrogator introduced several questions in regard to Mr. Noble's travels and doings up to the year 1838, and then came back to this subject:

Q.—"Well, it was according to the law of the Doctrine and Covenants that any minister could marry you or perform the ceremony?"

A.—"Yes, call it what you've a mind to."

Q.—"That was the doctrine of the Church?"

A.—"Oh! doctrine of the Church; it was practice, just simple practice, no doctrine about it. I was after a wife."

That is all the foundation there was in the examination of Mr. Nobles for the falsehoods that have been published in this city about "the brethren in Nauvoo" being "after women" and "playing for women" with "no doctrine about it." Mr. Nobles was answering questions about his first marriage, which took place long before the doctrine of plural marriage was introduced and with which it had no connection, and the object of the interrogator was to make it appear that, in marrying out of the Church, the witness was violating his religion and going contrary to the doctrine of the Church, so as to confuse him and make him as uncomfortable as possible and damage his evidence in chief.

This was contemptible enough. But it was not so despicable as the distorting of the testimony, and the false impression conveyed by the dispatch fiend, who seems to take delight in spreading abroad misleading items of pretended information about "Mormon" affairs. The press of the country should be warned against all his communications. They are entirely unreliable.

A SYNONYM FOR FALSEHOOD.

ONCE more the dodging, serpentine and altogether dishonest *Tribune* returns to the charge that John T. Caine brought home from Washington the Constitution of 1887, and all that

the convention had to do was to ratify it. We gave the facts in the case on Saturday, and now the *Tribune* pretends that we merely stated that he did not bring it "in his coat tail pocket," and therefore infers that he might have brought it "in his gripsack," and concludes with: "That kind of denial does not count." It then goes on to invent a number of fanciful things that exist only in its perverted imagination, and draws inferences from them that are as false as the original charge.

It is generally very easy to prove the wilful mendacity of the *Tribune* when it goes into details or specifications. All we have to do in this instance is to reproduce what we said, and leave the public to decide whether the *Tribune* has not wilfully lied in limiting our denial to John T. Caine's "coat tail pocket"—an expression of its own manufacture. This is what we said:

"We happen to know that there is not the faintest shred of truth in the statement. It would not matter much if there was. But the folly and nonsense of the *Tribune's* continual statement are patent to all the members of that Convention as well as many others. Hon. John T. Caine did not bring it, or any part of it, or any reference to it from Washington or elsewhere. He had no more to do with it than any other member of the convention, and not so much as some of them, for, being president of the convention, he was not even one of the committee that prepared it."

The *Tribune* has not the slightest particle of honor in a controversy, nor any scruple about crediting an opponent with words he never used and sentiments he never entertained. Argument is lost upon it, and its tactics are so snake-like and despicable that its name has become a synonym for everything unreliable and unworthy of credence or respect.

THE CHIHUAHUA "MORMONS."

IN reference to the "Mormon" colonies in Chihuahua, the *Anglo-American*, published in the City of Mexico, gives some interesting particulars with favorable comments. The number of our people in Chihuahua is placed at 5000, and the fact is emphasized that they own their own land in severalty, "entirely independent of the Mormon Church." The *Anglo American* adds:

"The colonies have recently purchased 100,000 acres of land near the head of the Conecho and San Pedro rivers. The company organizing the settlements is incorporated with a capital of \$1,000,000 and is a purely business enterprise. No class or religious distinctions are made, and people of all faiths are free to locate among the colonists and may worship in any manner that their consciences dictate. The main principle of the Church is obedience to the laws of the land which they inhabit and respect to the rulers and governors of the country. The Mormon Colonies are not accustomed to interfere in the politics of Mexico, and will only devote themselves to cultivating their lands and improving the portion of the republic where they are living."

"The beneficent influence exercised by such a class of people on the commonwealth may be seen at a glance, and the government may be assured that such a class of emigration will tend to increase the wealth and prosperity of the country."