

MOST SCANDALOUS LETTER WORK.

A German Preacher Writes from
This City to a Pastor in
Germany.

HIS SHAMEFUL FALSEHOODS.

Establishing Misrepresentations That
Bring Forth a Vigorous Protest and
Refutation from German Residents.

A letter purporting to have been written from Salt Lake City by one Zimmer, claiming to be pastor of a German church here, having been published in a number of German and Swiss papers, inquiries were made of German residents of Utah concerning the authenticity and the contents of the letter. The German residents here, however, have become highly indignant at the course of the writer of the letter and have prepared a reply which has been signed by about 200 reputable persons, for publication in Europe. We here reproduce in English Zimmer's scandalous letter and the reply, both of which have been translated for the "News."

THE ZIMMER SLANDER.

"Office of the Evangelical Clergy, 828 East Second South, Salt Lake City, Utah, State of Utah, North America, Oct. 20, 1903. Hon. Dr. P. Wurster, City Pastor, Heidelberg, Germany."

My dear brother, I have never thought to enter into direct correspondence with you, but conditions here force me to do this and ask you now to give me a listening ear.

In the district of Heilbronn a number of families have recently emigrated to distant Utah, the wonderful Zion of the Latter-day Saints, to find their remaining days in peace and happiness. The families of whom I particularly write at this time are those of Schmoecker, Friedrich Schuler, and Michael Thoma, both from Heilbronn. Mr. Schuler came here in the spring of 1902 and Mr. Thoma in the spring of 1903. The first mentioned Schuler beheld the situation of the so-called Latter-day Saints in a very short time. When the German Evangelists of North America opened their mission last year among the 3,000 Germans in Salt Lake City, Mr. Schuler and his wife interested themselves at once with this work. Mr. Schuler is now willing to give information concerning the "Mormons" to any one who desires such. His address is 102 West Second South Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

The family B., as mentioned above, arrived in the "Mormon" Zion last year. They find themselves in a very different position, and if they could they would gladly return to their native home and get it with tears and joy, but they cannot. Mr. B., while in Germany, was a member of the Lutheran church, and he is now a member of the same church. With the remaining money the family started on their way to Zion. When they arrived here last week they found themselves without money. The family B. is now at the mercy of their shabby co-religionists.

My dear co-religionist, I have seen the faces of the emigrants, the people so long that I feel justified in my judgment upon them. I am minister of Salt Lake City and Ogden, the two cities in Utah, and I come in contact with these "Mormons" every day, and have in this way seen many things which are hidden to an ordinary man, and now I say: The "Mormons" are not what you have been told. They are not a sect, but a people. They are not a people of the future, but a people of the present. They are not a people of the future, but a people of the present. They are not a people of the future, but a people of the present.

In one of the largest furniture houses in Salt Lake City, owned by H. D. D., a Mormon in every sense of the word, who has four wives, many Germans are employed, particularly the new comers, and newest converts, but behind this apparent love for his fellow man there is hidden another object in employing our emigrants. The Latter-day Saint employer, Mr. D., would have to pay from \$2.00 to \$3.00 a day when he employs these "green Germans" (as they are called here) but when they are called here a day by this way Mr. D. makes a profit on every man of from \$1.00 to \$1.50. This is a considerable sum during the year, sufficient for the employer to feed his four wives, but that is not all that Mr. D. gets from his laborers, as every man earns the big round sum of \$12 per week. Mr. D. pays him only \$5 in cash, the remaining \$7 he pays him in tithing money. When a laborer wants to use this tithing money, he can only be used in the leading "Mormon" stores, he will find himself the loser of 25 cents on every dollar. The laborer, however, is not allowed to say one word about this, for every "Mormon" is compelled to comply with the rule of the tithing money, and those placed over them. The 25 cent profit to the employer, which he receives at the tithing money, which he does not get, the employer would not but as his laborers this tithing money, in Salt Lake City a large store, the employers sustain these business houses. No other business in this city does such tithing money.

Resting this loss which is burdened upon the laborer here, the "Mormon" is also compelled to pay tithing of his whole income, and every first Sunday "Mormons" he also has to pay his tithing. This offering should not be supplied with the amount it would take to supply his family with their regular needs which is to be paid in cash. If he refuses to come up with these offerings, he is without excuse dismissed, and left at the mercy of the "Mormon" church, an apostle, an employer's bookkeepers have full sway in the priesthood, and the oldest laborers have perhaps already gone to preach to Germany and Switzerland to "Root like an hog on earth," is the motto used in every case where one opposes the rules of the authorities.

Now what shall a strange person do who cannot speak the English language? The "Mormon" laborer is surrounded by his family, thicker and thicker than the walls of the Salt Lake valley. I do believe that the human sense, could be brought to weeping before a "Mormon" over the terrible existing conditions here.

There is no Substitute for



It is a Matter of Health

Now for this reason I pray and appeal as a father of a family, as a Christian and a German pastor to you and our honorable German citizens in our native land, to warn our people from emigrating to Utah. The tears and the pains of many hundred Germans ascend to the heavens daily, but notwithstanding these existing conditions here, the missionaries of this religion continue their labors in Germany unmoiled. Nothing is said about the immorality of this beautiful Zion, whose first prophet and president, Joseph P. Smith, has four wives not counting his other concubines. They persuade old and young to come across the ocean, saying: Now as you are baptized a Mormon, you must also go to Zion (Salt Lake City) and go through the Temple to receive the full glory heaven by having it sealed upon you on the earth."

Nothing is said, however, that behind these secret walls of the "Mormon" Temple young and old women are dishonored under the cloak of religious ceremony, or what else does that mean when a German woman late of Berlin, after many sacrifices, has gone through the Temple and confessed to me with tears in her eyes: "Oh, Mr. Pastor Zimmer, how low I have been made to fall in that Temple! They have robbed me of my character, and I now stand lower than the lowest harlot in the City of Berlin."

I will now close, but I trust that you, honorable Mr. Pastor, will assist me in Christ's sake to have the "Mormons" banished on account of their immorality (which is not recorded in the Book of Mormon, but in the Doctrine and Covenants) and armed by their prophets, have them banished from Baden and all other parts of the German empire, especially so in Wurtemberg where they have their headquarters and recently held a large conference.

Inasmuch as this family B. reported to me the intentions of the malcontent B. and his family to come here and Mrs. Schuler, pleaded with me last evening to send them a word of warning, I pray you in all earnestness to discourage them from doing so. I give you permission to publish this letter and to give it to the police authorities that they may no longer suffer these "Mormon" Elders to continue their wicked preaching there. For the truth of your report I give you my ministerial oath. I will be very pleased to give you any further desired information. I remain with hearty greetings and best wishes to you and your family.

Yours faithfully,
G. A. ZIMMER,
Minister of the Evangelical Church of Christ, Salt Lake City."

REPLY OF GERMAN RESIDENTS.
"It is astonishing how certain men who profess to be Christians will take it upon themselves to bear false witness against their neighbor. Such an example we find in a letter written by Rev. G. A. Zimmer, 828 East Second South, Salt Lake City, Utah, in which he accuses the German Evangelical church, which is nothing but misrepresentation from beginning to end. His object (as he says) is to create within the hearts of the German people and its leaders enmity against the Latter-day Saints which would eventually result in the banishment of the Elders from Germany. We as a people understand a little or no attention to such attacks. In this case, however, where G. A. Zimmer makes mention of names of certain parties who have recently emigrated to Utah, and some fearful reports concerning them and the people and conditions here in general, and at the close seals it with his ministerial oath, we feel it our duty to say for our faith to grant every one the privilege to do and believe as he thinks right; and that on the part of the Church no unjust powers or influences are exercised over its members, nor even such as the case of some of the churches and their members in Germany."

Now as to the correctness and truthfulness of Rev. Zimmer's letter we will let our readers use their own judgment. The undersigned residents of Salt Lake City herewith testify in all earnestness and attach thereto the seal of the notary public that the contents of the above letter written by Rev. G. A. Zimmer, 828 East Second South, Salt Lake City, Utah, is in every detail a serious misrepresentation.

The shoemaker Schuler mentioned by Rev. Zimmer in his letter is Frederick Schulerberger of Borkingen, Germany, now residing in this city. Whether or not this shoemaker claims membership in the Church we are unable to state. Shortly before his immigration to Utah he paid the penalty of 18 months' imprisonment for immorality. Whether or not this Schulerberger is, as per recommendation of Rev. Zimmer a reliable person from whom to secure correct information on "Mormons" and "Mormonism" we question very much.

This mechanic B., about whom Rev. Zimmer writes has recently immigrated to Utah and is now in the deepest of poverty at the mercy of his co-religionists, is Thomas Bantel, who makes the following statement: That neither he nor any of his family have ever seen

COMPLETELY DESTROYED.

Only Contents of the Residence Were
Saved from Fire on Cannon Farm.

It is estimated that the loss on the home of Mrs. Sarah A. J. Cannon, which was burned yesterday afternoon, was fully \$5,000, and was not protected by insurance. The information telephoned to the "News" at press time last evening, which stated that the place belonged to the widow of Abraham H. Cannon, was incorrect. Mrs. Cannon, the owner of the place, is the mother of former Senator Frank J. Cannon.

The blaze was undoubtedly caused by a defective stove and the fire had a good start in the roof when the fire apparatus arrived. The place is located at Eighth West, between Tenth South and Eleventh South, but it could have been saved had the fire boys been able to get water. An engine responded to the alarm but the heavy steamer could not be taken near a road that contained water, for the reason that the heavy machine would have sunk almost out of sight. The river was fully 1,500 feet away and could not be reached unless additional hose were sent for, and by that time the place would have been destroyed, anyway.

The firemen and neighbors did good work, however, in extricating furniture and practically all of it was saved, even to the kitchen range.

GERMAN SYRUP.

We want to impress on our readers that Boesche's German Syrup is positively the only preparation on the market today that does relieve and cure consumption. It contains the specific, such as pure tar, extracts of gums, etc., which have been so highly endorsed for the cure of coughs, colds and consumption by the great medical congresses. The consumptive, whether his disease is in the throat or lungs, must have rest at night, and be free from the spasms of dry and racking cough in the morning. The diseased parts want rest, healing and soothing treatment, and the patient needs fresh air, good food, etc. German Syrup will give free and easy expectoration in the morning with speedy and permanent relief. Small bottles, 25 cents; regular size, containing nearly four times as much, 75 cents.

G. G. GREEN, Woodbury, N. J.

SCHOOL CENSUS.

Report of City Institutions Shows a
Total Enrollment of 12,692 Pupils.

The report of the city schools for the fourth month of the school year ending Jan. 8, 1904, shows a total enrollment of 12,692 pupils. There were 1,323 cases of tardiness in all the schools during the month and the average per cent of punctuality was 94.4 per cent. There were 28 cases of truancy and six of corporal punishment during the month. There are 45 colored children enrolled in the public schools of the city at the present time.

SUPREME COURT CALENDAR.

Chief Clerk Palmer Gives Out the One
For the February Term.

Clerk of the Supreme Court L. P. Palmer has made up the calendar of the court for the February term, which begins Monday, Feb. 8. The calendar follows in full:

Feb. 8—State vs. Fred Engstler, Second district; Kate Guthrie, administrator of Moroni Williams, respondent, vs. J. T. Gilmer, Monroe Salisbury et al., appellants, Third district; Dry Creek Reservoir and Irrigation company, appellants, vs. Draper Irrigation company, respondents, Third district; Feb. 10—M. W. Hicks, appellant, vs. Southern Pacific company, respondent, Second district; Jacob C. Johnson, respondent, vs. C. A. Hibbard, First district; August Johnson, respondent, vs. Utah Short Line Railroad company, appellant, Third district; Feb. 11—Urie U. Hickey et al., respondents, vs. Pacific State Savings & B. company, appellants, Third district; George C. Fox et al., appellants, vs. B. H. Dale, appellant, Third district; Charles E. Pence, respondent, vs. California Mining company, appellant, Third district; Feb. 12—Kate Johnson, respondent, vs. Park City, appellant, Third district; Oregon Short Line Railroad company, appellant, vs. Samuel P. Russell et al., respondents, Second district; John Mann, intervener and defendant, John Mann, intervener and defendant, Third district; Feb. 13—William Glasman, respondent, vs. Lizzie C. Glasman, appellant, Second district; The Bullion-Buck & Champion Mining company, respondent, vs. the Eureka Hill Mining company, appellant, Third district; Feb. 14—Nette Henderson, appellant, vs. Abbot Barnes as ex. of the estate of Henry Barnes, respondent, Third district; Feb. 15—George H. Hunsford, respondent, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad company, appellant, Second district; Charles A. Klenk, Jr., respondent, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad company, appellants, First district; Oliver S. Sartin, respondent, vs. Oregon Short Line Railroad company, appellant, Second district; Feb. 17—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 18—Ogden City, appellant, vs. the Ogden City & River Waterworks & Irrigation company et al., respondents, Third district; Feb. 19—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 20—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 21—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 22—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 23—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 24—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 25—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 26—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 27—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 28—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 29—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 30—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 31—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 32—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 33—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 34—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 35—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 36—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 37—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 38—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 39—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 40—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 41—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 42—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 43—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 44—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 45—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 46—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 47—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 48—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 49—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 50—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 51—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 52—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 53—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 54—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 55—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 56—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 57—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 58—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 59—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 60—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 61—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 62—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 63—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 64—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 65—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 66—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 67—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 68—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 69—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 70—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 71—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 72—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 73—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 74—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 75—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 76—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 77—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 78—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 79—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 80—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 81—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 82—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 83—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 84—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 85—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 86—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 87—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 88—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 89—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 90—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 91—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 92—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 93—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 94—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 95—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 96—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 97—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 98—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 99—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 100—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 101—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 102—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 103—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 104—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 105—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 106—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 107—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 108—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 109—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 110—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 111—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 112—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 113—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 114—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 115—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 116—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 117—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 118—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 119—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 120—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 121—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 122—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 123—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 124—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 125—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 126—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 127—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 128—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 129—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 130—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 131—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 132—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 133—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 134—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 135—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 136—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 137—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 138—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 139—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 140—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 141—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 142—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 143—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 144—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 145—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 146—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 147—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 148—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 149—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 150—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 151—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 152—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 153—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 154—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 155—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 156—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 157—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 158—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 159—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson, respondent, vs. Utah Construction company, respondent, Third district; Feb. 160—The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., respondents, vs. Helen Watson, appellant, Third district; Harriet Watson,