

## DESERET EVENING NEWS.

NEW YORK, LONDON, PARIS, BOSTON,  
AT THIS OFFICE.POSTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
THE DESERET NEWS CO.CHARLES W. FENSTERWALD,  
PRESIDENT.

October 26, 1861.

THE ORPHANS' HOME.

On Saturday evening we published a report signed by three ladies of the committee of finance of the Orphans' Home. This is a worthy institution, well conducted and kept up through the indefatigable labor of a number of ladies of this city of different faiths and creeds. The institution has received much money, but it needs more help, which we hope it will receive from the benevolent.

The report is as follows: "This report, however, which is not signed by all of the committee, and which we think would put some better face upon our record. The compilation is made that Utah has never received one cent in the support of the Home, and the following language is used:

## GREEN GOODE'S MEN AGAIN.

This reading public will be glad to learn that the New York "green goods" dealers have been trapped, and that their adarts and correspondences are in the hands of the detectives of the Central Office. No less than 300 documents were seized, while had been prepared to send out for the purpose of enticing the gallants.

A great many of these circles have been made to people in different parts of this Territory. We have several times exposed the swindlers. They demand as a right something that can only be obtained as a privilege, and it is questionable whether public funds can be appropriated at all for a private establishment. By this we mean that the Orphans' Home is not a mercantile or county or city institution. It was started and has been maintained by voluntary efforts and contributions.

It is and has been the object of the Legislature to make it to the report. The Home stands on an entirely different footing. A "donation" on the Legislature for aid to the Home would therefore be entirely out of place.

The "magnificent scheme" in view speaks of in this report for which legislative appropriations can be made, are all of a public character. The expression about Utah "waiting ready to stand by" at the World's Fair, is this respect. Reference is made to them in the report. The Home stands on an entirely different footing. A "donation" on the Legislature for aid to the Home would therefore be entirely out of place.

The "magnificent scheme" in view speaks of in this report for which legislative appropriations can be made, are all of a public character. The expression about Utah "waiting ready to stand by" at the World's Fair, is this respect. Reference is made to them in the report. The Home stands on an entirely different footing. A "donation" on the Legislature for aid to the Home would therefore be entirely out of place.

## PROBABLE RESULT OF VICTORIA'S DEATH.

This sensational dispatch, published a few days ago, to the effect that Queen Victoria, Empress of India, was dead, caused considerable alarm and anxiety throughout the country. The continuance of the Queen, and the letters which the detective have secured, we hope a good cause will be made out for her, and that the seconds will be sent up for a king soon.

Speaking of the Irrigation Congress, Mr. Tonge says:

"The days' proceedings were of a most interesting and practical character, and the Convention will mark the beginning of a movement which will result in the addition to the United States of a vast further agricultural empire in the arid semi-arid regions west of the Missouri River."

## THE DOWNTOWN BOSS.

It is gratifying to see that Mr. Sam Smith, the perturbate religious minister, is becoming known for what he is.

Some of the eastern papers are describing him in his true character, and while he relates with all the vice and vileness of which he is capable, he is exhibiting the unchristian character of his nature and exposing his innate vulgarity and immorality. He only requires time and opportunity to show that such a malignant and abominable species of "Mormon" people really are. We can afford to be patient in view of the fact of so many of them, and their finally disappear, as far as our eyes can see.

There is one condition that strengthens the democratic leaning—the unpopularity of the betrayer. The respect for the present occupant of the throne is almost universal, but there is a wide exception to the rule of that of Wales. This feeling grows out of the fact that his moral status is low and that his capacity in any respect scarcely reaches mediocrity. They need not be afraid of the "Mormon" people really are. We can afford to be patient in view of the fact of so many of them, and their finally disappear, as far as our eyes can see.

There is a report that the coming Mining Congress in Denver is to be manipulated so as to oppose the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

W. H. Crane has produced a new play at Milwaukee, written by Clinton Smart. It is called "Newspaper" and deals with certain phases of American life.

The London Times says that the United States has gone against Chile. The Foreign Minister of Chile, who is the son of the President, will insist, it is said, on a proper redress. If it is not given, the Chilean Ambassador to the United States will be recalled, and diplomatic relations suspended.

Dispositions from Washington state that Secretary Trowbridge regards the cowardly attack on United States as no deliberate insult to the flag of this country. And for this reason the President will insist, it is said, on a proper redress. If it is not given, the Chilean Ambassador to the United States will be recalled, and diplomatic relations suspended.

Excerpts from another quarter seem rather forthcoming to show that the Chileans do not like Americans. W. H. Barnes, an ex-secret service man of the British government, is now in Chile, and has been telling a little of what he knows. Barnes is a native of New Zealand, but while he visited Chile, he became fond of the country, and had letters of introduction to the Chileans. After his arrival there the revolution commenced. He was given a position in the secret service. Subsequently he was sent to Germany to purchase arms for the Chileans. He was in Berlin when the government fell, and knowing that the Chileans had \$100,000 in debt in a Berlin bank, Barnes drew this and placed it in his own credit. The Chileans repudiated the Berlin advances.

The nature of the impressions made upon the mind of Mr. Barnes can be ascertained by a perusal of a few extracts from his letter. He says:

"One of our earliest expeditions to Chile was to take the electric wire in Fort Douglas to a bridge with a reservation of four square miles of land

and hills, but an easement could be made, because there was an American. However, he thinks that the Chileans and Germans have something like a secret understanding."

Burns says the Chileans are as bad as the men who planned it and the injury of the man who made it. Standing at Fort Douglas and surveying the present site of over 20,000 inhabitants, embattled in trees, with all the fortifications and fortifications, and 10 miles of electric wire, he says: "It would be a worthy prize of gold to capture it." It would be a "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

A people who would not resist with all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not worthy of costly efforts. It would be "singular" if they made no resistance. And this has no connection with the question of abounding polygamy, for the last case in either case does not affect practical polygamy at all.

Those who would not resist with

all their might were an attempt to establish at the expense of the rights of citizens, solely on account of their religious associations with others who are unreconciled, are not