

EDITORIALS.

A NOTORIOUS HIRELING.

DR. J. P. NEWMAN, formerly chaplain of the Administration, "traveling consul" of the United States and representative of the same to the Garden of Eden, minister of the M. E. Church, and ex-champion of the anti-polygamy feather weights, has been engaged in a serious broil with his latest congregation. In December, 1881, he was "called," that is, hired, by the Madison Avenue Church in New York, as its temporary pastor. He was taken on trial, like any other hired man whose qualifications for the place were considered doubtful. He was a Methodist and the church was a Congregationalist. His salary was placed at \$6,000 per annum, and it is claimed that he agreed to become a Congregationalist if he was accepted as the regular pastor; also that he managed, through his friends, to get his salary raised to \$10,000 on his being permanently installed.

In May, 1882, he entered permanently on his duties, without formal installation, but did not announce any change of creed or fellowship. However, he preached to the Congregationalists and attempted to make it appear that the church was not a part of the Congregationalist body but a free and independent Christian church. Every three months he reported himself to the Methodist body as one of its ministers, while allowing his congregation to think that he was one of their own faith. The effects of his ministry were thus described at the annual meeting recently held, by Dr. J. W. Ranney, deacon of the church: "For the past two or three years our eight hundred members have been scattered among other churches. I find now that less than one hundred are with us."

The deacon moved that "the services of Dr. J. P. Newman be discontinued." The preacher resented this vehemently, called Dr. Ranney some very hard names, and the report of the meeting, which appears in the New York Herald, says: "Acrimonious debate followed for a full hour, in which such words as 'false,' 'unjust,' 'disgrace' and charges of sharp practice were bandied freely." The resolution was finally laid on the table, but the feelings that exist are very unpleasant and Dr. Newman and Dr. Ranney ventilate their differing views through the columns of the Herald in a very unsanctified manner.

That paper editorially reviews the matter and considers that "Dr. Newman rather provoked the quarrel in the Madison Avenue church over which he presides by a want of definition of purpose." It states that in consequence of this, "The Methodists are somewhat disturbed, since the state of affairs reflects to a certain extent on them; and the Congregationalists are equally disturbed, because there is a mistiness in the atmosphere which they cannot see through," and the Herald suggests that "it may not be intrusive to ask Dr. Newman to state definitely whether he is a Methodist or a Congregationalist, or both, or neither, since that seems to be the one question to which every one is vainly seeking an answer. Our clergymen ought to be willing to tell the whole truth, and then it is barely possible that laymen may follow their example."

There is no doubt that Dr. Newman is a man of ability. In Utah there is no less doubt that he is a person of questionable honesty. His attempts at wresting the scriptures to make a point, while discussing the polygamy question with Professor Orson Pratt in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, exposed him to that dubiety and in some minds established his duplicity and intentional misinterpretation of the sacred scriptures. He acted more like a political demagogue and pugilistic wrangler than a "Christian" divine, and even the little boys detected his sham piety and his word-twisting and he was referred to by them for years as Leviticus XVIII. 18.

We consider him as one of the humbugs of the age. We are pleased to know that he is violently opposed to the system vulgarly called "Mormonism." He is an ardent supporter of the policy of force to put down the "Mormon" religion. He cannot refute it so he wants to see it assailed by the civil law, to quench the zeal of its votaries by penalties and prisons, and that failing, to blow them to kingdom come with rifle and cannon, powder and ball.

We are not surprised that while hanging on to the Methodist Church he takes Congregational money to preach Congregational sermons. He is open to the highest bidder. Watch his course. If some other denomination offers him a softer thing he will accept the "call"—after prayer and due reflection as to its pecuniary advantages. We think with the Herald, that he ought to define his position, but do not think he is likely to respond while there is any probability that doubt on that question will leave him two opportunities for prospective remuneration. Give him a good chance for the fleece, it will be seen that he troubles himself little about the sectarian breed of the flock. He is simply a "hireling" that "careth not for the sheep."

The Smith family occupies 15 closely printed pages of the London directory this year.

THE MURRAY CROOKEDNESS IN KENTUCKY.

It seems that an investigation into the alleged crookedness of Eli H. Murray while Marshal of Kentucky, has been instituted and is likely to be carried on in spite of the strenuous efforts of of the Governor's friends to pooh! pooh! the charges and cover up the facts. We have known something about these accusations for a long time, and also that damaging documents were in existence that might at any time be brought forth to confront the ex-Marshall and present Governor. But we have said very little about them, as we have had no personal quarrel with the Governor, and when we have disagreed with him our remarks have been addressed to his attacks upon the people of Utah and his untruthful statements concerning them, their religion and their local laws. The charge made by Congressman White, however, and the investigation pushed by Mr. Springer, are matters of news with which we have necessarily to deal, and we consider it proper to give all the particulars we can glean, to the public.

The Governor does not like this, of course, and those who have selected him as their representative, and are using him to carry out their schemes against the peace of this Territory, are in a terrible rage. They want to make it appear that the "Mormons" have incited the present investigation. But this is entirely untrue. The Kentucky transactions, which it was fondly hoped were effectually covered up by the thick coat of whitewash which was applied when the scandal was common Kentucky talk, have not been brought to the surface by "Mormon" hands or "Mormon" suggestions.

Governor Murray and those of his associates who knew anything of this affair have been very bold about it because the papers in the case were not on file at Washington. It appears that they have now been filed in the Department of Justice. George K. Chase is assailed because he, being aware of this crookedness, did not file the papers in the case years ago. If this is urged, he will be compelled to tell the reasons why these documents were withheld. Those reasons will reach higher up than some people have imagined. If fully disclosed, it will be found that His Fraudulency Rutherford B. Hayes, as President of the United States, was a party to their concealment, and that Chase had what he considered good reasons for not placing the papers in question in official quarters. Hayes knew enough about them to be certain that if filed they would prevent the confirmation as Governor of Utah of the ex-Marshall of Kentucky whom Mrs. Hayes really nominated and strongly desired to be appointed.

Now that this investigation has been started, we hope it will be made thorough and complete, no matter who it will implicate nor whose official character it will smirch. As a more complete statement of the case than has yet been presented through the press, we give the following dispatch to the Chicago Times, and published in that paper of January 24th, headed, "Gov. Murray On the Gridiron."

"Washington, Jan. 23.—Special.—Eli H. Murray, Governor of Utah, was Marshal of Kentucky from 1869 to 1876. Learning that there were papers on file in the Department of Justice which would disclose some ugly facts against Murray, Mr. Springer yesterday called for them, and the Attorney General promptly sent them to the committee. They relate to one series of cases only, but sufficient evidence is contained in them to show conclusively that Murray's accounts, his emolument returns, and his fee-bills were, during his entire term, filled with fraudulent items. The charges which had been preferred against Murray were investigated by George K. Chase, who was chief special agent of the Department of Justice under Attorney General Pierpont and Devens. Chase confined himself exclusively to the charges made, which covered only a minute part of Murray's accounts—a few months out of over six years. A negro who part of the time was borne on the rolls in two different capacities, and a deputy marshal worked the cases against retail dealers. The law required them to take out, and keep posted up in a conspicuous place, licenses. Many Germans would, either through ignorance or forgetfulness, neglect to post the licenses. The negro would visit these places and report to the deputy marshal. He would fill out a complaint, which the darkey would not always swear to; the United States commissioner would issue the warrants and the accused would appear and produce their licenses and be discharged. On all such cases fees amounting to \$6 or \$7 would be charged against the government, two witnesses always being charged for, when in reality no witnesses were summoned or present. The deputy marshal swore this was with the connivance and approval of the marshal. The agent of the Department of Justice regarded these charges conclusively proved. Another practice was to charge for guards to help bring prisoners to Louisville, when, in fact, no guards were employed. The agent reported numerous cases where guards were charged for when the prisoners were simply notified to appear, which they did of their own accord. In

one case a guard was charged for when the prisoner was a blind man. In another case the prisoner was over 75 years old, and could scarcely walk. It was proved conclusively that mileage was habitually charged for a greater distance than was actually traveled, often from thirty to forty miles more. It was established by overwhelming evidence that the Marshal caused all prisoners arrested in remote parts of the State to be brought to Louisville, instead of being taken before a United States commissioner in their neighborhood, where they could have given bail or been discharged after a hearing. Being carried far from their homes, these poor people often had to lie in jail for weeks, because they could not give bail in Louisville, or secure the attendance of witnesses.

It was also proved that the law was violated in frequent instances in making charges against the government and in payments of salaries to subordinates. After one of the cases had been detected by the first comptroller of the treasury and disallowed, the Marshal resorted to a trick to deceive the accounting officers, while continuing the illegal practice. Employees were also required to sign the pay-rolls in blank, and only part of the money they received for was paid to them. A most determined effort was made by United States District Attorney Wharton to prevent these exposures and to stop the Department of Justice from making an investigation. Tremendous political influence, democratic as well as republican, was brought to bear to save Murray from disgrace. He was, however, compelled to resign. Nevertheless, with this record against him on file in the department of justice, he was appointed Governor of Utah, and, through the influence of the Kentucky Senators, confirmed.

The following telegram was received by the DESERET NEWS at half-past 3 o'clock this afternoon:

WASHINGTON, 28,

The charges against Governor Murray, of Utah, respecting irregularities in his office, while United States Marshal of Kentucky were considered today, and it was decided to summon Representative White, of Kentucky, tomorrow to explain the basis of his remarks in the House last Monday, reflecting upon Governor Murray.

The committee expects after hearing Representative White, either to give Murray an opportunity to testify in his own behalf, or report that the records of the Department of Justice show that the charges are sustained, and recommend that he be required to answer to that department.

MAIL MATTERS AT BOUNTIFUL.

We have made two notices of complaints against the Postmaster at Bountiful, preferred by citizens of that place who felt aggrieved by his alleged negligence, if nothing worse. These have elicited a response from the Postmaster. He feels much hurt at these complaints and claims that they are ungrounded. He admits that he may sometimes have made a mistake in sorting the mail, but has never acted in an ungentlemanly way or denied letters or papers to persons when there have been any for them, to his knowledge, in the office.

Our object has been purely the public benefit. We have nothing against the Bountiful Postmaster, personally. If he has been unjustly accused we will help to set him right before the public. But we think there have been mistakes made which have occasioned some of the complaints. In other instances the blame has been with other parties, as it appears that occasionally a parcel of the DESERET NEWS, plainly addressed to another Post-office, has been received at Bountiful, while the Bountiful package, sent in another direction, has not been received for some days after the proper date. In one or two instances the mail has been a day behind from this office, when, of course, neither the Bountiful Postmaster nor any other postal official was to blame.

We received to-day the following communication from a resident of Bountiful whose word can be relied upon, and we cheerfully give it place in vindication of the Postmaster:

Editor Deseret News:

In your issue of Thursday, the 24th, I notice an article in regard to our P. M., also one a few days ago complaining of his inefficiency; also of his insulting manners. So far as I can learn (and have taken some pains to ascertain) he has been very gentlemanly and obliging. So far as his qualifications are concerned, having never been a P. M., I am unable to judge, he has probably made mistakes, which don't?

JUSTICE.

THE NEW HOAR AMENDMENTS TO THE NEW EDMUNDS BILL.

It will be seen by our Washington dispatches that the new Edmunds bill has been reported back from the Judiciary Committee by Mr. Hoar, Mr. Edmunds being in the chair as President of the Senate.

The bill has received several additions in committee. We have commented on the bill as presented by Senator Edmunds, and showed its in-

justice and violation of established principles of jurisprudence. Some pointed remarks on the subject will be found in the report of an interview by a Philadelphia reporter with Hon. John T. Caine, to be found in another part of this paper. The amendments reported by Senator Hoar are more remarkable than the original provisions of the bill, and lead us to doubt the sanity of their author.

The enactment of last session known as the Hoar Amendment, which the Governor of this Territory jumped at as a chance under which to exercise despotic and extraordinary powers, exhibited a total absence of knowledge of the affairs of Utah, and ignorance of the laws which it was intended to amend. The same lamentable lack of understanding is patent in the new amendments introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The first seven sections of the bill appear by the report to be substantially as introduced by Mr. Edmunds. Section eight provides for the amendment of all laws of this Territory which provide for the identification of voters at elections. But there are no such laws in existence. There are no better provisions for an absolutely secret ballot in the country than those of our territorial statutes. Section eleven exhibits the same ignorance of our laws as section eight. It amends all laws which provide that prosecution for adultery can only be commenced by complaint of the husband or wife. But there is no such law upon our statute books. It seems very strange to us that learned Senators will persist in attempting to tinker the laws of Utah without examining them, and will continue to frame enactments to suit conditions and a people about whom they know absolutely nothing, and in recommending which they are guided only by hearsay and prejudice.

It appears by Section nine that Senator Hoar does not wish that the children of any but the first wife shall inherit any portion of the father's estate. He is very anxious to suppress polygamy and has pretended to be desirous that the wives and offspring who are by such suppression to be deprived of a husband's and father's care, shall be provided for. But this section goes directly against such provision. Under the laws which men have made the children of plural wives are called illegitimate. Under the laws of God they are just as legitimate as the children of the first wife. And a statute of this Territory provides that "Every illegitimate child is, in all cases, an heir to its mother. It is also heir to its father when acknowledged by him." This is an eminently just law, taking the word illegitimate in its legal sense. But the amendment recommended by Mr. Hoar is not only unjust, but cruel and infamous.

The idea of the Government of the United States taking out of the hands of a Church, the power to appoint its own trustees to manage its own Church property, and the President and Senate appointing such officers, as provided in sections twelve and thirteen, is the most ridiculous thing in the way of legislation ever suggested in Congress, unless it be the provision of section sixteen, taking away such money as may be found to belong to the Perpetual Emigration Fund and making it escheat to the United States. The Government has no more right or lawful power to do these things than it has to appoint trustees to manage the affairs of a private banking house incorporated under the law, or to take all Senator Hoar's surplus money and confiscate it to the United States treasury.

The last two sections of the bill are merely intended to give the Governor and his associates a little extra power, and to continue the Utah Commission in office a little longer. There is not the slightest necessity for redistricting the Territory, as that was done at the session of 1880, under the supervision of the then Governor, and it gives the citizens an equal representation in the Legislature according to numbers, as nearly as it could be done with the interference of the Executive, who endeavored to favor as much as possible the element of which he was a conspicuous part.

It is a shameful thing that the affairs of Utah which are made so much the subject of Congressional action, are not inquired into with an honest desire to arrive at the truth. The statements of arrant knaves and political schemers with personal ends in view, are accepted without investigation. The most palpable untruths are swallowed whole, like pills, without a glance. Obsolete laws and alleged Utah provisions that never had an existence, are cited and movements made to repeal them, without any attempt to learn whether they are in force or not. And the most foolish and untruthful statements, providing they reflect upon the "Mormons," are given credence to and repeated gravely in the highest legislative body in the land. With but a few honorable exceptions no pains are taken to obtain correct information. Rashly and with amazing disregard of consistency and justice, legislation is framed and recommended that, if directed against any other people than an unpopular religious society, would expose the authors and advisers thereof to derision and result in their final political retirement. It is disgraceful and contemptible, and when the country comes to its senses on the "Mormon" question will be so regarded by rational people of every party and every creed.

Salem County, New Jersey, had 150 marriages last year and 250 deaths.

A WEAK CHAMPIONSHIP.

A FEW of Governor Murray's friends—not many—have been exerting themselves to prop him up, and prevent him falling under the weight of the charges of dishonesty aimed at him and which are now broadcast over the country. The supports are, however, gradually giving way and the official ground upon which the Governor stands appears to be tottering under his feet.

There is one man who stands out somewhat conspicuously as a voluntary champion of Mr. Murray, and telegraphed him a few lines of consolation to that effect, but it appears that the condolence consists of rather cold comfort. The gentleman who assumes the special role of vindicator of the Governor's official integrity is Mr. Rothacker, formerly of Kentucky, now editor of the Denver, Colorado, Tribune.

Judging from the celerity with which the gentleman voluntarily stepped to the front in his self-assumed capacity, much was hoped for and expected from him, but the flabbiness with which he enters upon the conflict is but another verification of the truth of the adage—"Blessed is he who expects but little, for he shall not be disappointed."

Instead of Mr. Rothacker's paper coming out with an unobscured vindication of Mr. Murray, it contains a remarkably weak three-paragraph article on the subject, giving no information, besides being as clear as mud. It is mainly conspicuous for pointlessness. The first paragraph amounts simply to nothing, and we here append the second entire:

"The original charge was brought in June, 1875, nearly nine years ago. It was a charge that unusual fees had been charged by Murray, who was then United States Marshal for Kentucky. All the alleged facts in the case were furnished by a discharged deputy named Henry Diven. They were thoroughly examined into by an officer of the Department of Justice named Chase, and Murray was exonerated by the report. It was after the exoneration that Murray resigned."

It is clear that the writer of that statement either does not know what he is talking about or he is guilty of a conspicuous inexactitude, which will very probably be shown if Mr. Chase's report is brought before the public, which is not an unlikely circumstance. The papers in that gentleman's possession were suppressed purely and simply because they did not exonerate Mr. Murray. If the report had not been hidden up there is scarcely any doubt that Mr. Murray never would have occupied the position of Governor of this Territory, as in all probability the Senate, in the face of it, would have refused to confirm his appointment. The result would have been that President Hayes would never have heard the end of it from Mrs. Hayes, with whom Mr. Murray was a special favorite and as the most potent adviser of the Chief Magistrate she had selected him for Governor of Utah.

The third paragraph contains not a single point tending to clear Mr. Murray from the damaging allegations against him, but incorporates the following fling at Congressman White—

"The man White, who made the charges against him in the House, is a crazy, irresponsible creature who is held in general contempt by all the Republicans of Kentucky. Murray is worth a hundred of such cattle."

It is difficult to tell whether this is a greater insult to Mr. White or the people of Kentucky of whom he is the representative in the National Legislature. "Crazy irresponsible creature" and "cattle" are epithets that require no more ability to formulate and utter than is exhibited by street "gamins" in a dispute over a game of marbles. So it appears that Mr. Murray's chief champion is devoid of prowess and does not wield a very trenchant pen in his defense.

Would it not be well for such men as Mr. Rothacker and some of Mr. Murray's friends here to wait awhile before making plump assertions as to his spotlessness. Should the pending investigation prove that the allegations are well founded, the volunteer champions of the Governor claiming to know all about the muddle in which he finds himself, will feel correspondingly cheap. We assert neither one way nor the other, but feel quite positive that the weight of probability appears greatly in favor of the investigation resulting in a very bad showing for His Excellency.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

THE article which appears in another column on Industrial Education is from the pen of Hon. Edward Daniels, an active and ardent worker in the cause of human progress. It contains suggestions worthy the consideration of all promoters of the cause of education. That something more than mere book learning should enter into the course of juvenile instruction must be evident to those who can see the effects of the present incomplete system of teaching, and that tuition which will lead to the cultivation of all the powers of the pupil, must be far superior. Industrial education was strongly urged by the late President Brigham Young, and we hope, some day, when the blocks in the way of our