

BASKIN'S LATEST BILL.

The following is a *Herald* special from Washington, April 16. In the House Committee on Territories today the new bill to disfranchise the Mormons in Utah was discussed for a short time. An amendment making the disfranchisement applicable to all the Territories was adopted by a strict party vote. The Democrats opposed the measure all through, but the Republicans seemed determined to push it to a vote at once without giving further hearing to the opponents of the bill, claiming that the test oath proposition had been so recently argued before them on the Idaho admission bill that the committee was in possession of all the facts. During the discussion Delegate Dubois stated that at the late conference in Salt Lake the President of the Mormon Church had declared that there would be no further revelation received by the Church, from which Dubois argued that if no further revelation was received polygamy was irrevocably fixed upon the Church. His statement being disputed, he claimed to have the official proceedings to verify it. When 12 o'clock arrived the Democrats objected to further consideration and the bill went over till Wednesday next.

It is understood that the Delegates from Arizona and New Mexico will appear with Delegate Caine in opposition to the measure when it comes before the committee again.

It is now believed that it was the intention of Struble, of Iowa, who introduced the bill in the House, if it had gone through the committee today, to have asked the House to consider it when the committee on Territories was called for bills during the morning hour.

Delegate Smith, of Arizona, is violently opposed to the bill. He says it will disfranchise 1000 Mormons in his Territory, scarcely a fraction of whom are polygamists and all of whom are peaceable and law-abiding citizens. He characterizes the measure as an outrage, and says that its sole purpose is to make Arizona republican, when it will be admitted as a State.

Chairman Baker, of the Territories committee, who, in spite of his agreeable personality, is a bitter and unscrupulous partisan, tells me that the purpose of the bill is to prevent the Mormons from colonizing some of the new States like Wyoming or Arizona and Oklahoma after the latter shall be admitted.

Contrary to his announced intention of leaving for New York several days ago, Baskin is still here. He and Governor Thomas were seen together for some time at the capitol today. It is believed that both Thomas and West are assisting Baskin in urging the passage of the disfranchisement bill.

TORONTO, April 18.—The single tax association passed a resolution of sympathy with the Chinaman kept exposed on Suspension bridge "by two professedly Christian nations."

A WIFE CANNOT TESTIFY.

The trial of Edwin D. Crowther on an indictment for adultery, was commenced in the Third District Court Monday, April 14th. The jury was impaneled and sworn, and it was agreed by counsel that Mrs. Lydia Crowther was the defendant's legal wife.

The case was conducted by Mr. Varian for the prosecution, and Hamilton & Coad, who had been appointed by the court, for the defense.

Mrs. Ellen G. Hefferan Crowther was the first witness. She testified—I became the plural wife of the defendant twenty years ago, and have seven children by him. My youngest child is fourteen months old. The defendant is its father. He visited me at my residence in this city frequently in 1888 and stayed overnight. When the child was born he told me not to say anything about his being its father, to prevent his getting into trouble. We were supposed to be separated, but he visited me frequently. He received a pardon from the President some time ago, but he continued to visit me after getting it. My oldest child, Ella, is eighteen.

To Mr. Hamilton—I was not pleased with the action of the defendant in obtaining his pardon. My child was born February 15, 1889. Mr. Crowther generally came to my house like a thief in the night. I know Chancy Kane. He visited my house during the month of March, 1888, and twice he called with Mr. Crowther. I think he left here in April following to attend some races. We had a little hearing once before Bishop Wolley, of the Ninth Ward. I have seen a man named Lancaster. He called at my house for Mr. Kane. At the Bishop's hearing the defendant attempted to show that he was not the father of the child.

Ella Crowther testified—The last witness is my mother and the defendant is my father. My father received a pardon in July, 1886. He had been away from home a few months when I first heard of it. The defendant was at our house frequently the year before the birth of the youngest child. One night when I returned from the theatre I found him in my mother's room. He visited our house frequently in March, 1888.

Mr. Hamilton—Are your feelings toward your father, friendly?

The witness—Well, I don't know that I should feel friendly towards him.

Mr. Hamilton—Is that because of his getting a pardon?

The witness—It is because he has not treated us right since the baby was born. Mr. Kane, the party referred to by my mother, was a horseman. One day, when it was raining very hard, he tied his horse under the trees in front of our house. My younger sister invited him to come in. That is the way we became acquainted with him.

Ellen G. Hefferan was recalled and testified that after the birth of the child the defendant called at her house twice.

The prosecution rested here and Edwin D. Crowther was called by the defense. He testified—I am the defendant in this case. I have resided in this city since March, 1889. Prior to that time I resided at Coalville. I lived in polygamy with Ellen Hefferan up to March, 1882. I was at her house on March 10, 1888. I have never admitted the paternity of the child to anyone.

Mr. Varian—When did you leave your plural wife?

The Witness—In March 1882.

Mr. Varian—And you make an affidavit that you had abandoned your polygamous practice when you applied for a pardon?

The Witness—Yes.

Mr. Varian—How old is your boy Tommy?

The Witness—Seven or eight years old?

Mr. Varian—If this child was born on March 24, 1883, you did not cease to live with your plural wife after the passage of the act of 1882, did you?

The Witness—Not if that is so.

Mr. Varian—But you took an oath that you had done so?

The Witness—Yes.

Mr. Varian—That's all.

Mrs. Lydia Crowther was then called, but Mr. Varian objected to her testifying. He took the ground that under the law of the United States she was not a competent witness to testify in favor of her husband.

At this point the court adjourned.

This morning Mr. Varian argued further in support of his proposition that the legal wife could not testify in behalf of her husband. He stated that in the case of the United States vs. Wm. E. Bassett, the Territorial Supreme Court had overlooked a United States statute when it ruled that a wife could testify against her husband.

Mr. Coad took an opposite view. He also argued that the competency of witnesses was regulated by Territorial statute. The Supreme Court had decided this to be the fact in the case of the United States vs. T. R. Cutler, though Judge Zane had dissented from that opinion.

Judge Zane decided that the Territorial rule of evidence did not apply, thus disagreeing with the action of the Territorial Supreme Court in the Bassett, Cutler and other cases. He held that the legal wife could not be permitted to testify, even by the consent of the defendant, in a case of adultery.

Edwin Crowther testified—I am a son of the defendant; in 1888 I resided at Coalville with my parents; in the latter part of April of that year, father was in Coalville, and remained there for six weeks or more; he was there during the entire month of May.

To Mr. Varian—He worked with me every day, except Sunday, during that time.

Asa Wilson testified—I am the defendant's son-in-law; resided in Coalville in 1888; my child was buried April 4; Mr. Crowther was not there then, but came to Coalville a few days later, and remained a couple of months.

To Mr. Varian—I saw him there