

WHAT PERE HYACINTHE SAID.

The utterances of Pere Hyacinthe while in this city on the subject of polygamy, although they are not entitled to consideration as in any way authoritative, have occasioned some comment because the gentleman is a celebrity. His opinions were formed before he came here, and he had no opportunities of looking at the matter practically during his brief stay. But an attempt has been made to dispute the fact that he made some admissions not commonly confessed by gentlemen of his cloth, and to exaggerate into undue importance other remarks of his on this subject.

In Saturday's EVENING NEWS we published the report of an interview with Pere Hyacinthe, in which his remarks were faithfully reproduced as interpreted by Brother C. R. Savage, who is thoroughly qualified to render in English what the gentleman uttered in French, and who vouches for the exact correctness of every word we printed. The sheet that is known in the whole inter-mountain region as a perpetual libel, pronounced our report "A Bold Forgery," and, quoting that part of the interview relative to polygamy, added these words:

"Part of that is very apt to have been something like what Pere Hyacinthe said, but a part of it is not at all likely to be so. His declarations against polygamy as anti-Christian, and man being in his depraved condition as a polygamist, do not fit in with the other purported admission that 'regulated polygamy among the Mormons and Mussulmans is a better condition than is found in Christian cities,' and we believe the latter to be an open and shameless forgery. It is impossible to believe that the Pere would say a thing like, especially right between two bold and open declarations against the polygamous state. So we don't believe he said anything of the kind, and take this present occasion to utterly deny it for him and repudiate it, that it may not be paraded hereafter by the lechers on his authority. Let the point be settled right here and now, and if the polygamists can't establish that he did say so, let them refrain ever after from quoting it."

Of course Pere Hyacinthe did not authorize this denial, and he has not taken occasion to find fault with anything we have said concerning him. We took no notice of the impudent assumption and attack upon our report, because we are accustomed to daily assaults of this kind, and usually pay no attention to them. On Tuesday the same sheet repeated its abuse as follows:

"An effort was also impudently made by the polygamist organ to make it appear that in an interview with its reporter, Pere Hyacinthe conceded the superior morality of Mormons and Mussulmans, with their polygamous social life, to that of monogamous Christianity. Of course, that was a bald and wicked misrepresentation and exactly contrary to the very ideas the Pere was expressing, and if anything more were needed to stamp it as a wicked and willful perversion of his words, his lecture on Sunday night was sufficient for the purpose. We give a comprehensive abstract of that lecture on our local page to-day."

On Wednesday the assault was kept up, and here is another excerpt or two from the same sources:

"There had been an effort on the part of the chief polygamist organ to make it appear by means of a bogus interview that the great Frenchman had expressed the opinion that Mormon and Mussulman polygamy is morally preferable to Christian monogamy in its practical effects. We showed that it was impossible he should have given voice to such a sentiment, both because of his lack of basis in facts for such an idea, and also because his opinions would inevitably be exactly the other way."

"It was seen at once that the polygamist organ had committed another bold and scandalous misrepresentation, probably in the hope that the Pere would pass on without doing or saying anything to give it the lie."

The poor creature who daily drools at the News without exciting anything but pity and disgust, supposed that he could continue as of yore to lie, uncontradicted and at pleasure. But for once we will favor it with a notice. We herewith present our report of the Pere's remarks to a representative of the News, and the report published in the sheet which has attacked us that he public may see the utter baselessness of the charges of "bold forgery," "willful perversion," "scandalous misrepresentation," etc. Here is the account as it appeared in our columns:

"At this point the Pere offered some remarks in relation to plural marriage. As he proceeded he warned to the theme, and was forceful and animated. He said it was the great wrong of the 'Mormon' Church. It was barbaric and dragged the marriage relation down to where it was before the coming of Christ, whose mission placed it upon an elevated plane. Man was in his debased condition a polygamist, but woman never, as she clung to one man she loved."

The representative of the News now turned interrogator, and inquired whether the marriage of one man with more than one woman was not, in the Pere's opinion, in harmony with the physical nature or constitution of woman as well as man?

Yes. That cannot be denied, but it is opposed to the higher, pervading Christian idea of an elevated morality and life, and men should have grace from God to enable them to overcome physical conditions and instincts.

What is the position of the Bible in relation to the question? I must admit that from none of the teachings of that book, in the injunctions of the Prophets or Apostles can the faith of the 'Mormons' in polygamy be assailed. It cannot be successfully done. But it is opposed to the higher plane of morality that pertains to Christianity in its essence. It is opposed to the ideal of true religion.

What about the relative condition of polygamic and monogamic society?

I must admit that regulated polygamy among the Mormons and Mussulmans is a better condition than is found in Christian cities. The great sin of the 'Mormons' is in investing polygamy with a religious atmosphere which does not belong to it. The higher Christian idea is one God and one wife.

And here is that part of the report of the Pere's Sunday night discourse which refers to the same subject, as it appeared in the sheet that attacked us:

"Outside of Christianity, polygamy, the plurality of wives or concubines, recognized by law and by religion, is a fact nearly universal. It is found throughout the Gentile world, and it is found associated with polytheism, as if the inability of man to love only one woman on earth was a direct reason why they could adore an only God in heaven; as if, passing across a clouded, capricious, and sensual imagination, the pure rays of divine unity and of conjugal unity ought to be shattered at the same time, the one in the reason and the other in the heart, and abandon man, according to the forcible language of the Saints, to all kinds of fornications and the practices of Baal or of Astarte."

Speaking of the accounts of the Old Testament, they present a strange spectacle, which often troubles the feeble, polygamy-surviving polytheism among God's chosen people. The most holy men practiced it, we say, and Moses gives it a place in his law, so difficult was it to purify the hearts and senses of men, even after their intelligence had received the true light. This fact only confirms my proposition, that polygamy is a practice so universal outside of Christianity that it is even found among the people of God. It is pagan or Jewish.

Why is this? It is because man is naturally a polygamist. Understand me well: I do not say that the original nature of man was so corrupted, or that he was a stranger to monogamy; very far from it. In the most generous and ideal aspirations of our moral being, we still find the unity of love and its perpetuity, which is the direct consequence of the existence of that pure state before the fall of man. And love to-day, which is worthy of the name, when it enters into the heart of a young man like a holy enthusiasm, causes to mount from his heart to his lips the words of love, which are often belied afterwards by his conduct; but in all cases they are repeated through the ages, 'Thou only I love, and thou only forever.'

But man has become flesh, and the flesh, as St. Paul says, is not under the restrictions of the law of God. This is why, in the ancient Bible, when man had not been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, polygamy was tolerated by the religious law. Moses had said, in excuse for the practice, choosing the least of two evils, 'There shall be no harlots in Israel.' To prevent the existence of prostitutes, he recognized concubinage, and 'concubines' was the only name that was given to the women of the second degree.

I confess that I prefer the polygamy of the Jew or the Mussulman, practiced openly, what may be called loyal polygamy, restrained by law and religion, obliged to care for and respect the rights of each woman and each child; I prefer this to the hypocritical polygamy of so many so-called Christians, who, in the large cities of Europe and America, make so many women first their slaves and then victims to their passions, abandoning them to the hazards of existence, the children to the horrors of infanticide, for which children they are responsible before God and man. But I see in the polygamy of the ancient Israelites only what Jesus Christ taught us to see in it, a condescension to the hardness of their hearts, which condescension should cease of itself after the Holy Spirit creates in the Christian a new heart to replace the heart of stone which man in his unregenerated condition has inherited from his fathers.

Let me be permitted here to state freely the point on which I reproach the Mormons, simply from the standpoint of a Christian teacher, for I will not touch on the question of the laws made by the United States. What I reproach them for is not the fact that they have engrafted polygamy into their system. On this point I should have no fault to find with them if they inhabited the Orient, or if they were Jews or Mussulmans. But they are Christian by baptism and by faith, and they pretend to practice the plurality of wives in the name of the gospel, even in the name of the perfection of the gospel, going backward under pretext of progress; they confound the church with the synagogue and with the mosque, and they assume to place under the keeping of Jesus Christ and his angels that which was formerly an infirmity, and which would be to-day an infamy."

The reader will perceive that the

views expressed by the Pere in Saturday's interview were repeated and amplified in Sunday evening's lecture. And the statements enounced by our vile assailant to be a forgery and manufactured by this paper, appear in its own columns as the veritable utterances of the distinguished preacher. That which the libeller alleges the Pere did not say and could not have said, is published in his own sheet as a report of the Pere's discourse.

The News reported him as saying that polygamy was "the great wrong of the Mormon Church;" that "it was barbaric;" that "man in his debased condition, was a polygamist;" that while polygamy was physiologically defensible it was "opposed to the Christian idea of an elevated morality;" that the teachings of the Bible were not opposed to it, but it was opposed to the ideal of true religion; that regulated polygamy was a better condition than that found in Christian cities; and that the sin of the Mormons was in investing polygamy with a religious atmosphere that did not belong to it. The sheet that declares the Pere did not say and could not have said this, reports that he said "polygamy was nearly universal;" that "the most holy men" of the Bible practised it; that he "confessed he preferred the polygamy of the Jew or Mussulman" to the "hypocritical polygamy of so-called Christians" in the "large cities of Europe and America;" that he "reproached the Mormons" not because they have engrafted polygamy into their system, "but because they are Christians by baptism and faith" and "practice the plurality of wives in the name of the gospel."

Thus all that the infamous libeller pronounces a "bold forgery" of the News, is actually reported in his own columns as the veritable words of the Pere. On Monday we said in regard to the Sunday evening's lecture:

"In Pere Hyacinthe's lecture last night, which was mostly devoted to Polygamy, he expressed substantially the same views on the subject as given by him in his interview with a representative of the News on Saturday."

On Wednesday the libeller said editorially:

"Neither of the Church papers, the avowed slave nor the curiously 'independent' organ, had one word in regard to the lecture."

And he proceeded to work himself up into a fury over this alleged "exhibition of a fettered press," and declared that it was simply because those remarks were against our own views, that we said not one word, when we had already given the Pere's remarks "against our own views," and are continually quoting from the writings and lectures of our opponents.

We shall make some comments on the contradictions in Pere Hyacinthe's opinions on the subject of polygamy apart from the foolery and falsehood of this attack upon our veracity, when we have space for the purpose, leaving the lowlived libeller to his daily dirty work again without interruption on our part. Cesspools are best left alone until attention to them becomes a necessity, and those who revel in slander need not be noticed by decent people except on rare occasions.

WHITE'S EXPOSURE OF THE MURRAY "VINDICATION."

THE course taken by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice in regard to the Murray whitewashing business has not been placed before the country in its full iniquity. And it is very doubtful if it will receive that publicity to which it is entitled. It has been pretended that Eli H. Murray was "vindicated" before that committee, while in fact he merely succeeded in getting the investigation suppressed. Proofs were proffered to establish all that had been alleged against him but they were not accepted, and those who were ready to furnish them were only blackguarded for their pains.

Failing to get the evidence at hand fairly before the Committee, Mr. White of Kentucky took advantage of the discussion in the House of Representatives, April 18th, over the Bill to limit the time within which prosecutions may be instituted for violating the internal revenue laws, to vindicate himself and show up the course of Eli H. Murray in reference to internal revenue prosecutions in Kentucky. But the same influence that procured the whitewashing of Governor Murray before the Committee interfered to prevent his exposure in the House. However, Mr. White succeeded in getting upon the record a great deal of damaging evidence against the whitewashed official, and we copy the Kentucky member's remarks as they appear in the Congressional Record of April 25:

I desire to call the attention of the House, and of the Republican side especially, to the fact that it cannot afford to defend any man in its party who has been found guilty of corrupt practices. Prior to the year 1876 it was a very common occurrence for men to be arrested for the most trivial and technical violations of law and carried to the most remote United States commissioner in the State of Kentucky for preliminary trial. There was evidently collusion between the district attorney, who had a brother who was United States commissioner in Louisville,

and the marshal who had deputies to divide with him the costs.

That method of plundering the public treasury was carried to such an extent that when I was elected to the Forty-fourth Congress the petitions and complaints from the State of Kentucky were so numerous that I was compelled, contrary to my inclination, compelled in spite of my prejudices in favor of the then district attorney and marshal of Kentucky, to ask that the Department of Justice would direct to be made an investigation of the charges of gross malfeasance in office. That investigation was had, and, be it said to the credit of the Republican administration then in power, the corrupt officials were turned out of office. G. C. Wharton, United States district attorney, was removed, and Eli H. Murray, United States marshal, was permitted to resign.

What was the state of the case at that time? If I understand the bill presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMillan] it is intended to remove the temptation now for such violations. At that time, although there was a United States commissioner in the little town of London, Ky., 160 miles from Louisville, it was customary to take the men arrested beyond and in the vicinity of London by the commissioner there to the city of Louisville for the purpose of having simply a preliminary examination. If one was arrested at the head of the Big Sandy or Kentucky Rivers, he was taken to Louisville for the preliminary examination, although to get there he might have to go through the town of Mount Sterling, where there was a commissioner, which was 133 miles from Louisville. What was that done for? For no other purpose than to run up the costs and get the fees from the Government. That was changed somewhat after the investigation which I set on foot during my term in the Forty-fourth Congress. It was changed so that the person arrested had a right to a preliminary trial before the commissioner nearest his home.

Notwithstanding these changes by the Department of Justice requiring the man arrested to be tried before the nearest commissioner, arrests were frequently made and prosecutions instituted simply to make costs for we find the following statement in the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of November 25, 1881:

The district attorney is made the judge of the propriety of commencing a criminal prosecution against a citizen on account of which he and the marshal will receive pay from the Government, whether the party be guilty or innocent. These officers may prefer complaints against citizens, cause United States commissioners to issue warrants, may arrest and examine the parties before the commissioner, and the district attorney, marshal, guard, witnesses, and the commissioner will all get their fees from the Government, even though the party arrested be discharged.

He says further:

Instances have been brought to my attention where numerous prosecutions have been instituted for the most trivial violations of law, and the arrested parties taken long distances and subjected to great inconvenience and expense, not in the interest of the Government, but apparently for no other reason than to make costs.

There is an indictment against certain Federal officials by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who ought to know all about this matter. It was not made in 1876, when I asked for this investigation, but in 1881.

Now to come directly to the measure before the House. This bill will go far to prevent senseless prosecutions, more properly called persecutions, by corrupt district attorneys and their relatives who are commissioners, and marshals and their willing deputies, from hunting up cases five years old, where citizens may have been indicted for trivial or technical violations, like the selling of one pint of whisky, or for selling five pounds of tobacco which may have been raised on his own farm; to prevent them from hunting up citizens remotely located—sometimes 300 miles—from where there is a Federal court, and dragging them before that court for no other purpose than to make costs and get their fees, even though the party arrested be innocent.

An attempt was here made to gag the gentleman, but the Speaker ruled that he had the floor in his own right for one hour. Mr. White continued:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the privilege of incorporating in my remarks voluminous extracts from the testimony which has been taken before the Springer investigating committee. I hope the chairman of that committee is now present. Yes, I see his smiling countenance. I wish to quote from the testimony before that committee, because it is the most extraordinary proceeding perhaps that was ever permitted. A committee appointed to investigate expenditures in the Department of Justice undertook to investigate the expenses of marshals and district attorneys for Kentucky. They called me before that committee. For what purpose? The following will perhaps throw light on the question:

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 28, 1884.

SIR:—I am instructed by the Committee on Expenditures Department of Justice to request you to appear before the committee to-morrow (Tuesday) morning, January 29, 1884, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the matter of the accounts of the United States court officials in Kentucky.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. M. SPRINGER, Chairman.
Attest: J. B. IRWIN, Clerk Committee.
HON. JOHN D. WHITE,
House of Representatives.

I did not receive that notice in time to appear on the day stated, and so a second notice was sent to me.

On the 30th of last January I testified before that committee as to the source of my information on the subject for which I was summoned to give testimony.

The chairman of that committee [Mr. Springer] asked me this question.

Since you have been a Representative in Congress, have you been informed of the existence of any abuses or irregularities in the administration of the office of United States marshal or United States deputy marshal?

Referring to Kentucky, I testified that I had been so informed. They asked me for the names of witnesses. I gave them the names of reliable witnesses. Did they summon those witnesses? Oh, no! but they determined to see Mr. Murray. [Laughter.]

I reviewed the investigation that I had set on foot in 1876, and showed that the investigation resulted in the removal of G. C. Wharton, United States district attorney, who was afterward reappointed by Mr. Hayes and confirmed by a Democratic Senate, and then hired by the whisky ring to lobby the unlimited bond-extension bill through the Forty-seventh Congress. I reviewed the case in which United States Marshal Murray, now governor of Utah, after an investigation by the general agent of the Department of Justice, and not to gratify me—for I must confess that in the beginning I was loath to believe these prominent officials guilty of malfeasance in office—was permitted to resign, although Mr. Harlan, then an attorney for this man, pleaded that he should be allowed to remain, and hunted up influential men to try to get him retained. Still, when Mr. Hayes had become President, Mrs. Hayes had Murray appointed governor of Utah. [Laughter.] Go to the Department of the Interior, and not a single line can be found recommending Mr. Murray as Governor of Utah when he was appointed the first time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, did they call the witnesses who I told them knew all about these facts? Did they call Mr. Samuel Craft, clerk of the United States court, Louisville, Ky.? Did they call H. F. Finley, now the judge of the fifteenth judicial district in the State of Kentucky, one of the purest, bravest, and best republicans in the United States, and who made the charges in May, 1877, as appears in my testimony, and which I have incorporated in my remarks—did they call him? Did they call Henry Divan, who claimed to know, personally, the truth of the charges regarding the official conduct of Marshal Murray? Did they call anybody who claimed to know, personally, about these matters? Did they call the United States commissioner at London, by whose office many of the arrested persons were carried 160 miles to Louisville? Did they call Maj. A. T. Wood, the United States commissioner at Mount Sterling, through whose town they carried the prisoners from that end of the State? No, sir. Then, what did they do? Why, they called Mr. Murray! [Laughter.] Mr. Murray was allowed to come before the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and read a long speech, evidently prepared by his attorney, and which covers more than twenty printed pages, to try to unload his guilt upon others, and to abuse witnesses who had testified for the Government against him.

What next? They called in John Harlan, a Justice of the Supreme Court. And what does he say? Why, that he had been Murray's attorney, and that he had come from Louisville, Ky., to Washington in 1876 "for the purpose of seeing the Attorney General touching the charges which had been made in the public prints affecting Murray's conduct as marshal for the State of Kentucky;" and that Attorney General Taft had told him that he did not believe that Murray had "knowingly made any improper charges." But I will not undertake to quote from memory, and shall give Justice Harlan's testimony in full in the appendix to my remarks.

I refer to this matter because that committee has decided to stop the investigation; and the reason they decided to stop it was because Governor Murray, one of the men under investigation, came before the committee and said he was not guilty, and then undertook to prove by John M. Harlan, of the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the Speaker of this House, who did not pretend to have any knowledge of the facts or to have investigated this thing, that he had a good character. The committee then resolved to close that investigation.

There is the conclusion of the greatest farce under the name of an honest and thorough investigation that I have ever known.

Why was Mr. Speaker Carlisle called before that committee? To tell what he knew about the facts? Not at all. But to give a good character to a man who had read a statement the day before to the committee to refute definite charges against him for plundering the United States Treasury out of thousands of dollars, and who was turned out of office by President Grant after an investigation of his official conduct by the Department of Justice in 1876.

Mr. White here quoted his remarks on January 21st, directing the Springer committee's attention to ex-Marshal Murray's official crookedness, and read the virulent attack made by Governor Murray upon himself and others before that committee, all of which has appeared in print, and went on to say: