

WASHINGTON.

A Begging Circular for a Beggarly Sheet—That Monogamous Lobby—More of the Bill—The "Liberal" Delegates Disappointed—A Just and Able Article, Etc.

News' Special Correspondence.]

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13, 1887.
On the outside of the wrapper of a paper published by the Baptist organization in Utah, is the begging note enclosed. The paper is being gratuitously distributed at present. It may be worth mentioning that the sender of the note makes no claim that the journal has any merit:

DEAR FRIEND.—We send you a sample copy of the *Mountain*, with the hope that you will subscribe for it. The price is only fifty cents a year. Perhaps you will kindly send us, on a postal card, the names of a few acquaintances and friends to whom we might send sample copies, and thus aid the cause. The three Territories represented by the paper are the most interesting and important missionary field of our country; especially is this true of Utah, which has been receiving the attention of the Christian world of late years, and so which the Edmunds-Tucker bill is giving unusual prominence at the present time.

The dispatch from Salt Lake published in the eastern newspapers that a

STRONG MORMON LOBBY

was coming to Washington to pose as monogamist Mormons willing to give up polygamy, created quite a breeze of excitement, and some newspapers went so far as to give editorial mention of the statement, using it as another illustration of the corruptness of the Mormons and their disposition to treason. I see that Delegate Caine has given it a flat denial, and that a tardy and gingerly correction was made from Salt Lake. For all this, however, the original statement is accepted by nineteenth of the people as true, and this is how the intelligent public is being enlightened. Speaking of the Associated Press agent at Salt Lake, a member of the Associated Press here asked if he was any worse than the *Tribune* butcher who was here some time since. "Worse," exclaimed a Mormon, "worse! Why Lannan's angel's wings are sprouting, half developed. Why, as compared with the agent there, Lannan is actually a gentleman." "Great heaven!" exclaimed the man of news, "I do not profess to know much about the Mormon problem, but I do know a gentleman when I see him, and if—well, I will close the shutters on the subject."

Of course, you are more or less familiar with the nature of the bill as the

COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

on the Edmunds-Tucker bill have agreed to report it. The more it is investigated the more it will be found to be Mr. Edmunds' bill. In Tucker's substitute, much of Senator Edmunds' bill was incorporated, and there are but two things of any moment in the measure as understood to be agreed upon, that were not in it as it left the Senate. The two are the test oath section and the appointment of trustees to control the Church property. The former was put in by Tucker, and in the latter Mr. Edmunds has surrendered. These are the only points amounting to anything in which the Vermont senator has not had his own way. The section increasing the penalty for cohabitation is supposed to be stricken out. The one extending the statute of limitations is also gone; that part of the section giving the appointing power to the Governor, of all Territorial, county, precinct and municipal officers, is also lost and even the President is only given the appointment of the probate judges. I may be permitted to say that there was not a lingering doubt that the Senate would never consent to the giving of such enormous patronage to a petty Territorial governor, and especially to a democratic one. The old adage is again verified that "there's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip," and despite Mr. Tucker's howling and the life-long labors of "Jack Mormon" R. N. Baskin, as he is known here, the bill is

NOT SATISFACTORY.

There is not a thing in it that the howlers wanted. Though all the rest had been omitted the would-be spoilers had rejoiced beyond measure if the clause giving to Caleb the appointment of officers had been secured and become a law; and without that, all the rest (and there isn't much of it) is void and empty. Baskin and the rest may now sing with the preacher, "All is vanity and vexation of spirit," and when this bill shall pass they will have ample time for meditation before anything else can be got through. No man who knows anything about the situation ever dreams that these howlers will rest until they have the people of Utah under their heels and where they can tax and rob them unmercifully.

There is no denying the fact that these modifications largely increase the probability of the bill passing the Senate and becoming a law by relieving the signature of the President. There is also no disguising the fact that it will work increased hardship upon the Mormons; but it is a fact that it gives to those who have promoted and worked for the bill

ABSOLUTELY NOTHING

that they wanted. It is a fair assumption that it will see no greater changes. There is yet another meeting to be held, but its purpose is to perfect the bill in phraseology rather than for any

other purpose. The wording of the test oath section has been changed, but in what way I have been unable to learn. There is good reason to believe it remains in effect substantially as formulated in the Tucker bill; but a report is in circulation that it has been materially broadened and made so that no man who believes in polygamy as a proper condition can vote.

The *Star* of last evening has this to say regarding the test oath section: "It is learned that the section of the anti-polygamy bill passed by the House, which excludes from the registration lists the names of all persons who refused to take the oath to obey the Edmunds act, has been made much more stringent by the conferees. In its present shape the section excludes from registration those who refuse to support the law of 1882 (the Edmunds act) or this amendatory act, or who practice, aid, abet or avow a belief in polygamy. The conferees in adding these restrictions to the original bill were animated by a desire to prevent the encouragement and sustenance of polygamy by persons who keep within the letter of the law by refraining from the practice of polygamy while openly avowing their belief in the doctrine." I feel safe in saying that this may be written down

AS UNTRUE.

The test oath will not be made more stringent than it is at present; and unless, in its wording, some alteration is made which will render it a matter of principle with a Mormon not to take the oath, I do not think there will be any appreciable change in the conditions from what they are at present. The great features are the receiver's suit that will grow out of the forfeiture of Church property and the disfranchisement of women. The House bill adopts largely the views of Senator Morgan, who so vigorously opposed the bill as it passed the Senate in 1886, because of Mr. Edmunds' trustee plan to run the Mormon Church, and hence will probably provoke no opposition in that quarter. There may, however, be some opposition to the section

DISFRANCHISING WOMEN.

though I have no idea that it will prove successful. As it stands at present, the great danger seems to be the formulation of a test oath that will prevent every Mormon from voting. If that shall be done, we will hear no more the necessity for further legislation against the Mormons. Securing the offices, the howlers will glut themselves and will be only too anxious to keep matters quiet.

On the matter of Associated Press dispatches from Salt Lake in regard to the Mormons, I send herewith an original article from this morning's *Washington Gazette*, which is singularly clear:

FAIR PLAY IS A JEWEL.—THE INDEFENSIBLE CONDUCT OF THE ENEMIES OF MORMONISM IN UTAH.—Two very significant dispatches were published the past week by papers receiving the Associated Press service from the West. They were both sent by the agent at Salt Lake City, Utah. The first was to the effect that "a strong Mormon lobby had left here yesterday (Monday) for Washington to work against the Edmunds-Tucker bill." Aside from the improbability of this story, owing to the lateness of the session and the stage the bill had arrived at—it having passed both houses of Congress and being in conference—its inquiry showed its utter falsity. The dispatch concluded, "The Gentiles here are much discouraged at the delay and begin to dread another failure of Congress to assert itself against

MORMON TREASON."

If this dispatch had been a "special" to some paper it might have been excusable and would have been comparatively harmless; but when it was sent broadcast over the country by a prejudiced agent of the Western Associated Press, it was an outrage. The object of that association is to collect and distribute news with fairness and impartiality, and it is but simple justice to say that it does it without fear or favor in this city, as well as in a vast majority of other places. There are exceptions to all rules, however, and a black sheep will manage occasionally to get into the herd. In this instance the black sheep seems to be the representative of the Western Associated Press at Salt Lake City. Through prejudice or hatred of the Mormons the dispatches from that point are purposely couched in language calculated to create a most unfavorable impression of these people. The editor of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, as agent of the Western Associated Press, most certainly goes

OUT OF HIS WAY

to stigmatize the Mormons as traitors, until they are proven guilty of treason in open court.

The Constitution of the United States clearly defines treason, and the Mormons, while they may be fanatics, have as yet done nothing of a treasonable nature that people in this section have heard of.

The second dispatch refers to a portion of an editorial which was to appear in the *Salt Lake Tribune*, whose editor is the agent of the Western Associated Press. As editor he writes an article for publication in his own paper, and as agent of a powerful association of newspapers he heralds the editorial from one end of the land to the other as "news," urging Congress, in terms which can only be characterized as a glaring attempt to bulldoze that body, to hurry and agree on and adopt

a stringent act directed against the Mormons. As editor he has a perfect right to publish his opinions, but as agent of the Western Associated Press he certainly goes

OUT OF BOUNDS

when he sends out such stuff broadcast and calls it "news."

The gentleman not only misuses his trust, but abuses the confidence reposed in him by his superiors in the Associated Press. The *Sunday Gazette* uses the Associated Press dispatches, and is well acquainted with the personnel of the association here as well as in New York, and it believes the officials, to a man, in this part of the country are honorable, high-minded gentlemen. Not one of them would for a moment stoop to use his office for personal gain. All are animated by a high sense of honor, and the remark applies particularly to Mr. William Henry Smith, the general manager in New York, and Mr. McKee, the manager here. But to return to the Mormon business.

THE TRUTH IS

that for many years the only news by the Associated Press from Utah has emanated from the office of this same *Tribune*. It has always come poisoned with prejudice, and is always one-sided.

The Mormons may be a very dangerous people, and their polygamous ideas are certainly to be condemned, but they are human beings and are entitled to at least common justice. This the aforesaid editor, or rather agent, does not accord them. The people of the States as a consequence have heard but one side of the story and are necessarily prejudiced. They should be given a chance to hear both sides. This is but fair play and "fair play is a jewel."

WALTON WOLD.

Our Correspondent Gives a Racy Sketch of the Scene in the House When the Bill Passed—Honors to Bennett—The Two B's, Etc.

News' Special Correspondence.]

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17, 1887.
A little before one o'clock to-day, Mr. Hammond, who was substituted for Representative Tucker on the House conference committee on the anti-Mormon bill, moved that the House proceed to the consideration of the report. This was agreeable to notice given by him when he presented the report on Tuesday last. The bill, as is known, is stripped of many of its heinous features; nevertheless, considering the loud and vociferous unanimity with which its more vicious predecessor passed the House January 12th, it was a matter of surprise that there should be so strong an opposition to its consideration. It was antagonized to begin with and it was a serious question whether the ayes and nays were uppermost on the motion for its consideration. Then it came to a

RISING VOTE.

and Reed, of Maine, seeing there was not the response he wished in its behalf, rose, and lifting his arms up and down after the manner of the wings of a full and fat crane rising from the earth, motioned his henchmen to vote for it. While his arms were thus in motion he said, with that long, rasping drawl which is characteristic of him, and with a pronounced Yankee accent, "It's the Maw-mawn bill." That did it. One hundred and four voted for the consideration and they were very largely Republicans. The nays, almost all from the Democratic side, numbered 68. So it came up.

Mr. Hammond announced that he would allow an hour for debate and then move the previous question. He gave half the time to Judge R. T. Bennett, of North Carolina. That gentleman thereupon rose and began a

CHARACTERISTIC SPEECH

which lasted just half an hour. He took up the first three sections of the bill, beginning by asserting that it was designed to infringe on the rights of conscience, and he compared the treatment of the "Mormons" with Cromwell's treatment of Catholic Ireland, where he gave no quarter to Catholics because of their faith, though he asserted that he didn't propose to encroach on their rights of conscience. He dwelt especially on the passage which gives the right to the marshal and his deputy to arrest in their view all offenders against the law. Once in their clutches a man might hope no more. "In one of Dante's works, there is an inscription over the gate to hell, and"—said he parenthetically, "all here are interested in that subject—which reads 'abandon hope all ye that enter here.' " Thus it will be with the victims of these marshals. The people of his district knew what the name of the marshal and his deputies had inspired in the days when this class of legislation was in force

IN THE SOUTH,

and that the names were almost uttered with bated breath. "We are not disturbed by the wrongs of people a long way off; and the passage of holy writ which requires every man to love his neighbor as himself, has become a dead letter in this age." Among his sentences were these: "I have the greatest respect for the conscience of this House." "I appeal to the justice of this House—it is always just, always just." To Representative Stewart, of Vermont, who as a member of the committee on judiciary, which reported Tucker's bill, and

who interposed an objection to one of Mr. Bennett's points, the latter turned and, bowing very low, mockingly said: "I bow to you as the heathen to his god; I clothe you with all awe;" and then showed that Stewart's objection

WAS POINTLESS.

He declared the section giving the authority in question for the marshal and his deputies to arrest optionally and hold persons who in their view are violators of the law, even if passed, was void. He also criticized the action of the committee in reporting that the section giving the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States in cases of unlawful cohabitation was unnecessary. The committee in its report held that the right now existed, and Mr. Bennett quoted the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Cannon and Snow cases to show that the right of appeal in such cases had been denied by that Court itself because of the absence of statutory provision therefor. Mr. Bennett was applauded by the galleries and by the House when he had finished.

Representative John R. Eden, of Illinois, also of the judiciary committee, was allowed by Mr. Hammond five minutes. It was a surprise that he

OPPOSED THE MEASURE.

though he confined his objections mainly to the section giving to the marshal and his deputies such enormous powers. He thought it a grave danger to confer such powers and looked upon it as a bad precedent. When he had finished Mr. Hammond took the floor and spoke for twenty-five minutes. He defended the bill from the attacks that had been made upon it and regarded the section which conferred the great powers upon the marshal and his deputies as justifiable, as he was required to assume that they would do their duty. He stated that since 1876 such a law had been in the Territorial statute books of Utah. Mr. Bennett at once took the book which Mr. Hammond held in his hand, and he and Mr. Eden began a search for the law. But it was

NOT THERE.

Mr. Bennett then wished to interrupt Mr. Hammond to make the correction, but the latter would not allow it, nor make it himself. When he had finished his speech Mr. Bennett again appealed to him to correct the misstatement or give time for it to be done, and he again refused. Before the previous question was put, Mr. Bennett, whose actions are largely a part of his effective delivery, walked to his seat, the law volume (which contradicted the assertion of Mr. Hammond who claimed to have made his statement upon it) in his hand, held high above his head, all the while staking it vigorously in the sight of the whole House.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Hammond referred to the press dispatches which alleged that the conference committee had formulated a

TEST OATH

that would prevent all believers in polygamy from voting. He denied the report. There was nothing of that nature in the bill, but as the Supreme Court, he held, had decided that an oath might be administered which would exclude all violators of the law from voting or holding office, the committee had deemed it prudent to prescribe the form of oath as a precaution. Closing his speech, which attracted very meagre attention, he admitted there were many things in the bill that did not meet his approval, but all laws passed were of that nature.

The previous question was then demanded and carried without a dissenting vote. The measure was then put upon its passage. In response to the Speaker's call for the ayes in favor of the committee's report by which was meant the passage of the bill as reported by the committee, there was a

HEARTY RESPONSE.

When it came to the nays, there was also a lusty and determined answer. A division was called for by Delegate Caine, when some eighty odd voted for the motion and about 30 against it. The Speaker again decided in favor of the friends of the infamous measure, when Delegate Caine raised the point that there was no quorum. A roll call was then demanded and thus a House the members of which have persistently been unwilling to put themselves on record in this regard was compelled to do so. There were 202 who voted for the bill and 39 men, fearless of public clamor, to whom a clear conscience was more desirable than the unreasoning applause of the insane multitude who fawn only when you cringe, voted honestly against it. It may be interesting to follow the record of these two classes of men and see which proves the

BETTER CITIZENS.

and to which the history of these times written hereafter will accord the highest meed of praise—those who defended the oppressed or the horde which stopped not at enslaving a people so long as their sails might catch the popular wind of the hour.

While the bill is nothing like as heinous as when it passed the House on Jan. 12, still it meets with greater opposition and more pronounced, and there was less, indolently less enthusiasm; save when Mr. Bennett spoke the House was characteristically inattentive and the fact that no quorum re-

sponded showed how little real interest the bill provoked. But for the lash of ignorant and besotted constituencies, it had been buried fathoms deep and never resurrected; but the howl is against you and the bounds instinctively

FOLLOW THE CRY.

Mr. Hammond's argument was thin—I have almost said thinner than Tucker's, but that is impossible. He had the dignity, however, not to be carried away by his own wild desire for success as did Tucker, over five weeks ago; and he did not make himself a laughing stock as the other did. I do not believe his heart was in the work. His own statement that the bill did not meet his approval could be nothing else than a partial apology for the part he was compelled to play; and I do not believe he would have thought this day lacked anything of historic interest had the bill failed. He did not desire to immortalize himself by enslaving a people as was the hearts burning desire of the politically damned Tucker. All honor should be paid Mr. Bennett. Even were he wrong, his fearless course in opposition to a

WILD DEMAND.

must command the admiration of every being with a spark of manhood in his breast. "Thank God," said he, quoting memorable words, as he placed his hand upon his breast, "there is no tyranny here." "I stand here not for myself, but for the right," was another utterance, and I am satisfied, if the grateful hearts and prayers of a quarter of million of true, honest, sober, earnest people are cause for pride in man, then Judge Bennett may be proud. He has won them, and they are deserved.

The two B's were there for a time, but were soon off arranging a dispatch with the local adulter of the *Tribune* for their worthy organ.

I heard that Senator Edmunds had sent for the bill almost as soon as he heard it had passed.

WALTON WOLD.

BIRTH.

HARTER.—To the wife of John Harter, Jr., 9th Ward, Feb. 24, 1887, a daughter.

WOOLLEY.—In the Ninth Ward, this city, Feb. 24th, 1887, to the wife of Taylor H. Woolley, a fine daughter.

MITCHELL.—In this city, on Washington's Birthday (Feb. 22, 1887), to the wife of Horace Mitchell, a daughter. All doing well.

DEATHS.

VANBUREN.—Died at Orangeville, Feb. 16, 1887, of old age, at the residence of her son, (A. C. Vanburen,) Lucy Vanburen, born June 14, 1813, at Utica, New York; baptized into the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, November 8, 1835, by Elder George M. Hinkley. She was in the meetings of the Saints in Nauvoo and other places in the rise of the Church. She came to the Valley in 1835.

BATES.—At Waship, Summit County, Utah, February 25th, John Bates, an old and highly respected resident of that place.

HOLLOWAY.—At Orangeville, Emery County, Utah, February 21, 1887, Anna Elizabeth Callaway, daughter of Levi H. and Anna Callaway, born on the 26th of February, 1872, at Panaca, Lincoln County, Nevada.

ALLISON.—At West Jordan, Feb. 20, 1887, Eliza Allison, aged 68 years and 3 months lacking a few days. She was born November, 1819, baptized July 4, 1835, by Elder G. W. Penrose at Orsett, Essex. She lost her sight in 1853, and her husband a little later. Blind and penniless she saved sufficient means to enable her to emigrate to Utah in 1863. She has been here ever since, faithful, patient and thankful for everything and finally passing away in peace as if going to sleep. Peace to her ashes.—[Cox.]

PETERSON.—In the 13th Ward, Salt Lake City, February 26, 1887, of tetanus, Julius Vernon, son of Samuel, Jr., and Sarah Isabelle Peterson, aged 9 months and 10 days.

JENSEN.—At Vernon, Feb. 11, 1887, Johan Magnus Jensen, son of Olef and Elsie Jensen, of peritoniaitis; born at Landskrona, Sweden, April 25th, 1860; emigrated to Utah 1866.

Stricken down in health and youth, With scarcely any warning, Hid from loving ones on earth 'Till the resurrection morning. Yet while we mourn, eternal gain Is thine, beloved brother; At rest in Christ, we'll meet again With father and with mother.—[Cox.] Swedish papers please copy.

KARRICK.—In this city, February 27th, of whooping cough, L. Karrick, son of James H. and Millie E. Crookwell, aged 10 months and 24 days.

SUTHERLAND.—At Big Cottonwood, Feb. 22, 1887, of brain fever, Catherine E., daughter of John and Ellen Sutherland, aged 15 years, 4 months and 28 days.

WRIGHT.—In the Third Ward, on Sunday February 27th, 1887, at 4 p. m., Ann Wright, relict of the late Caleb Wright, who died two years ago. She was born July 16th, 1807, in Egypt, New Jersey, and came to Utah in 1851, where she has since resided. She died in full faith of the Gospel, and was greatly respected by all who knew her.

MEXICAN PENSIONERS.

We have received necessary papers, and are forwarding applications for members of the Mormon Battalion, over the age of 62, or their widows, for pension for service only, without disability. Write us and get your applications in early. No pension, no pay. Can refer to several persons for whom we have obtained pensions.

S. W. DARKE & Co.

d s&w 2tc