

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE

DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - JUNE 17, 1885

THE CASE OF LUCY DEV-
EREUX.

THERE are some features connected with the case of Lucy Devereux that will bear ventilating and a little explanation. The young woman named, as is well known, is a prisoner in the Utah Penitentiary. So is her babe. The cause of their incarceration was that when before the Grand Jury, when the case of W. D. Newsom, charged with polygamy and unlawful cohabitation, was under investigation, she refused to answer certain questions propounded by that body. In consequence of the declination she was taken before Judge Zane, who decided that the interrogatories were proper. As the witness persisted in her refusal to answer them, the Court decreed that she should be imprisoned until such time as she changed her mind.

That the memories of our readers may be refreshed, we here present the questions, the second of which, however, was withdrawn by the District Attorney:

- 1.—Is not your little girl's name Mui-zeta Maud Newsom?
- 2.—Who is the father of your little girl?
- 3.—Is not Wm. D. Newsom the father of your little girl?
- 4.—After you went to live at Newsom's house did you not occupy the same bed with him?

The whole burden of each of these questions is apparent on its face. It is to obtain evidence of sexual intercourse between W. D. Newsom—the person whose case was being investigated—and the witness. The latter had previously stated that she was not married to Mr. Newsom. If she has not his being the father of her child would not be affirmative proof upon that point. The offense of polygamy consists totally in the act of marrying a plural wife, without any relation to subsequent conduct, the affirmative answer to any or all of the questions would not establish the act of marriage, which the witness had already denied.

But how would answers in the affirmative affect the charge of unlawful cohabitation? According to the rulings of Judge Zane sexual intercourse forms no part of that offense under the Edmunds Act. We will use his own words, as given in his ruling in the Cannon case:

"I am of the opinion that it is not necessary, to show an offense against this law, to show sexual intercourse. It is sufficient to show that a man lives with more than one woman, cohabits with her and holds her out to the world as his wife. That being so, that he did not have sexual intercourse with her, occupy the same bed with either of them, is no defense and is immaterial, so far as the jury is concerned."

In the case in which this ruling was given the defendant was refused the opportunity of introducing evidence to the effect that these conditions had not existed, yet Lucy Devereux is sent to prison for not answering questions upon these very points.

A pertinent case came before Judge Zane a short time ago. A fellow named Rudolph Ames, seduced his wife's sister, a child being the result. The birth of the infant was not held to be any evidence that the defendant had married the woman. Not only that, but it was not even held to be evidence that he was guilty of unlawful cohabitation. And he, being a non-"Mormon," was discharged. But W. D. Newsom is a "Mormon," which makes all the difference, and evidence that he is the father of the child of Lucy Devereux is demanded from the witness herself, the mother of the infant, in order to fasten either polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, or both upon the accused. How wonderful are the ways of the anti-"Mormon" crusaders!

The only hypothesis upon which the questions can be insisted upon is that the answers might lead toward proof of a marriage or to unlawful cohabitation according to the "holding out" theory. But why should not precedents in this respect be maintained, without having recourse to ridiculous judicial advance and retreat tactics? Legal oscillation and somersaulting, are not calculated to keep the head of the Court above the current of popular contempt.

Why should such evidence be ignored in the Ames case and sought with vindictive oppressiveness in that of Newsom? It must be upon the general proposition laid down by Attorney Dickson, that the Saints are a virtuous people, and consequently when evi-

dence of sexual intercourse is apparent it is to be presumed that it has occurred under the marriage relation. Whereas such is by no means to be presumed with regard to non-"Mormons."

Lucy Devereux is incarcerated in prison, yet she has committed no crime. She is not even charged with one. Yet she is consigned to the fate of the law-breaker—placed upon a par with the thief and incendiary. Her sole offending consists in declining to tell who is the father of her infant. And with its mother the little baby girl is also, of necessity, consigned to a place designed for felons.

The proceeding is perhaps more vindictive than most people are aware. No special pains have been taken to hide an expressed intention of adjourning the present Grand Jury from time to time and keeping them in existence as a body until the period for the empaneling of the next arrives, for the purpose of giving Lucy Devereux and her infant no opportunity of being released from prison. If the present jury were to go into Court and state that the District Attorney had no further business to place before them and ask to be discharged and the judge act upon the request, the young woman would be liberated, the body to whom she was required to answer being no longer in existence.

The liberation of this unfortunate young woman, who has broken no law and is charged with no crime, would be a great disappointment to such malicious officials as the District Attorney, and probably some of those composing the grand jury, who were placed in the panel because they were "in sympathy with the prosecution" of "Mormons."

It is said that "comparisons are odious." They are, however, not infrequently appropriate. Occasionally some of the phases of the anti-"Mormon" crusade have been compared to the methods of the iniquitous Spanish Inquisition. History states that cruelties were perpetrated upon the victims of the latter for the purpose of extorting "confessions" from them. Is not this the very process resorted to in the instance under consideration? Incarceration in a repulsive prison is applied in the case of a woman innocent of any crime, in order to squeeze a statement from her in relation to the paternity of her babe.

Nay, more than this; the demoniacal disposition is evinced to render the infliction perpetual. Providing the witness refuses to answer, which we understand she intends to do, the proposal to make one grand juryman on to the other, so that she could be held to answer to each successively, if carried forward in definitely would make her's a case of imprisonment for life.

The infamy of this proposal is intensified in putting the government to unnecessary expense of adjourning a grand jury from time to time aside from the requirements of legitimate business. Thus is the government made an involuntary participant in a piece of barbaric cruelty worthy of the dark ages.

But Federal officials here are in the habit of claiming that they are not acting from personal motives in the anti-"Mormon" crusade. They are operating in the capacity of agents of this great Republic, and upon this question represent 55,000,000 of people. If this were true, and all this concentrated greatness—done up in infinitesimal parcels—really existed, great heavens, what a spectacle would be here presented! A ponderous Republic of great magnitude centralizing its mammoth powers to crush a helpless woman and a tiny infant. Such a suggestion is not only an insult to the government of this country, but a parody on common sense.

The perfidy of this contemptible business should be placed where it belongs. It rests upon the shoulders of the actual operators. It may be asked what properly-constituted people from whose hearts have not been ejected the last drop of the "milk of human kindness" think of such things? Ask them what estimate they would place upon the courage, magnanimity, benevolence and general manhood of the burly ruffian who, taking advantage of the plenitude of his physical powers, fells to the earth a poor, weak, helpless woman. The answer to each would doubtless form a fitting parallel, except that there would be a surplus in favor of the brutal inflictor of corporeal blows. His cruelty would be of a temporary character while that of the modern inquisitors is intended to be perpetual. While the latter are inspired with cold, calculating vindictiveness, the act of the former would be more the result of impulsive passion, and therefore more susceptible of being excused, if cruelty to the helpless can be palliated under any pretext whatever.

GRAIN STORING.

In a communication published elsewhere in this issue, we are asked to give the orthodox opinion as to the propriety of preparing for a time of future scarcity of food. It would seem from the statement made by our correspondent that some of the Latter-day Saints with whom he has talked are either inclined to doubt the truth of the predictions which have been uttered in regard to a coming famine, or think the

time for their fulfillment is so far distant that there is no present need of their preparing for it.

A correspondent, in writing a few days since upon the same subject, remarked that the predictions of President Young and others as to a time of coming scarcity either meant something or nothing. With us there is no question on that point. They meant something. They were the result of inspiration. They will certainly be fulfilled; but just when, we are not prepared to say. However, the Latter-day Saints have been counseled, yea urged to prepare for that time, and that counsel, given by the highest authority of the Almighty upon this earth, has never been revoked. It is binding upon the Saints to obey it now, and any view contrary to this cannot be orthodox among the Saints.

Aside, though, from all considerations of inspired counsel or command upon this subject, we consider that the policy of combining our efforts upon some intelligent plan for the storing of grain is a wise one to pursue. There is virtue in the self-denial which it would involve and the communion of interests which would grow out of such a measure alone. And suppose the day of want for us as a community be deferred beyond the limit which the sanguine would set for it, is it not a fact that failure of crops and consequent want occasionally occur in other parts outside of this Territory and among people to whom we might with propriety extend relief? Why should we not aspire to extend temporal as well as spiritual salvation to our fellow-men. We have heard of late of suffering in West Virginia for want of food. True, that is a long distance from here, but such a condition of things is liable to prevail at any time nearer by; and what joy it would afford every generous, right-feeling man in the community, to be able to vote unitedly the necessary relief in such an extremity!

The present prospects indicate that a very abundant harvest will be reaped in this Territory, but not so throughout the Union. An estimate of the probable wheat yield for 1885 has been made by S. W. Tallmadge, of Milwaukee, from which it is shown that the yield for the present year will fall far short of former ones; in fact, that there will be a shortage throughout the Union of considerably over one-fifth.

The figures are made up by States with the assistance of the different State Agricultural Departments and other reliable authorities, and are based upon the actual acreage sown and present condition of the growing crops.

The estimate shows the probable yield of winter wheat to be 231,000,000 bushels; of spring wheat 130,000,000; total of winter and spring 361,000,000. The United States Department of Agriculture officially report the crop of 1884, winter wheat 370,000,000 bushels; spring wheat 143,000,000; total of winter and spring 513,000,000 bushels. From these figures it will be seen that the crop of 1885 compared with that of 1884 will show a shortage in winter wheat of 139,000,000 bushels; spring wheat 13,000,000 bushels; total shortage 152,000,000. The average wheat yield of the United States for five years past is 461,000,000 bushels. The estimate shows a shortage compared with the average crop for five years of 100,000,000 bushels.

The following is a table of the estimated yield by States and Territories:

SPRING WHEAT.	
Minnesota.....	37,000,000
Iowa.....	28,000,000
Nebraska.....	25,000,000
Dakota.....	25,000,000
Wisconsin.....	15,000,000
Total Spring, bushels.....	130,000,000
WINTER WHEAT.	
California.....	23,000,000
Michigan.....	25,000,000
Ohio.....	22,000,000
Indiana.....	18,000,000
Kansas.....	21,000,000
Missouri.....	12,000,000
Oregon.....	16,000,000
Penn'a.....	18,000,000
New York.....	11,000,000
Illinois.....	10,000,000
Kentucky.....	5,000,000
Maryland.....	5,000,000
Tennessee.....	4,000,000
Texas.....	4,000,000
Washington.....	4,000,000
Virginia.....	3,000,000
N. Carolina.....	3,000,000
Colorado.....	3,000,000
W. Virginia.....	2,000,000
Georgia.....	2,000,000
S. Carolina.....	1,500,000
New Jersey.....	1,500,000
Utah.....	1,500,000
Arkansas.....	1,500,000
Alabama.....	1,200,000
Delaware.....	1,000,000
New Mexico.....	1,000,000
Montana.....	1,000,000
Idaho.....	1,000,000
Maine.....	1,000,000
Vermont.....	300,000
N. Hampshire.....	200,000
Mississippi.....	200,000
Arizona.....	200,000
Nevada.....	100,000
Other States.....	300,000
Total Winter, bushels.....	231,000,000
Total Winter and Spring, b.....	361,000,000

We shall be pleased to hear more upon the subject of storing grain and see a movement to that end take definite shape at no distant day.

THE ENGLISH POLITICAL
CRISIS.

The scene in the English house of Parliament yesterday was most extraordinary. While in some respects it was, on account of the decision reached on the question at issue and the uproarious character of the proceedings incited by the result, discreditable and undignified, in one aspect, at least, it was not destitute of grandeur. The attempt to show that the venerable Premier was startled by the defeat of the government does not harmonize with his remarks, which clearly show that he anticipated the outcome. He almost plainly prognosticated the coming of the conservatives into power, telling them

that when that event transpired they would regret the precedent they were establishing. He accepted the issue as one of "life or death," and would not envy the opposition should they be victorious upon it. The fidelity with which the great statesman and the minority clung to a conviction of right with the probability of defeat before them was the redeeming feature of the spectacle. They would rather be on the losing side than recede from their position against beer and spirits. The struggle was in some respects one of temperance against drunkenness, but victory perched upon the banners of beer and whisky. It is a notorious fact that Great Britain's local politics are more or less governed by liquor men, and the same element appears to be getting a tolerably strong hold on the general government. It is a queer feature of the question decided yesterday, that Sir Michael Bass, one of the most extensive brewers in the world, voted with the minority.

The result of yesterday's vote on the question of taxing beer and spirits will doubtless cause a political revolution. According to English ideas and practice, the ministry should resign. In this event and the going into power of the conservatives, the country would be likely to assume a more vigorous attitude in her foreign relations. This will be decidedly the case if the Marquis of Salisbury should be tendered and accept the Premiership. He belongs to the Beaconsfield school of statesmanship, which embodies a "spirited foreign policy," and the upholding of the honor of England at all hazards. Such a development would be almost sure to increase the prospects of war with Russia, which, under the milder regime of Gladstone, has been declining. This prospect is increased by the popular sentiment, which is by no means averse to a war, although such a general condition of the people is most anomalous.

Should Mr. Gladstone step down and out at this juncture it will probably, on account of his great age, be a permanent retirement from public life, in which he has done as much service to the nation as any man the country ever produced. His last official acts, should they prove really to be the last, will be held to his credit in all future time, as his retirement would be in the midst of a struggle for the maintenance of peace, and in the interest of temperance and sobriety.

Since the foregoing was written dispatches have arrived bearing the news that Mr. Gladstone has resigned. The particulars indicate that his apparent defeat was more a triumph than anything else. He goes out amid a blaze of glory, and his retirement is doubtless the proudest event of his life.

MGR. CAPEL.

The far-famed Mgr. Capel is in the city, and will lecture at the Opera House to-night. We had the pleasure of meeting him to-day. Personal contact with the gifted gentleman causes one to cease to wonder at the extensive and powerful influence he wields. He is of medium height, and somewhat portly build, and is apparently the embodiment of health, indicated not only by his general appearance, but also by his vivacity, amounting almost to exuberance. He has a large head and face, his countenance beaming with intelligence and good nature. His manners are pleasant and affable, his whole demeanor denoting the gentleman of education and culture. He manifested great interest in the "Mormon" question, upon which he said he was not well-informed, but quite anxious to be. He was not in a position to pass fair opinions in relation to the controversy, in progress connected with it, but thought that matters of every character should be settled without animus, and by progressive, intelligent means only. To-night he will devote his exceptionally fine reasoning and oratorical powers to showing that between religion and science there is in reality no irreconcilable conflict. He may deliver another lecture on a different subject on Wednesday evening, and then leave for San Francisco. He purposes calling here on the return trip, and delivering a series of lectures, providing the prospect is good for a large attendance. The celebrity the gentleman has attained, together with the high order of his abilities should attract large audiences.

THE BRITISH POLITICAL
DILEMMA.

The political dilemma in Great Britain is without parallel. The Conservative party had been resorting for a considerable time to the most vigorous tactics for the purpose of ousting the Liberal government from power. Those who held the reins were not willing to relinquish their grip until an opportune moment was reached. They desired their retirement to be at a time when the numerous serious complications in which the country has been involved should appear to be merging toward solution. This was necessary, that after their successors should be installed, if matters under their manipulation should grow worse instead of better, they could "point with pride" to the probability that had they

remained at the helm the ship of State would have been floated into calmer waters, for which it was headed when they relinquished the direction of affairs. It was also desirable that they should be retired upon an issue regarding which defeat would be more honorable than victory. The wished for combination of circumstances arrived and the existing government seized the opportunity to rid themselves of a task, the performance of which is necessarily filled with heartburnings, deep anxiety and incessant and prodigious labor.

This is unquestionably an age of unique developments. The British crisis is certainly one of that character in the field of politics. In all great political party struggles heretofore the chief object of the "outs" has not only been to oust the incumbents of office, but to get themselves installed in the places occupied by the "ins." The first step in the British political combat has been practically attained. Those who have helped them out now hesitate about assuming the responsibility which necessarily devolves upon them. They see that the affairs of the nation are like a tangled skein, and unless the nicest skill is applied in the attempt to unravel the complications will become more perplexing than ever, and there will be a great danger of snapping the thread, when the most desirable condition attainable is to preserve it intact.

It is doubtful if in the history of that country the victors in a great political struggle ever before hesitated to accept of what they have apparently been fighting for, but such is the situation now. In course there are prominent Conservatives who are not only willing but anxious that the party should assume the reins of office. But they do not belong to the class to whom so great a trust can be safely confided. Their very eagerness is evidence in point. Those who belong to the school of extremists of which Lord Randolph Churchill is a type, are not of the class fitted to conduct the affairs of a great government. His methods border upon rabidity in his anti-"Mormons," while the character of his enthusiasm is allied to boyishness. The former peculiarity was recently evinced by the violent nature of his attacks upon the policy of the Gladstone government, and the latter on the occasion of the late Conservative victory, when he leaped upon his seat, waving his hat and shouted with frenzied exuberance of joyfulness. These are indications that such as he do not possess the cool heads of genuine statesmen. They are too liable to become intoxicated with the stimulation of success.

Those who exhibit hesitancy to venture upon the assumption of a giant responsibility, such as the government of Great Britain under present conditions, give at least one evidence of their fitness for the undertaking. They show a comprehension of the extreme gravity of the situation, which we apprehend will before long become more difficult, for this is a day of national and international perplexity, the work over.

Probably the safest and wisest of all the Conservatives is Sir Stafford Northcote, a gentleman who is esteemed by all parties as being governed by a high sense of honor, which he does not eliminate from his political operations. When leading in party in the House of Commons for many years, his style of leadership has been objected to by men of his own political color, as lacking in vigor, but the tameness imputed to him was simply an exhibition of reluctance to combat measures of the Liberal government simply because of the sound from which they sprang. He demands a strong conscientious incentive to fire him up to demonstrative and vigorous opposition. Consequently he has been found in many occasions supporting Liberal positions when he was convinced contributed to the public weal.

Northcote has exhibited many solid statesmanlike qualities, but is not nearly so brilliant as the Marquis of Salisbury, who, in addition to his many other attainments, possesses the abilities necessary to make him one of the most efficient journalists in the world. But he is impetuous, and while he belongs to the Beaconsfield school, he would be apt to carry the flashy and vigorous policy of that far-seeing statesman beyond even the bounds adopted by its originator. Besides, it is extremely doubtful whether he has the semi-prophetic gift by which Disraeli comprehended ahead the results of issues and the methods by which they could be carried to a victorious climax.

Heretofore the Queen has exhibited a predilection for a Conservative in preference to a Liberal cabinet, and Beaconsfield was the favorite of all the Premiers that ever ruled. Her dislike for Gladstone almost amounts to aversion. This sentiment was manifested when he went into power as Disraeli's successor, when she all but snubbed the "grand old man." It is no longer presumed that her political bias has been changed. It is probably based on the idea that a Conservative regime tends more than that of Liberalism to the preservation intact of the British Empire in its extent and power abroad. It insists on the maintenance of British prestige, and the retaining, not to say extension of foreign markets held in the special interests of English commerce. The Liberal party leans more to the centralization of the interest of public affairs at home, the tendency to let outside or distant concerns take care of themselves or go to the ground being plainly apparent.