

coming attached to his labors when news of his family's afflictions reached him. He was well received by those whom he visited and his labors were quite successful. Considerable prejudice is still being stirred up in certain sections by William Jarman, who is well known to Elders and Saints who have been in that country, but notwithstanding this, the Elders make many friends and succeed in doing much good wherever they go.

Waterloo addition was the scene of a disastrous conflagration Sunday which destroyed two of the pretty homes with which that locality is dotted, entailing a loss of about \$6,000.

The fire broke out at midnight in the home of Mr. C. E. Hudson, the insurance man, and was first discovered by Mr. Hudson as he ascended the stairway into the attic of his home to investigate the cause of a crackling sound which had attracted his attention. There he found the upper floor in flames, and after quickly notifying the sleeping occupants of the house as to the danger they were in, all hands turned their attention to the work of removing the furniture.

In the meantime a passer-by had noticed the flames, and rushing over to the poor house, an alarm was turned in to the fire department. The flames spread with lightning rapidity, and ere long had spread to an unoccupied house owned by Ed. W. Duncan, of the National Bank of the Republic.

Shortly after, Chief Devine arrived with the hose wagon, but as there were no fire hydrants in the vicinity, nothing could be done. Then the steamer was sent for, but by the time it arrived and was in operation both houses had been reduced to ashes, which, with the bare walls, was all that remained of what had been an hour before two beautiful houses.

Quite a portion of Mr. Hudson's furniture was destroyed, the loss on that being estimated at \$1,000, while the destroyed buildings were valued at about \$5,000. Both houses were covered by insurance, Mr. Hudson having \$3,500 on his.

The cause of the fire was a defective flue, which had been overheated by a fire lighted in the parlor during the evening.

Elder Herman Hugo Haag, the well known young artist, died suddenly at the home of his brother, Professor Richard T. Haag, 218 F Street Friday at 5:50 o'clock. The deceased was born in Stuttgart, Wurtemberg, Germany, October 15, 1871. Shortly after his conversion to the true Gospel of Christ, when only 11 years old, he emigrated to Utah, where two of his brothers were then residing, (one of whom has since died while on a mission in Palestine.) Early in life he manifested great interest in religion and also in art and his whole life was devoted to his convictions in these directions. But his devotion to these received an early and severe test through sickness, which, however, had only a tendency to strengthen his ambitions. In 1883 he was suddenly taken sick with a disease which affected his whole system and from which he never completely recovered. He was nigh unto death, but by a miracle, as it were, was healed in the Logan Temple soon after he first took sick. In 1887-8 he attend-

ed the Brigham Young Academy at Provo, where he surprised his teachers with the superior skill and genius he displayed in drawing. Enthusiastic in the love for his art and encouraged by friends and the best artists in Utah he started on a trip to Europe in the summer of 1889. He pursued his studies in Paris for two years and made astonishing progress in so short a time. In composition (and figure painting) he took the first prize among forty competitors, some of whom had studied many years in the same school. When he returned, he was engaged at the Latter-day Saints College as special instructor in art, in which capacity he labored with much success until September, 1894. At that time he entered the University of Utah as special instructor, where he was actively engaged until two days before his death. A cold and consequent spell (brought upon him by his long disease of long standing) were the immediate causes of his sudden departure. He leaves a father (in Germany) two brothers and a sister (in Utah) many relatives and a host of dear friends to mourn.

Judge Merritt rendered a decision Monday in the Milles Atwood estate case, involving important questions relative to the proof of a will. In effect the court says that the intention of a maker of a will cannot be shown by his declarations outside of the will's contents. The suit under consideration was brought by Florence Atwood, through Amelia A. Sutton, her mother and guardian, for a share of the Milles Atwood estate. The deceased had distributed his property by will, and had failed to mention Florence Atwood. It was sought to show that he did so, intending that she should have no part of his property, for the reason that he said she was not his child. The will said nothing of this, and on its face gave no information of the deceased's intention regarding the claimant. An exhaustive hearing was had before the court, and today Judge Merritt gave his decision, reversing the ruling of the Salt Lake county probate court, which held that the claimant had been intentionally omitted from the will, and therefore had no right to any part of the estate. Judge Merritt said there was no dispute as to the claimant being omitted from the will, so there were but two questions in the case, as follows:

1. Is the petitioner a daughter and heir at law of the deceased?
2. If she is, does it appear that such omission was intentional on the part of the testator?

As to the first question, after reviewing the relations of the deceased with the mother of Florence as his plural wife, Judge Merritt said: "I have not the slightest hesitation in determining that Florence is the natural daughter of the deceased." He further pointed out that as such child she was legitimated by congressional enactment, and adds, "It is therefore my opinion that the petitioner Florence Atwood is the daughter and heir at law of the deceased Milles Atwood."

Upon the question, Judge Merritt said the oral declarations of the deceased as to his intention as to Florence could not be legally admitted, and that from the evidence legally admissible "it does not appear that her omission from the will of the deceased was

intentioned, and that therefore she is entitled to intervene in the matter of the estate and as a party to the settlement thereof, and is entitled to the distributive share of her deceased father's estate as provided for by statute, and that the decree in the probate court to the contrary should be reversed and the cause remanded to that court."

Having forged the names of two prominent persons to a note and mortgage for \$1,700, both of which are bogus; and having forged the names of a well known firm of attorneys to a supposed certificate of clear title to the property; then to have forged the name of the county recorder to a purported certificate that the mortgage had been duly recorded, are the new crimes charged against Joseph P. Bache, whose embezzlements have lately come to light.

The story of this sordid transaction is like this: About two years ago F. A. Grant, the insurance agent, applied to Mr. Bache for a loan of \$1,700 on a certain piece of property. Mr. Grant was informed that at a certain time the money would be ready for him. Later, however, Mr. Bache informed Mr. Grant, through a third party, that the money had arrived from the east but that a bank in this city in which he had a large overdraft had applied the \$1,700 to its payment. So the transaction ended, as Mr. Grant thought.

It seems, though, that Mr. Bache was determined to make a loan to Mr. Grant under any and all circumstances, so a bogus set of papers were drawn up and the name of Mr. Grant and wife signed thereto by the adept penman who has heretofore recorded the doings of the Supreme Court of Utah. These bogus papers were sent by Bache to a Mr. Ambler, a citizen of Florida, and the man from whom Bache had received the \$1,700; and it was not until the first part of this year that anything more of this illegal transaction had been heard.

Then came J. B. Blazer, to whom, by some unaccountable streak of luck, the papers had been sent for investigation by Mr. Ambler. In April, 1894, Mr. Blazer assaulted Fred McGurrie in Justice Whitehorse's court, when he was fined \$50 and appealed the case to the Third district court. Then followed a civil suit for damages in the sum of \$5,000, Mr. McGurrie securing the arrest of Blazer and compelling him to file a bond for his appearance. On top of this came an indictment of Blazer for subornation of perjury, March 28, 1895. While all this was going on Blazer had received the bogus papers from Mr. Ambler, and was making no investigation, the result of which was to be advantageous to the one-time justice of the peace. While a great friend of Mr. McGurrie, Mr. Bache at the same time became one of Blazer's bondsmen in the subornation of perjury case. Later on Blazer left the Territory and is now living in Kansas; and the assault case was dismissed on payment of the original fine and costs. It is surmised that Blazer's good luck in this matter was a consideration for silence as to the bogus mortgage papers. But that did not allow Bache to escape, for he had to pay Mr. Ambler the \$1,700 as the easiest way out of a very bad dilemma.