

BY TELEGRAPH.

PER WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

FOREIGN.

LONDON, Jan. 11.—The State line steamer *State of Alabama*, Captain Candy, which left Glasgow December 24, for New York, and which was reported putting back disabled, has arrived at Queenstown. She experienced terrific weather when eight hundred miles westward of Queenstown and lost three blades of her propeller.

No defense will be made by the Marquis of Queensberry in the suit his wife has brought for divorce.

PARIS, Jan. 11.—Official dispatches from Touquin report that the French troops made an attack on a large rebel force entrenched at Thanbo, but were twice repulsed. During the fighting four French officers were wounded, five European and eight Touquin soldiers were killed, and fifteen European and twenty-seven Touquin were wounded. Reinforcements of artillery and infantry will be sent to the French at Thanbo.

BERLIN, Jan. 11.—The Reichstag was crowded to-day, the occasion being the calling up of the government military bill in its amended form for the second reading. Herr Von Wedell Presdorf, President of the Chamber, read the committee's report of the bill. The committee said it was not authorized to advocate any of the proposals in connection with the measure because none of them had obtained the sanction of the majority of the committee.

General Von Moltke opened the debate in favor of the second reading on behalf of the government. He said he did not believe that any state should assume the responsibility of increasing the supply of combustible material, which at present existed in a greater or less degree everywhere.

STRONG GOVERNMENTS,

he contended, were the best guarantees of peace, while danger lay in the ambition of party leaders and their influence on public opinion. "If any state," said Von Moltke, "can work effectively to preserve peace, it is Germany, who aims solely on the defensive for this. She must be strong and prepared for war. Should we, against our will," he continued, "be involved in war, we shall be able to wage it. If this bill is rejected, we shall most certainly have war. To-day's votes in the Reichstag on this measure will not fail to have its effect abroad. The army alone renders possible protection to all other political institutions, which must stand or fall with it. A grant for a short time will not be accepted. The

EYES OF EUROPE

are fixed on this body. I appeal to your patriotism to adopt the bill and show the world your readiness to make any sacrifice, even of your own adverse opinion, if the wellbeing of fatherland is at stake."

Baron Stauffenberg followed General Von Moltke, and while he was speaking Prince Bismarck entered the chamber. At the conclusion of Baron Stauffenberg's speech, Bismarck arose. He said, "The desire of all the military authorities of the empire is only opposed by Herr Richter, Herr Windhorst and Herr Grifenberger. It was difficult to conclude peace at Frankfurt, and it is still more difficult to maintain a degree of intimacy."

MUTUAL CONFIDENCE

exists between Germany and Austria, such as never existed at any period of the German federation. We are bound to maintain peace for this quarter of the globe, but for this a strong army is required. Our relations with all the powers are of the best, and our good relations with Russia are beyond all doubt."

BERLIN, Jan. 11.—Bismarck continued as follows:

"What is Bulgaria to us? It is all the same to us whoever governs there. The friendship of Russia is surely more important to us than that of Bulgaria. We have not allowed ourselves to be induced by any one to make an enemy of Russia for the sake of Bulgaria. To maintain good relations among the Powers is more difficult than you think. We cannot allow our efforts to be nullified by journalistic or parliamentary attacks. Our relations with France continue good. To maintain them is difficult, because a long historical process must be accomplished before the feelings of the past are appeased and the differences reconciled. We have done everything to induce the French to forget and forgive. We have no present ground to apprehend war with France, neither have we any reason to fear it, if it should happen. There can be no question about our attacking France, but we must protect ourselves against attacks. Under no ordinary circumstances shall we

ATTACK FRANCE,

but we shall always be compelled to arm ourselves in such a manner as to be equal to the contingency of war. This is the supreme object of the army bill. I have a firm confidence in the peaceful disposition of the French Government and a portion of the French people. Still, the past teaches us that we cannot count upon peace with France as permanent. A government may one day come into power at Paris which will make war upon us. This you must take into account. If we do not prepare, or if you say to-day

that when war comes we shall grant everything, we should be laughed at. Is there in France a single paper or a single public person who says, 'We renounce our rights to Alsace-Lorraine?' The possibility of French aggression is, therefore, a sufficient motive for the bill. France is a strong and well-armed power. Her army is brave and ready to fight. We must never sit idle with our hands in our laps, however peaceful France may look for the moment. Suppose the

FRENCH PROVED VICTORIOUS,

what would we have to expect? We should have the same French against us from whom we suffered from 1793 to 1813 and we should again suck our blood so that we would be paralyzed for 30 years. Endeavors would be made to permanently weaken us. Such demands would be made as to give up Hanover. I am only describing the possibilities that might arise in the event of our defeat. The peace of 1870 is a mere child's play in comparison with what peace would be after a war in 1890. He who wishes to take responsibility for this, let him. The Federal Government will not take the responsibility and they therefore submit this bill. They wish to have permanently sufficient trained soldiers in the Empire. We have chosen the seven year term because this was the period of the previous compromise, and our Constitutional life depends upon that compromise. The Federal council did all they could in consenting to the septennial period. They had only the interests and

SECURITY OF THE EMPIRE

and the well-being of the Fatherland in view. Do you believe that if you refuse to adopt the term proposed in the bill, the Federal Council will deviate from their original proposal? If a similar demand were made in France do you think there is any possibility of its being refused? [Cheers.] No ground exists for placing difficulties in the way of the Federal Government in regard to the duration of the bill, especially in view of the fact that we have kept strictly to the text and spirit of the Constitution. Understand, now, that we resolutely adhere to our demand for the septennial. We cannot give way even a hair's breadth [applause] from the right. Who can guarantee the same majority in this house? Do you wish to make the rise and fall of the German army dependent on the majorities in the Reichstag? By doing so you change the imperial army into a parliamentary force. In this case we might have to appeal to the electors to discover whether that is really the

WISH OF THE NATION.

We shall see whether the electors will permit ideas actively to exist according to which the strength of the army is to be determined by the Reichstag without the consent of the Federal Council and the Emperor. You can hardly expect the Emperor in his nineteenth year will contribute to the destruction of the work to which he has devoted the last thirty years of his life—the creation of Germany and the army of the German Empire. If you believe that possible, if you awaken the slightest suspicion that these are your aims, and if you do not speedily satisfy the wishes of the Federal Government regarding the defensive powers of Germany by a complete acceptance of the bill, then we prefer to deal with another Reichstag. We will enter into no further negotiations with you. The danger in which we might place the German nation, by procrastination, forces us to promptly obtain a decisive answer, or to address ourselves to others who will give us such an answer.

THE QUESTION

has been asked, why has the government not waited for the expiration of the existing septennate? The leading reason was that the government has been convinced that the system of frontier guarding requires immediate strengthening. We did not wish to endanger the empire by delaying the bill and we were not prepared for any opposition to so moderate a demand. Had we known this beforehand, we should have done better to first consult the electors as to whether or not they wish to preserve to the German empire in its present possessions. As it is, we must now insist upon our demands."

At the conclusion of the speech Prince Bismarck was loudly cheered.

BERLIN, Jan. 11.—Madame Krantine, of the Wallner theatre, shot herself to-day, inflicting a severe wound.

BRUSSELS, Jan. 11.—The superior officers of the army have been officially notified to be ready in the event of a rapid mobilization of the troops, and the general inspection which is usually held in the summer has been ordered for February.

PARIS, Jan. 11.—It is stated that the Government of France will ask a credit of 87,500,000 francs to enable it to commence the manufacture of rifles and increase the defenses. Rumors are current that M. Boulanger will resign the war portfolio because Premier Goblet refuses to countenance the heavy military credits.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Jan. 12.—The mission of Zankoff to Turkey, it is expected, will be without result. Zankoff hoped to obtain the assent of the Porte to his resumption of power in Bulgaria, but it is unlikely he will gain Turkey's support, as it is considered impracticable that he should be replaced in office in view of the opposition to him of the Bulgarian army and people.

LONDON, Jan. 12.—Lord Iddesleigh is dead.

Thus far but meagre particulars are known regarding the death of Lord Iddesleigh. It has been ascertained, however, that he was taken suddenly ill this afternoon, while in conference with Lord Salisbury, and that death ensued shortly after.

Later.—It has now been ascertained that Iddesleigh was not taken with his fatal illness while engaged in conversation with Salisbury, but that he faintly while ascending the stairs of Salisbury's residence in Downing street. He was taken into the prime minister's and almost instantly expired.

FURTHER DETAILS.

Sir Mortimer Granville, Lord Iddesleigh's physician, has issued a bulletin in relation to his lordship's death. In it he says Lord Iddesleigh, for many years past, has suffered with cardiac affections which, while not placing his life in immediate peril, rendered the prospect of its sudden termination only too possible. He died of syncope. The melancholy event, although startling to those around him, has not been unforeseen by his immediate friends, and it has been anticipated by his medical attendants.

Sir James Ferguson, under secretary for foreign affairs, in an interview said: "Lord Iddesleigh, a moment before leaving the foreign office, spoke to me very calmly about quitting the office. He expressed the hope that our separation would not be permanent."

HENRY M. STANLEY,

the explorer, was waiting to see him about the Emin Bey expedition, and Iddesleigh asked me to see Stanley and make another appointment for later in the evening. Lord Iddesleigh was looking well, in fact better than usual. He conversed with me pleasantly, and when we parted he was in good spirits."

The body of Iddesleigh lies in Salisbury's room. The prime minister arrived shortly after Iddesleigh was taken ill and while the doctors were trying to rally him. He is greatly affected by the death of his former minister. Manters, Salisbury's private secretary, says the moment Lord Iddesleigh came inside the anteroom he sank down upon a chair. I was in the next room. Hearing groans, I went into the anteroom and lifted him to a sofa. The doctors were in immediate attendance and remedies were applied, but Lord Iddesleigh never spoke. He died 20 minutes after he was taken ill. His son, Henry Stafford Northcote, was sent for, but did not reach his father until ten minutes after all was over. He left later for Pynes in Exeter, the family seat, to tell his mother of her husband's death.

PARIS, Jan. 12.—The speech of Bismarck in the German Reichstag yesterday created a deep impression here, and the general opinion is that it does not increase the prospects of peace. The *Matin*, in its comments on the German Chancellor's utterances, says: "The account opened in 1870 will never be settled as long as a German flag floats over Metz and Strassburg."

LONDON, Jan. 13.—The sudden death of Lord Iddesleigh has created sympathy everywhere. The newspapers extol him and some of them make very uncomplimentary comments on the treatment the dead man received at the hands of the prime minister. In this respect the *St. James Gazette* says: "It cannot be said that Lord Iddesleigh was murdered. It is no crime to be a young man in a hurry and it is no crime to push one from the stool on which you believe you would make a better figure. Perhaps some of his assailants will now feel remorse and especially those to whom he was a joke, not one of whom was worthy to unloose his shoes."

PARIS, Jan. 13.—Floquet, on assuming the chair of President, in the Chamber of Deputies to-day, said he hoped to see concord and that a spirit of compromise would prevail among the members of the chamber, who, he hoped, would all be animated by the patriotic emulation to work for the progress of national institutions, in the first rank of which the government placed the army. This declaration was received with applause. Continuing, Floquet said: "When, without distinction of party, we follow with equal solicitude the earnest efforts of the valiant youth of France and when, with unanimous impulse, we accept every sacrifice to increase our country's power, we do not feel agitated by feverish impatience or desire; only with a tranquil perseverance will we place ourselves in a position to fulfill all our duties and secure for France the respect of all. The essential condition of that is peace, which we prize as highly as anybody in the world." (Prolonged applause.)

HUNTING MORMONS.

By reason of Utah's remoteness from the centre of population and the fact that the incidents of the war upon polygamy are not very closely followed in the press dispatches, the people of the United States are not as fully acquainted with the nature of the Government's operations in that quarter as they should be. An occasional paragraph mentioning a sensational episode in the arrest, trial or imprisonment of a Mormon is about the extent of the information which is to be had through

the regular news channels, so that the practical workings of the law remain essentially in the dark so far as the vast majority of the people whose representatives have enacted that law are concerned. This is the more to be regretted because it is probable that further legislation will be needed in time and also because the exercise of powers so unusual as those which have been conferred upon territorial officials there ought to be vigilantly watched by the entire citizenship of the republic.

The penitentiary of Utah now contains twenty or thirty more prisoners than can be decently accommodated, but the campaign against offenders continues with as much vigor as ever. Under the Edmunds law the Mormon criminals are divided into two classes, men who are guilty of polygamy and men who are guilty of unlawful cohabitation. The former being such as have taken plural wives since the passage of the law are not numerous. The latter, being such as, having more than one wife when the Edmunds law was passed, have not renounced all wives but one, are many. For offenders against the interdiction of polygamy there can be no reasonable excuse. They deliberately violate it when they take additional wives, and in setting up their private views as superior to the law of the land they cannot unjustly complain of the consequences. As to the latter, however, so much cannot be said. Under the rulings of the court unlawful cohabitation is made to cover a great many things, and it is to this feature of the crusade that the attention of the people should be directed. To that end a thorough understanding of the situation previous to the passage of the Edmunds act is necessary.

Up to the time when the Federal Supreme Court declared this act constitutional it was held by the Mormons, as well as by many eminent lawyers of the States, that no power existed in Congress under the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was a part of a religious creed. Confident of their safety in this respect, a generation of men and women entered into plural marriage. Many of these people are now middle-aged and some are old, and most of them have large families of children. Old men with two, three or four wives, all married long ago and the mothers of children, found, on the passage of the Edmunds law, that they must not only cease recognizing these families as legitimate, but that even a casual visit was likely to be construed as a criminal offense. Unlawful cohabitation has been held to obtain when a man has taken a second wife to a theatre, when a daylight call has been made, when the bedside or the coffin of a child has been visited, when the illness of an old wife of the long ago has induced the former husband to take the risk of the officer, the court and the judgment in attending her, and when the hundred other things liable to spring from domestic ties have occurred. Proof of actual cohabitation, as it is known and defined in other parts of the republic, has not been necessary. Any of these, and others even less objectionable and more natural have served as excuses for the infliction of penalties comprehending both fines and imprisonment.

Of course, it is not to be denied that in some cases these apologies have been offered merely for the purpose of covering up the real object of visits which may have been in themselves unlawful, but the fact remains that proof of nothing more than the acts named is necessary to send men to prison, and perchance to deprive many helpless human beings of their natural protectors. Relieved of the necessity of obtaining proof of actual criminality, the marshals and other officers swarming over the Territory are not at great pains to secure serious cases. Many an old man with white locks has been sent to the penitentiary in Utah of late on evidence that went no further than to show that he may have called in broad daylight, perhaps in the company of a third person, on an old wife with whom the may have lived for nearly forty years, and many a younger man has been sent over the same road for yielding to a natural desire to see his children—children none the less his though not born in lawful wedlock. Here may be seen the possibility, and in fact the certainty, that the American people in undertaking to uproot one great wrong are committing another. Their eyes are not on the dragged prisoners or the thronged courts. In their ears the wails of sobbing women and children, themselves the victims of circumstances in many cases, do not fall. They only know that with a mailed hand and an iron heel an effort is making to strike down and to grind down an evil of great proportions.

It is a fact patent to every one who has followed these prosecutions that most of the energy of the United States officials has been expended upon men charged with unlawful cohabitation. The reason is plain. Under the court's rulings it is an easy matter to convict such alleged offenders, whether they are morally guilty or not. The new polygamists are not so easily caught, nor are they so easily convicted when they are caught. Proof of recent marriage is necessary in their case. Not much proof of anything is necessary in the case of the others. Is this a state of affairs which promises to put an end to polygamy, and is it one which the American people wish to continue?—*Chicago Herald.*

SENTENCE DAY AT OGDEN.

A FEW STRIKING POINTS IN THE FIRST DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS LAST SATURDAY.

Our special report of the court proceeding at Ogden last Saturday was necessarily abridged. There were a few incidents involving points of more or less striking interest, and that our readers may have the benefit of them *in extenso*, we call those particular portions from the account given by the *Ogden Herald* of Saturday. Brother Thomas Kirby, of Hyde Park, Cache County, was the first man called for sentence.

The Court—Mr. Kirby, you have been convicted on your plea of guilty of the crime of unlawful cohabitation. Calling your attention to the first count, which charges you with committing the crime from the first of January, 1884, till the last of December, 1884, have you anything to say why the sentence of the court should not be pronounced upon you?

Mr. Kirby—I would like to make a remark. I married my wife twenty years ago. At that time I did not know of any law against it. I did it with an honest heart in the sight of God.

Court—When was that?

Mr. Kirby—That was in the year 1867.

Court—That was five years after the act expressly making it a crime. In 1862 there was an act passed prohibiting plural marriage in the United States. You say you did not know of that law; but this is for continuing in the relation; it is not for entering into the marriage. I suppose you know about the policy of the courts in this class of cases, where parties charged with these crimes promise to obey the law in the future.

Mr. Kirby—I have read that it has been your honor's policy to suspend sentence where parties would agree to obey the law, but I could not think of committing violence to my conscience and turning my back upon my wives and my children. I am as conscious that I am doing right in the sight of God as I am that I stand before you. With all due respect to Your Honor, I could not, after living twenty years with my wife, who has borne me children, be villain enough to tell her to go and shift for herself; with all due respect to you I could not consent to it. I have worked hard for my family. I love my second wife as much as it is possible for a man to love his wife. I am aware of what is staring me in the face, but I could not violate my conscience and turn my back upon my children and their mother and thereby bastardize them and harlotize my wife.

Court—I understand that you do not wish to avail yourself of that privilege?

Mr. Kirby—I do not.

The court then imposed a sentence of six months' imprisonment and a fine of \$100.

Abraham Chadwick was next called and the Court said:

You have been convicted by the verdict of the jury of the crime of unlawful cohabitation on three counts and calling your attention to the first count charging the crime to have been committed on January 1st, 1885 and continuously during that year. What have you to say why the sentence of the court should not be pronounced?

Mr. Chadwick—I have nothing to say.

Court—You are aware of the policy of the courts in this territory in relation to suspending sentence in cases where parties promise to obey the law. You do not wish to avail yourself of that?

Mr. Chadwick—I cannot say that I can. Rather than throw my family off I will go to the "Pen;" I had rather go to the Penitentiary than do it.

The Court sentenced him to six months' imprisonment in the Utah Penitentiary and imposed a fine of \$300.

John Marriott was called.

Court—Mr. Marriott you have been convicted upon your plea of guilty of the crime of unlawful cohabitation on two counts. Calling your attention to the first, which covers the time from the first of January '84 till the end of the year, have you anything to say why the sentence of the court should not be pronounced?

Mr. Marriott—I would like to ask a question about my family. According to the laws of the United States I have no wife. I want to know which woman I must live with when I come out?

Court—I don't understand what you mean by having no wife.

Mr. Marriott—I have not been married according to the laws of the United States, but I have been married by the laws of God, and I want to know which woman I am to live with when I come out.

Court—The first wife that you were married to most assuredly. She is the wife recognized by the law as being the legal wife and the only legal wife.

Mr. Marriott—It was not so considered in Brother Snow's case.

Court—When was that?

Answer (from within the bar)—It was about a year ago.

Court—Do you mean that your first wife is dead; that you are living with other women without a marriage ceremony being performed? Well, that is a complication of marital affairs which is too complicated for me to undertake to say. Whether it would be right to live with one of these wives after the death of your first is something that I would not like to say without knowing