

## A LETTER FROM "EXILE."

HOW THE NEWS OF PRESIDENT CANNON'S ARREST WAS RECEIVED—HARD TIMES IN ENGLAND—EFFECTS OF POOR LIVING—THE DILKE SCANDAL—REMARKABLE ESCAPE FROM DEATH.

42 ISLINGTON,  
Liverpool, England,  
March 8th, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

The news of the arrest of

PRESIDENT GEORGE Q. CANNON

which came by cable, was quite startling to the Elders and Saints in this country, and was so unwelcome as to cause considerable doubt as to its accuracy. And until American papers confirmed the meagre report, hopes were entertained that it might prove unfounded. Knowing the intense animosity entertained against the chief men of the Church, and so freely expressed in regard to that able champion of the truth, the desire of all who can estimate their worth has been strong that they might escape from the snares set for their feet. And now the prayers of the faithful will be fervent and frequent that some way will be opened by which that gifted and valiant servant of the Lord may be delivered out of the toils. However,

## THE WORK OF GOD

does not depend upon the liberty or the life of any man. This has been demonstrated many times to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, but it seems as though the enemies of truth cannot profit either by the lessons of history or by the examples given them in instant experience. Joseph the martyr was slain and the Church still lived. Brigham the Pioneer died and Zion still flourished. The present leaders may be bound or banished and the system they advocate will grow and spread all the same, for it is divine in its origin, true in its nature, deathless in its constitution and unconquerable in its aims and destiny. It is the Kingdom which shall never be destroyed and which is not to be given to another people.

The promoters of the present unholy crusade may for a time oppress the Saints in the Most High and think to wear them out. But in a little while it will be said, "Behold they are not!" and the trials which the true and patient endure will fit them for the glorious future that is at hand. These offenses must needs come, but "woe unto them by whom they come."

With all the difficulties which the Saints in the mountains have to endure, they are in comparative comfort and peace. They do not have to suffer like many thousands in this land of woe and luxury, of poverty and wealth. More people than live in the whole of Utah have during the past winter been on the ragged edge of

## STARVATION AND MISERY.

The riots in London were only a metropolitan outburst of the desperation which has been felt all over the United Kingdom. Birmingham and Leicester caught the spirit of the London outbreak and much damage was done by the rough element, which is always ready to take advantage of popular excitement. The window-smashing, shop-gutting, robbery, destruction and violence that have attended these popular outbreaks were more the work of the criminal orders who mix with the protesting unemployed laborers, than of the workmen who were rendered desperate through hunger and destitution. The winter has been prolonged and severe. The depression in trade has been more than ordinarily heavy. Wages have been exceedingly low and hundreds of thousands could get nothing at all to do. The relief system is such that many prefer semi-starvation to the insolent and heartless cross-examinations of the workhouse officials, and hesitate to break up their homes and go into the cheerless imprisonment of the poor-house. One great difficulty is the

## LACK OF THRIFT

and self-denial of the average working man and woman. The weekly wage is commonly used up as soon as earned, and in many instances anticipated. People not only live "from hand to mouth," but they run into debt, and on Saturday night, when in full work, pay off the score for the past week's living instead of laying in a store for the coming week, and putting by a trifle for "a rainy day." So when misfortune comes they have nothing wherewith to meet it, and sickness or stoppage of work makes them paupers. Private efforts to relieve the prevailing distress have been most praiseworthy. Contributions have been made for doing out food to the hungry, and benevolent men and women have exerted themselves in this direction with an energy and devotion which cannot fail to gain their reward. Many thousands of pounds sterling have been subscribed, but the money is soon expended and the relief, of course, can only be temporary.

The difference in the death rate at the East-end and West-end of London illustrates the

## EFFECTS OF POOR LIVING.

The West-end is the aristocratic district, the East-end is its social as well as geographical antipodes. Statistics carefully prepared show that while at St. George's, Hanover Square, a wealthy parish, the death-rate is only 17 per 1,000 per annum, in a population

of 88,000, at St. George's-in-the-East, a poor parish, it is 35½ per 1,000 in a population of 40,000. The death-rate of children in the first year of life is 118 per 1,000 in the former parish and 245 per 1,000 in the latter. Hampstead, with its 50,000 well-fed inhabitants, has a death-rate of 12½ per 1,000, against ill-fed Bethnal Green, which, with 127,000 inhabitants, has a death-rate of 25 per 1,000. In the former, 95 per 1,000 of the children die in infancy, in the latter, 151.

That this is not a mere question of locality is evident from the fact that St. James', Westminster, which is partly a poor district although at the West-end, has a death-rate of 18½ per 1,000 in a population of 28,000, while in Whitechapel, at the East-end, entirely a poor district, it is 22½ in a population of 69,000; the infantile rate is 105 in St. James and 205 in Whitechapel.

The birth-rate in each place corresponds with similar discrepancy to the death-rate, being 18 per 1,000 at St. George's in the West to 35½ per 1,000 at St. George's in the East; the birth-rate at Hampstead is 22 and at Bethnal Green 39, and at St. James 20, against 34 in Whitechapel. Thus, while poverty shortens life, it is favorable to reproduction. Compensation seems to be a law of nature.

The readers of the News have learned by telegraph of

## THE DILKE SCANDAL.

They have probably not learned the particulars and principles of the baronet's escape from the consequences of his scrape with the Crawford woman. The evidence in the trial for divorce instituted by Mr. Donald Crawford, M.P., against his wife by reason of her adultery with Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., was so complete and undeniable that a decree was obtained without difficulty as against the wife, but it was dismissed as against the co-respondent. Neither Mrs. Crawford nor Sir Charles put in appearance. In view of the fact that the chief evidence was the statements and admissions of Mrs. Crawford, which were of the plainest and most damaging character, and disclosed such flagrant immorality and indecency that even reference to it must be avoided, it will be difficult for the public to see how Sir Charles could be whitewashed while his poor guilty paramour was utterly condemned.

But Mr. Justice Butt decided that, although her confessions, uncontradicted, entitled the plaintiff to a decree, yet as she had not appeared in court where she could be cross-examined, her statements were not to be received as evidence against another with whom she was alleged to have committed adultery. If she had come into the witness box and sworn to the statements she had made to her husband, Sir Charles would have had an opportunity to test the state of mind she was in when the statements were made, also whether she was not accusing him to shield some one else with whom she had done wrong, and many other things that the case might suggest. But it would be a monstrous thing to let her mere statements be considered against a gentleman in the position in which Sir Charles Dilke stood before the country. So the wretched and betrayed woman is

## DRIVEN OUT OF SOCIETY

to welter in her shame, and the active author of her ruin is welcomed in club and in drawing room, is sustained as the Liberal Member of Parliament for Chelsea, and is smiled upon by the lady to whom he was engaged to be married. His coat of whitewash is complete and not a foul spot shows through to the gaze of satisfied society. But how he looks in the eyes of God, heaven and justice, they who are not hoodwinked with the legal distinctions can measurably understand. If Sir Charles Dilke had married

## TWO WOMEN

and supported and acknowledged them as his wives, he would have been hurled from place, and barred out of respectable circles, and denied the communion of holy church, and cast down from upper-ten-dom to lower life and the devil. But he could crawl into bed with two mistresses at the same time, one of them the wife of a parliamentary associate, as the fallen woman disclosed, and the thinnest kind of a subterfuge suffices to cover up his guilt and render him fit for the highest circles and an object of public confidence and social distinction.

## THE STEED REVELATIONS

have accomplished some good, even if the revelator was thrust into jail three months for telling too much truth about low-lived wickedness in high places. It has been a trifle more difficult for titled and wealthy lechery to procure victims, and has caused several vile panders to high toned lust to come to grief. A noted West-end purveyor of virgin merchandise for the aristocratic market is under indictment, on the testimony of two victims to her wiles sacrificed to the demands of high-paying old "gentlemen." Cases of prosecution for procurement of girls under the new limit as to age have been pushed in various parts of the United Kingdom, and though the aggregate of vice has not been lessened to any appreciable degree, it has met with obstacles and hindrances that count in the right direction.

## STEED SUFFERED LIKE HAMPTON

for a technical violation of law in the actual interest of justice, and humbug

society sends both to prison, and hoists its Dilke into Parliament and its filthy Vandercook into Federal authority. Dirt sticks to its own, and kindred elements cohere. The world of course will sustain the ways of the world, and those who do not fall in and who seek to interrupt its course must expect to suffer.

A clergyman at Chislehurst, where the bodies of the late Napoleon III and his son are at rest, has attempted to make

## DANCING RESPECTABLE

after the manner of "Mormon" regulations. He has permitted it in the school rooms attached to St. Mary's Church, every Wednesday evening, subject to appropriate restrictions. Of course he is severely censured. Dancing is all right in the ball room, with wine and voluptuousness, whirling and dissipation, but in a building attached to a sacred edifice, in decorous order, horrible! But the reverend gentleman says:

"The reproaches of such people fall lightly on me, and I am honored rather than dishonored by them. I look around me and I see no half-dressed women; I see no men hot with excess of eating and drinking. So much, I fear, can scarcely be said of the parties that the mockers frequent or give."

This is good sense, and the indifference of the priest to the censure of his carping critics, might be profitably entertained by all who are found fault with when they are conscious of doing no harm. Men and women who have evils to correct ought to be fearless of blame and careless of the gobbings of Mrs. Grundy.

One of the wonders of the times is the recent

## REMARKABLE TRIP

over the North Sea of a lovely passenger in the fishing smack *Columbine*. It is a vessel of only twenty-one tons register. "A fine old maldon lady" named Elizabeth Monat sixty-five years of age, went on board from the island of Shetland, intending to go to Lerwick to visit her niece. The wind soon blew a gale and the Captain was knocked overboard by the boom. The sailors lowered a boat to pick up the Captain, but they could not get back to the smack, which scudded before the wind and soon swept out to sea. The old lady was below and so sick that she was unable to rise, but mustering all her strength she tried to get on deck, but the ladder fell and she could not replace it. All night the abandoned vessel ran before the wind under the double reefed mainsail which was set. The smack rolled heavily and shipped seas which washed down the hatchway, drenching the poor woman to the skin. Thus she remained in the darkness and horror all night, and when morning dawned, no land or sail was in sight. All the food she had was two crackers and a bottle of milk. She could look above the hatchway and see out, but day after day passed and nothing was to be seen but the sky and the sea.

Thus for

## SEVEN DAYS

the vessel drifted, during which she never slept, and the last four days were entirely without food. She licked the drops of water that condensed on the windows, and, becoming weak and her legs being swollen, she lashed herself near the hatchway so that she could look out. On the last day of the voyage the weather was stormy and the *Columbine* ran ashore on the

## COAST OF NORWAY,

near Lepsoe—200 miles from Shetland. A violent gust tore away the sail and rigging, and the woman's head could be seen in the hatchway. No boat was at hand, but a young man swam out to the smack and found the old lady nearly insensible. She was conveyed ashore with a rope, carried to a farm house and kindly cared for. Two English gentlemen assisted her. She was started back as soon as she was fit for the journey, sailing from Bergen to Hull in the *Domino*. She went thence to Dunbar and afterwards to Leith on her way to Lerwick, where she at last joined her niece. This was her first visit from her home in Shetland and was certainly an eventful trip. Miss Monat gives the glory to God for her deliverance in whom she has always put her trust. The *Columbine* was supposed to have been lost in the gale, and this remarkable escape of the vessel and the lone passenger a food for comment in every part of the British Isles. The interest in

## "MORMONISM" IN ENGLAND

is not very lively, neither is the opposition so violent as it has been. Since the Nottingham disturbers found out that the Latter-day Saints can claim the protection of the law, other rowdy religionists have been a little cautious. The defendants Wood and Taylor who disturbed the meetings there were bound over in £100 each to be of good behavior for a year, and enlightened from the bench as to their liabilities. One of the chief glories of Old England is its impartial execution of the law and its equal protection to all classes and denominations.

The Elders are laboring faithfully, the scattered Saints are united but generally poor in this world's goods, though rich in faith, and all are anxious for the time to come when the way shall open for their escape from Babylon and when there shall be full liberty to serve God in Zion. And no one desires this more fervently and hopefully than

EXILE.

## SENATOR EDMUNDS SCORED BY A WOMAN.

THE CHIEF MOVER IN CONGRESSIONAL ANTI-"MORMONISM" CAUTIONIZED AS AN ENEMY TO WOMAN, AND UNWORTHY THE SUPPORT OF HIS CONSTITUENTS.

The woman suffragists of New York having taken rather an active part of late in opposing the measure of Senator Edmunds for the disfranchisement of the women of Utah, one of them received from him the following letter:

WASHINGTON, Senate Chamber,  
19 February, 1886.

DEAR MADAM.—Yours of the 15th ult. is received. If you and your associates understood the state of things in Utah, I am sure you would support instead of opposing the provision to relieve the women of Utah from the degradation of voting as their Mormon masters require. I have so far received not a word of opposition from any Gentile woman in that Territory, and the state of the law is such, that it is impracticable to disfranchise Mormon women without including the Gentile women. In haste,

Respectfully yours,  
Geo. F. EDMUNDS.

Miss———  
New York.

In response to the foregoing, the following caustic reply was sent:

STATE COMMITTEE,  
Woman Suffrage Party,  
New York, March 20, 1886.

Hon. Geo. F. Edmunds, Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR—A letter from you to a member of our party, which would have been sooner answered but for the recipient's absence, seeks to excuse your latest assault on American liberty; but your attempt is a failure. You are already guilty, with your confederates, of a particularly unjust and wicked crime against the first wives of polygamous men in Utah. These women are not responsible for their husbands taking additional wives; in most cases they were practically powerless to prevent this; yet you have disfranchised them, and thus punished them for the acts of their husbands, to which, as a rule, they are at heart opposed. You have not only inflicted this odious penalty of disfranchisement, which is commonly prescribed as a punishment for the foulest crimes, on many thousands of innocent women; but you have unconsciously deprived them of that trial by court and jury, and that opportunity to prove their innocence, which the Constitution and natural justice both secure to the worst felon; you have inflicted this detestable penalty on these blameless thousands by one sweeping and arbitrary exercise of legislative power, without even the semblance of a trial, and without giving them a chance to defend themselves. Not content with your guilt herein, you now seek to treble it by oppressing two other classes of the sex you pretend to respect.

When you and those who follow you misled Congress into disfranchising the polygamists of Utah, true friends of freedom protested; not because they had any sympathy with polygamy, either in its Utah form or in the far worse form wherein it exists among public men at Washington—but because they knew that one successful attempt to invade the sacred and vested right of suffrage, on whatever pretext, would surely be followed by a fresh attempt at disfranchisement; and because that they knew in the continued exercise of suffrage by the women lay the true hope of the latter's uplifting to the mental and moral level of monogamy. Their fears are justified. Having succeeded in making this most dangerous precedent, though as a lawyer you well knew the wrong and peril of enacting penalties for acts already done, and the injustice and illegality of taking away vested rights—you now seek to use this precedent as ground for committing two new violations of vested and natural rights. You seek to disfranchise the Mormon women who are not engaged in polygamy, and also the women who are not Mormons. Whatever may be said in defense of the law you have already procured, which inflicts this heavy penalty on thousands of men and women without that jury trial which is their constitutional right, your present effort to inflict this odious punishment on thousands of unquestionably innocent women is unpardonable. The right of suffrage belongs to those women as a God-given right of their nature; and as a legal right it has vested in them by sixteen years' possession and use. It cannot be disturbed without a flagrant breach of settled principles of law. If you are the lawyer you claim to be, you well know that this is true; if you do not know it, you are too ignorant of law and justice to be fit for a Senator. Either way, your action shows that your constituents will do very wisely to remove you from the Senatorial seat wherein you have shown yourself aristocratic, tyrannical, and reactionary. Your course in this matter has destroyed your prospects of the Presidency; your party's leaders well know that you cannot carry New York, and that though disfranchised, the womanhood of America would manage to turn other States against you.

The pretext whereon you seek to enact this new wrong deserves no serious

consideration. The non-polygamous Mormon men are largely in the majority; and so long as they are not disfranchised—so long as the issue is made against them at the polls because of their religion—so long will they stand together and control the elections. To disfranchise their wives and daughters will not change the situation. Your effort to achieve this wrong has not this excuse. It is a sheer attack on womanhood, an attempt to punish thousands of pure women for the crime of being women. Where is your "chivalry?" Your attempt is of a piece with your stubborn efforts in the Senate to prevent women from earning an honest living at the bar, and is an outgrowth, not of a desire to promote virtue, but of a disposition which you have on all occasions shown, to prolong the oppression of the weaker sex and keep women subject and dependent.

Your intimation that the woman suffragists do not understand the state of things in Utah is as impertinent, as your suggestions on the floor of the Senate, that the ladies of your own State and elsewhere, who seek to be relieved from the wrong of disfranchisement, are trying to degrade themselves—was unseemly and ungentlemanly. The woman suffragists do understand the state of things in Utah, and long have done so. Indeed, woman suffrage in Utah was originated by one of their most devoted leaders—Mr. Hamilton Wilcox, an earnest opponent of polygamy in all its forms—who after careful examination recommended the abolition of woman's political degradation as the sole really effective legislation against polygamy. Mr. Wilcox stated in 1869 that the abolition of disfranchisement would at first strengthen polygamy, but would afterwards operate to overthrow it. The first prediction came true, the second is coming so. Under the effect of political liberty many Mormon women are now beginning to speak out against polygamy; yet this auspicious moment is the very one chosen by you for an end-avor to thrust them back under the intolerable wrong of disfranchisement. Furthermore, the woman suffragists know—what, it seems, you do not—that no religious belief, however obnoxious to those who do not share it, can be extinguished by persecuting those who live according to it. They know—that it also appears that you do not—that in the growing intelligence and power which the exercise of suffrage secures to its possessors is found the sole real hope for the deliverance of Utah women from their belief in and their practice of polygamy. It ill becomes you to talk of the "degradation" of non-polygamous women, when you yourself propose to inflict on them a degradation far worse than voting under compulsion—the degradation and insult of undeserved, lifelong, hopeless disfranchisement.

Neither is your statement correct that women are forced to "vote as their masters require." The ballot now is as secret in Utah as in New York, and women, unless very dull can vote freely. Were the vote not free, common sense would suggest legislation to make it so, not to take it away.

Nor is your statement correct, that the Mormon women cannot be disfranchised without including the Gentiles. With such sweeping and unscrupulous legislation as you have engineered through the Senate, a provision could have easily been included restricting the disfranchisement to members of the Mormon community or church. Unjust as this would be, it would have at least been fair to Gentile women.

But you are bent—or were, till you discovered the strength of the opposition you provoke—on degrading every innocent woman in Utah, and stabbing the movement for justice to women throughout the world. Every woman, and every truly chivalrous man, should regard you as the deadly foe of womanhood, and treat you as such.

You are free to ally yourself with grasping corporations, cattle kings and land grabbers, who sell their purposes of wholesale plunder beneath professed zeal for virtue—if you choose. The country can stand your doing so, if you can. But when you dare to lay a hostile hand on the ark of American liberty and civilization—universal suffrage—you deserve, and will receive, scorn and hostility, whose extent and power will astonish you.

CLEMENCE S. LOZIER, M.D.,  
Chairman.

## A Clear Skin

is only a part of beauty, but it is a part. Every lady may have it; at least, what looks like it. Magnolia Balm both freshens and beautifies.

## NOTICE TO BRICKMAKERS.

A NEW EAGLE HORSE POWER BRICK Machine. Guaranteed to do the Best kind of work. To be sold at a bargain. GEORGE A. LOWE,  
South of City Hall, State Road.