

## ST. JOSEPH STAKE CONFERENCE.

Minutes of quarterly Conference held in Pima, St. Joseph Stake, Dec. 12th and 13th, 1885.

On the assembling of the Conference there were present on the stand the Stake Presidency, also Bishops of all the Wards excepting St. David. After the opening exercises President Layton made a few remarks and called for reports from the various Wards, which were given by the following named Bishops: John Taylor, of Pima; Jas. Cluff, of Central; Samuel Claridge, of Thatcher; John Welcher, of Layton; P. O. Peterson, of Graham; M. M. Curtis, of Curtis; and Elder Wiley Hallady, of Mathews. The reports were all very favorable considering the disadvantage the people are laboring under at the present time, showing that the country is building up and increasing in population very fast.

The High Priests' quorum was then reported by President H. Welch, showing that most of the members were alive to their duties.

Stake Supt. Seth C. Jones gave a report of the Y. M. M. I. Associations, which was very flattering, especially as to that of the Layton Ward, as a building was about to be erected through means donated by the young men of that place.

James Duke reported the Elders' quorum in good order, and the home missionaries were reported by R. Alfred. Stake Supt. Alfred Cluff also reported the Sunday schools, after which he gave some good instructions in regard to parents training their children to attend Sunday School, etc.

Frederick Layton spoke of the new canal which had just been made, and encouraged the people to get shares in the same. Instructed the Bishops to look after their wards and exhorted the people to be diligent in keeping the commandments of God.

Dismissed by Jos. East. At 2 p.m., prayer was offered by Prent. W. D. Johnson. Hiram Welsh was then set apart as first and J. A. Burns as second counselor to John Taylor, of Pima, also Wiley Holladay to preside over the Mathews branch.

Brothers Geo. Glass, John M. Moody and W. Whipple then addressed the congregation, touching upon many important points of doctrine, after which Conference adjourned until Sunday at 10 a.m., with benediction by Seth C. Jones.

The Sunday morning meeting opened with singing, and prayer by Jacob G. Bigler. Brother S. Claridge then spoke upon the necessity of training our children, also the unity that should exist among the Saints.

The general Church authorities and Stake officers were presented by President J. H. Martineau, and were all unanimously sustained.

President Layton then gave some very good instructions to the young, urging them to prepare themselves to fill responsible positions in the Kingdom of God.

The statistical report was then read by the Stake clerk, Jas. East.

Benediction by Enoch Burnes.

At 2 p.m. prayer was offered by Geo. Skinner. After the Sacrament had been administered, Prent. J. H. Mortensen alluded to the great amount of good instruction imparted to the Saints, and urged the putting of it into practice. He encouraged the people to improve their homes and make them enticing to their children so that they will love home and not be so apt to go astray.

Prent. W. D. Johnson urged the necessity of building meeting houses; bore testimony to the truth of the work in which the Saints are engaged and expressed a desire to work out a salvation in the Kingdom of God.

The conference adjourned to meet at Pima, and benediction was offered by Patriarch Wm. McBride.

JOSEPH EAST,  
Stake Clerk.

## MORE FROM OGDEN.

APOSTLE SNOW CONVICTED—SENTENCE DEFERRED—FEELING AS TO HAMPTON'S TRIAL, ETC.

OGDEN CITY, Utah,  
January 1st, 1886.

Editor Desert News:

When the court opened again, at half past seven last night, the jury in the case of the United States vs. Lorenzo Snow returned

A VERDICT OF "GUILTY."

Some of the people here expressed surprise at this decision, but the majority were prepared for and expected it. Sentence is deferred until Jan. 8th.

Although we, in this city, have become considerably accustomed to the judgments of the courts as rendered in your city, many here were astonished at the action of Judge Zane in the case of B. Y. Hampton, and his refusal to act favorably on the suggestions of Drs. W. F. Anderson and J. M. Benedict. It looks like a vicious determination on the part of the "powers that be" to vent their spleen on the heads of those who attempt to suppress vice and crime in any "society" outside of "Mormondom." The two physicians mentioned are well and favorably known in this place, and their professional skill and ability are appreciated.

In my opinion to say the least, Judge Zane made a grave mistake in not

adopting the views and acting on the statements contained in the certificates and in the exercise of his discretion, imposing on Hampton a fine instead of sentencing him to a year's incarceration in prison in his present and chronic condition of bad health.

It is the opinion here, as far as I have learned, of those who have read the "open letter" to the Judge that, in justice to himself, and to vindicate his veracity, the doctor could not do less than he has done. And I can echo your sentiments, that if it does not benefit his honor, it certainly does great credit to Dr. Benedict.

New Year's day, thus far, has passed off very quietly. The business places have been all closed and everything wears a sabbatic serenity; but during the coming week we shall witness some stirring and even thrilling events in the District Court. A number more of our friends are to be judicially or legally (?) immolated—offered on the altar of sacrifice to appease partisan wrath and answer the demands of an unjust law specially enacted against the rights of an unoffending and upright people. And the end is not yet. But I will close, sincerely wishing you and your thousands of intelligent readers a happy new year.

WEBER.

## QUESTIONS ON LAND ENTRIES.

A LIST OF THE QUERIES TO BE ANSWERED BY EVERY LOCATOR ON PUBLIC LAND UNDER HOMESTEAD, PRE-EMPTION OR DESERT LAWS.

We have received from S. W. Darke & Co., of this city, the following list of supplementary questions issued by Commissioner Sparks of the General Land Office in Washington, to be propounded hereafter to persons who appear to make final proof on land entries under homestead, pre-emption or desert land laws, and to their witnesses as well. It is well for persons who expect to make proof to understand beforehand what questions they are required to answer, in addition to those previously asked, and which have been in force for years past, hence we publish this special catechism for the benefit of our readers:

## HOMESTEADS.

## Cross-Examination of Claimant.

Is the postoffice you have named the nearest to the homestead?  
If not, why not?  
Are you a voter?  
Do you vote, in the precinct which includes your homestead?

Who built your house upon your homestead?  
How did you get possession of it?

Who was living in the house at the time you made your original entry?  
Is the house situated entirely within the boundaries of your homestead land?

How did you establish your residence upon the land?  
What proportion of the time since you first established your residence upon the land have you eaten and slept upon it?

Where have you eaten and slept the remainder of the time?  
What was the value of improvements upon the land when you made your settlement upon the land?

By whom were they placed there?  
How much of the land is fenced and how?

From what place did you move to this homestead?  
Do you own any land lying contiguous to this entry?

How long after you established actual residence on the land did your family go upon it to live?  
Where were they meanwhile and why did they not go there when you did?

Who cultivated the land during your absence, what crops did they raise, and who received these crops or the money for them?

Has there been any rock quarried from any part of the entry?  
Is any part valuable as mineral ground?

If you have ever made any other homestead entry what did you do in reference to it?  
Have you ever made a pre-emption filing?

Has it been transmuted, commuted or relinquished?  
Have you ever made a cash entry, and what use have you made of it during the past five years?

Have you ever mortgaged, given away or deeded any of the land; is it recorded; where?

## Cross-Examination of Witnesses.

Are you in any way related to claimant?  
How far is your residence from the homestead?

How long have you been acquainted with claimant?  
How do you know the settler is a citizen of the United States?

Have you any means of knowing whether or not he ever made a former homestead entry except his own statements in relation thereto?  
What family has settler?

How did he establish actual residence upon it?  
If settler's family did not reside the whole time on the entry what was the reason for their absence?

What are your means of knowledge?

What do you understand by temporary absence?

Have you heard claimant make any statement as to his mortgaging or conveying the homestead?

What inducements have been offered to you to testify in this case?

## PRE-EMPTIONS.

## Cross-examination of Claimant.

How long have you been in the United States?  
What is your trade or occupation, and where do you carry on your business?

Is your postoffice address the nearest postoffice to your claim; if not, why not?  
Are you a voter? In what precinct do you vote?

From what place did you move to this claim, and when?  
Did you own land in the place named? How much?

How have you disposed of it?  
Who, if any one, was living upon this claim prior to your settlement upon it, and when did they leave the land?

Are the buildings upon the land wholly within the boundaries of your claim?  
To whom does the adjoining land belong?

What portion of the land is enclosed by fencing, and what sort of fencing is it?  
How did you establish your residence upon the claim—by what acts?

Did your family accompany you: if not, why not?  
When did they come upon the land to live?

Where have you eaten and slept during the past two and one-half years?  
Have you retained the exclusive use and benefit of the crops or proceeds thereof?

Have you made any promises to either of your witnesses to give them or either of them, or any other person, any of this land?  
Have you ever commuted a homestead entry to a cash entry?

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES.

Are you in any way related to claimant—how?  
Where did you first know him?

When did he come to the United States? have you seen his naturalization papers? and were you a witness for him at the time he received such papers?

Is claimant a registered voter, and in what precinct does he vote?  
How long have you known the land? Has there ever been any coal, mineral or rock extracted from the entry?

How far from the land do you reside?  
For what purpose is the land used?

What is the occupation of claimant and where does he carry on business?  
Where did claimant reside prior to coming on the land in question?

To whom did this former residence of claimant belong; how much land was there connected with it?  
What improvements were on this entry when claimant settled thereon; who placed them there?

How was claimant's residence upon the land commenced—by what acts?  
What proportion of the time during the past two and one-half years has he eaten and slept upon the entry?

Where did he eat and sleep the rest of the time?  
Who has received and used the crops raised upon the land during the past two years, or the money therefrom?

How much of the land is now under cultivation?  
Do you expect in the future, after patent is granted, to derive any benefit either directly or indirectly from this tract of land?

What inducements have been held out to you to testify in this matter?

## DESERT LAND PROOF.

## Cross-Examination of Claimant.

How far do you reside from the land embraced in this entry?  
From what source do you derive the water used in irrigating this land?

What was the character of the land at the date of your first entry thereon?  
Did it at that time produce any agricultural crop?

Have any of the crops which you have sown or planted failed in any year?  
Have any of the crops spoken of in your direct testimony been raised without artificial irrigation?

Had any ever been cut upon the land previous to the making of your entry?  
Will the natural water supply spoken of in your direct testimony irrigate the land without artificial aid?

Why have you not raised crops on or cultivated all the entry?  
How large in acres is the largest portion of your entry upon which water has not been conveyed and in what legal subdivisions?

Can water be distributed over this portion; why has it not been done?  
Are there any suits, contests or disputes involving your rights to the water to be used in reclaiming this land?

What has been the approximate cost of conducting water upon this entry; who defrayed it; where did you obtain the money; did you in any manner pledge the land as security for the payment of this money; to whom?

Had any of the land been cultivated, or where there any improvements of any kind upon the land at the time of original entry?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES.

Are you in any way related to the party who made the entry; how?  
Have you ever made an entry of this same tract or any portion of it?

When was the first work done toward bringing water upon this land; by whom; from what source?  
How many crops have been raised upon the land by the person who made the entry?

Was any hay ever cut upon this land previous to the filing of the entry in question; how many tons; upon how many acres; what kind of grass was it?

Will crops grow in the region where the land is situated without irrigation?  
Is there any land in that vicinity on which crops are raised without irrigation; now far from; what kind of crops?

Did the natural water supply on the land actually irrigate any portion of the lands?  
Have you ever seen any crop produced on lands such as this now is; when irrigated; what kinds?

What do you mean by the words "irrigation" and "cultivation"?  
Can the largest portion which has not been irrigated be irrigated; why has it not been?

Can the water claimed by claimant be procured each and every year in the same quantity?  
In what year or years have you been upon the entry since the application?

Do you expect, if patent be granted, to obtain any of this land yourself; upon what terms?  
Do you own any land contiguous or near to this entry?

Do you obtain your water supply from the same source?  
Do you know of the pendency of any suit or contest involving the right of applicant to the water?

## FIRST DISTRICT COURT.

OGDEN CITY, Utah,  
January 4, 1886.

## LORENZO SNOW'S SECOND TRIAL.

Shortly after ten o'clock to-day the court was opened in the usual manner. The interest of the public in the proceedings was unabated. The room was filled with spectators, and many others tried in vain to gain admission. The bar was well represented.

## SPECIALLY INTERESTED

parties inside the bar were Apostle Lorenzo Snow, President C. F. Middleton, David M. Stuart, James H. Nelson, Senr., Chas. W. Hemenway, James Taylor and James M. Brown.

Frank Wheeler, who had been convicted of grand larceny, was sentenced to five years imprisonment in the penitentiary.

James M. Brown, who had been convicted of "assault under color of authority," was requested to tell, if he had any reason, why sentence should not be passed on him, and he stated that he had lived here all his life, had never wronged any one, but always tried to do his duty as a citizen and an officer. He proceeded to justify his course in the matter with which he is charged, when

## THE COURT STOPPED HIM;

and defendant said he had nothing further to state. He was sentenced to pay a fine of \$40, and to remain in the custody of the marshal till the fine was paid.

Jack Hayes charged and connected with an attempt to commit rape, was sentenced to the county jail for three months.

David M. Stuart, convicted on his own plea of unlawful cohabitation with his own wives, was arraigned, etc. In response to the usual question, he said he was born in Scotland in 1826; joined the "Mormon" Church in 1842, immigrated to this country in 1845, when he became an American citizen, or rather declared his intention to become such, and subsequently completed the requirements for citizenship. In 1847

## HE CAME TO UTAH.

He related some incidents of the journey to and arrival in this region, and said that in 1849 he went to California with a company to search for and dig gold.

After being there (where Sacramento now stands) for some time he was called to preach the Gospel in California and other places, until the arrival of Johnson's army in this Territory. He subsequently came to Ogden unmarried. Here he accepted, adopted and practiced plural marriage in good faith. He served several terms in the City Council, but when the Edmunds law was passed he stepped down and out from civil office, and became disfranchised. In 1884 he removed part of his family from his farm in the country, to Ogden, in which action he became involved in debt. In 1885 he heard the court was in session, when, on being indicted, he came into court under charge of the officers, acknowledged his offense

## AND PLEADED GUILTY.

He was again present to receive sentence.

The Court said: "Do you, Mr. Stuart, intend to promise to obey the law in the future?"

Defendant replied that he wished to retain his agency, and therefore had no promises in this respect to make; he knew that if, in the future, he broke the law, he must take the consequences.

The Court then addressed the de-

fendant in the style usual to him under similar circumstances, and endeavored to convince him he was in the wrong. He said he had been led to believe that Mr. Stuart was one of those who would, in the future, obey the law, but he was misled in the matter. He therefore sentenced him to incarceration in the

## PENITENTIARY FOR SIX MONTHS

and to pay a fine of \$300 and costs of court, and stand committed until such payment be made.

Charles W. Hemenway, charged with libel stood up, and the Court said it was understood that defendant had promised in the future to obey the law, and whatever others might do, that he, as a journalist would refrain from such conduct and the use of libelous language. Defendant assented to the demands of the Court and sentence in this case was deferred till the 8th of February next, that the Court might satisfy itself of the good faith of the defendant in this matter.

In the Snow case defendant filed a further plea in bar, on the ground that he had already been indicted and convicted of the same offense that the other two indictments charged, and that therefore they should be barred out. The counsel for the defense proceeded to show that the offenses charged in these two indictments were only a continued offense, and in his remarks Judge Harkness quoted statutes and authorities to sustain his position. The arguments, however, went for nothing, the plea was disallowed, and it was ordered that

## A JURY BE IMPANELED

to proceed with the trial of the defendant on the remaining indictments.

At 2 p.m. Sure D. Olsen was ordered to stand up. He had pleaded guilty to the charge of grand larceny. The court read a communication signed by a large number of officials and leading citizens of Salt Lake City, bearing testimony to his former uniformly excellent, moral, upright, and honest course and conduct as a citizen, husband and father, stating that those who were acquainted with him, were utterly at a loss to account for the action of which he was convicted. The prosecuting witness was in full sympathy with the writers of the letter to the court, and asked that in this case

## SENTENCE BE SUSPENDED.

After admonishing the defendant in a feeling manner and administering good advice and counsel to him, his honor said sentence would be suspended during his future good conduct. Mr. Olsen, who appeared to be much impressed with the kind offices of his friends and the clemency of the Court, left the hall of justice a free man.

The jury now being made to try the "segregated" charge of unlawful cohabitation during the year 1884, the case was proceeded with. The charge was stated by Mr. Bierbower, for the prosecution. The defense was conducted by Messrs. F. S. Richards, R. Harkness, M. Kirkpatrick, R. K. Williams, C. C. Richards and H. H. Rolapp.

Mrs. Sarah Snow was the first witness called. She recognized Mr. Snow as her husband during the year 1884; but did not know whether he acknowledged her as his wife. Witness believed that defendant called at her house several times, (say two or three times) during 1884. He stayed

## BUT A FEW MINUTES,

at each call. He had the same number of wives in that year as at present—seven. Witness in 1884 lived in her own house in Brigham City. She did not live with defendant during that year as his wife, neither did he eat or sleep at her house during that time. Two of the calls were made to inquire after the condition of a sick daughter, but he did not remain during these visits to exceed five minutes.

Harriet Snow and Eleanor Snow next in turn occupied the stand, the questions and answers being the same substantially, as those in the evidence of Sarah Snow.

Mrs. Minnie Snow was next called. Had lived in the brick house since May 1882. Defendant was home more or less during that year, but she did not know whether he went visiting any other persons or not. He lived with the witness during the year 1884, and had he lived with any other person during any part of that year in Brigham City witness would have known it.

Mrs. Lorenzo Snow, Jr., was called, but nothing new elicited.

Frank H. Snow testified that he saw defendant several times in Brigham City in various places during 1884, but never, that he could remember at the old homestead.

Lucius A. Snow said all the defendant's wives were generally known and acknowledged as such by the defendant and others. Had also seen his mother and the defendant at the home of witness together some time in 1884. Witness lived on the farm, about two miles from the city. He then said he wished to make a statement to the effect that his mother, Harriet Snow, was at present as much the wife of the defendant as she ever was; that he did not eat or sleep in the house of witness' mother during 1884, but that did not make the slightest difference to her status as his wife, for such she was.

Mrs. Mary Snow testified that she was married to defendant in 1857, but had not lived with him as a wife for eleven years past. He had sometimes called on her as any other gentleman