DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE

DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY - MAY 5, 1886

PILING UP THE FEES.

We drew attention a few days ago to the unlawful doings of the Federal officials here, who brought a number of prisoners and witnesses from American Fork to this city, out of the First Judicial District into the Third, for the purpose of increasing expenses and of giving business to the fee-fiend Commissioner. On Monday these nefarious proceedings were repeated with aggravations. A raid was made upon Payson but no arrests were effected, and the chagrined deputies brought several witnesses to this city, a distance of over seventy miles, so that they might be taken before Commissioner McKay when they could have been taken before a Commissioner in their own judicial district.

This not only multiplies expenses in the shape of fees and mileage, but is contrary to law. If those witnesses were wanted before a grand jury it must have been the grand jury of the First District. Why then were they brought the long distance to this city, in the Third District, in order to be bound over to appear before the grand jury in the First District?

It is time that these doings were brought to the attention of the National authorities, as no one here seems to be inclined to interfere or do anything to restrain the rapacity of the fee-gourmands.

PROSPECTS OF THE NEW EDMUNDS BILL.

According to a special dispatch to the *Herald*, when Mr. Chandler was making his argument against the new Edmunds bill before the Judiciary Committee of the House, on Monday, he was informed by the Chairman that it was not necessary to discuss the provision for the appointment of "trustees for the management of the Mormon Church," and expressed the opinion that the "Government ought not to go into partnership with the Mormon Church."

This sounds the death knell of Senator Edmunds' scheme to rob the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and place the State in control of the Church. That may be considered, for the present at least, as a dead issue. When the bill is reported back to the House it is evident that it will be considerably amended, and there is no probability that any effort to reinstate the Church robbery clause would be successful.

Both sides are to be heard again on the subject of the bill, the Utah Delegate and others speaking pro and con, and it is understood that the addresses are to be finished by Saturday May 1st. How soon the bill will be reported after that is not known. It will take some time to make up the report, and when it is presented to the House there is no reason to believe that it will be advanced, but will take its place on the calendar. It is hardly likely to be reached in time to pass in any form during the present session, as, if amended in any way, it will have to go back to the Senate for consideration of the House amendments. The rabid ring and their sympathies do not draw much solid comfort from the outlook.

MURRAY AND WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.

Mr. Eli H. Murray's removal from the Governorship of Utah is regarded by the *Woman's Journal* as a praiseworthy act "because he was the originator of the plot to deprive the women of that Territory of the right of suffrage," but it is alleged that Murray's opposition to the feminine suffrage was because a Mormon with from five to twenty-five wives controlled from five to twenty-five votes.

The above is from the New York *World*. It shows how much the leading papers of the country know of the "Mormon" question, about which they discourse so often and on which they attempt to dictate congressional legislation. There are other papers besides the leading organ of the Democratic party, which will urge the enforcement of the Edmunds law and yet do not know anything of its provisions. The *World* does not seem to understand that since 1882 no polygamist nor any woman married to a polygamist can vote at any election in Utah. As a matter of fact no woman in this Territory was ever entitled to vote by virtue of being a plural wife. Therefore neither now nor at any former time was "feminine suffrage enlarged because a Mormon had from five to twenty-five wives."

Opposition to woman suffrage in Utah must be based upon something else than polygamy. Even the first or legal wife of a polygamist is debarred from voting. When papers talk like the *World*, whether attempting to be facetious or in sober earnest, they only expose their ignorance of the subject. They stir up Congress to do something desperate against polygamy, and what they urge has not the remotest bearing on the polygamy question.

There is no earthly reason why women in Utah should be disfranchised more than men. If it is claimed that they vote as directed, the same is said of the men. If that is said of the "Mormons, the same is said of the "Gentiles." It is alleged that the "Mormons" vote as ordered by the priesthood. It is claimed on the other hand, with far more reason and backed by irrefutable evidence, that the "gentiles" vote as dictated by a ring of conspirators through a vile paper that alternately lashes, threatens and cajoles.

The truth is that if anybody in Utah, male or female, wants to vote for Tom, Dick or Harry, Murray, Dickson, Zane or the Devil, there is nothing to prevent if the voters are duly registered, and there is no way of finding out how they vote unless they choose to tell it themselves. There is more nonsense talked on supposed compulsory voting in Utah in Congress and by the press than almost any other public question.

As to Eli H. Murray being the "originator of the plot" to deprive the women of Utah of the suffrage, that very mediocre individual was never known to originate anything. The plot was devised long before Mrs. Hayes thought of him for Governor of Utah, and was no more original with him than was the method he pursued of working up fees while Marshal of Kentucky. He merely stood in the front and fired the shots that were made for him by others, and never performed an act or uttered a sentiment on the "Mormon" question that was not prompted by those who used him for their tool. It is vastly amusing to read the nonsense that papers publish about the man and the measure.

If we did not know by experience that it is too much to expect, we would respectfully ask the editors of leading journals to find out something about Utah affairs before attempting to discourse upon them; but that we fully understand would only be labor in vain.

A KICKING BISHOP.

Several papers have made favorable comments on some remarks made by Bishop Bowman of the Methodist Church, while attending a meeting of ministers in Chicago. They were discussing in lively style the eight-hour labor movement, and Bishop Bowman was requested to express his opinion on the subject. In the course of a few brief remarks on the prevailing strike in the southwest he said: "If they could get Jay Gould by the neck and kick him around four or five blocks and not quite kill him, I think it would be a very good thing and one that would tend to simplify the labor problem materially."

If this is a Christian method of correcting an evil, we fail to see it in that light. The sight of a Methodist Bishop holding the Wall Street capitalist by the scuff of the neck and kicking him along the street, would not be very edifying to pious people, nor strictly in accordance with Christian principles. And what effect such episcopal violence would have upon the labor question, does not appear to the naked eye.

One of the essential qualifications of a Bishop, according to the instructions of Paul to Timothy and to Titus, is, that he must be "no striker," and "not a brawler." And if Bishop Bowman was to knock out Jay Gould in "four rounds," or "around four blocks," it is not at all probable that the hours of labor would be in anywise reduced, that wages would go up, that capital would come down, or that striking the railroad king would prevent or put down strikes on railroads or elsewhere. A kicking Bishop would not be a corrective example to kicking laborers.

Whether the Bishop meant to be jocular or in earnest, his remarks, which have attracted so much attention, were wrong in principle and evil in effect, and only exceeded in folly by the commendatory comments which have been made upon them by the press, to pander to the clamors of unthinking people. If pugilistic dignitaries of an aggressive sect can offer no better remedies for the serious evils that menace the country than the Bowman medicine, it will certainly get "no better very fast."

MURRAYISMS.

A correspondent of the Pittsburg *Dispatch*, who signs himself "Murray," writes two columns of stuff headed "The Mormon Menace," in which he tries to explain the reason why "Mormonism still lives and flourishes and to-day beards the American Congress in the American capital," in spite of "the fulminations of political parties," "laws of the most stringent character concocted by the shrewdest lawyers and congressional experts," armies sent against it, driving it "from State to State," daily newspapers working against it, etc. He says this explanation is "hard cash." In other words, he tries to discount Dement, by not only charging that Congressmen have been bought with "Mormon money," which he informs a startled world "buys as much as Christian coin," but by stating, without reserve, that he, the mighty scribe for a paper that not one man in a hundred outside of Pittsburg ever heard of, has "been plainly offered various sums from $1,000 to $5,000 to shut his mouth and stop his mouth against this unlawful hierarchy."

Prodigious! What a valuable correspondent he must be! What a mighty power he must wield! All he has to do is just to shut his mouth and stop his pen on one forbidden subject, and coin will roll into his pockets by the thousand. But he can't be mum, for his name is Murray. Ominous cognomen! Who will believe a yarn like that with such a signature?

One would think that after refusing so tempting an offer he would have something wonderful or novel to reveal that is worth more than $5,000 to suppress. But alas! This Murray, like the other Murray, has nothing original about him. He can only repeat the old gossip about Joe Smith, Nauvoo Legion, the army sent to Utah, John D. Lee—who, he says, is "to-day one of the most popular of all their dead leaders"—polygamy and women in favor of it, hatred to Christian civilization, and the necessity of "force of arms" to "cut up the Mormon Church, root and branch." Not a new idea, not a practical suggestion, but only old things badly told and poorly strung together. Any paper that would pay $5 a year for such stuff must be badly off for "copy." And to think that by simply *not* writing it, the immaculate Murray could have scooped in various sums from $1,000 to $5,000!

Barnum should secure that Pittsburger with all dispatch. And if he could get the other Murray he would have a whole show in itself. If they did not draw alone, he could advertise after the fashion of the G. A. R. local announcement of its recent festival, in an Ogden paper which is even more obscure than the Pittsburg *Dispatch*, to wit:

"Let All Attend—Singing, music, recitations and tableaux, Governor Murray, General Kimball all at the G. A. R. Festival"

We knew the defunct official would find his true occupation at last, and of the $5,000 declined was only made another attraction he would complete the exhibition, in the Barnum style, as "the greatest of the kind on earth." But a still greater curiosity than the newspaper scribe or the Congressman who has been offered cash to shut his mouth on the "Mormon" question, would be the "Mormon" who offered the money and carried the bag. We venture to say that, with all the stories that have been told of "Mormon" bribery and the influence of "Mormon" gold in Washington, no one on earth can produce an authenticated case of the kind, nor name the "Mormon" who has made such an attempt. Yarns of that kind should hereafter be denominated Murrayisms.

THE MILK IN THE COCOANUT.

A lawyer of this city named Bennett has prepared a pamphlet on the Utah question for use in Congress. He is working in the interest of the minority who want to rule in place of the majority. It is an effort with that object in view. All the speeches and writings and misrepresentations and exaggerations of the various anti-"Mormon" advisers of Congress, tend in that direction. They mean revolution. With whatever specious pretensions they are put forth, and with whatever language they may be clothed, that is the end to be achieved. Strip them of their verbiage, special pleading, pretended remedies for alleged evils, sham patriotism and catch sentences, and this bold and shameless scheme stands forth in its naked imprudence to shock the senses of every just and fair-minded beholder. It says in effect, "We, the few, cannot gain political pre-eminence in Utah, because our opponents, the many ar banded against us. Therefore we claim that the many should be disfranchised that the few may govern. The "Mormons" will not vote for Gentiles, therefore they must not be allowed to vote at all." A page of comment would not make the matter clearer. This is the substance of the pamphlet that C. W. Bennett has prepared for private circulation where it is expected to do the most good. We do not think the conspirators for whose benefit it is written will reap much profit from its compilation.

THE TRIUMPH OF UNBRIDLED LUST.

The proceedings in the Third District Court during the past few days coupled with the ruling of the Supreme Court of the Territory in the Yeariau case, give additional cause to the people of Utah for saying that the officials who are so eager to punish the "Mormons" for faithfulness to their families, are equally anxious to protect lecherous "Gentiles" who practice the vilest kind of sexual bestiality.

In the Davenport case, witnesses were called to testify, whose evidence was rejected when male resorters to houses of ill-fame—some of them former or present attaches of the court, were placed in jeopardy. Why the change? How is it that their testimony was considered good in one case and bad in others? Why could their statements be believed against a female prostitute but not against male prostitutes? Was it not because in both instances the effect was to shield the filthy resorters and leave them unpunished for their crimes? Is it not a patent fact that the Davenport woman was prosecuted, not because she kept a vile house, but because she informed against the frequenters of her den? No other fallen woman has been tried in the Third District Court for this offense, and this one has long since left the city. The other poor creature who was implicated at the same time, was nearly scared to death by the Federal officers because she had given similar information, and then when she was induced to turn and testify so as to help the debauchees, she was let loose without prosecution. The same prosecuting attorney—C. S. Varian, who in a burst of fury refused to believe the witnesses who saw the lechers in the performance of their criminal acts, tried to compel the same witnesses to testify, and did receive their testimony, in the case against the woman who helped to expose the guilty creatures whom he refused to prosecute. Let it be widely known that this Varian, who would not believe these witnesses under oath when they were ready to testify to what they saw men do whom he openly refused to prosecute, demanded that these same witnesses should testify against the woman who was a partner in their guilt. Also that the reason he assigned for publicly refusing to prosecute the wretches detected in their vileness, was his disbelief in the veracity of the men on whom he now depends for evidence against the woman, and whose testimony, secured her conviction in her absence! Varian wouldn't believe their testimony against men in his own circle, but depends on it to prosecute the woman with whom the detected debauchees were seen to commit crime.

The case on which Judges Boreman and Powers decided the Justices of the Peace had no jurisdiction, was of a person in the form of a man who was seen to commit the offense with which he was charged, and who, in the first place, did not deny his guilt. That decision screened him and the other lechers on the list from the legal consequences of their infamy. The Justices are prevented from punishing them, and the Prosecuting Attorney of the Court which is acknowledged to have jurisdiction, openly proclaimed that he would not prosecute them. What does this mean but a free license to male debauchees to commit all kinds of lechery so long as it is outside of "the marriage relation?"

Mark the change, too, as to the admissibility of testimony in different cases. When the resorters to houses of ill-fame were in danger, the prosecuting officer was blazingly indignant at the idea of allowing men to testify who looked through holes in a door and detected the depraved creatures in their guilt. He wouldn't believe the oath of such men, though they were policemen engaged in detective business. But when a "Mormon" was charged with cohabiting with a woman alleged to be his wife, the testimony of a fellow who said he climbed up and looked over a transom into a room at 11 'clock at night and saw two persons—no one knows whom—in a bed, was the sole, direct evidence to condemn the accused. Knot-hole espionage and window-peeping is deemed a virtue against a "Mormon" and a damning vice against a "Gentile." It is proper in a deputy marshal, but villainous in a policeman. It is to be encouraged when the spying is to discover parties who are married, and utterly condemned when the object is to suppress prostitution.

The latest case in demonstration of the virtuous proclivities of the Prosecuting Attorneys who are waging the warfare against "Mormon" family affairs, is that of the guilty Griffiths. After he had acknowledged his crime in the lower court, because the penalty was more than he anticipated he appealed to the District Court, and those immaculate assailants of plural marriage refused to proceed with his case, and he was set at liberty, without a trial, although he had plead guilty before the justice to the charge of resorting to a house of ill-fame, in order to suppress the disgusting and shameful details of his bestiality which would have been sworn to by an eye-witness.

Are not these facts most glowing testimonials to the sweet-scented virtue and high-toned morality of the courts and officers that are carrying on the persecution against the "Mormons?" How sincere they are when they proclaim as their object the maintenance of the home and the sanctity of the family relation Blow the trumpet, sound the gong, proclaim the triumph of the "Christian" crusade! A "Mormon" who has two homes goes to jail, while his families are left exposed to the wiles of this wicked world, and a "Gentile" who, married or single, visits vile houses, wallows in shameless vice and disports himself in rampant lust, can laugh at law and defy restraint; the "Mormon" courts cannot punish him, the "Gentile" courts will not, and between the two he can freely revel in the orgies of a civilized and "Christian" "necessary evil!" Surely the pious preachers pugnacious editors and moral statesmen who have contributed to this highly satisfactory condition of affairs in Utah ought to rejoice in the success of their work.

DAMAGES BY STOCK.

We are in receipt of the following communication:

Payson, April 26th, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

I have a few questions to ask as to what farmers may do in regard to stock depredations, as there are so many different opinions here on the points I will name. It is usual with us where a number of men own land in a field, to appoint a committee to try and keep the field clear of stock. They are supposed to get their pay for this from the parties whose stock they drive out of the field. Now, the questions are these:

Can anyone owning land in the field assess damages sustained by another man in the field, or would he be considered an interested party?

Second: Could the committee assess damages, or would they be debarred for the same reason?

Now there are points to be considered in this. If the committee can't assess damages and there is no one at work in the field, they must come to town and hunt some one to do this, and if any of the field owners can't, then they must come to town to get some one to assess damages, no matter how many men are at work in the field.

If this is the case it puts the matter in rather an awkward position. First, if they drive the stock to town, how shall those who go to appraise know that the stock held have been there or whether the damage has been done by some other stock, except on the word of this committee? And if they should leave the stock in the field they would do more damage and likely get bloated on lucern.

By answering these questions you will confer a great favor. Perhaps it would be a benefit to others about these points if you could answer through the News. I will state that I am a regular subscriber, and have been a great many years, and do not know how I could do without it.

Yours, etc., J. D.

The whole question turns on the interest which the field committee or any land owner may have in the property damaged, or the damages to be appraised and paid. The law requires as an appraiser, a "disinterested male citizen over twenty-one years of age." The fact that a farmer owns land in a common enclosure, or field not enclosed, does not constitute him an interested party when damage is done to a crop or portion of land in which he has no ownership. If he has no partnership in the land or the crop damaged, he is not an interested party, although he may own land, and or a crop, or have a partnership therein, in the same field. He might, therefore, lawfully appraise damages done by stock to his neighbor's property. And if the owner of the stock was not satisfied with the appraisement the latter could, under the law of 1880, choose another appraiser who, with the first, might make another appraisal, and if unable to agree call in a third, the appraisal of the three to be final.

But if we understand our correspondent correctly, the field committee expect to be paid for their labor out of the amount recovered from the owners of stock committing the depredations. In that case neither of the committee could be considered "disinterested" within the meaning of the law. For though the appraiser might have no interest in the property damaged, yet he would have an interest in the amount to be recovered, and therefore would not be a lawful appraiser.

We do not see that the difficulties raised by our correspondent are insurmountable. One member of the committee is enough to go for a disinterested person to appraise the damages, if no one is on the spot but the committee. Then it does not follow because they cannot assess the damages, that they cannot testify to the identity of the stock that committed the trespass. The appraiser can determine the damage done, the committee can prove what stock did the damage; this ends the difficulty assumed.

So long as the appraiser has no ownership or part ownership of the property damaged, or interest in the amount to be recovered, he is a lawful appraiser, if a male citizen over twenty-one years of age. The law is just, and we think its provisions are plain and simple. Its full text will be found in the Deseret Evening News of March 22, 1886.

WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH PLURAL WIVES?

The following special dispatch appears in the Salt Lake *Herald*:

Washington, D. C., April 29.

F. S. Richards closed the argument to-day in the Snow cases. His reply