

exhaustive statistics concerning the Mormon mission in Europe. During the year 1883, there had been 94 branches in England, with one Apostle, 12 High Priests, 70 Seventies, 389 Elders, 119 Priests, 90 Teachers, 95 Deacons, 2,416 members; total, 3,193. The number of emigrants to Utah during the year had been 392. Newcastle had 5 branches, 5 Seventies, 23 Elders, 3 Priests, 7 Teachers, 7 Deacons, 112 members, the total being 162. In the Netherlands, there were 5 branches, with 225 officers and members; in Turkey, 3 branches, with 15 members, in Scandinavia, 45 branches, with 4,016 officers and members; and in Switzerland and Germany, 25 branches, with 757 members. The totals for Europe were 172 branches, with 8,237 officers and members, and of these 1,014 had already emigrated to Utah. There were also colonies of Mormons in some of the States of America. The largest number of them, however, lived in Utah Territory.

In March, 1887, the American Congress passed a law to confiscate the church property of the Mormons. On being asked why they should do such a thing as this, Elder Rankin replied, "That's just what we want to know." A test case, he said, had been heard before the judge in Utah, who, of course, upheld the action of the Legislature. An appeal had been lodged, and would in due time be heard before the Supreme Court. There, at present, the matter rested.

Elder Rankin is, by the way, a native of Fifeshire, in Scotland, his father having been an Episcopalian and his mother a Scotch Presbyterian. Both parents were converted to Mormonism, and Elder Rankin was nourished in the bosom of the Church; but, he said, when he grew to man's estate he thought out the matter for himself and became convinced of the truth of the faith which he had inherited.

THAT PRECINCT DISPUTE.

There is an effort being made to have South Cottonwood precinct, Salt Lake County, divided, and a new precinct, Murray, created. Two petitions have been submitted to the County Court, one asking for and the other protesting against the separation. One document reads:

To the Honorable County Court of Salt Lake County:

The undersigned residents and taxpayers in the precinct of South Cottonwood, hereby respectfully represent that said precinct covers a large tract of country, about four miles east and west and about three miles north and south, an area of some ten or twelve square miles; is divided into four large school districts, Nos. 22 and 23 on the east side, and 24 and 25 on the west side; that within district No. 25 there are situated two large smelting works, several stores, boarding houses and saloons. Many transient persons frequent this dis-

trict. In the vicinity of the smelters and saloons, where the county has authorized the sale of intoxicating drinks, is where their peace officers are most needed and where they should reside, but this right and privilege has been persistently ignored by the majority in the precinct and the people of this district left without protection. Either the magistrate, or constable, or both, are generally selected from two to three miles away from this locality. The conveniences of the people and the administration of justice demand that said precinct should be divided as the only remedy for the inconvenience and hardships complained of. Your petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honorable body to set off, make and constitute School District No. 25 (as now bounded and defined on the county record) into one separate precinct, to be known as Murray Precinct, and appoint (until our next general election) two discreet and trustworthy persons living in the immediate vicinity of the smelters to fill the offices of magistrate and constable in said Murray Precinct, and we, in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is signed by Harry Haynes and 91 others.

The protest is as follows:

To the Honorable County Court of Salt Lake County:

Gentlemen—The undersigned residents and taxpayers of South Cottonwood Precinct hereby respectfully enter our protest against the division of our precinct, as asked for by Mr. James and others, who have signed a petition asking you to form a precinct within the boundaries of School District No. 25. We do not see what benefit it will be to do so, and if it was necessary to do it, the best way to divide the precinct would be by a north and south line through the precinct, instead of taking only School District No. 25, as it would make awkward looking precincts geographically. The claim that is made that on account of the smelters and saloons drawing so many transients to that neighborhood that there should be a justice and constable close by, so that the citizens in that neighborhood could be protected, is not a very strong one from the showing of the justice's docket for the last year. During the time there has been only one summons issued, and that case was settled without coming to trial, and there has not been a warrant issued for any arrest for eleven months. The claim that the majority of the voters will no elect a justice and constable who reside in the west side of the precinct is not correct, as previous to the present justice, the three former ones lived on the west side, namely: William McMillan, O. A. Woolley, and William Bradford. We do not think it would be any benefit to the bona fide residents and taxpayers of the precinct; although there are quite a number of names signed to the petition, when they are examined closely there are not many property taxpayers, as a great many

of them are only renters, who are here today and gone tomorrow. Some of these are entered twice, with a little difference in the given names, and some of them have left the precinct altogether five or six months ago. There are also the names of quite a number of minors attached to the petition. Please consider well our protest before granting the petition, and we, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Richard Howe and 89 others have affixed their signatures to this protest.

The matter has been taken under advisement by the court.

CURRENT EVENTS.

Edmunds Law Prosecutions.

At Provo, March 30:

United States vs. Thomas Yates; adultery; to be arraigned on the 30th instant.

On March 27 Deputy Marshal Whetstone arrested J. M. Hansen, of Newton, on the charge of unlawful cohabitation. There was an indictment, nearly two years old, out against him and he was therefore placed under temporary bonds to appear when wanted.

On March 28 Jens Sorensen, of Richmond, was arrested on the charge of unlawful cohabitation by Deputy Whetstone. An indictment had been out for him for some time and he was placed under temporary bonds.

On March 30 Judge Judd did the following business in the First District Court at Provo.

Joseph Clark was brought down from the penitentiary to answer for the third time to indictments under the Edmunds-Tucker law. Having already served a term for unlawful cohabitation, he is now in prison on a charge of adultery with his plural wife, of which he was found guilty. Today he pleaded guilty to another charge of the same offense and was given three years, to commence at the expiration of the term now running.

Thomas H. Winder was tried on a charge of adultery with a second wife married since the confinement of the first in the insane asylum, and was found guilty; sentence was set for April 1.

George H. Brimhall was before the court under similar circumstances and made a statement of his case before the grand jury, upon which he was also found guilty; sentence set for April 20.

United States vs. J. H. Tidwell; the defendant pleaded guilty to a charge of unlawful cohabitation, and sentence was set for April 20; a charge of adultery against him was dismissed.

Emma Saunders; fornication; the case was dismissed.

Thomas Yates; adultery; plea of not guilty was entered.

J. B. Warden was charged with adultery, and pleaded not guilty.

Proceedings on March 29 before Judge Judd:

United States vs. Geo. H. Brim-