political as he sees them. He cannot afford to have unhealthy or reactionary measures prevail in any part of the vast trust committed to his care; and when a political opponent who holds over and is undisturbed in the occupancy of an important office abuses the sufferance shown by not only not assisting his chief, but making open war against him and endeavoring to bring his achievements to naught and his continued efforts into ridicule, he exhibits a phase of sycophantic scrubbery debasing to himself and disgusting to sensible people when he asks the hand he has smitten to be extended in charity. Open and avowed opposition is manly in some instances, but begging from one who is wantonly antagonized never is.

THE PROHIBITION QUESTION AGAIN.

A CONTROVERSY is going on in Kansas on "The Problem of Prohibition." It is likely to become a great political issue, not only in that State but in the whole nation. The Provo discussion, in this Territory, affords a pretty good illustration of the two sides to the question in a small way. In Kansas the clergy are taking part in the debate, and they divide on that as they do on most subjects social, political and religious. Some are in favor of license, others are for prohibition. Logically and morally the prohibitionists seem to have by far the strongest position. But, practically the supporters of high license can point to some striking facts and statistics.

The chief argument, however, advanced in favor of controlling the liquor traffic by license, is the undeniable fact that where prohibition is the law, drinking is nevertheless a practice and an illicit business is carried on, while the State gains no revenue from the evil it spends much money to suppress. This, at first sight, appears very plausible. But when examined it does not exhibit much strength. If it is claimed that the liquor traffic is carried on extensively in spite of prohibitory law, that proves either that the law cannot be generally enforced, or that the officers are not diligent in their duty. Where arrests can be made, and where courts inflict the law's penalties on conviction, prohibition does prohibit, and the cases of secret infraction of the law are simply on a par with criminal practices of other kinds which exist in all countries in defence or evasion of the law. In such places, then, the failure, if any, is due to the inefficiency or negligence of those who should enforce the law.

The situation in Kansas shows this pretty clearly. The controversy demonstrates that though prohibition is the law, there are drug stores where liquor is kept for sale on the sly. But the very fact that it has to be kept *on the sly*, proves that a restraint is placed on the traffic, and the arrest and punishment of druggists who have thus broken the law shows that the law can be enforced, and that therefore prohibition can be made to prohibit. Intelligent witnesses testify that there is not one tenth, and some say not one twentieth, the liquor now used in that State that there was before prohibition. This is a stron endorsement in favor of the efficiency of the law.

But there is a stronger endorsement in the vote of the people. After five years trial a very large majority are in favor of prohibition. This was evidenced in the vote for Governor at the last election. The issue turned on this question. And it showed that there was a majority of 43,000 voters who were in favor of the prohibitory law and its enforcement by further legislation.

It was claimed by one Reverend gentleman in favor of open saloons that prohibition created hypocrisy. To this another clergyman retorted, "Of all the hypocrisy with which this country is cursed to-day, there is no form so damnable as that which grasps $1 of license and authorizes the sale of $10 worth of liquor to curse and destroy the people." It was charged that "in Atchison, saloon keepers openly defied and violated the law." This was denied in these words: "For months there has been no open saloons in Atchison. As a result one police court has been almost out of business. A number of lines of legitimate retail business have found their trade greatly increased. A large number of the houses formerly used for saloon purposes are now devoted to better use. The citizens of Atchison not identified with liquor selling or drinking, propose to try to build up the city without asking the aid of a traffic which destroys the property, life and happiness of its citizens."

This is worthy the attention of the people of Provo and of all other cities in Utah where prohibition is made possible by charter. One of the most orderly "Gentile" towns on this continent is Colorado Springs, where no intoxicants can be lawfully sold. The place was built on that principle. It is a standing protest against the liquor license, and an abiding witness in favor of prohibition. But the people of cities where the liquor traffic is condemned must understand that it takes something more than sentiment to execute the law. Loud denunciations of the liquor traffic and verbal demands for its suppression are all very well, but the city officials must be sustained financially and otherwise in fighting the opponents of the law and suppressing the evil. Men must be put into office who will endeavor to carry out the people's will, and their hands must be strengthened in the performance of that duty. While people declaim against liquor selling in public and engage in liquor buying and drinking in secret, and while those who know of the law's infraction will not lend their aid, as witnesses, to secure its enforcement, illicit liquor dealing will flourish and the foes of prohibition will have arguments to hurl against it.

The financial aspect of the question is very alluring. The revenue from licenses forms a very large portion of the income of many cities. It comes, too, from the source which causes a large expenditure. And the argument that this should of right furnish that revenue is quite plausible. But the rowdyism, revelry, rioting, assaults, murders and other crimes which are certainly the result of unrestrained dram-drinking, being the cause of so much expense to every city, ought to show the sensible that the great root of these evils should be reached, if possible, and that it is cheaper in the long run to fight the liquor traffic, even at the loss of the revenue gained in such a questionable manner, than to bear its consequences and suffer the loss occasioned by extra police service and the cost of prosecutions for multiplied offences.

When the surreptitious liquor traffic has been allowed to gain a strong foothold, of course the expense of its suppression will necessarily be large. But it is better to spend money for that purpose and at the same time prevent crime, than to let the evil increase to the certain expenditure of more money and the injury of society resultant from the increase of crime.

We maintain the ground which we have taken all along in regard to this matter, and that is, where prohibition is impossible, high license is the best substitute. Where prohibition is possible it should be sustained and enforced. When once established with any good show of success it is folly to let down the bars, for it will be found much easier and cheaper to keep them in place than to pick them up and put them back after they have been cast down, trampled in the mire and given entrance to unnumbered evils.

BOREMAN AT BEAVER.

ON Monday the 6th inst., the December term of the Second District Court opened at Beaver. Judge Boreman delivered himself of one of his characteristic Methodist attacks upon the "Mormon" Church, and no doubt relieved his spiritual stomach of a great deal of bile. We hope it has done him "a power of good." We do not think it will do us any harm. Off the bench the feather-weight official couldn't do anybody harm. His utterances have no significance whatever, except from the fact that they are judicial. Intrinsically they are too valueless to be designated even by a cypher.

The remarks to which we allnded were addressed officially to the Grand Jury, and were intended to influence that body, in the direction of the speaker's animus. As reported to the press, he commenced by stating that "the jurors should not be influenced by favor or affection or friendship on the one side, nor from hatred or malice on the other." They should not indict from a malicious or vindictive standpoint, neither should they be influenced by fear or from any personal consideration." So far, so good. That is perfectly right and proper. A grand jury, like a petit jury, should be impartial. It will be a bright day for Utah when impartial juries shall be assured, and picking and packing shall be abhorred things of the past.

But, as reported, the Judge proceeded to assail the "system" here, which he said is "hostile to every thing that is American" and is "fighting the government," and the people, who, he said, are "teaching their children perjury." He ridiculed the claim of "persecution" and placed the family relations of the "Mormons" on the same plane as stealing and murder. He told the grand jury that they would notice, in this term of court, that the people here "teach their wives and children to perjure themselves," and would meet in their duty, "hostility to the laws." In this style he went on to impress the jury with his own bitter and soured sentiments.

If this was not calculated to create and foster the very prejudice which he pretended in the first place to condemn, we do not understand the force and bearing of the English language. A prejudiced Judge is as bad or worse than a prejudiced grand jury. What justice can be expected from a court and a jury which, at the beginning of the term, start out with a pronounced animus against the people, and their religion, who are specially marked out for the law's vengeance! The sincerity of the Judge's harangue appears like that of the fellow who shouted to a mob that had seized an alleged culprit, "That's the villain, there's the town pump, but don't pump on him!"

The "system" which seems so much to disturb Jacob S. Boreman's digestion, is impregnable against any such puerile assaults as he is able to make upon it. His calibre, when deposed from the bench, was patent to all who knew of his existence, and when, in the providence of the Almighty, his judicial day shall be ended, that will be the last the world will hear of his little penny whistle. But now, it is a shame and disgrace to the country that the judicial bench should be turned into a stump so that a religion obnoxious to its occupant may be officially assailed, and that an honest and sincere people who are attached to that religion may be abused and maligned by wholesale. And is it in conformity with the principles of fairness and equity, which are supposed to underlie the jurisprudence of this great country, that a Federal Judge should, in advance, so scandalize and libel the class from which expected defendants belong, as to stir up the passions and prejudices of the grand jury before whom their cases are to come, that unfavorable action may be predicated almost to a certainty?

But such scenes as those at Beaver on Monday are not new nor uncommon in Utah, and there is no wonder that an imported judiciary commands no greater respect than that which is entertained for it in this inter-mountain region.

THE WILSON-MOEN CASE.

THIS *causus celebre* has been more talked about in the press than any other of late, the celebrated Campbell divorce proceedings and the boodle trials in New York being inferior to it in point of general interest and those details which, while not repulsive, are so peculiar and even romantic. It eclipses in apparent improbability some of the most extravagant sensational dramas, and yet the whole story is not yet known to the general reader. The details are, briefly told—A wealthy citizen of Rhode Island, named Moen, has been subjected to blackmail at the hands of one Wilson commonly known as "Doc" Wilson, for several years, the amounts thus extorted aggregating $300,000. It has not yet certainly come to light what the basis of the strange power exercised by Wilson over his victim was, but the payments were becoming so notorious that questions were asked regarding the proceeding, the only reply received being that he, Moen, was conscious of nothing detrimental to his character, but could not afford to be drawn into public notoriety by means of a rupture and legal fight with a blackmailer. Some men are so constituted that they will submit to a great deal of injustice and oppression to avoid a conflict of whatever nature; but the idea of permitting a villain to systematically and periodically rob a person with no grounds whatever to stand upon except audacity, was a little too much for those who talk first and then investigate, to digest, but they might, despite their pertinacity, have gone to the grave entirely unsatisfied had not Wilson in an unlucky moment (for him) brought suit upon a note given him by Moen. Then, after the strange proceedings which occurred in court, the blackmailer himself gave a statement of the whole affair. He said, in brief, that he is the son of Moen, born after marriage. His mother died years ago, and Moen married a second wife, by whom he has sons and daughters to inherit his vast wealth. The child of the first wife was given in infancy by the father to one Jonas Wilson, who received payment for rearing it and keeping the secret. On his death bed Jonas revealed to the youth the truth concerning his parentage. Thereupon young Wilson went to his father, recited the story of his toil and poverty, his exile from a home where he had the right to dwell, his claim as an heir to the wealth in which the father rolled, and he demanded acknowledgment and reparation. After hot contention and many repulses and threats by the younger man to force the elder to confess him his son, Moen yielded so far as to buy his silence, and for years Wilson bled him freely. The family of his reputed parent, the Wilson's knowing the secret of the young man's birth, and learning of his success with the millionaire, proceeded to levy blackmail upon the blackmailer, and the latter asserts that as fast as he relieved his father of money the Wilsons, by extortionate demands, fleeced him of it. In support of his claim that he is the son of Deacon Moen, Wilson shows letters of the Deacon in which he is addressed as "son." The mystery seemed to be clearing up, but when approached by reporters Moen denied the whole story and slammed the door in their face. Lately, also, an old family nurse has appeared on the scene and her testimony is unequivocally in support of the victim and against the plunderer; but it might as well be remembered that this class of testimony is sometimes a purchasable commodity. The remainder of the proceeding, so far as we can give it, has already appeared in our dispatches.

It is a most peculiar case. Wilson had some other hold than the mere weakness of an old man, surely. Perhaps he is Moen's son; but perhaps again, his mother was not Moen's wife. Such instances are more numerous than some people dream of.

At the masquerade ball in Adin last week, St. Jacobs Oil took the first prize. Nothing strange in this, as it is highly prized in every family where used—especially in ours.—Bieber, Cal., *Mountain Tribune*.

THE RAID ON LEHI.

Eight "Mormons" Arrested—Seven Brought to this City.

Not Allowed to Waive Examination—They are Placed Under Bonds.

Last evening's D. & R. G. W. train from the south brought up a large number of people from Lehi, Utah County, among them being those mentioned in yesterday's NEWS as having been arrested for living with their wives. The force of deputies who accompanied Marshal Dyer on the D. & R. G. W. freight to Lehi on Tuesday night included J. W. Greenman, Arthur Pratt, O. C. Vandercook, Bowman Cannon, J. C. Cleveland, T. F. Smith and D. W. Rench. They had with them quite a number of warrants for persons charged with unlawful cohabitation, and had also been furnished with a chart of the city, on which the residences of those for whom they were seeking were marked. They wandered about until nearly 4 o'clock yesterday morning before they began their work.

Those whom they succeeded in finding and arresting were Bishop Thomas R. Cutler, Edwin Standring, James Kirkham, George Kirkham, John L. Gibb, John Hart, Samuel James and Wm. Yates. The family of the latter were afflicted with that dread disease, diphtheria, so he was permitted to remain, with the condition that he reported himself in two weeks, with the witnesses subpœnaed, before Commissioner McKay.

The house of Andrew R. Anderson was searched, but the gentleman was not at home. It was again ransacked by the deputies at a late hour, but nobody was found. The witnesses subpœnaed to appear at the Commissioner's forthwith were Mrs. Laura Cutler, Mrs. Julia Cutler, Mrs. Rebecca Standring, Mrs. Mary A. Standring, Mrs. Martha Kirkham, Mrs. Emma Kirkham, Mrs. Sarah Gibb, Mrs. Annie Gibb, Miss Bella Gibb, Mrs. Mary Kirkham, Miss Sarah Kirkham, Mrs. Ann James, Mrs. Jane James, Miss Ruth James, Thos. James, Mrs. Mary J. Hart and Mrs. Alice D. Hart. Several of the ladies were in delicate health and had to be left at home, their husbands giving security for them. The brethren under arrest were taken to Bishop Cutler's and then to the hotel, and this afternoon, with the witnesses, were brought to this city and ushered into the presence of Commissioner McKay. At their request they were accompanied by Messrs. Jesse Smith, Thomas Fowler, George Comer, John Zimmerman, Louis Garff, Wm. Garff, Wm. Bone, Sen., Thomas R. Jones and Samuel Taylor, who came to act as bondsmen, and who, with Judge E. A. Smith and County Clerk J. C. Cutler, of this city, gave surety for the appearance of the defendants when wanted.

It was nearly 6 o'clock when the cases were called by the Commissioner. Mr. Moyle, who appeared for all of the defendants, said it was their desire to waive examination and let the cases go to the grand jury. They would give bonds for their appearance and also for the appearance of the witnesses for the prosecution.

Commissioner McKay refused to allow this. The Judge of the First District and the District Attorney had found fault with him on a former occasion for permitting that course. There was a Commissioner in the First Judicial District, where the defendants resided, before whom they could have been taken and bound over. But the District Attorney did not want this; he wanted a preliminary examination, and for this purpose ordered that the defendants be brought to the Third District. The Commissioner did not care to disregard the District Attorney's request, and occasion him more labor than was necessary in case the witnesses were not the ones desired.

Mr. Moyle said that he would give the assurance that the witnesses in each case were those who knew of the circumstances, a statement that was corroborated by Marshal Dyer.

The Commissioner still refused to grant the request, and set the hour of examination at 8 p. m. Upon the urgent recommendation of Mr. Moyle and Marshal Dyer, however, he finally agreed to proceed at once with some of the cases.

The complaints in all of the cases were made "on information and belief," by Daniel W. Rench, and were dated at various times from Oct. 2 to Dec. 7, 1886, the last one being that against Bishop Cutler, in which the proper names of his wives were placed, but in all the others fictitious names, such as Jane Doe, Lucy Roe, etc., were made use of. The defendants pleaded not guilty in each instance, and

GEORGE KIRKHAM

Was the first called for examination. He admitted that one of the witnesses unable to appear, Mrs. Mary Kirkham, was his legal wife and lived with him.

Mrs. Sarah Kirkham was then called and testified—My name is Sarah Kirkham; I have five children by the defendant; was married to him 11 years ago; his wife Mary was living at that time; my youngest child is two years old.

JOHN L. GIBB

came next. He stated that Mrs. Sarah Gibb, who was not present, was his first wife.

Mrs. Hannah Simmons Gibb testified—The defendant is my husband; he had a wife, Sarah, when I married him, nine years ago; I have four children, the youngest two years old; I live within a couple of blocks of the first wife's house; my husband provides for and lives with me.

Miss Isabella Gibb testified—I am 16 years old; my mother's name is Sarah; my youngest sister is three months old.

JAMES KIRKHAM

also said that his first wife, Mrs. Martha Kirkham, was at home, being unable to leave the family.

Mrs. Emma Kirkham testified—My full name is Emma Wootton Kirkham; I have been married 11 years to the defendant; my husband then had a wife, Martha; she is still alive; I have three children, the youngest nearly two years old; Martha has six children, the youngest two years of age.

SAMUEL JAMES

was then called, and made a similar statement to that of those who had preceded him with reference to his first wife Ann James.

Mrs. Jane James testified—My full name is Jane East James; the defendant is my husband; he had a wife, Ann, when I was married to him, 25 years ago; I live in the same house with her; I have three children, the youngest 13 years old; Anne's youngest is 26; she also has three children.

Miss Ruth James testified—I am 15 years old; my mother's name is Jane James.

Samuel Thomas James testified—I am 22 years old; my mother's name is Jane; I live at home part of the time; Ruth is my sister, and lives at home.

JOHN HART

then came forward in answer to the Commissioner's summons, and the examination in his case was proceeded with.

Mrs. Mary Jane Hart testified—I am the defendant's first wife, was married 10 years ago; I have one child, three years old.

Mrs. Alice Dorothea Hart testified—I am married to the defendant, John Hart; was married over five years ago; I have three children, the youngest three months old; I live about two and a half miles from his first wife's house.

EDWIN STANDRING

was the next. He stated his first wife was Mrs. Rebecca Standring, and that she was at home.

Mrs. Mary A. Standring testified—My full name is Mary Ann Cutler Standring; I am the defendant's wife; he had a wife, Rebecca, when I was married to him, about nine years ago; I have one child, nearly six years old; Rebecca has no children; we live in the same house; defendant lives there also.

BISHOP THOMAS R. CUTLER,

the seventh and last defendant present, then came forward, and the witnesses in his case were called.

Mrs. Laura E. Cutler testified—I am the wife of the defendant; was married 16 years ago; he had no wife at that time; I have six children, the youngest two years old; my husband lives with me.

Mrs. Julia Barnes Cutler was called. She was in very delicate health, and had to be assisted into the room. She also appeared exceedingly nervous, and when she took her place in the witness chair the defendant interposed the statement that she was his wife and lived with him. She was excused by the Commissioner.

THE BONDS.

At the conclusion of these proceedings the Commissioner announced that he would fix the bail in each case, with the exception of Thomas R. Cutler's, at $1,500. Bishop Cutler, he thought, could give a heavier bond, so $2,500 was the amount required.

Sureties signed for the respective sums, the defendants also furnishing bail for the witnesses subpœnaed, conditional for their appearance before the grand jury of the First District, at Provo, Utah County, on Wednesday, the 23d of February, 1887.

One of the marshals, in speaking of the defendants after the close of the examination, said, "They are the

BEST LOT OF MEN

I have had to deal with, no trouble at all, and everyone good natured." This admission, from a prominent anti-"Mormon," indicates to what class a majority of those who are suffering in the present crusade belong.

Several of those brought up from Lehi returned on the south-bound freight train which left this city at 10 o'clock last night. The majority of them, however, stayed over until this morning, and a few delayed their return until to-morrow.