

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

PUBLISHED DAILY MORNING, 6 A.M.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE DESERET NEWS CO.

CHARLES W. FORTESCUE, EDITOR.

FEB. 13.—FEBRUARY 13, 1891.

THE CONFISCATION SUITS.

The official report of the present condition of the suits is evident, the property of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints will be found in another part of this paper. It will be interesting to all who watch the progress of this and every other matter the Americans see—the prolonged history of a Church is something.

The history of the case is very clearly related, and the writer of the article will bear his difficulties in serving at once the interests of the states of this litigation if the report is carefully read. We do not care to comment upon what took place during those three points in the statement.

It is evident that the law and the attack upon the Perpetual Endowment Fund have failed, and that the legislation has been upon a total misunderstanding of the facts, and false representations as to the Fund and its assets. The whole proceedings were simply a farce.

The litigation still necessary in order to obtain permanent possession of the property of the Church is of little magnitude. It will take considerable time and much wrestling of the law in order to effect the purpose in view.

The fact that through the appointment of a Receiver it per cent. of the whole amount seized has been withheld away in expenses, is a sufficient component upon the policy planned, general expanded shows that the Receiver is not only adjoint to the litigation, and naturally immune to the action of the District Attorney, or the Head of the legal profession, than any question of other property that may be discovered to be Church property, it is useless to continue such expansive appendages as the Receiver and his attorney.

As to the dispute over the late Receiver's costs and accounts we have nothing to say. The public are not particularly interested in the squabble. Happens, however, that the decisions of two Examiners ought to settle it and make an end of the trouble.

Another the usual upon the property of the Church has not reflected much credit upon any one engaged in it. And it will certainly form a great blot upon the legislative and judicial pages of the history of the United States.

THE FEES FIXED.

The County Court, it appears, has at length settled the question of the amount of the compensation which the Assessor and his deputies are to receive for obtaining the information required by the Bureau of Statistics. It will be remembered that the Assessor demanded eight dollars a day for himself, to supervise the work, and five dollars and a half a day for each of his deputies, also that the statute requires the work to be done at the time of making assessments, while the Assessor was making a prompt and distinct protest of this requirement of the law thus writing to his agents.

After wrangling with the question the Court has decided to give the Assessors dollars a day for his own services and five dollars a half a day for each of his deputies. This is a very good pay for eight hours work which is not of a laborious character, and we think it ought to be quite satisfactory to those who receive it. The question as to when the work shall be done has been left open. We presume it does not matter as much when the work is done as how it is done. Still, although the law should always keep within the law.

A DRAMATIC ENDING.

The winding-up scene of a pathetic story was witnessed this morning in the baggage car of the U. P. train as it was about to start southward from this city. The circumstances connected with the imprisonment of the aged veteran James H. Jenkins, of Gosden, Utah County, have already been presented in these columns. On account of what occurred today, it may be appropriate to briefly repeat them.

The unfortunate man was convicted, under the Jenkins-Jackson act, in the First District Court, of adultery with his paramour wife. In October last he was taken before Judge Blackhorn to receive judgment. That functionary sentenced him to imprisonment for two years in the Utah penitentiary. A few days ago, John L. Jenkins, of Salt Lake, son of the prisoner, was notified that his father was in a dying condition, caused gouty dementia. As soon as possible after the receipt of this sad intelligence, the son hastened to the bedside of his parent. Information concerning the patient's condition was telegraphed to Delegates Collier at Washington. That benevolent gentleman must have taken immediate steps to obtain the release of the dying prisoner, as information that the father had been pardoned by President Harrison reached this city on Wednesday last. As was as predictable after the receipt of this welcome news the patient was conveyed to the house of a friend—that of Brother William D. Owen, Jr., of the Tabernacle Ward—postponing his removal to his own home in Gosden.

The funeral of Brother Jenkins to

the best of his family was attempted this early hour this morning. Every provision was taken for his safety, inasmuch as the U. P. station, but he was not successful in his efforts. In this situation he was placed in the bogies, but he was not permitted to go west further on the homeward journey. He sank rapidly, and before the train started, in the presence of his surviving son, and a few others who were present, at ten minutes to seven, he quietly and peacefully breathed his last.

We find the man, holding a little slip of paper, in which, in our opinion, was intimated to the deceased James H. Jenkins, will reflect on the oral suit of the hardy ex-soldier of his judicial sentence. To enable him to make the greatest complaint, it will be necessary, after considering all the features of the case, when he recovers, in his usual parlour, the quietude seems in the cage, to transfer the opinion of the hardy ex-soldier of his judicial sentence.

To enable him to make the greatest complaint, it will be necessary, after considering all the features of the case, when he recovers, in his usual parlour, the quietude seems in the cage, to transfer the opinion of the hardy ex-soldier of his judicial sentence.

But that is only one instance of those who were "entirely untrue and false in every particular," appearing in this paper, but of which he reflects this was permitted to appear. The present contradiction is doubtless due to the fact that president "Liberal" in Payson was so disgusted with the falsehood that they threw it down the throat of the defense and made him bring back the retraction which appeared this morning.

The fact that this先生, "entirely

untrue and false in every particular," has been telegraphed in eastern papers, shows how ambiguous stories are manufactured for circulation and how the eastern press becomes the victim of foolishness in Utah.

walked up into matter of fact, painted and illumined and magnified, and published as though reported by an eye witness. While used for the purpose, it is given as "a true and exact account." In this connection, it is worthily informed that it is known to a dozen or more respectable persons, and it is easier to deny it.

It is astonishing that so straightforward a confession appears this morning was published in the Tribune, but it is evident that the disreputable leader who sent the original falsehood has been compelled to eat his own words by virtue of his own party.

But that is only one instance of those who were "entirely untrue and false in every particular," appearing in this paper, but of which he reflects this was permitted to appear. The present contradiction is doubtless due to the fact that president "Liberal" in Payson was so disgusted with the falsehood that they threw it down the throat of the defense and made him bring back the retraction which appeared this morning.

The fact that this先生, "entirely untrue and false in every particular," has been telegraphed in eastern papers, shows how ambiguous stories are manufactured for circulation and how the eastern press becomes the victim of foolishness in Utah.

A LEGISLATIVE ABSURDITY.

It appears that the British Parliament is again struggling with that anticipated piece of legislative absurdity, the law to prevent marriage with a deceased wife's sister. A bill to shield the provision has many times been presented, but has never prevailed. It has now passed its second reading in the House of Commons. It may again pass its third reading, but will again be defeated, and with a strong opposition in the House of Lords. It will

be fought by the Lord spiritual, if approved by most of the Lords temporal.

The Church of England bishops who are eight of residential bishops have seats in the House of Peers, have

been very hostile to the measure,

which, among other things, religious authorities appear to oppose, and these bishops are supported by a scriptural exhibition which, even if it was not ob-

served by reason of its being a part of the Mosaic code that has been superseded by a higher law, has no actual bearing upon the subject in dispute.

It is this "Neither shall thou take a wife to thy brother's widow, etc." which, it is said, is the cause of the opposition.

It is remarkable to perceive that under these circumstances—advanced age and ill-health—a sentence of imprisonment for two years would be an adequate punishment for life. Every mortal appearance pointed that way, and virtually so it has turned out.

It is that the promptness of action on the part of President Harrison indicates that a much more humane sentiment pervades the breast of the chief executive than animates the judicial functionaries of the government.

Through the courtesy of the veterans whose spirit took the right of the field, the

alleged heart of at least one of the judicial functionaries was moved,

and it is to be hoped that the same will be done for the deceased wife's sister after the death of her husband.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not suppose unless one is unwilling and opposing it by a living will—will not qualify under "no fault" marriages.

It is remarkable to perceive that the law quoted for a man from marrying two sisters while they are still living—which we do not