

FROM THURSDAY'S DAILY APRIL 14.

The First Company.—On Saturday, April 16, the first company of this year's emigration from Europe will leave Liverpool in the steamship *Nevada*.

Refused.—Yesterday afternoon, in the *habeas corpus* proceedings before Judge Zane, the petition of A. H. Neff, for release from imprisonment after serving 30 days for his fine, was refused. His fine and costs, amounting to \$489.85, were advanced by O. P. Arnold, and he was released.

Arrested.—Yesterday Samuel Rideout was arrested at Hooper on a charge of unlawful cohabitation by Deputy Whetstone. He was taken before Commissioner Black, and pleading guilty was placed under \$1,500 bonds to appear before the grand jury. His wife Elizabeth was placed under \$200 bonds. Security was furnished by A. T. Wright and Geo. H. Tribe.

Booth's Programme.—The Union Pacific folks have issued a special time card of the movements of Edwin Booth and his company from the 17th to the 25th. On the morning of the 17th they leave this city, going via Ogden City and Weber and Echo Canyons, arriving in Cheyenne on Monday the 18th, where one performance will be given. Denver is the next point, where four performances are announced. On the 25th Omaha will be reached.

Adultery.—Mrs. Mary White, the woman who was before Commissioner McKay yesterday afternoon on a charge of adultery, was held to await the action of the grand jury. Her bonds were fixed at \$1,000, which she was unable to furnish, and was sent to the penitentiary. The circumstances of the case are not fit for publication. The companion of the woman in the crime, Frank Engler, escaped from the City Hotel at the time of the police raid, and has not since been apprehended.

A Useful Pamphlet.—J. H. Parry & Co. have just issued a pamphlet which will be of much value for reference. It should also be studiously perused by the young men of the community. It contains: The Declaration of Independence, The Constitution of the United States, Washington's Farewell Address, The Anti-Polygamy Law of 1862, The Poland Law of 1874, The Edmunds-Tucker Law of 1887; also, the Instructions to Registrars and the Test Oaths Formulated by the Utah Commission, and the Suggestions of the Central Committee of the People's Party.

Arrivals, Releases and Appointments.—On Wednesday, March 9th, Elders Ephraim H. Williams and Alfred Spencer arrived in Liverpool per S. S. *Alaska*, in good health and excellent spirits.

Elders Jos. D. Smith, President of the Irish Mission, and D. P. Callister, Traveling Elder in the Nottingham Conference, are released to return home with the April 19th company.

Elder James P. Low, of the Glasgow Conference, is appointed to the Presidency of the Irish Mission.

Elder E. H. Williams is appointed to labor in the Nottingham Conference, and Elder A. Spencer in the Birmingham Conference.

Accidentally Killed.—We have just received a communication from Montpelier, Idaho, giving the details of a fatality which occurred there on the 27th ult. It seems that a young girl named Nellie M. Kirk, while out riding was accidentally thrown from her horse and her foot catching in the stirrup, the frantic steed dashed away with her, continuing his wild career in spite of all the efforts of her friends until she was so terribly shaken and bruised that her injuries resulted in death. She was the daughter of I. F. and M. E. O. De Kirk and was born June 10th, 1875, in Montpelier, Idaho Territory. The horror-stricken parents were rendered almost frantic with grief at her sad fate. Our informant is Julia D. Dillman.

The Alleged Thieves.—Yesterday afternoon John H. Gibbons and Willard F. Allen, the D. & R. G. W. brakemen whose arrest on a charge of grand larceny was noted in the News a short time ago, were brought before Commissioner McKay for a preliminary hearing. They are charged with having stolen some goods shipped from San Francisco to a firm in Gunnison, Colorado. The prosecution endeavored to prove that the defendants had appropriated the goods to their own use, and that one of them, Gibbons, was then wearing a suit of clothes made out of the stolen cloth by Buckle & Son. The evidence introduced made out a pretty strong case against the accused, but pending the introduction of another witness for the prosecution, a postponement was had until this afternoon.

Court Notes.—Proceedings in the Third District Court to-day: Wm. Fuller vs. Salt Lake & Fort Douglas Railway Company; demurrer to complaint overruled; ten days to answer.

Crescent Mining Company vs. Wasatch Mining Company; demurrer overruled; ten days to answer.

Hyman Steadman, Morris Raphael and John Brough were admitted to citizenship.

Wasatch Mining Company vs. J. A. Jennings et al.; motion for new trial argued and submitted.

Bunce vs. Decker; demurrer confessed; twenty days to answer.

The grand jury for the term was impaneled and received the instructions of the court.

Prisoner Recaptured.—One of the prisoners confined in the county jail at Provo, serving out his sentence for petit larceny, and considered trusty, took a notion on Tuesday evening to "skip;" accordingly, about dusk and just before locking up time, he left the jail yard, and as it afterwards became known, started for Idaho. Deputy Sheriff Thomas Fowler being in attendance at the jail, saddled his horse and went after him. After some little difficulty in ascertaining which route he had taken, he succeeded in tracking him to the Point of the Mountain and from there to Salt Lake City, where he managed, by keeping on a warm trail, to run him down, and last night lodged him in the city jail for safe keeping, returning with him to Provo on this morning's train.

Deputy Registrars.—The Utah Commission have appointed the following additional deputy registration officers:

GARFIELD COUNTY.

Pangulitch—Albert De Long; Coyote—Edward Allen; Cannonville—William Thompson; Hillsdale—John Wauson.

RICH COUNTY.

Woodruff—Stephen Fraser; Randolph—John Dykens; Lake Town—A. Nebeker; Meadowville and Gordon—J. S. Moffatt.

SANPETE COUNTY.

Mount Pleasant, F. C. Jensen; Spring City, Jacob Johnson; Ephraim, George Quinn; Manti, George Fox; Petty, William Dickson; Mayfield, H. P. Larsen; Gunnison, J. M. Robbins; Dover, William M. Scott; Chester, E. J. Conrad; Moroni, N. E. Eliason; Wales, H. C. Beaumann; Fountain Green, C. H. Moore; Fairview, Joseph S. Wing, Sr.; Thistle, Nelson Tidwell; Winter Quarters, E. L. Carpenter.

A GRAND JURY.

THE BOARD OF INQUISITORS IMPAELED AT LAST.

This afternoon the Third District Court completed the work of impaneling a grand jury for the April term. The following were first called for examination:

176 Richard Duerden, 167 John Nimmo, 177 F. S. Fox.

Mr. Duerden was excused for his belief in plural marriage.

Mr. Nimmo was not a taxpayer and was excused.

Mr. Fox was accepted.

137 G. L. Bemis and 191 Wm. Fennemore then took their places.

Mr. Bemis was excused as he was not a taxpayer.

Mr. Fennemore was not a citizen.

171 H. D. Jones and 27 Moses Hirschman were called and accepted.

Mr. Varian said that one juror, Mr. Pack, desired further interrogation.

Mr. Pack stated in reply to Mr. Varian, that he would not convey information voluntarily as to those whom he believed to be living in polygamy; he thought such an act would detract from his self-respect; he would do it if so ordered by the court, but would rather be excused; thought he could perform the duties of a grand juror, but they would be unpleasant in that respect. He was accepted.

The test oath was then administered to the jurors. The panel is as follows:

123 H. W. Haight, 153 L. B. Yerxa, 15 J. H. Walker, Jr., 75 J. F. Corker, 85 E. Wilkes, Jr., 194 John Pack, Jr., 33 Augustus Podiech, 173 G. B. Barstow, 65 L. B. Rogers, 37 Henry Monheim, 45 Jacob Alt, 6 Thos. Mitchell, 177 F. S. Fox, 171 H. D. Jones, 39 M. Hirschman.

FROM MONDAY'S DAILY, APRIL 18.

PECULIAR DOINGS.

Mr. Dickson and the Court Leap Outside of the Law.

THE EXAMINATION OF JURORS IN RELATION TO THE TEST OATH.

To-day there was a fair attendance at the Third District Court to witness the proceedings. The names of those present, in obedience to the summons as petit jurors, were:

64 D. W. Hunter, 66 D. M. McAllister, 192 John P. Benson, 166 Geo. Hardman, 144 H. Barker, 105 John Erickson, 188 H. W. Barnes, 174 Enos Stookey, 144 John F. Colad, 142 S. Brinkhurst, Jr., 115 J. W. Campbell, 98 E. Snelgrove, 81 J. P. Bradley, 102 J. Hennessy, 182 David Cook, 10 E. J. Swanson, 416 Chas. Crismon, 154 Thos. Williams, 65 Jos. A. Silver, 87 A. D. Woolley, 175 E. E. Phillips, 116 J. W. Andrew, 96 W. S. Brighton, 178 Robt. Ure, 35 Alex. Rogers, 107 Emory Ward, 181 P. H. Tower, 189 Lucien Symons, 127 Louis Strasburg.

Mr. Phillips handed a note to the Court, and was excused.

The jurors were called, and requested to be sworn on their voir dire.

Mr. Stookey—I ain't prepared to take the oath.

The Court—Well, you can take that afterwards. What oath do you refer to—do you mean you want to affirm, or swear?

A.—No, the oath.

The Court—Well, you will have a chance to take that afterwards.

(The jury were thereupon sworn to answer questions as to their competency to act as petit jurors at the April 1887 term.)

DANIEL M. HUNTER, examined by Mr. Dickson:

Q.—Where do you live, Mr. Hunter?

A.—Fourth Ward, in this city.

Q.—How long have you resided in this county?

A.—About twenty years, I think.

Q.—Are you a citizen of the United States?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Native born?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are a taxpayer within the Territory, are you?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And you read and write the English language?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you believe it right for a man to have more than one living and undivorced wife at the same time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you believe that that is the law of God?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath that you will not obey that law?

A.—I wouldn't like to take an oath to that effect.

Q.—You wouldn't like to take an oath that you would not hereafter obey the law?

A.—No, sir.

Challenged and excused.

[In the foregoing examination of Mr. Hunter the proceedings are given in full. In those that follow the ordinary questions and answers are omitted, those bearing upon the test oath only being given.]

DUNCAN M. McALLISTER was next called and interrogated.

Q.—Do you believe it right for a man to have more than one living and undivorced wife?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath that you will not obey the law?

A.—I am willing to take the oath.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath—do you believe that to be the law of God?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you hold any office in the Church—Mormon Church?

A.—I am an Elder in the Church.

Q.—An Elder in the Church—have been for a long time, I suppose?

A.—I have.

Q.—And you believe that plural marriage is according to the law of God?

A.—I do.

Q.—And yet you are willing to swear that you will not obey the law of God as you understand it—that you will not hereafter, at any time, take a plural wife, although you believe it to be the law of God—a divine law?

A.—I am willing to take an oath to the effect that I have no intention—

Q.—No present intention, you mean?

A.—No intention.

Q.—What do you mean by that, no intention at this time when you take the oath?

A.—No intention to take another wife.

Q.—Do you mean by that no present intention?

A.—Well, yes, of course, that is what I mean.

Q.—Do you recognize or understand or believe that you would be at liberty to take the oath now, having no present intention to take another wife—that you would be at liberty next week, or next month, or next year, if you changed your mind, to take another wife in obedience to the Divine law?

A.—Well, I believe—

Q.—Just answer that question.

A.—When I take the oath—

Q.—Just answer that question.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it your understanding that inasmuch as you have no present intention of taking another wife, that you might conscientiously take the oath, and next week, or next month, or next year, if you changed your mind, you would be at liberty to and be justified in taking another wife in obedience to the Divine law?

A.—As I understand your question now, you are obligating me to say something in reward to what I may do in the future?

Q.—That is just what the oath requires you to say, that you will not—

A.—So far as—

Q.—Wait a moment.

A.—So far as I can comprehend the meaning of the oath when I take it, I am under obligations to observe what I state, that I will not take another wife.

Q.—You understand that the oath don't say—you are not required to swear that it is not your present intention to take another wife, but the law requires, if you take the oath, that you shall swear that you will not hereafter—take another wife; are you willing to take that oath?

A.—Yes, sir, I am willing to take that oath.

JOHN BENSON.

Q.—Do you believe it right for a man to have more than one living and undivorced wife at the same time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath that you will not obey that law?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You decline to take the oath?

A.—Yes, sir.

Mr. Dickson—Mr. Benson is disqualified.

The Court—You are excused.

GEORGE HARDMAN.

Q.—Do you believe it right, according to the law of God, that a man may have more than one living and undivorced wife at the same time?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath that you will not hereafter obey that law?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you believe it right, according to the law of God, that a man may have more than one wife at the same time?

A.—Well, not much.

Q.—How?

A.—No, not very often.

Q.—And you cannot say now whether or no you regard this alleged revelation touching plural marriage, as a

A.—I wouldn't like to.

Mr. Dickson—We excuse Mr. Hardman.

The Court—You are excused.

HENRY HARKER.

Q.—Mr. Harker, I will ask you if you believe it right, according to the law of God, that a man should have and may have more than one wife at the same time?

A.—Well, that is something that I have never given a study yet.

Q.—Are you a member of the so-called Mormon Church?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—In fellowship?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You partake of its Sacrament?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you hold any office in the Church?

A.—Well, as a trustee—trustee—an office of trustee is all I hold; not in the Church, no Church office, I don't hold.

Q.—Not an Elder or a Teacher?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—But you are in fellowship and partake of the Sacraments of the Church?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You understand, of course, that it is one of the tenets of the faith that plural marriage has been revealed as a divine ordinance?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—And have you no opinion as to whether it is a genuine or a spurious revelation?

A.—Well, I have never made it a study.

Q.—Have you read the revelation?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have heard it preached and taught?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—By this Church. Do you regard it as a spurious and false doctrine?

A.—No, I don't.

Q.—How?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You understand that the leaders of your Church claim to have received such a revelation from the Almighty?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you believe that any such revelation was received, or do you reject it?

A.—Well, I wouldn't reject it.

Q.—Do you accept it?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You believe, then, that it is a divine law?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Are you willing to take an oath that you will not hereafter obey that law?

A.—Well, not under the present circumstances, I wouldn't take such an oath.

(Challenged and excused.)

John Erickson was not a believer in plural marriage and was passed without further examination.

R. W. BARNES.

Q.—Do you believe it right, Mr. Barnes, according to the Divine law, that a man should have more than one living and undivorced wife at the same time?

A.—Well, under certain circumstances I believe it is right.

Q.—You believe that such a revelation as that has been given to the Church of which you are a member?

A.—How is that?

Q.—You believe that such a revelation as that has been given to the Church of which you are a member?

A.—Well, I have been taught that; as for my belief, I don't know that I could say that I believe it or disbelieve it; I don't know.

Q.—Well, do you reject that as a spurious and false doctrine?

A.—Well, I can neither reject it nor believe it; I don't know whether it is true or false.

Q.—Are you in fellowship with the Church?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—You attend its services?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Partake of its sacraments?

A.—Not always, no, sir.

Q.—Occasionally?

A.—Sometimes.

Q.—When you have the inclination to do so?

A.—How is that?

Q.—When you feel inclined to do so?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are in good standing in the Church?

A.—I suppose so; I don't know anything to the contrary.

Q.—You know that the leaders of your Church claim that such a revelation was received by them from the Almighty, do you not?

A.—Yes, sir; I think—I understand that.

Q.—Do you believe that they did receive such a revelation, or do you believe that they are endeavoring to impose a false doctrine upon their members and followers?

A.—Well, I haven't given the matter sufficient study; I can't say that I believe it or reject it, as I said before I don't know.

Q.—How old are you?

A.—I was 21 last Wednesday.

Q.—You have received some education?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have read the revelation?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You have listened a number of years to the teachings of the Church in regard to that revelation?

A.—Well, yes, not so very often.

Q.—Yet have you never thought of it?

A.—Well, not much.

Q.—How?

A.—No, not very often.

Q.—And you cannot say now whether or no you regard this alleged revelation touching plural marriage, as a

spurious