

THE DESERET WEEKLY,

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, - - - \$2.50
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, - - - 1.60
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

Saturday, - - - May 7, 1892

THE TEMPLE LOT IN JACKSON COUNTY

THE taking of depositions in the suit brought by the Reorganized or "Josephite" Church against the Church of Christ or "Hedrickites," for possession of the Temple grounds at Independence, Missouri, was resumed at that place on the 18th inst. Among the witnesses examined was Charles Johnson, of Southwest, Missouri, who married Maria Louise Cowdery, daughter of Oliver Cowdery. It was through Johnson that the "Josephites" obtained the quit-claim deed on which they base one of their pretended "rights" to the property in question. His wife and her mother died a short time ago within forty-eight hours of each other, and particulars were published in our columns.

In cross-examination it was disclosed that this man and his wife had done considerable business in signing quit-claim deeds for land to which they declared they held title, people paying them in order to quiet litigation. From the *Kansas City Journal* we learn that the witness claimed that through his wife's inheritance by reason of being the daughter of Oliver Cowdery, who had large real estate interests in Jackson county in an early day, he had title to seventy-three acres in the western portion of the city and also in Kansas City. The witness stated that about two years ago Bishop Kelley, of the Reorganized church, had visited him and paid him \$100 for a quit-claim deed to the Temple lot.

Johnson signed the quit-claim deed, he said, for the \$100 and an oral consideration. The oral consideration was that suit should be brought for the possession of the Temple lot, and all expenses of such suit were to be paid by the church. The outcome of this suit, the witness thought, would materially aid him in establishing his claim to the land without expense to himself. After once establishing his claim in the Circuit court of the United States, he would be able to reap a harvest of shakels from property owners who would, in order to sell their property, have to give a clear title. Some of the finest residences in the city are located on this land, and Johnson could collect handsomely from people who have dwelt in fancied security.

In addition to this shaky title purchased by the Josephites, they base their claim on the absurd notion that the original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was disorganized, at the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and that the "Reorganized" church is its successor. On this theory, every time the First Presidency becomes disorgan-

ized by a vacancy in the office of President, the entire Church becomes disorganized and a new Church has to be started or the whole thing is dead. Against this ridiculous notion is the established order of the Priesthood as set forth in the Doctrine and Covenants, by which the Church is to be perpetuated, its Presidency chosen and appointed by the body, and all vacancies in its quorums and councils filled, that it may endure for ever.

Whatever errors of doctrine and discipline may have been imbibed by the "Hedrickites," they are in peaceable and lawful possession of the property which they have bought and paid for, and the present underhanded attempt to oust them and wrest from them this land, cannot be too strongly condemned by fair and honest people.

A CAREER OF EXTRAVAGANCE.

THE taxpayers of Salt Lake City should pay attention to what is going on in the City Council. If they will read the minutes of the meetings of that body they will learn that the extravagance and recklessness of the preceding "Liberal" body are not only reproduced but increased in the present. Nearly every week new offices with large salaries are created, and schemes devised to spend the people's money unnecessarily. The latest proposition is to bond the city to its utmost legal limit. The sum of \$800,000 is wanted in addition to the regular income from taxes, licenses, fines, etc., and it is boldly demanded and will very likely be obtained by bonds at five per cent. interest.

It will be found on investigation and in experience that the large expenditures in process and in prospect, like the extension of water-mains to uninhabited districts, are chiefly in the interest of real estate speculators and with a view to their profit. There should be a check on this spendthrift spirit and this pandering to the demands of a speculative class. It was expected by many citizens of different parties that the Mayor, as a man of property and experience in local affairs, would act in a conservative spirit and hold the reins of control as far as possible over the more radical members of the Council. Whether his "Liberal" affinities will permit of the exercise of this restraining influence is a matter of doubt. But the beauties of "Liberal" control are becoming more and more apparent to the burdened and helpless taxpayers.

THE CITY OFFICIAL APPOINTING POWER.

THERE appears to be, in the minds of the present city officials, some very wide-range ideas with regard to the distribution of the appointing power. As an instance, at last night's session of the City Council, Treasurer Duke, with much complacency, notified that body that he had appointed A. C. Reese license inspector and requested that the appointment be confirmed.

Is there such an office as "license inspector?" If so, what are his duties? Does it devolve upon him to look after

other officials and see that they attend properly to their business, or what? An inspection of the published volume of ordinances throws no light on these questions. Neither does that book furnish any evidence to the effect that the appointing power to any office is vested in the treasurer.

We have already directed attention to this subject—the appointment of officers aside from the Mayor and Council, the question having been brought up by recent actions of the committee on public construction. They notified the council that they had appointed an inspector of retaining walls and an inspector of sidewalk walks for the Seventh and Eighth paving districts. On the face of these transactions it appears as if the question of their advisability is still pending, as the subject was referred to the committee on streets. It is learned, however, that the first committee had not only made the appointment in the case of the retaining wall sinecure, but had set the appointee agoing in the performance of his alleged duties before sending in any notification to the council.

Even the so-called pavement inspector has—so we are informed—been set to work in performing his real or imaginary labors. Yet the question of the appointments, involving the payment of \$200 a month, is still pending in the hands of the committee on streets, which has as yet made no report, and the Council has taken no action. What kind of a city government is this, anyway?

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE woman suffrage bill which recently passed the New York assembly by a vote of 69 to 34 reads as follows:

"An Act to prevent discrimination on account of sex at elections.

"The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

"Section 1. Every citizen irrespective of sex shall hereafter be entitled to vote for all and every officer hereafter to be elected in this State, and on any question submitted to a vote of the people, and it shall be unlawful to make any discrimination between citizens on account of sex at such elections.

Section 2. No poll clerk, inspector of election or other election officer or person fulfilling such duties shall hereafter refuse to register or to receive the vote of any adult citizen at any such election by reason of the sex of such citizen, provided such citizen shall in all other respects possess the qualifications now required by law.

Section 3. This act shall take effect July, 1893.

This bill is now before the Senate, but in spite of the growing influences in its favor it is not likely to become a law at present. Prejudice is an unreasoning force and requires time and progress to overcome it. Women themselves are not united in demanding it, and this is considered a potent argument against it. Its fallacy is easily exposed, for it is evident that no person should be deprived of a right which he justly claims because another does not want it, but reason cuts very little figure when custom and prejudice prevail.