

### THE PRATT FAMILY REUNION.

The Pratt family reunion took place on Wednesday, at Liberty Park. About 200 relatives and friends assembled and partook of picnic under the shade of the trees. President Taylor and Counselor D. H. Wells, with a number of their families, joined in the festivities of the occasion.

President John Taylor said he was pleased to meet with the Pratt family and spend a little time with the wives and children of his early associates. Brother Parley brought the Gospel to him. He (President Taylor) was then living in Toronto, Upper Canada. After that Brothers Orson Pratt and Orson Hyde came over there and they all labored to build up a branch of the Church, and he (Brother T.) was chosen to preside. Their long associations had been of the most friendly character. There had never been an unpleasant word between either of these brethren; sometimes there had been pretty hard "scratching" to get along, as these older members of the family well understood. It was not all fair sailing. I have been thinking since I came down here to-day what a change there is in the family of Brother Parley. When I first knew him he had only one wife, a very delicate woman indeed. I remember that she and Brother Pratt came over to Canada to make us a visit. There had been a prophecy about Mrs. Pratt having a child. I believe Brother Heber C. Kimball was the author, and he went so far as to say it should be a son, and his name "Parley." It seemed a most unlikely thing that this delicate lady could have a child, she being about 40 years old and very feeble. There was considerable interest over the prediction, and my wife said to me, "Well, if that woman has a child, I will believe Mormonism, sure."

I went up to Kirtland and while there Mrs. Pratt was confined, and sure enough this boy was born, although it cost the life of his mother. She died immediately after giving birth to this promised son. Here Brother Taylor enquired if Parley was present, being told that he was absent, the President remarked that he, Parley, was that child. I was thinking had it not been for polygamy, most of you present would not have been here to-day. When I returned to Canada, many members of the branch asked me what about Mrs. Pratt. I told them that she had gone to another sphere, when their countenances fell. "How about the promised babe?" they inquired. "Oh," said I, "that's all right, he is safe." When they heard this, their faces beamed with joy and faith sprang up in their souls.

Brother Orson was more fortunate in his case. His first wife had a large family. I am pleased to be associated with you and to know that you cling to the faith of your fathers. I have noticed that the boys are true to their covenants, and when called to fill missions they go; I think there are several now performing labor of this kind, viz: Helaman, in Mexico; Milson started yesterday to India and Moroni L. is in England. These mothers have striven to bring you along in the right way. God bless them. They like many others have not had the easiest time while their husbands were filling missions in the farthest parts of the earth.

I rejoice that you are following in the footsteps of your fathers. May you honor virtue and pursue a noble course and increase in every good that will commend you to the righteous, that the name of Pratt may be perpetuated in the earth. I could ill spare the time to come out to-day, as I must leave to-morrow, but I wanted to see you and become acquainted with the children of my old associates. They have left us some time, but their works will follow them. God bless you all. Amen.

Speeches and songs by members of the family were then given, and a general good time enjoyed. An organization was effected by the appointing of a committee consisting of Parley P. Pratt, Milando Pratt, Alma Pratt, Belinda Musser and Larinda Weihe. The committee were instructed to take steps to have a family reunion every year from this time. Milando Pratt was chosen custodian of the Pratt family record, after which the party retired to their homes, cheered and comforted by the association and meeting together.

### MR. DICKSON'S DEFENCE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY W. H. DICKSON is out with a defence of the Supreme Court of this Territory in its action in the Hopt case. He thinks that "the press has assailed the court with a ferocity and virulence which will scarcely be justified upon cool reflection." We do not take this to mean the DESERET NEWS, as we have not used any language to justify these expressions; other papers can answer for themselves. Mr. Dickson admits that it is "a gross absurdity to deny that the judiciary had the power" to make the order staying the execution, "otherwise the writ which is given as a matter of right is rendered nugatory by the execution of the prisoner before he can have the benefit of it." But he says, in a published communication:

"The question which confronted the judges was, which court had the power

—the Supreme Court of the United States, to which the case had been removed by virtue of the writ of error, and which therefore had jurisdiction over the case? or the Supreme Court of this Territory from which it had been removed?"

This question, he goes on to show, was "debatable," that if the court here had the power, "beyond question it was its duty to have stayed the execution. If it had not the power, just as clearly was it its duty to deny the motion." Admitting that it was debatable, that is, it was an open question whether the court had authority or not to grant the stay, seeing that a man's life was in jeopardy, that he had an undisputed right to an appeal, and that the appeal was pending, if the Court had granted the stay would it not have been recognized by all parties concerned as a lawful exercise of power? Would it not have stayed the execution as fully as did the respite granted by the Executive? Who would have called the Court in question for the exercise of this power under the peculiar circumstances surrounding the case? And would it not have been far more consistent with the general rule and practice, for the Court to have stayed the execution instead of recommending the Executive to exercise power which Mr. Dickson admits is vested in the judiciary?

But there is a point in this case which the District Attorney very ingeniously avoids. Suppose the argument to be correct, that as soon as the writ of error was obtained and the necessary papers were made out and certified, the case passed from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Territory to that of the Supreme Court of the United States, and that therefore the higher court only could issue the stay. How about the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Territory when the application was made for a stay before the writ of error was obtained?

It is a matter of record as it is a matter of fact, that Hopt's attorneys applied for the stay, after the decision of the District Court was affirmed, and that they were opposed by the District Attorney with the objection that the appeal was not taken and possibly might never be taken. On this objection the court refused the application. At least no other reason was offered for its denial. And is it not a fact that when Hopt's attorneys showed that the District Attorney might, after the appeal was taken, claim that the case had passed from the jurisdiction of the court, he answered that it would not matter, as a stay could be had from a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States by telegram?

Just look now at the inconsistency of the position of the Court. They would not give the prisoner a stay of execution because the appeal was not taken, and as soon as the writ was obtained they denied it because it was taken. The Court clearly had the power while the case was within its jurisdiction to grant the stay of execution. Should not the stay have been granted when applied for between the time of the affirmation of the lower court's decision and the obtaining of the writ of error taking the case to the jurisdiction of a higher court? What does Mr. Dickson say himself: "Now if this Court had the power, beyond question it was its duty to have stayed the execution." Will Mr. Dickson deny that the Court had the power at the time we have named? He cannot. Then by his own showing the Court "beyond question" shirked its responsibility.

Mr. Dickson does well to come to the rescue of the court because, as he says, the judges cannot reply to the strictures of the press—and therefore, we acknowledge, the press ought not to be too ready to criticize them—but more because it was he who led the court into its grave error. They refused to grant the stay at the very time they should have granted it, on his representations and objections, and were no doubt led astray by his jaunt remarks about the telegram from a Justice of the Supreme Court, which turned out to be a delusion and a failure.

He says the Supreme Court of the United States was not in session and hence arose the whole difficulty. Did not the Supreme Court here know officially that the higher court was not in session? Did not the District Attorney also know that fact officially? And does not this knowledge materially affect the question as to the culpability of this court in its course towards the prisoner. And now supposing that the Acting-Governor had not seen fit to stretch his authority so as to cover this extraordinary case, and save the life of the appellant who was placed in unlawful jeopardy, at whose door would have been laid the crime of his death? Would not the responsibility have been upon the court which refused to exercise that judicial authority which was the proper power to have intervened?

Mr. Dickson says the press has assailed the court "infected with the popular indignation resulting from a further delay in the execution of the defendant." We are astonished at such a charge from such a source. What has the gentleman done with his logic? Why, the popular indignation was aroused because Hopt was not executed, and the press censured the Court for not saving him from execution! The press blamed them for shifting the responsibility that belonged to them on to the shoulders of the Executive. The press thus

went against the "popular indignation." It wanted the prisoner protected while he had any rights left in law but the popular demand was "let him be shot." We are sorry that the judges have not a better advocate, and still more grieved that they have not a better case. They made a big blunder and the less said about it the better for their Honors.

### THE PREDICTED SPLIT.

SOME of the leading journals are very pronounced in their expressed anticipations of a split in the Republican ranks next November, probably resulting in the defeat of Blaine. It is held that the reason the Stalwarts opposed Arthur and sustained Blaine at the convention was to get rid of the former as the least objectionable of the two, and reserve the climax of their revenge in the shape of an attempt to defeat the election of the latter.

It is notorious that the most implacable hatred has existed between Conkling and Blaine for eighteen years, and the only apparent symptom of relaxation of this antipathy was exhibited in the support given by the Stalwarts to the successful candidate at Chicago. No persons familiar with the dispositions of the two men believe that this action was a real tender of the "olive branch," but look upon it as a means by which future vengeance can be wreaked, and Conkling and Grant are expected soon to move every means within their power to prevent Blaine from carrying New York. He has often wounded the pride of both, and such men as they seldom if ever forgive an affront.

The origin of the bitterness between Blaine and Conkling arose principally from personal remarks made by each in the course of a debate in April 1866. On that occasion Mr. Conkling referred thus to his opponent.

"If the member from Maine had the least idea how profoundly indifferent to his opinion upon the subject which he has been discussing, or upon any other subject personal to me, I am, I think he would hardly take the trouble to rise here and express his opinion. And as it is a matter of entire indifference to me what that opinion may be, I certainly will not detain the House by discussing the question whether it is well or ill founded, or by noticing what he says. I submit the whole matter to the members of the House, making, as I do, an apology (for I feel that it is due to the House) for the length of time which I have occupied in consequence of being drawn into explanations originally by an interruption which I pronounced the other day ungentlemanly and impertinent, and having nothing whatever to do with the question."

The reply from the man from Maine betrayed animosity of equal, if not greater intensity, and was cutting beyond endurance. He said:

"I know that within the last five weeks, as members of this House will recollect, an extra strut has characterized the gentleman's bearing. It is not his fault. That gifted and satirical writer, Theodore Tilton, of the New York Independent, spent some weeks recently in this city. His letters published in that paper embraced, with many serious statements, a little jocose satire, a part of which was the statement that the mantle of the late Winter Davis had fallen upon the member from New York. The gentleman took it seriously, and it has given his strut additional pomposity. The resemblance is great; it is striking. Hyperion to a satyr, Thersites to Hercules, mud to marble, dunghill to diamond, a singed cat to a Bengal tiger, a whining puppy to a roaring lion. Shade of the mighty Davis forgive the almost profanation of that jocose satire!"

The keen sarcasm and terrible ridicule of that speech has rankled in the breast of Mr. Conkling since the day it was uttered, and it is asserted that he believes the hour of his vengeance approaches.

### BY WAY OF EXPLANATION.

THE Salt Lake Herald of Sunday morning contains another communication signed S. A. Kenner, in reference to the DESERET NEWS and its remarks on proceedings growing out of the Hopt case. The writer was evidently very much out of temper when he penned it, and probably not without some cause. But he had no occasion to descend to the scurrility which characterizes his response. Putting aside the epithets which disfigure his communication, the grievance he complains of is the publication in this paper of two dispatches which we clipped from the Ogden Herald of Friday, and the statement made by us that we had ascertained they were forwarded by Mr. Kenner. In refutation of this Mr. Kenner presents the following:

SALT LAKE CITY, June 14th, '84.  
S. A. Kenner, Esq.:

Dear sir:—Referring to the dispatches to the Ogden Herald which this day's issue of the DESERET EVENING NEWS alleges were sent by you, I will say that the files of this office do not show that such dispatches were sent by you or in fact by any one; and further I have no personal or official knowledge of such dispatches.

Yours Truly,  
F. D. GILES,  
Mgr. W. U. Telegraph Co.

This of itself would not prove that Mr. Kenner was not the author of these sensational and untruthful communications, as there were other means by which they could have been forwarded; and the mere fact that the manager of the telegraph office had no knowledge of such dispatches is not conclusive evidence that they were not forwarded; we presume that the wires sometimes convey messages that are not placed on file, and of which the manager has neither personal nor official knowledge. But Mr. Kenner states in the most positive manner that he did not send the dispatches, and further that he knew nothing about them till they appeared in print. That is quite sufficient for us, and would have been without any documentary evidence from the manager of the telegraph office. And we think that his denial is not strengthened by calling the writer of the article in the News a liar, and accusing the News itself of resorting to "actual lying to bolster up its position."

Let us see, now, how much ground there is for this grave charge couched in such intemperate language. The facts are these: The sensational and untruthful dispatches were published in the Ogden Herald of Friday evening. There can be no dispute as to that. They were appended to a longer communication purporting also to be a special dispatch to the Ogden Herald, signed "K." The opinion was expressed to us by persons not connected with either paper that the K stood for Kenner, and that he was the author of all the dispatches. The Ogden Herald office was telephoned and the question was asked whether Mr. Kenner sent those dispatches in reference to Hopt, and the answer came back, "Yes." The question was repeated so as to be sure there was no mistake.

This is how we "ascertained" that Mr. Kenner sent the dispatches. Suppose we were misinformed, either by error or intention on the part of our informant, does that justify the statement of Mr. Kenner, that the News "ascertained no such thing," and that "it lies infamously when it says so?" To ascertain, is to make sure; to establish with precision; to make confident. After receiving the reply we were made confident that the surmise was correct, and therefore stated we had so ascertained. We had the additional reason for believing Mr. Kenner to be the author of those dispatches, in the fact that in his first communication on the subject of the mass meeting most of his attack on the News was based on misstatement of our language. He pretended to quote from the News that which did not appear in the News. And as he was inaccurate in one case we had some reason for believing that he was inaccurate in another. And the reply from Ogden confirmed us in our view and rendered it reasonably certain.

We have made further inquiries of the Ogden Herald and have received answer that in replying "yes" our informant "referred to the correspondence and dispatches in a general way," and did not think his remark was to be used for publication, and explains what he says he ought to have done at the time, namely that the correspondence published as a dispatch came from Mr. Kenner, but the second and third—which are the objectionable items—were sent from Salt Lake by telephone from what was considered a reliable source. Thus it will be seen that the whole matter was a mistake and there was no "infamous lying" about it at all.

Mr. Kenner says "The gentlemanly qualities of the News writer are further illustrated by insinuating that I was drunk at the time." Here is what the News said: "Charity suggests that the author was slightly unbalanced by the spirit of the mass meeting or some other exciting cause and was 'not himself at all.'" If "the spirit of the mass meeting" was the spirit of liquor, and if there is no other exciting cause that could affect the gentleman, there might be some reason for the conclusion which he has jumped at that we accused him of being drunk; but as it is, it is only a hasty assumption. Mr. Kenner establishes his own "gentlemanly qualities" beyond dispute by his second intemperate and vituperative communication. And even if we had insinuated that he was slightly unbalanced in the manner he himself suggests, by his own showing it would have been more agreeable to his feelings than to intimate that he lied. He misquoted the News and assailed the misquotations, and we charitably responded that he was excited instead of imitating his own "gentlemanly" style and saying that he "lied."

How much cause was there for Mr. Kenner's assault on the News? Simply this. We said: "The action at the mass meeting to-day was, in our opinion, characterized more by unreasonable sentiment than cool and consistent argument." He thereupon rushed into print with a defense against what he intimated the News had said about the "motives and utterances of those who attended the mass meeting;" about the "impulse which brought the meeting together;" and sundry other things that the News had said nothing about. And he undertook to insinuate unworthy motives to the News and to cast ridicule upon it for expressions that it had never used. This may be very "gentlemanly" but it does not strike us in that light. But why should Mr. Kenner become so excited about those few words in reference to the mass meeting? We did not mention his

name, either in connection with our opinion as to its action, or as "an active participant in the proceedings." He does not figure as one of the speakers in the local report, and we never thought about him in connection with the affair. We learned afterwards as a mere incident that he was one of a committee to present the Resolution passed by the meeting to the Acting-Governor, that was all.

And now was there not some "unreasonable sentiment" at that meeting? Was the motion, received with loud applause, that "the execution be proceeded with and the law points settled afterwards," a "cool and consistent argument?" Was there anything consistent in the action intended to result in killing a prisoner who had an undisputed right to an appeal, while his appeal was pending and before it could be heard? We need not pursue this matter further, and will only add that the News has no desire to "deprive any young man" or old man "of his only capital of life," that it has not attempted to do so, and that if anything in this controversy has tended to damage the "good reputation" of Mr. Kenner it certainly has not originated with the News.

### ANOTHER "SPAULDING STORY" REFUTED.

A SHORT time ago the Pittsburg, Pa., Leader, published a statement made by Rev. W. R. Coover, to the effect that Sidney Rigdon had acknowledged that the manuscript said to have been written by Solomon Spaulding, was stolen by him (Rigdon) while he was working at a printing office in Ohio, where Spaulding had left it for publication, and that after stealing it he gave it to Joseph Smith who, with his aid, fixed it up as the Book of Mormon. This story was swallowed with avidity by anti-"Mormon" preachers and papers, and the statement was copied as supplying the missing connection between Rigdon and Smith previous to the publication of the Book of Mormon.

The generally disseminated story is that Spaulding left his manuscript with one Patterson, a printer in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and that by some means Sidney Rigdon, perhaps working as a printer, got hold of it and conveyed it to Joseph Smith. But investigation has demonstrated that Spaulding's manuscript whatever it may have been—it is clear that it was not anything like what has been claimed for it—was taken to the printer Patterson in Pittsburg not later than 1814; that it was not suitable for publication and was taken by its author to Amity, where he died in 1816, and a trunk containing it was removed by his widow and daughter to Sabine, Onondaga County, New York; that in 1820, after Mrs. Spaulding's marriage to Mr. Davidson, her second husband, it was conveyed to her new home at Hazelwicks, New York, where it remained till 1834, when one Hurlburt, a bitter and wicked apostate "Mormon," obtained it for the purpose of proving that the Book of Mormon was made up from it, but the book was never published, nor was the manuscript seen afterwards. It is also certain that Sidney Rigdon was not a printer; that he was not in Pittsburg until 1822, when he was called to be Pastor of the First Baptist Church at that place; that he never saw the Book of Mormon or knew anything of Joseph Smith until the fall of 1830, when Parley P. Pratt showed it to him for the first time; and that he did not see Joseph Smith until early in 1831, about a year after the Book of Mormon was published. It is established that the Spaulding's manuscript was said to be in Patterson's office at Pittsburg, Sidney Rigdon was a youth of twenty years working at home on a farm and living with his mother in St. Clair township, Alleghany County; and the Joseph Smith was but nine years of age and living with his parents at Sharon, Windsor County, New York, removing with them shortly after to Palmyra in the same State.

The connection of Spaulding and Rigdon, of Patterson and Rigdon, and of Rigdon with the Prophet Joseph has never been established or even approached. It was but the wildest kind of conjecture, and every attempt to bolster it up by pretended affidavits and the alleged recollections of old ladies and gentlemen under a cross-fire of interested questions, have only resulted in displaying the weakness of each endeavor, and in furnishing facts which refute the nonsensical theory. But it was thought that this statement of Coover's, although it was contradictory of known facts and data, and of statements previously quoted by anti-"Mormons" in support of their notion, would supply the connection heretofore impossible to make and establish the theory of the Spaulding origin of the Book of Mormon.

But alas! for the hopes of the Spauldingites—if we may use that term—the same paper in which Coover's fabrication appeared has recently published a refutation thereof, which we clip from the Pittsburg Leader as follows:

It will be remembered by our readers that just previous to the commencement of the debate with Rev. Kelley on the Mormon question, Rev. W. R. Coover stated to a Leader reporter that Sidney Rigdon, a former resident of Pittsburg, had stolen the manuscript of the Mormon Bible, which had been written by a Doctor Spaulding,