

## FROM EX-MARSHAL IRELAND.

The following statement by Ex-Marshall Ireland, respecting the report of the late grand jury, has been heretofore crowded out by the press of matter on our columns:

The grand jury report published the 15th instant, on the conduct of the marshal's office, purports to cover the period from 1882 to the present time.

The report says, "We find the management of that office to have been the same during the period covered by this report." It then goes on to show where fraudulent and wrongful acts were committed in the management of the penitentiary, as well as the marshal's office proper.

If these charges refer, or are intended to refer, to my administration of the United States Marshal's office, I assert they are without any foundation in truth.

I can speak only for myself and not for others. It is true that a portion of the potatoes charged and used at the penitentiary were raised there, partly by prison labor and entirely at the marshal's expense of team, seed and tools. This was brought about, as the grand jury well knew, by the refusal of the government to provide means for raising them, and the difficulty of obtaining funds to purchase them as needed.

Milk was furnished by the marshal's cows during my term at much less than it could have been purchased. In no case were prisoners furnished with milk at their expense. A fair average price for the year was charged for potatoes. It is not true that greater prices were paid for supplies for the year than the regular market. Special prices could not be had, as it was well known that payments must sometimes wait deficiency appropriation from one to three years.

It is not true that my fed to my team was paid for by the Government. The department consented to pay for the necessary grain in consideration of the great amount of supplies hauled to the penitentiary, for which no charge was made.

It is not true that I was paid by the grocery firm or any other for the hauling of their goods. Not one dollar was so paid; the government allowed \$15 per month for hauling meat and that was all ever received by me.

There have been no fraudulent vouchers rendered by me.

The supplies furnished were not excessive in quantity, nor can it be shown.

The prices paid were not extravagant or above the market.

The wagon account "imposition" is simply this: I advised the government to furnish its own team, and was not heeded. To hire from the livery would cost more than double what the government paid me. This has been shown to the grand jury. There was no imposition in my wagon account, as those gentlemen well know; on the contrary, a great saving was made by the arrangement. If this is doubted, it can be

easily settled by inquiry at the livery stables.

That it is bad policy for the marshal or any employe to keep property or animals about the penitentiary I fully agree, but the grand jury should place the blame where it belongs, to-wit, with the government.

It is a well-known fact that it is not true that persons convicted of violation of the laws of Congress against polygamy and unlawful cohabitation were allowed greater liberties or favors than those imprisoned for other offenses.

Regarding the item of team hire in the Marshal's office, it is true that as \$15 per day was charged and paid for team and subsistence, and even more than that in some instances, but never for my own team: In all such cases it was the actual amount paid, and the money was well earned.

It is well known here that during a portion of the time covered by the investigation, the work in the Marshal's office was very arduous; means at the disposal of the Marshal for the enforcement of the laws of Congress were very limited; men and teams were often run for twenty-four hours without rest.

If I have been guilty of any attempt, directly or by inclination, to defraud the government, I understand that I am subject to criminal as well as civil prosecution, and it is the duty of the government to call me to account through its courts. I assure the government officials in advance, that in no case will I permit the statute of limitation to be interposed as a defense.

E. A. IRELAND,  
SALT LAKE, Dec. 20th, 1889.

## POLITICS OF MANY NATIONS.

A rumor comes from Vienna, that centre of dubious reports, to the effect that the Sultan has invited the Czar to visit Constantinople, and that the latter has accepted the invitation, has caused a flutter among European diplomats. The reports which have lately been sent out from St. Petersburg as to the Czar having taken no pains to conceal his astonishment that the German Emperor should pay a visit to the Sultan were undoubtedly authentic, and represented accurately the Czar's feelings. When, however, it was learned that the Emperor would go to Constantinople despite the amazement of the northern potentate. It is probable that the Czar, seeing the necessity of offsetting the Emperor's action and counteracting the influences of his conference with the commander of the faithful, resolved to confer with the Sultan himself. Under none of the existing circumstances could he pay a gratuitous visit to the city whose inclusion within the Russian domain he most covets, as the guest of the sovereign whose capital he would invade, but an invitation was the easiest thing possible to obtain. The Russian ambassador to the Porte had only to intimate in the most vague manner that his imperial master would be

pleased to accept the hospitality of his whilom enemy and the object was accomplished. The Sultan himself, one of the most finished diplomats of the time, was equal to the occasion, and forthwith there issued a note couched in the most affectionate terms, soliciting the honor of the Czar's presence in the city of Mosques. The time definitely fixed for the visit is the early part of next year, an arrangement most favorable to the Sultan, as sufficient time will have elapsed for him to realize some of the benefits which will undoubtedly attach to him from the visit of the Kaiser to enable him to make a date with the Czar which will be advantageous to both. Both Emperor and Czar have much to gain from certain voluntary concessions on the part of Turkey, which neither will permit the other to obtain by force of arms, while the Sultan has nothing to lose in any event. The semi-hostility of the powers toward one another, arising from their jealousies, guarantees to him absolute security in the position from which each would be delighted to oust him. It is evident, however, that though the two emperors will obtain from the Sultan concessions of great benefit to their respective governments, the wily Mussulman will secure from each assurances of his freedom from molestation that will enable him to devote more time to the negotiations of loans and less to the cares of the state.

The new law which the German government has introduced into Parliament, on the subject of socialism, is exciting much discussion in Germany. It was in 1867 that the first vote of exceptional powers was made, for the purpose of suppressing socialistic agitation, but they were voted only for a period of two years, so that the government has had to come from time to time asking their renewal. The new law, if it passes, is to be a permanent measure. A long report is submitted to Parliament along with the new bill, in which the government sets forth the history of the similar measure of the past, and declares that it does not combat ideas or teaching, but only violations of the public peace and dangerous agitation. Prussia, Saxony, Hesse-Darmstadt and Hamburg approve the bill; the other states—a large majority—give only a conditional assent. To secure their end, that is, a permanent grant of power, the government leaders are willing to modify the existing law in some minor particulars. For example, they propose a committee on complaints, composed of magistrates, before whom cases of alleged abuse of the law can be brought. Their concessions by no means satisfy the opposition. The national liberals strongly object to the bill in its present shape. They desire that the Supreme Court shall have jurisdiction in cases of alleged abuse, and to have an appeal to that court act as a stay on all proceedings till the case is heard. They also oppose the clause giving the government the right of expulsion of social-