THE KILLING OF BRASSFIELD.

As we have already published, a Mr. S. Newton Brassfield was killed on 1st South street, Monday evening, April 2d, by a shot from some person still unknown. This summary citation to meet the future has caused quite an amount of comment, as varied in surmises, style and character as are the classes commenting, to which we add some of our views of the case, based upon statements deemed the most reliable.

It is said that Brassfield, not long since, came here from Austin, Nevada. Of his occupation and general conduct during his sojourn we are not informed, nothing concerning him having come underour notice until recently. Among other operations, however, either through great foolishness on his part, or through the influence of evil counsel, or both, he was lately married to a Mrs. Mary Hill, wife of Archibald N. Hill, who is absent on a mission in Europe. CHINES APPY MARKY It is possible that, had Mary Hill been Elder A. N. Hill's only living wife, Mr. Brassfield might have taken a different course; at least the advice given him would no doubt have been different, as in that case robbing another man of his wife would merely have extended by one more the instances of fashionable corruption, while his advisers would not have looked upon it as so particularly favoring their insance forts against plurality of wives.) Had Mary Hill left the children and only taken what portion of the property the rest of the family deemed just, or arbitrated the matter, the illegally married couple would probably have been suffered to pursue their way to their own liking, as has been done. But no, in the absence of the father and owner. she and Brassfield attempted to take away the children and such property as she pleased to claim; and, when opposed in their unlawful course, Brassfield threatened to shoot. But threatening availing nothing, the party applied for a writ of habeas corpus, to produce the children, which was granted by and, on the 4th inst., argued in chambers before the Hon. S. P. Mc-Curdy, U. S. Associate Justice assigned to the Second Judicial District, this being the Third. The law says that such writ "may be served in any part of the Territory," but whether a Judge can lawfully issue, hear and decide upon such writ outside of his District is, to say the least, very questionable. The Hon. Z. Snow, Deputy Attorney General, conducted the defense, ably presenting the chief points in the case. Illness prevented the attendance of the Attorney General. The Judge's decision had not reached us at going to press. The foregoing is a brief and plain statement of the main features of the case, and is correctly in accordance with the most reliable information on the subject. Whether Brassfield was killed by some one whom he had threatened to shoot, or by some relation or friend of Elder Hill's family, or by some one who had made a cat's-paw of him in his ill-starred operations, or by

a grudge, thinking it would, of course, be laid upon the 'Mormons', or by some one outside of these four named classes, is yet to be learned.

We are told that Brassfield has been heard to remark that he had rather have given \$3,000 than to have got into such a scrape. Those who had given him such unfortunate advice had, probably, begun to see their folly.

Whoever did the shooting appears to have been fleet of foot, for he was closely pursued to First East street, running the guantlet of several pistol shots, then north to South Temple street, then west to past this Office, where his pursuers lost sight of him in the darkness.

There is an ancient and true writing which reads -- As ye sow so also shall ye reap. Mr. Brassfield is said to have come here to engage in freighting to Austin, &c., and, had he not so grossly infringed upon the rights of another, it is presumable that he, as do all who mind their own business, would have passed and re-passed entirely unmolested, for then there would have been no family foully wronged, and consequently no cloak under which revenge for an old grudge could be laid upon the 'Mormons'. But Mr. Brassfield seems to have chosen to vary the monotony of legitimate business by sowing the robbing another man of his wife and a further effort to rob him of a part of his children, to say nothing about property,

and he speedily reaped the fruit such sowing is apt to produce in all communities we have ever lived in or heard of.

However much violence is to be deprecated as a method for righting wrongs, we presume some time will yet elapse before laws are so enacted, observed and enforced, anywhere in Christendom, that an invasion of the rights of the domestic circle will not have to run the risk of meeting sudden retribution, either at the hands of those directly aggrieved, or at the hands of some enemy under the cloak presented by so strong and general a feeling of just indignation.

