

ators against the Government, as the Utah court declares, they cannot be disfranchised as a body, but they must each individually be placed on trial and be convicted by the testimony of credible witnesses. If witnesses cannot be found with proofs of treasonable action, their right to equal treatment with all other aliens cannot be lawfully abridged. Mere suspicion that Mormons who apply for naturalization intend to be disloyal to the Government would hardly constitute proper grounds for refusing them the same right to become American citizens that is accorded other aliens."

The foregoing remarks have still more force when it is considered that it was proved by competent evidence that there is nothing in the endowment ceremony that is antagonistic to the government. The refusal of naturalization does not only extend, according to the recent decision, to persons who have passed through these religious rites, but to all members of the Church, emphasizing still more strongly the constitutional point made by the *Bee*, which is a vigorous and ably conducted journal.

THE GRAND JURY REPORT.

TODAY we present for the perusal of our readers an exceedingly elaborate campaign document. Its extreme length and straining after details are evidences of its political purpose. The paper fairly bristles with condemnatory judgments pronounced on the bases of *ex parte* hypotheses. It is also a significant fact that this elongated political report is understood to have been in the hands of the chief "Liberal" organ several days before it was presented in court. While one-sided denunciation is hurled unstintedly at political opponents, the grand jury gives evidence of having been exceedingly kind to its friends.

The management of the penitentiary is made a conspicuous feature of the report, the U. S. Marshal being belabored over the backs of the poor convicts. That official is charged with extravagance bordering on profligacy because it costs 35 cents per head daily to sustain the prisoners. In consequence of this fearful squandering of government money—35 cents a day upon a prisoner—the grand jury exclaims in awful economical ecstasy: "We are of the opinion that many of the supplies furnished were *excessive in quantity and extravagant in price.*" Supplemental to this plea for pinching, the report further says: "We are of the opinion that the fresh meat, ham and bacon furnished during this time was, as to quantity,

about 25 per cent in excess of what was necessary, and as to price was 25 per cent too high." It is also asserted that the price paid for flour (\$2.66 per hundred pounds) was excessive. A fair calculation of the views of the grand jury would bring a reduction on the cost of keeping a prisoner of nearly fifty per cent, or say, 18 cents a day, or six cents a meal.

If ever the members of the defunct grand jury should be so unfortunate—we hope they never will—as to be landed in the penitentiary for a term, there will be a tremendous revolution of opinion in their cases with regard to this financial question. They would no longer be advocates of the theory of skeletonizing convicts. The tendency of the times among all civilized peoples is to treat prisoners as if they were human. This plea for starving convicts shows therefore that the late grand jury are, in that particular, behind the age, which does not favor the manufacture of striped shadows.

The species of generosity exhibited in the document reminds one of a story told by Col. Ingersoll on the occasion of his lecture, in this city, some years ago, illustrative of the generosity of some men toward their spouses. A wife asked her well-to-do husband for a little spending money when the response came in tones of manly thunder, "What did you do with that thirty-five cents I gave you three weeks ago?"

Some of the computations of the jury are extraordinary, to say the least, as witness this statement:

"From his twelve cows the marshal supplies milk for the table of the deputy warden and guards, at the expense of the government, and sells from \$70 to \$80 worth of milk per month to the prisoners or such of them as have money to buy it, at the uniform price of twenty-five cents per gallon. This industry furnishes a revenue to the marshal of not less than \$100 per month, and at the same time has solved a disputed question concerning prison discipline, viz.: as to whether it is best to furnish healthy penitentiary convicts with articles of food other than the regular prison fare, even though it brings profit to the officers in charge. It is but justice to the marshal to state in this connection, that when questioned in regard to this milk supply, he answered that many of the convicts were old men with poor teeth and obliged to eat mush."

It remains for a political grand jury to solve such difficult numerical problems as the one here presented. It may, for aught we know, be true that the Marshal sells from \$70 to \$80 worth of milk per month to prisoners able to purchase it, but we beg to be excused from placing the

utmost confidence in the assertion that he makes out of this from \$70 to \$80, a monthly revenue of \$100.

The suggestion in reference to a certain class of prisoners having had greater liberties than others is not only ungenerous but vindictive. The grand jury are aware of the reason for such liberty having been extended if it has been accorded. Some of the prisoners referred to have been utilized to perform labor on the prison grounds because they could be better trusted than the generality of inmates, not one of them ever having attempted to escape. Through their influence and example the management of the penitentiary has been rendered comparatively easy and simple, as the effect upon the other inmates has been salutary in every respect. Thus they have relieved the government to no small degree.

The balance of the compliments paid in the report to the Marshal have heretofore been before the public and relate to the general management of the business pertaining to his office.

The affairs of Salt Lake County are given considerable attention. The proceedings relative thereto are called an investigation, but the way partial extracts have been made, with a view to conveying an impression contrary to the plain showing of the full record, and the strained and unjustifiable constructions that are put upon other parts, are such as to render the report utterly unreliable.

The first complaint is made concerning road work, which constitutes a large part of the county's business. The allegation is offered that no bids were received for road work. But it is not stated that the labor was performed by the agents of the county, employed in such manner that the profit which would have gone to the contractor was saved by the county.

The report says that in a few instances the county road supervisor or county surveyor would approve bills presented, "but these instances are rare." The county court had passed on most of the bills direct, and this mode of procedure did not satisfy the jury. But a short distance further along, when bills were found which were approved by a selectman, and then submitted to and approved by the county court, fault is found because the court itself did not take the supervision which in other instances is cited as reprehensible. Both methods