

progress will do more to promote confidence, to attract capital and to permanently build up Utah than any step that can be taken by its citizens. While the unrest, misrepresentation, fanaticism and bitterness manifested in and provoked by this so-called "Liberal" faction, if persisted in will keep this Territory in the background, and cause the very name of Utah to signify contention, disorder, bigotry and bitterness, alike subversive of social order, business interests and political freedom.

### IS IT "FUNNY BUSINESS?"

THE increased registration in this city would be matter for congratulation if it were a true indication of an increase in the population and of political interest among the citizens. Doubtless both of these causes have contributed to the results. But we are inclined to the belief that in addition to them, what is called "funny business" has been resorted to for the purpose of swelling the registration lists.

The net increase foots up 2,350 names. The largest increase is in the Second Precinct which furnishes 966 additional voters. There may possibly be nothing wrong in all this. But it is something that ought to be investigated. It would be interesting, and perhaps profitable, to find out whether all these newly registered names have owners who have resided in this city and Territory for the periods required by law.

It will be remembered that the largest proportion of the names of persons who, it appeared, had no legal right to vote at the last municipal election, were found on the list of the Second Precinct. There are indications that work similar to that performed then is in progress now, manipulated by the same wire-pulling fingers, and with expectation of a similar reward.

We advise both Republicans and Democrats who want a fair deal, to make diligent investigation of this matter. And we warn every person who thinks he can figure in the fashion we have hinted at, that this time he will find out it is in reality no "funny business."

### AN INCONSISTENT RULING.

THE Chief Justice of Arizona, if the dispatches received are correct, has made a singular ruling. Perhaps when the full account of the matter before him is published, it will explain the reasons for his opinion. He decides that the laws of Congress in relation to polygamy and unlawful cohabitation, relate to all the Territories and

places over which the United States have jurisdiction, except the District of Columbia.

The Edmunds act of 1882 states distinctly that its provisions in reference to the two offenses named are for "a Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction." The Edmunds-Tucker act of 1887 is declared by its title to be an amendment to the act of 1862, which also relates to "a Territory of the United States or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction." Parts of each of these statutes relate specially to Utah. But in every section of this kind the Territory of Utah is specifically mentioned.

If the clauses in the Edmunds-Tucker act not specially applicable to Utah, do not include the District of Columbia, then they do not include the Territory of Arizona. If there is a part of this country over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, without doubt and beyond controversy, it is the District of Columbia. The Constitution of the United States settles this. And while the "exclusive jurisdiction" and "absolute sovereignty" of the United States over the Territories have to be inferred from other provisions in that instrument, Section Eight in express terms confers that authority upon the Congress over the district we have named.

Therefore if the laws passed upon by the Arizona Chief Justice apply to any other place than Utah, they take in the District of Columbia. Such parts of them as do not relate to that district do not apply to Arizona. We are aware that a court in the District decided that the Edmunds-Tucker act does not apply to that district but that does not affect our argument. If the judge had simply decided that the disputed clauses were in force in Arizona without making reference to the District of Columbia, he might possibly have been right. But in exempting the latter and including the former he was clearly and inconsistently wrong.

### A NUISANCE TO BE ABATED.

THE complaint of an old citizen, to which we give place today, is a very common one. There are too many dogs in town. The tax remedy does not meet the disorder. It is no comfort to a person assailed by a ferocious or vociferous canine that he has a numbered collar on. Dogs bound over fences, or jump up from the side-walk and act as though they would eat up the passer by.

In the day time they hite at the

heads of horses, causing runaways or at least frightening women and children who are taking a buggy ride. After dark they start up from unexpected places and bark at pedestrians, and in many places make night hideous and sleep impossible by their discordant howlings.

We do not know what the civic authorities can do more than continue to enforce the city ordinance in relation to dogs, unless some more stringent measures can be devised to protect the public. But respectable citizens can show a little more regard for the comfort of their neighbors and the public generally, by getting rid of some useless curs that infest the city, and by housing and chaining up more valuable dogs at night.

It will be a matter of regret if the public have to take the matter into their own hands, and shoot down the howling and yelping dogs that form such a formidable nuisance. This would be perhaps in violation of a city ordinance, and would be, therefore, to be deplored.

If duty to neighbors had a little more influence upon the public mind, this and many other grievances might be removed without requiring anyone to make a very great sacrifice.

### A DESPERATE STRUGGLE FOR LIFE

THE alleged central committee of the Republican party in this Territory, that is a bare majority of a body claiming that position, have met and formulated some resolutions which they issue for the guidance of Republicans in Utah. Mr. Arthur Brown was the only committeeman present who voted against the resolutions and this he did with a vigorous protest, which, with the resolutions, will be found in another part of this paper.

The gist of this action is that the "Liberal" party—what is left of it, does not want to disband. The gentlemen composing the committee take a "Liberal" not a Republican stand. It is in the interest of the "Liberal" faction that they ask Republicans to remain within its ranks, and plead with those who have deserted them to return. "Don't leave us," is the plea to those Republicans who still linger in the "Liberal" corral; "Come back," is the wail to those who have escaped.

As to the old bugaboos about "polygamy" and "Church and State," they are too stale to notice; and we should think both Republicans and Democrats, however "Liberal" in their views, would be tired of them and too sensible to be disturbed by them. They are nothing but Goodwinisms, and a few years will demonstrate their base-