truding animals and care for them till the owner can be notified. But all this is open to serious objection, entails great trouble and some expense before a remedy can be had, if at all, and suggests that an ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of cure.

Another grievance is that animals may run at large in regions where tracts of land are enclosed for farming, and may break down fences and commit damage, and redress is very difficult to obtain. Sometimes wire fences are cut purposely to let them in, or by men riding through fields for convenience, and roaming animals enter and crops are injured. Their owners may be hundreds of miles away, and recovery of damages is a forlorn hope. One more grievance is, that there is no person, outside of incorporated cities and towns, who is authorized by law to keep and care for animals taken up by the owners of improved property trespassed upon, make complaint and see that the law is complied with.

It seems as though the law might be reasonably amended in these particulars. First, Make it unlawful for any owner of land within a joint enclosure to either herd or turn animals loose within that enclosure while there are standing or ungathered cut crops on any portion of it. Second, Provide for the taking up of trespassing animals, and their care, and the necessary legal proceedings by a poundkeeper or such officer as may be designated, in every precinct, the same as in towns and cities.

It will be seen that the provision in Section 3 of the present act, page 83 of the laws of 1890, does not cover the ground of complaint. All the trouble, expense and care devolve on the person who is damaged by trespassing animals, and in the case of a lone woman or poor man, or any person who is unfamiliar with the law, great hardship ensues and there is little chance of a remedy.

Will some of our legislators from the rural districts examine the law, look into these grievances, and introduce either a good estray bill or the necessary amendments to the present statute? If they do they will earn the gratitude of a great many of their country constituents and perform good service to the Territory.

THE CHANGED CONDITIONS.

AMONG the many evidences of the changed conditions in Utah, is the unanimity with which the press of the Territory commend the message of Governor Thomas to the Legislature. It is something altogether unique for "Liberal," Democratic, Republican and "Mormon" papers to unite in praise of a gubernatorial message. It is also a new departure for the Chief Executive to present so voluminous a document without saying something offensive to some portion of the people of the Territory. This time we have a business state paper free from rhetoric, abounding in good suggestions and breathing a spirit of fairness, conciliation and desire for the general welfare which is very pleasing to all classes of the community that wish for the common good. That the "conditions *are* changed" can no longer be disputed, and the saying must cease to be received either with disbelief or with derision.

WHAT NEXT?

The following paragraph appears in the Salt Lake *Tribune* of this morning, at the close of an editorial on the Utah bill. It needs no comment except that it is one of the most striking among the many proofs that Utah is undoubtedly under "changed conditions:"

"We hope some real friend of Utah in Congress, seeing the situation, keeping his finger upon the pulse of the East, knowing how liable this bill might be to pass in the absence of any one who can intelligently combat it, will introduce an enabling act, calling a Constitutional Convention, at some time in the future, to draft a Constitution to be submitted to the people, and if it carries, then to ask for Statehood in a manly, honorable way, and not advertise to Congress, under the guise of a desire to serve the Mormon people, that after all they are not fit to be trusted for a moment; that is, until the sentiment of this Territory is that the Territory is prepared for Statehood, to let things rest. For they are doing just as well as possible; things are all coming out right; the change is going on, the Territory is prospering, and there is no occasion, in the anxiety to obtain a lien on the offices here, to needlessly insult this whole people."

THE REPORT ON THE CHURCH CASE

JUDGE LOUFBOUROW, the Master in Chancery, appointed by the Supreme Court of the Territory, to examine into the Church personal property case and make findings, has filed his report which will be found in this issue of the DESERET NEWS. It is not different in any essential respects from what we anticipated.

The petitions of the local organizations for portions of the property are treated in a rational manner, and we think the logic and the law of the findings in relation to them are sound. But in the conclusions concerning the claims of the unincorporated Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, we think the reasoning faulty and the recommendation unsound and not warranted by the premises.

It is true that the uses to which the fund was originally put were various. Also that the donors did not select any particular charity or religious purpose to which their donations should be applied. The fund was to be under the direction of the Presidency of the Church, to be expended for such purposes as might be necessary for the good of the religious organization known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

But among those uses and purposes, it is clear that the support of the common schools in which children of people of all persuasions and denominations were educated, and which were under the control of the Territory and entirely disconnected with the Church, was not included nor intended. It must be evident to every fair and impartial mind that the legal disincorporation of the Church, seeing that the Church organization continued intact and without actual change of form or essence, did not on any just principle deprive that body of its property rights. It simply ceased to be a corporation under the law.

What follows? Why that the Church alone had a natural right to the personal property which belonged to it before the corporation was dissolved. Also that no lawful uses could be so near akin to those to which the fund was originally put, as the purposes to which it would be applied if the petition of the Church should be granted.

It is undeniable that the donors intended their donations for Church uses. That is, for the benefit of persons and charities and institutions under the immediate auspices of the Church and its Presidency. They did not intend that they should be applied to any purpose or person that was not under that direction and Presidency. They did not give their money to support schools for the children of other denominations. The educational purposes, mentioned, then, were not such educational purposes as the Master in Chancery recommends they shall now be devoted to.

Further. Take away the use of "the support of polygamy," alleged to be one of the original purposes of the fund, and what other of the original uses can be claimed unlawful? There is no pretence that if the petition of the Church be granted any portion of the fund would be devoted to the support of the practice of polygamy. It is admitted by the Master that it is only the practice of polygamy and not belief in it that is criminal. So that no valid objection is advanced against the actual owner of the property—the unincorporated Church, being permitted