the time. Indeed, it is easy enough to see that most people, except ourselves, are wasting much time, and often doing much damage, by misdirecting their physical powers. It is a waste to use more force than is necessary, as when a man works with dull tools; and it is equally a waste to work till the novelty is gone, then leave the thing to its own destruction, as in tending a garden well for six weeks in the Spring, then letting the sprouting weeds do the rest of it.

But it is not in the expenditure of physical energy alone that there is a waste of power. We are quite as prodigal of mental and moral forces, and have fewer admonitions to lead to reform. We waste words enormously. We surround what is important or proper to say with little nothings, and the main thing is often lost entirely. A gabbler is not a good conversationalist; it is not by the use of a sea of words that a man is convinced. Books are too wordy; sermons are too wordy; public speakers are by far too verbose. It may, indeed, be true, that, in the cases cited, words are largely substituted for mental force; still, a waste is no less certain.

There is, too, much sound advice, good argument, and wholesale remonstrance wasted. All these are useless unless the mind addressed is in a receptive mood, and mentally able to comprehend what is said. A drunkard does not leave his cups. nor a profligate his debauchery, by merely being advised to do so. A way must be opened to the heart; then little advice is needed. Argument, no matter how convincing, is vain with men buried in prejudice or superstition. A skillful exposure of an evil does more for its abatement than the clearest proofs by reasoning. "Uncle Tom's Cabin" convinced a great class that slavery was an atrocious sin, whom no speech in Congress or elsewhere ever touched. It is not John B. Gough's argument that rescues men from the demon alcohol. It is his great sympathy with their misfortune, so heartily expressed, that saves them.

Is there anything so utterly wasteful of mental and moral forces as engaging in religious controversies? Both parties engaged in the conflict usually come out of it badly demoralized. Bad blood is stirred up, alienations are set afoot, and the uncharitable side of the character grows apace. If the contest is between individuals, the waste of energy is the least of the resulting evils; if it is between neighboring churches, the resulting feuds are well nigh Satanic; if between nations, rivers of blood is the price of it.

So, from little things to great, from the performance of our daily duties to the great concerns of intellectual and moral action, there is a constant waste or misdirection of power, a waste which generally might be prevented by studying how, where and when to use it.—*Providence, R. I., Journal.*

AMERICAN BRIGANDAGE.—It is quite startling, to say the least, this steady growth of bold brigandage. During the past three days two of the boldest highway robberies on record have been committed upon roads leading from Denver, and up to this time the banditti are free and unmolested. The first of these robberies was committed on the Santa Fe stage road south of Pueblo. There the robbers rode up to the coach in broad daylight and played "stand and deliver" in true Dick Turpin style. Then, after robbing the stage and express, rode away unmolested to the fastnesses of the mountains.

The last robbery is of still greater magnitude. Five masked men flag and stop the Kansas Pacific train, cut off the locomotive and express car from the passenger coaches and get away with twenty-seven thousand dollars. This is done in the heart of the most densely populated portion of Kansas, within a few hours ride of Leavenworth, Lawrence, Topeka and Kansas City. The reward of $17,500 offered for their arrest and recovery of the money may perhaps result in their capture. It is hoped that it will. If such bold outrages as these are allowed to pass without the arrest of the bandits, our railroads and coach roads will soon become as unsafe as the old post roads in England two centuries ago.—*Denver Democrat, Dec.* 10.

WASHINGTON NOTES.

From the Washington *Star*, Dec. 12—

The reports telegraphed from this city of the probable early discharge of one hundred and fifty female counters from the Treasury department, is, we are glad to state, greatly exaggerated. The discharges alluded to embrace about a dozen counters who had charge of the recounting of national bank notes sent here for redemption, which are twice counted in the treasurer's office, and the third count was deemed entirely unnecessary.

The following candidates for the position of second lieutenants in the army have been examined by the board of examination in this city, under general orders 81, of 1873, from the Adjutant General's office—Jas. Brennan, army; Chas. St. John Chubb, District of Columbia; James S. Jouett, son of Capt. Jouett, of the navy; Chas. L. Hodges, army; Chas. W. Mason, son of Lieut. Col. John S. Mason, 4th infantry; James S. Marteller, Virginia. The result of the examination will be promulgated at an early day.

Enforcing the Amendments.

A case that is known as the Grant parish case is to be argued in the Supreme Court of the United States during the present term. It is an appeal from a decision of Mr. Justice Bradley, which arrested judgment in the case of The United States vs. Nash and others, indicted and convicted for conspiracy and murder under the Enforcement act of 1870. The appeal will require a decision by the Supreme Court of the meaning and effect of the clause placed at the end of the late amendments of the federal constitution, by which power is given to Congress to "enforce those amendments "by appropriate legislation." The amendments prohibited the States from doing certain things. This, however, was not the first time that the federal constitution restricted the power of the States in relation to matters that were otherwise within their exclusive province. The original constitution contained ten or twelve such prohibitions, among the most familiar of which are those which prevent the passage of any *ex post facto* law or law impairing the obligation of contracts. But the constitution did not create in Congress any special or substantive legislative power to enforce these prohibitions. It was assumed that they would enforce themselves, so to speak, through the operation of the judicial power, which, being made to extend to all cases arising under the constitution, would reach any case in which a State law violated one of these prohibitions, and thus it would be declared void and become inoperative. All the legislation that would be needful would consist in provisions that would keep open the access to the Supreme Court of the United States, which would be accomplished by providing for the transfer to that ultimate tribunal of any case that involved the construction or operation of any part of the federal constitution. The framers of the constitution therefore did not consider it needful or wise to provide for "enforcing" the prohibitions addressed to the States by the creation of a special and affirmative legislative power in Congress. They intended that Congress should have nothing to do with enforcing these prohibitions beyond the provision of the necessary means for enabling the judicial power to make them effectual as the supreme law of the land.

But now we have amendments of that constitution which are claimed to have enlarged the legislative power of Congress by the creation of a substantive and affirmative power to do what is described as "enforcing" the new prohibitions which those amendments have addressed to the State. It is to be observed that these new prohibitions do not differ in their nature from the old ones. Like the old ones they are simply declarations or provisions of a fundamental and imperative character that the States shall not do certain things. Thus, the fourteenth amendment declares that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws;" and the fifteenth amendment declares that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of color, race or previous condition of servitude." It is plain that these provisions can all be enforced by the judicial power of the United States without any intervention by Congress, if left to their own operation.

But what is the meaning and operation of the clause which gives Congress power to "enforce" these provisions "by appropriate legislation?" Is it to be regarded as a departure from the system that has always prevailed in regard to the operation of these restrictions which are imposed on the States, which they were left to be enforced by the judicial power? Does it create in Congress an active, affirmative power of legislation, by which, without waiting for any breach of the inhibitions by a State, can enter a State and make laws on any subject that touches the enjoyment of life, liberty or property, or the equal protection of the laws, or the exercise of the elective franchise by colored persons, or anything else that belongs to the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States? Is this the result of declaring by an amendment of the federal constitution that a State shall not do what the amendment forbids it to do, and then saying that Congress may enforce the prohibition by appropriate legislation? It is quite obvious that if this is the effect there is no limit to the centralization that it produces. On the other hand, if the "enforcing" clause of these amendments is to be limited in its construction to the provision of means for enabling the judicial power of the United States to declare any State law inoperative that violates one of these prohibitions, or to the definition of the rights that pertain to United States citizenship, the whole country, without any exception of party or section, will be able to regard the amendments as wise and salutary improvements of our federal system. The decision of these questions by the Supreme Court will therefore be looked for with great interest—*New York Herald, Dec. 12th.*

DIED.

In Parowan, Iron County, at 20 minutes to 6 a.m., Dec. 12th, MARY STEELE, wife of Brother Joseph Fish.

Deceased was born in Belfast, Ireland, December 23rd, 1840; removed to Glasgow, Scotland, with her father and mother, John and Catherine Steele, where she was blessed in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; emigrated with her parents to Nauvoo in the year 1845; was one who was driven into the wilderness in 1846; went with her parents in the Mormon Battalion, and arrived in Salt Lake Valley, July 29, 1847; in 1850 went with her parents to Iron County, with President G. A. Smith, where she resided until the time of her death, which was occasioned by heart disease; raised a family of four girls and two boys, the youngest a girl of two years and a half; has passed away in full faith of the gospel and the hope of a glorious resurrection, leaving many relations and friends; was in life a most dutiful child, an affectionate wife and a loving mother, and her name will long be cherished in kind remembrance by all who knew her.—COM.

At the residence of her daughter, Mrs. M. A. Smart, Union, South Cottonwood, Nov. 16, of cancer, MARY, relict of the late William Ramsay, from Deptford, Kent. *Millennial Star*, please copy.

At Provo City, on the 21st of December, at 4:30 p.m., LYDIA E., wife of Samuel S. Jones, after a lingering illness of three months.
