

of capital and labor identified or recognized practically as mutual, and a spirit of fraternity and equity prevail which shall cause humanity to recognize the rights of all, and fill the world with harmony and the glorious fruits of industry and peace. We hope Labor Day of 1892 will prove both pleasant and profitable to all concerned.

LONG DISTANCE READING.

A RECENT experiment in electric light signalling has proved successful. The summit of Mt. Washington was chosen, as the point to operate from. The flash-lights which were transmitted therefrom were read at Portland, eighty-five miles distant. The operator at the latter place, who read these lights, estimated that they were eighty miles above him.

Other experiments have been made during the past week between Mt. Washington and towns not far distant. At North Conway, about twenty-five miles from the electric station on the mountain, common print was read by aid of the light, and at Littleton, a town about the same distance, a letter was read without trouble.

Great things are expected in the line of the electric system of signalling. Some are enthusiastic enough to think that the day of conveying signals to Mars or Venus or Jupiter is not far distant.

THE REAL ISSUE IN IDAHO.

A DISCUSSION has been going on for several days between our morning contemporaries over the Idaho test oath.

It has been stated on the one hand that test oaths had their origin in this country with the Republican party, and an infamous one prevailed in the South shortly after the war, the object of which was to perpetuate Republican rule in the South, by the disfranchisement of all citizens who ever participated in or countenanced the rebellion. This was settled by the famous Cummings case, in which the Supreme Court of the United States pronounced the test oath unconstitutional.

On the other hand it is claimed that the test oath in the South was justified by the rebellious spirit of the people, and that the persons named who refused to take the oath were perhaps, or no doubt, in sympathy with the rebels even if they fought on the other side. And as to the Idaho test oath, it was framed by a Democrat and was defended in court by a Democrat, and the opinion sustaining its constitutionality was rendered by a Democratic Justice of the Supreme Court.

A good deal of recrimination is indulged in and much partizan feeling, all of which which is unnecessary in this case and most of it wide of the mark. The old Idaho test oath which the Supreme Court declared was not unconstitutional was supported in Idaho by both parties. However, on the rule established by the "Liberal" organ, it was a Republican measure, even if framed by a Democrat, because it was passed by what it would call a Republican Legislature. When referring to the

killing of the silver bill in Congress, it casts the blame on the Democratic House of Representatives because the Democrats were in the majority, although it is well known that members of both parties voted against it. The Republicans were in the majority in the Idaho Legislature that passed the original test oath.

But the truth is that neither party is clear from blame in the enactment of that measure, which while declared not unconstitutional because it does not violate the letter of the supreme law was clearly in contravention of its spirit, and while framed so as to appear to be for the suppression of unlawful polygamy, was in reality intended to deprive members of a particular church of their franchise simply on account of their church membership, without reference to their individual acts.

But this is all foreign to the present issue. It makes little difference who framed, or passed, or sustained that old test oath because it is not now in the way. We do not think the record of either party is unspotted in reference to it. But it is a dead issue. The oath now to be tested is another thing entirely. The substance of the old test oath is in the State Constitution. Both parties or rather members of both parties, helped to fix it there. No one is fighting that. But the first Legislature of the new State enacted an additional provision, which was at the time admitted to be *ex post facto*, and therefore unconstitutional, and which is of the same nature as the infamous oath declared unconstitutional in the Cummings case. It is this new oath which is being tested, and that alone, in Idaho.

No person who has been a member of the "Mormon" Church for a certain length of time immediately preceding registration can either register or vote. The provision was framed, not to support any law or oppose any particular practice, but to prevent a certain class of citizens against whom no violation of law could be alleged, from participating in the affairs of the State. They are subject to all the laws and taxes and other duties of citizens without any of the political privileges of citizenship. That is now under test.

As the matter stands, the movement for its repeal is not a partizan effort. Both parties have declared against the oath. Both profess to be anxious for its repeal. The Democrats declared their desire that it might be immediately tested. Republicans at once proceeded to make up a test case. The important thing now is to see who opposes the movement. It is rumored that the success of the case to come before the court depends on a canvass now going on, to see how the "Mormon" vote will stand as to parties. If that is true it is abominable. It seems to us that public journals would do better to advocate justice in this case in spite of party, than to throw the blame of the evil to be remedied, in this direction or that.

The constitutional provisions stand. The shameful enactment of the first Idaho State Legislature ought to be stamped out. Both parties should forward the movement for its destruction. The only immediate means to kill it is by the power of the courts.

When the case is tried will be the time to see who really wants the Mormon citizens of Idaho to exercise the suffrage and who does not. Until then we must credit both parties with the sentiments enunciated in their respective platforms. Let the dead past lie buried.

THE WOOL TRADE.

"BRADSTREET'S," the well known trade journal, gives the following review of the wool markets for the week ending August 27, 1892:

"The demand for wool is not as strong as it was a week ago. Manufacturers are now well supplied. The goods market is in excellent shape, and the mills are all busy. The consumption of wool is heavy, and has greatly increased during the past year. There are at present no indications of wool prices advancing, and manufacturers feel confident of securing wool a month hence on as favorable terms as it can be bought now. There is therefore little pressure to buy, and dealers show very little inclination to force sales. Quotations on all grades are firmly maintained. The markets are more heavily stocked with domestic wools than they have been in previous years at this time. This is an element of strength rather than weakness, for the wool is in stronger hands. Dealers are much better able to wait for manufacturers to buy than growers. The receipts from the country are beginning to fall off, and the accumulation from now on will be less rapid. The buying is still largely of fleeces. They are lower relatively, and buyers have availed themselves of this advantage. There is less doing in Territories. Texas wools are quiet. California and Oregon wools are dull. Pulled wools are moving slowly. Stocks in pullers' hands are light. Skins are costing more than they did a year ago, but wool is on the average 8c. lower than in August, 1891. Australian wools are quiet. The next London sales will open September 13. About 300,000 bales will be offered, but very little of it will be suitable for this country. French and German Manufacturers are expected to be the principal buyers. At the June sales the French were not strong competitors, and their stocks are now thought to be light. The depressed condition of the English mills may have some effect on prices, but the general opinion is that the advance will be maintained. Carpet manufacturers continue to buy quite freely. Now that wools from the cholera districts are to be excluded, there is a better demand for Scotch, china and Mediterranean wools. Values are very firm, but unchanged."

THE CHURCH SUITS.

What is generally known as the Church case—the United States of America, plaintiff, vs. the late corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, defendant—came up for argument before the judges of the Territorial Supreme Court this morning. The petitioners, Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, were represented by Hon. F. S. Richards and Attorney W. H. Dickson; on the side of the government were United States District Attorney Varian and Attorney J. L. Rawlins.

As before stated in these columns, the case now comes up for argument on the report made some time ago by Master in Chancery Loofbrow,