zens, they are not inhibited from using. The Mormon, Methodist or Presbyterian legislator must not "keep his hands off" a senatorial or other contest in which his duty of citizenship requires him to take part; but he should not drag his church into the contest, and seek to exert its influence to gain his ends. When, for instance, the Mormon Church acts, it does so as an organization, through its duly constituted authorities; and no officer or member can invoke that power o influence except in due form. We presume that other organizations are in about the same position. The Church does not allow the exercise o its influence in the place stated, since the issues involved belong to the state, and do not concern Church matters. And it does not say that Church members, prominent or otherwise, shall not take an active interest in the contest. The Church does not disfranchise its members politically, for that would be domination of the worst sort in the state.

Those Idaho legislators who may be Mormons, and other citizens of the same faith, have as much right to "take an active interest in the contest" as have legislators and citizens o any other religious faith, or of no religious faith at all. Every member of the Mormon Church, from the highest officer down, has this right, and it is his privilege to be as active in political matters as the obligations o good citizenship require. And the idea that some people affect to possess, that because a citizen is a prominent Mormon he may not use his personal influence and activity in the political duties and privileges of a citizen, is a fallacy that cannot be got rid of too early. Mormons have the same rights as other citizens; no more, and no less. The instruction in the "edict" referred to is not to be given any other meaning than its own direct expression.

SCIENTIFIC FACTS REQUIRED.

Almost from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, each succeeding Legislature in Utah has remodeled the work of its predecessor upon the subject of fish and game. Each assembly coolly assumes that the last one did not know much about fish and game, and then proceeds to write, in the form of a law, a record of its own ignorance of the same subject. There may have been Legislatures in Utah in the past score of years or more that did not do this, but if so they are not recalled at present.

This traditional custom is in process of being continued at this session. At least one bill has been introduced to revise the fish and game law, with several counties yet to hear from. How many members resolved, between the time they were nominated for the Legislature and the third of November, that if they should be given a chance at law making they would give the State a good fish and game law, has not been ascertained; but doubtless it is large.

And yet how many members of the present assembly know anything definite about the fish and game of this region from the standpoint of a legislator? How many know when our mountain trout spawn? How many know if the spawning season is the same in Cache, Sanpete and Washington counties? How many know when deer have their young? How many know whether snipe breed in the State, or are wholly migratory? How many know whether or not there are found in the State snipe of both classes?

These are a few of a large number of questions that members of the Legislature should be able to answer before dealing with the subject matter. If the solons cannot give the answers out of their own stock of knowledge, a proper course should be taken to procure the needed information with scientific accuracy and reliability; and the usual and in fact only method to be pursued in such case is to call in and pay respect to the suggestions of the official or commission appointed by the State with a special view to his or its familiarity with the subjects involved. A fish and game law, to be of value, must be founded upon scientific facts relating to the fauna of the State. While the Legislature is not in possession of those facts, it cannot frame a suitable law upon the subject. Empiricism and guess-work ought not to be tolerated in such legislation.

Much of the above will also apply to the law paying bounties on certain birds and wild animals. It is a la that is generally revised at each session of the Legislature, and while it has been under discussion the ridiculous spectacle has been seen of a member from one county asking to have a certain bird protected, while a member from another county wanted to have a bounty offered for its destruction, while neither could state a known scientific fact, or refer to any scientific authority, in support of his position.

It is time to abandon such methods of dealing legislatively with scientific subjects, and it is hoped the present assembly will make a new departure.

BORING FOR SERVICE PIPES.

Many people hereabouts have had both pockets and feelings hurt by having to cut up lawns, etc., in order to lay gas or water pipes through a short distance. To those who, in future, have to face such a prospect, the recent experience of Charles Lurcott, an employe of the Scientific American, will be of interest. Mr. Lurcott was desirous of having a service pipe to his workshop, and on the way had twenty-four feet of lawn which he did not want cut, so he determined to bore a hole through the soil to a point below the floor of the shop. The boring apparatus was extemporized out of a piece of three-sixteenths inch flat iron, a three-fourths inch bar, some six foot lengths of piping and a carpenter's brace. The flat iron, three-sixteenths by one inch and two feet long, was bent cold with a twist of half a turn in six inches at one end, the other end being scarfed and riveted to a six foot length of three-fourths inch round iron. The opposite end of the three-fourths inch iron was threaded into a three-eighths inch pipe coupling, and with the addition of three six foot lengths of three-eighths inch pipe and couplings, the apparatus was complete. To connect the carpenter's brace with each piece of pipe as the boring proceeded, a short length of one-and-a-quarter-inch pipe was screwed into a three-eighths inch one, its other end being filed square so as to enter the brace. This simple and cheap boring machine cut its way readily through the soil, and in just fifteen minutes a hole large enough for a half-inch pipe was made for the required distance of twenty-four feet. The auger cut its way without any tendency to swerve out of line. The ground at the time was frozen and covered with several inches of snow, and anyone who has had to dig a trench under such circumstances will appreciate the saving of labor attending this method of pipe laying. In some parts of this city this would be a much simpler and easier way of going under sidewalks than that now followed.

THE MORRIS CASE.

There is another disagreed jury in the case of Joseph R. Morris, accused of crime in connection with the fraud by which Salt Lake county was robbed of a large sum of money in the furniture contract. On a former occasion two jurors stood out for a verdict of acquittal, and this time three stood out, the majority in each instance being convinced of the guilt of the defendant. In connection with both trials there has been, prior to the case being given to the jury, talk of a prospect of disagreement, showing that those who made such prognostications possessed an idea that every member of the jury was not as straight in line with his oath as he should have been. Such cases as this do more than all else to bring the jury system into contempt, because, as it is manipulated, it involves great public expense which ought not to be tolerated, and turns criminals loose on the community. For, independent of the guilt or innocence of the defendant in this case, juries that can be counted upon in advance to disagree, themselves possess an element of criminality that is dangerous to the public weal. If a defendant or his friends can prevail through friendship or other relation to a juror to influence the latter's vote, then such juror is unfit for service; as is also one whose dislike for a defendant would invoke hostility to the latter. In each of the Morris trials it has been stated that there were jurors whose vote might be counted a certain way in advance, and the result showing ou ground for the opinion expressed. It is evident therefore, that the officers responsible for selecting such jurors either did not know their men or chose inferior material. The Morris case now has cost the public treasury an enormous sum. On the evidence in his possession, the present county attorney is able to decide whether or not he has a good case. And if he has, the he ought to try for a good jury and get the business settled. The fact of ex-Selectman Morris's guilt or innocence ought to be established legally in short order. And this "jury-hanging" business deserves careful scrutiny.