to the effect that a report would be made as soon as the matter had been thoroughly investigated and not before, and that he had no further communication to make on the subject. It was pretty well known that the member from Maine was prompted by the paid agent of the anti-"Mormon" ring, and the lack of special interest in the subject was manifest in the flatness with which his interference fell upon the House.

Spurred up by the same goad, some newspaper correspondents have made insinuations to their respective journals in regard to the "Mormon lobby" and the influence of Mr. Beverly Tucker, who is reported as one of that lobby, upon his brother Hon. J. Randolph Tucker, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. The New York *Times* having printed one of those communications, the Delegate from Utah has replied, showing the falsehood the insinuation, stating that he does not even know Mr. Beverly Tucker, who is *not* a representative of "Mormon" interests, and naming as the so-called "lobby" the following well-known lawyers, who are engaged to present the "Mormon" side of the question either before the committee or the Supreme Court, and who have not attempted to approach improperly any member of the House or Senate; namely, ex-Governor Boutwell, Hon. George Ticknor Curtis, Messrs. Hunter and Chandler, and A. M. Gibson, Esq. Mr. Caine challenges any Congressman to state whether he has been spoken to improperly by any of these gentlemen.

They have confined themselves to the presentation of the case of their clients, in calm, logicail reasons against the proposed special legislation.

These are the facts. The "Mormon lobby," in the sense spoken of by some members of the press, is wholly imaginary. And is it not a failure to get a dip into that legendary big sack of "Mormon coin, that causes so many stupid remarks in relation to it and to the "lobby," which is supposed to be dispensing cash with reckless freedom, and which always appears to be money lavishly thrown away? Our Delegate writes an excellent letter to the *Times*, and he is perfectly right on the "lobby" question. There is not a Congressman living who can truthfully state that he has been offered money to influence his vote in favor of any question relating to the "Mormons."

The following in relation to the investigation of the new Edmunds bill by the sub-committee of the House Committee on the Judiciary appears as a special dispatch in the Chicago *Times*:

"WASHINGTON, April 26. — The stringent anti-Mormon bill passed by the Senate some time ago has been in the hands of a sub-committee of the House judiciary committee for a long time, and the eastern people who are clamorous for the suppression of polygamy are seeking to prob the sub-committee into more activity by insinuations, if not direct charges, that the delay is due to the strong lobby influence in favor of the Mormons. The sub-committee consists of Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, Mr. Eden, of Illinois, and ex-Governor Stewart, of Vermont, who cannot be supposed to be under the influence of the lobby. Mr. Tucker said to-day, that he had appointed Mr. Stewart a member of the sub-committee because he comes from the same State as Mr. Edmunds, the author of the bill, and appointed Mr. Eden because he represents the State where the Mormon church first took shape, and from which it also took flight. He says that he and Stewart have been diligently informing themselves in regard to the laws of the United States and the Territory touching Mormonism, and have had frequent conferences. The questions involved are very important, and will be maturely considered before final action, but no responsibility will be dodged by members of the committee. Some time ago, the sub-committee heard what was to be said by a large delegation of ladies and others in favor of the Senate bill, and to-day heard an elaborate argument by Mr. Jeff Chandler, one of the most prominent lawyers of Washington, on the Mormon side of the question. Among those present to-day were George S. Boutwell, ex-secretary of the Treasury, Judge Richards, A. M. Gibson, and Delegate Caine, of Utah, all of whom represent the Mormons, and Judge Baskin, representing the Gentiles. In one corner of the room sat three Mormon wives, one of them a wife of Richards. Miss Kate Field, with her escort occupied a position near Chairman Tucker, and busied herself taking notes of Mr. Chandler's remarks. The committee frequently interrupted Chandler with questions, so that the hearing was prolonged to about three hours, although no one but he addressed the committee. Governor Boutwell remarked that with the opening of spring he had felt a general breaking down of his health, and he would have to ask the committee to wait about three weeks for him to recuperate. This they declined to do, and gave notice that they would hear Boutwell, Richards, Caine and Baskin next Friday and Saturday. The remarks of members of the sub-committee to day indicated that they will recommend to the full committee important amendments to the bill as it passed the Senate, and among them the elimination of the quasi partnership of the United States government in the management of the Mormon Church property."

MORE JUDICIAL JUGGLERY.

THE case of Elder Henry W. Naisbitt, which was tried in the Third District Court on Friday, is one more of those judicial outrages against which the Latter-day Saints have good reasons to complain. The testimony all went to show that the defendant had not committed the offense with which he was charged, namely, unlawful cohabitation. Summed up, it proved that though he had three living wives, he had only cohabited with one of them during the past three years. This was clear, positive and direct. The witnesses were all for the prosecution; none were called for the defense. There was no need of any. The testimony brought against the accused was all in his favor. The case was submitted without argument.

Passing by the legal infamy of compelling the wife, whom the court adjudged the legal wife of the defendant to testify against her husband, let us look at the evidence on which he was convicted. He had, beyond doubt, lived with only one wife during the time mentioned in the indictment. But the legal wife testified that although he had not treated her as a wife except to furnish her support, he had at her request once looked at the new house she was building, and when her last baby was born—which was within the time of the indictment—he was present by request. This constituted his entire acts in relation to her that were counted on as cohabitation. As a matter of fact, during the past three years he had not cohabited with her at all. They had separated and were not even friendly because of a disagreement.

But the Prosecuting Attorney demanded that the Court should instruct the jury to the effect, that if the defendant cohabited with one wife and visited the legal wife he was guilty of cohabiting with more than one woman. The Court, always ready to do the bidding of the Prosecuting Officer, when a "Mormon" is on trial, charged the jury that if the defendant recognized and supported his lawful wife and visited her but once, that was cohabitation; and if during that time he lived with one of his other wives, that constituted cohabitation. The jury had no other course to pursue, if they followed the directions of the court as to the law, than to bring in a verdict of guilty, for the facts shown were, that the defendant had lived with one wife and had once visited another. The jury, then, are not to be blamed for the verdict, but the Prosecuting Attorney and the Judge for their ridiculous rendering of the law.

This is another twist given to the flexible and chameleon-like third section of the Edmunds Act. How many more distortions it is capable of can only be determined by the number of differing cases that may come before the courts. Conviction of "Mormons" who have married plural wives is the end in view. If they cannot be prosecuted for polygamy because of the statute of limitations, this law against unlawful cohabitation is made to do duty whether it really applies to them or not. It matters not how carefully a man who has plural wives may live within the letter and spirit of the Edmunds law, if he is marked down for punishment that law is wrested and strained and construed so as to reach him.

This proves two things: First, that it is useless for a "Mormon" who has ever married plural wives who are living, to try to obey the act of March 2, 1882. For the man who cohabits with his wives to the full extent and meaning of the term, fares no worse than he who honestly tries to observe the law in every respect. The man who places his religion, and what he conceives to be his duty to his wives and to his God before all other things, meets with no worse fate than he who, without repudiating his religion and his families, puts the law of man first and orders his life by its demands. Second, that those who are enforcing the law with such vicious severity, do not want the people whom they are persecuting to conform to the Act of Congress. If they did, when it is made clear that a man has been keeping it with evident purpose to avoid its violation, they would refrain from stretching its meaning beyond the bounds of common-sense in order to entrap him. Nor would they impose the same penalty upon one who has abstained from living with his wives, as upon another who has made no effort to obey the law.

It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court of the United States will, in its ruling upon the Snow case, place some definite construction upon the ever changing term "unlawful cohabitation," so that people may know what they may or may not do legally, and not be placed in the unsatisfactory position occupied by Brother Naisbitt, in having kept the law as he understood its meaning and then being made a victim to its penalties exactly as if he had wilfully and openly broken and defied it.

Attorney Dickson as the inventor, and Judge Zane as his echo may justly claim the honor of giving several new interpretations to well known words in the English language, and to be the champion transformationists of the modern judicial stage. When they have given a meaning to the terms which the bar look upon as settled though peculiar, another case suggests a new construction and, presto! change! it comes forth to the astonishment of all beholders.

A "Mormon can be made guilty of cohabitation with two women when he only cohabits with one, and of unlawful cohabitation when he cohabits with nobody. Broad farce and deep tragedy are combined in the acts of the courts, and the general effect is the most profound contempt for all who are engaged in the dishonest, juggling and diabolical business.

WHITTLED DOWN TO A SMALL POINT.

THE ridiculous "conspiracy" charge made by Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Varian against the Cannon boys has now fizzled out. It was absurd from the beginning. It was also a spite proceeding. Enraged at receiving a blow in the face from a sixteen years' old boy, as chastisement for putting insulting questions to a lady who had been to the lad as a mother, Mr. Dickson proceeded, through his assistant, to most vindictive, retaliatory extremes.

The boy and his brother who was with him at the time of the assault, as well as their cousin, who bore the family name, but had no hand in the affair, were not only charged with battery but with conspiracy to murder, and the attorney who was engaged to defend one of the parties was included in the trumped up conspiracy accusation. A pliant grand jury was induced to bring in a verdict of conspiracy to assault against the three young men, but the charge against the attorney had not even the faintest shadow or scent of excuse and had to be dropped.

The course of Mr. Frank Cannon in going into court and pleading guilty to the battery, so as to take the whole blame on himself and relieve his younger brother and cousin, was chivalrous and generous, and when all the circumstances are viewed we think should entitle him to lenient action by the court. As a matter of fact he did not strike Mr. Dickson. It was the boy Hugh who gave him the blow on the cheek. Frank was present and was thus a party to the assault, but he committed no actual violence. On the contrary he was seized by the throat by Mr. Dickson. And as for young Angus, he came up after the assault and was himself assaulted. A childish attempt was made to swell the cheap affair into something of huge importance, and that which in any other place would be classed among the most petty of police cases, has been magnified and dilated beyond the bounds of common sense.

Mr. Varian acted the part of prudence and fairness, after the plea of Frank Cannon, in moving for the dismissal of the conspiracy case and the charges against Hugh and young Angus, and it is to be hoped that the court will pass sentence in the same spirit. We do not wish to palliate unlawful violence, neither do we think that vindictiveness and retaliation are proper in vindication of the law. And nothing is gained by giving a comparatively small offense undue and ridiculous proportions and importance.

THE OVERSHADOWING PROBLEM.

THE labor question is the great problem of the hour. The strikes and disturbances which are agitating this great republic from centre to circumference are evidences of the disturbed relations between employers and the employed, and the lack of that union of interest and sentiment that ought to hold together two interdependent sections of the community. The conditions are serious. The results of the present struggle cannot fail to become in a large degree disastrous. Both labor and capital will suffer loss, and life and property will be sacrificed. If in the end the condition of the toilers shall be permanently ameliorated, the conflict will not have been in vain. But although some temporary gains will be achieved in places, it is quite doubtful that the masses will be generally benefitted.

One feature of the labor agitation must not be overlooked. The excesses which have attended it are chiefly attributable to those restless and lawless elements which are massed under the names of Anarchists and Socialists. Many of these are not *bona fide* working people. They are professional agitators and theorizing cranks. Many of them are refugees from European society. Some criminals in act, others assassins in spirit. They are brimful of revolution. Destruction is their watchword. They are eager to break down, and do not want to build up. Their influence, therefore, is Satanic, for Satan is The Destroyer. They nice, the hearts of the real workers and fire them into deeds of lawlessness urging if they could be separated from the true labor element, the prospects for a pacific settlement of the labor question would be much more encouraging. But they are active, subtile, persistent and aggressive, and impress the masses by their positive and determined force.

We notice that some of our cotemporaries, perceiving the danger to the country from these elements of evil, spring the question of measures to prevent their increase in the land. They imagine that a revision of the naturalization laws would have the effect of hindering the immigration of those enemies to society. It is argued that if those laws are adjusted so as to make citizenship more difficult of acquisition, the safety of the government would be made more probable, because those dangerous elements would not become part of the body politic. We do not view the matter exactly in that light. We do not think that much fault can be found with the laws on the naturalization of aliens. The fault lies rather with the administration of those laws.

But before discussing that point it might be well to inquire whether or not the danger is really more from the alien than from naturalized sources. Are not most of the anarchists and socialistic forces foreign to all intents and purposes? Foreign in spirit and alien in persons? Will the exclusion of turbulent aliens from citizenship conduce to the welfare of the country? Are they not as likely to stir up tumult and plot against the peace of society when excluded from the rights and privileges and permanent residency of citizenship, as if admitted to those blessings with the probability of acquiring "a stake in the country?" Make the possibilities of reaching citizenship more difficult and remote, and you merely increase your alien element with all its revolutionary and turbulent tendencies, instead of absorbing it, with the probabilities of its being toned down and assimilated to the prevailing influences.

The foreigners will come, and if prevented or hindered by stringent provisions from the status and benefits of unison with all the interests of the nation, will be more likely to work against those interests on the outside than on the inside of the naturalization circle. True, they would have no votes, but an alien, dissatisfied and disruptive population, it seems to us, would not be a very desirable irritant to foster and continue. We think that every encouragement should be given to foreign-born people who make their homes in the United States, to become *bona fide* citizens thereof, and that any attempt to exclude the few malcontents who remain foreigners in spirit while residents in fact, which would also keep out many well-meaning persons from the body politic, would be detrimental rather than beneficial to the nation.

The naturalization laws now require five years' residence in the United States, and evidence to the satisfaction of the Court that the applicant "has behaved during that time as a person of a good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same." This, we think, covers all the ground necessary. The trouble is not with the law, but with its administration. If courts will really satisfy themselves that applicants have the foregoing qualifications, the nation will be protected against anarchial and revolutionary characters.

One of the greatest evils in the United States is the large stretch of discretionary power exercised by the judiciary. Aliens are admitted by wholesale, for party reasons, who give no proofs of the possession of the statutory qualifications beyond residence, and sometimes not even that. On the other hand, applicants are frequently required to give assurances that the law does not require at all. Different judges have different notions as to what is meant by "a good, moral character." It is interpreted according to their varied notions.

We drew attention a short time ago to a case where a prohibition judge decided that an applicant was not of a good moral character because he had engaged in the sale of intoxicants. In Utah the judges decide that an applicant is not of a good moral character who has married more than one wife, while the most depraved libertines that ever defiled themselves and the weaker sex can pass muster without an obstruction. Here, too, an applicant has to promise that he will not practice plural marriage for the future, but may lie, gamble, swear, get drunk, beat his wife, swindle the public, consort with vile women, seduce his neighbor's wife or daughter, commit any crime in the catalogue, and if he has not practiced plural marriage in the past and will agree not to do so in the future, he is all right in the eyes of the judges, for that seems to satisfy the court that he "has behaved as a man of a good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."

If any change is needed in the naturalization laws, in our opinion, it is not in regard to the qualifications of applicants, but to the discretionary powers of the judges in admitting aliens to citizenship. These qualifications might be more distinctly and specifically defined. The evidence required might be specified. Forms for filling up to be sworn to by applicants and witnesses might be given. And instead of the matter being left to the whims and notions of different judges as to the meaning of the terms of the law the whole matter might be placed on a definite basis without making the laws more stringent and exacting, or changing them in spirit and purport.

An alien anarchist or one who has spent his time in subverting the Constitution and government of the United States could not now become a naturalized citizen if the existing law was administered according to its letter or its spirit. A man who has been a notorious libertine or drunkard, or a destroyer of society, could not receive the position and privileges of citizenship if the law was properly enforced. The law is good, but the courts are left too free to interpolate it with their own ideas and notions.

But citizenship itself is more likely to render society solid and conservative than the growth of an alien population. A few plotting and reactionary individuals will take advantage of the lax administration of the naturalization laws, but its general influence will be salutary and for the permanent good of the nation. And the citizen laborer will be far more likely to hesitate about joining in schemes of revolution and destruction than the alien workman who is not a constituent of the body politic. Therefore we think citizenship should be encouraged rather than retarded.

The immigration laws will most likely have to be revised, so as to guard as much as possible against the influx of the criminal and revolutionary element which escape or are forced from the old world governments. And while free speech must not be interfered with in this liberty-loving nation, all overt acts of the destroying demons who desire to annihilate order and dissolve society ought to be punished with vigilance and severity. Secret societies whose object is anarchy and plunder should be watched, and their influence counteracted by every lawful power of the local and national authorities.

But while capital seeks to squeeze out of labor all it can grasp, with no heart and no sentiment for the toiling masses, and while labor tries to grab all it can make out of capital without regard for justice, equity or interest in the welfare of the employers and the business they sustain, the root of the labor troubles will remain and, as circumstances will allow, will grow into difficulties that will perplex the nation and bear bitter fruits of discord and disaster, as well as the seeds of future disturbances, with revolution as the culminating catastrophe. Only in a union of interests between employers and the employed, will be found a solution of the gigantic and perplexing problem that confronts the nation today.

ESTRAY NOTICE.

I HAVE IN MY POSSESSION:

One brown HORSE, about 8 years old, bald face, both hind feet white, branded on left shoulder T Y

If not claimed and taken away within ten days from date, will be sold to the highest responsible bidder on May 10th, 1886, at my corral.

J. B. JACKSON,
Estray Poundkeeper.
Anabella, Sevier Co., Utah, May 1, 1886.

ESTRAY NOTICE.

I HAVE IN MY POSSESSION:

One bay MARE, 8 or 10 years old, left hind foot white, brand resembling a heart on left thigh and vented on left shoulder; brand resembling ∞ on right shoulder.

One bay yearling horse COLT, left hind foot white; no brands visible.

One bay stud COLT, 2 years old, white strip in face, hind feet and left front foot white.

One bay MARE, 3 years old, left hind foot white; no brands visible.

If not claimed within ten days will be sold at public auction to the highest cash bidder, at the Fillmore estray pound at 10 o'clock a. m., May 13th. J. H. MACE,
District Poundkeeper.
Fillmore City, May 3, 1886.

ESTRAY NOTICE.

I HAVE IN MY POSSESSION:

One bay stud COLT, 2 years old, half star in forehad, brand resembling an ox yoke staple with half circle over it on right shoulder.

If said animal is not claimed within ten days from date, it will be sold on May 13th, 1886, at the estray pound, Grantsville, to the highest bidder.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS,
District Poundkeeper.
Grantsville, May 3, 1886.