

from his native country to make this country his home." Well, now, this is too much. Logically, then, the naturalization law means that an alien can declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States on the date of his departure from the port of Liverpool and not after he sets foot on American soil, even if he should be detained six months on the coast of Newfoundland. Not only this, but carrying the theory forward in its legitimate channel, the alien would be a full-fledged citizen from the date of his declaration of intention.

We emphatically dispute the existence of the alleged California decision, claimed to establish the residence of a person in that State from the hour he made up his mind to take up his abode there and began the journey over the plains at the rear end of the swift-footed ox. Even in those days of western judicial crudity we doubt if a pronounced imbecile or haggling light ever occupied the bench in the Golden State to produce such a legal enormity. We doubt if a lawyer or newspaper outside of Utah could be found to advance or endorse it. If it exists, let the parody on legal sense be produced and held up to the public gaze as a melancholy outgrowth of judicial incapacity.

In connection with the statement of the News already quoted, we said:

Just let a person apply this theory to the general affairs of life, and then calculate the character of the bolt he makes from the line of the commonest kind of common sense.

That the intention to do anything of any character whatever, constitutes the contemplated act an accomplished fact is the acme of absurdity. With as much logic as in the matter of residence it could be held that a man and woman were married from the time they formed an intention to enter that relationship with each other. The application of such a theory would, beyond dispute, lead to the most embarrassing situations and results.

It remained for a political party to formulate this monstrous theory in order to stuff the ballot boxes with the votes of persons who were not qualified electors, and to consummate the infamy by taking it as a basis in the defense of their tools who were arrested for breaking the law. How can they escape the odium attached to a well founded charge of *particeps criminis*? Let every man answer the question according to his liking.

A SPECIES OF INTIMIDATION.

"C. E. POMEROY met a couple of very fly young Mormons Feb. 13 in a North Bench car who had considerable to say about P. V. Junction and Colorado voters. Mr. Pomeroy took out his note book and inquired for names and addresses as he wished to cite the blowhards before the grand jury to testify as to their knowledge of the alleged frauds. This shut the young roosters up, and they had no more to say. The lawyers tell Mr. Pomeroy this was just the thing to do. So whenever any Gentile hears a Saint shooting off his mouth about Liberal frauds at the election, cite that Saint before the grand jury and make him back up what he says or crawl-fish."

The foregoing is from this morning's issue of the organ and defender of the conspirators who are popularly held responsible for robbing the people at the polls on Feb. 10. It is very desirable in certain quarters that the means by which that robbery was accomplished should be forgotten. All talk about a registration car making a trip over the Rio Grande Western Railway is especially irritating to a certain class of persons now in this city. To be reminded of the nefarious means by which a triumph is gained is generally exasperating to the persons who gained it. It mars the joy with which they gloat over their victory, for remorse is a sensation which few men have the power to subdue at will, when circumstances exist of a nature to produce it.

It has never been denied, but virtually admitted, by the parties chiefly concerned, that a registration car went over the Rio Grande Western, and that inmates of it registered men by the hundred who had no right to vote in this city. This is a topic which ought to be discussed and ventilated by all good citizens, until a public sentiment shall be created that shall produce a universal abhorrence of the foul crime against the elective franchise. In street cars, on the streets, in all public places, and at the firesides of the people, it is proper that the shameful character of this great outrage should be dwelt upon so that the community may be educated up to a proper detestation of the methods by which the conspirators won the election.

People have a right to discuss this matter, and express their hatred of this great wrong, even though they may not have such a personal knowledge of it as would qualify them to testify before a grand jury condemning it. A threat to summon persons overheard talking about it, to give evidence before a grand jury is intimidation of a character which confesses what it seeks to conceal.

IT WILL HARDLY PASS.

FROM further information which has come to hand respecting the nature of the anti-"Mormon" bill recently introduced by Senator McDonald in the Canadian Parliament, it would appear that it exceeds anything of the kind attempted even in the United States. An exchange says of it:

"It forbids any kind of marriage relation with more than one woman or one man, or the entering into what among the sect called the Church of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as Mormons, are known as spiritual or plural marriages. It is also provided that it shall not be necessary, in order to procure conviction, to prove positive cohabitation between the parties accused, and a wife or husband of defendant may be used as a witness against him or her. The bill was read the first time."

If such are the provisions of this bill, it may have been framed in Utah and sent to Canada to be introduced "by request." Surely no Canadian lawyer or statesman would ever devise an intended law which should provide that "in order to procure conviction," positive proof of the offense should not be required. The British constitution has not yet been sufficiently undermined and honeycombed to be rotten enough to admit of the passage of such legislation. "The bill was read the first time," by its title probably. When it comes to be considered by sections, its antagonism to the British constitution will be too apparent, in our opinion, to admit of its further serious consideration.

TEST OATH.

UNDER this caption the St. Louis *Republican*, in its issue of last Saturday, February 8th, published the annexed article as its leading editorial. It is high-toned, clear and logically unanswerable. Its perusal is commended to the leading "Liberal" anti-Constitution demagogues and opponents of human freedom in Utah:

"The religious test oath has always been odious among free peoples, and in America test oaths of any kind except those pledging the affiant to support the constitutions, State and Federal, have been looked upon as a part of the machinery of despotism. The spirit of Americanism requires that punishment shall not be inflicted for any uncommitted wrong, and rejects the doctrine that any man may be rightly punished by human law for his thoughts, however criminal. When a crime has been committed and the perpetrator convicted of it, infamy, involving loss of citizenship and the privilege of office-holding, rightly follows as a part of the punishment. A citizen in moments of such mental aberration as may