

thirty persons through the burning of the *Martha Washington* are outrages not easily overlooked; the wretch is not apt to be benefited by the solicitude manifested in his behalf by the organ referred to and its coadjutors.

DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

THE date of our Savior's crucifixion is a subject of much dispute to which some people attach considerable importance. For their benefit we clip the following from an eastern exchange:

"Herr Flab, the German savant, in a work recently published, shows that there was a total eclipse of the moon concomitantly with the earthquake that occurred when Julius Caesar was assassinated, on the 15th of March, B. C. 44. He has calculated back the Jewish calendar to A. D. 31, and the result of his researches fully confirms the facts recorded by the Evangelists of the wonderful physical events that accompanied the crucifixion. Astronomical calculations prove without a shadow of a doubt that on the 14th day of the Jewish month Nisan, (April 6th), there was a total eclipse of the sun, which was accompanied in all probability, by the earthquake when the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake and rocks were rent.—Matt. 27:51. St. Luke describes the eclipse in these words: "And it was about the sixth hour, (12 noon), and there was darkness over all the land till about the ninth hour," (3 o'clock).—Luke 23:44. This mode of reckoning corresponds perfectly with the results of another calculation our author made by reckoning backwards from the great total eclipse of April 20th, 1818. Allowing for the difference between the old style which also gives April 6th as the date of the new moon in the year A. D. 31, as the vernal equinox of that year fell on March 25th, and the Jews ate their Easter lamb, and celebrated their Erib Pasah or Feast of the Passover, on the following new moon, it is clear April 6th was identical with Nisan 14th of the Jewish calendar, which, moreover, was on a Friday, the Paraskeve, or day of preparation for the Sabbath, and this agrees with the Hebrew Talmud. Thus by the united testimony of astronomy, tradition, and Biblical history, there can be but little doubt that the date of the Crucifixion was on April 6th in the year 31.—Ez.

INTELLIGENCE IN ANIMALS.

THAT animals have intelligence as well as instinct, though of a lower order than that of man, is believed by many persons who are not bound by orthodox notions or chained down by the dicta of the schools. Many stories are told of the actions of animals, denoting plan and design and the exercise of intelligent thought for the accomplishment of a defined purpose, and also power to communicate thoughts to each other, which indicate a great deal more than what is comprehended in the quality called instinct. The following told by a Piegan Indian, are instances in point which will interest those who have studied this subject. The narrator was old, blind and feeble but he had been a close student of nature, like most of the untutored red men, and what he had seen in youth he remembered distinctly in age. This is as near as possible a literal translation of what he related:

"I was a young man, and I sat beneath the tree making arrows. I heard above a redhead (red-headed woodpecker) much crying. 'Why cry much?' I thought, and looking much I saw. I found why cried that little bird. Now, a great branch had split, and the end on the ground lay. Near where the split was hole. H'ya? there redhead's home. There her children. H'ya! much to be feared was he who was crawling to her home. A snake was crawling there, to steal and eat her children. That why redhead much cry. Then fly away redhead and tell husband come quick. Then both come back, and flying much try to hit snake. Soon husband strike snake through head and bill stick in wood. Make wings move to stay there all time bill, so bill not come out. Snake make his body go one way, another way. Can't move his head. Soon bird pull out bill, snake ground fall, soon die. I pick him up, hole through head. H'ya! Very strong redhead. I make arrows under trees, all this I saw and I know this how strong is redhead.

"Now, I hunted in the mountains, and on a cliff I saw many swallows and many swallows flying about crying. I thought, because afraid of me cry those little birds. No! Close by on shelf, a big rattlesnake crawling to steal those swallow children. Then fly away, all swallows, go and tell black-greasy-wings (the hawk) about snake. Come quick back and bring black-greasy-wings. He see snake and fly very high, then fly falling down (swooping down), catch snake. H'ya! Very smart black-greasy-wings. One claw stick in top of head, one claw under. Not open mouth snake, can't bite. No die black-greasy-wings. My very, very high, then let snake go. Fall on rocks snake, all mashed and dead. Then black-greasy-wings take snake to feed his children."

A PECULIAR INSTITUTION.

WE are informed that Mrs. Angie F. Newman, who succeeded by the use of a batch of slander and misrepresentation in obtaining a congressional appropriation of \$40,000 for an alleged "Industrial Home" in this city, is now engaged in figuring for additional funds for that peculiar concern. Of course we have no objection to the distribution of national cash in this Territory in the way of buildings or other material improvements. But we do not like to see money wheedled out of any one by deception, and it is as wrong to hoodwink the Government as a private individual.

There never was any use for such an establishment as that—on paper, for which Mrs. Newman was engaged to secure an appropriation. It is about as sensible a project as collecting money to buy woolen socks for the Hottentots and religious tracts for unemployed and starving laborers. It is calculated to have about as much effect in suppressing polygamy as ice would in causing butter to melt. It was a convenient peg on which to hang a petition for dollars from Uncle Sam and was successful in obtaining two-fifths of the sum demanded. That is the only success of the scheme. Division, acrimony and discontent have made the concern a public scandal ever since the cash was bagged, and the quarrels of the parties to the movement over the disposition of the booty have not yet subsided.

Before any further appeal for funds obtains a hearing at the seat of government, it would be in order to investigate the concern proposed to be established in this city. And pertinent to such an inquiry is the affidavit made by Mrs. Marianda C. Boss which will be found in another part of this paper. It is supported by the affidavit of Miss Georgina Snow. Whatever people may think of the unfortunate woman whose poverty urged her to accept the pretended hospitality of the "Home," no one, we presume, will pretend to question the statement made by Miss Snow. Neither can it be objected to on anti-"Mormon" grounds; the lady will not be accused of any affiliation with the people whose social system the so-called "Home" is supposed to assail.

Since the opening of the establishment, hired and furnished at great expense out of Government funds, as a pleasant residence for an imported matron and a few assistants and as a fad for a few ladies of leisure, four women have entered the place under the impression that it was really a "Home" where they could obtain means of self-support and learn some occupation looking to that end, as set forth by its promoters. Only two of them remain. A Danish woman from the Sevier fled from the place after a short residence, denouncing the treatment sustained therein, and now Mrs. Boss has succeeded in getting away with her children. How long the other two will remain is yet to be seen.

Of course there is the matron's story yet to be heard. We are not disposed to cast censure upon her until she has defended herself. We have no fight with any individual connected with the concern and have no disposition to injure one of them. It is not to be expected that many persons having much self-respect will put themselves voluntarily into the bondage and degradation of such a place. The class likely to go there will not be of the most reliable. Any woman who wants to work and is able can find employment in this community without forfeiting her independence. And as for washwomen, they are in great demand. There is no need for them to go into an "Industrial Home," to be loaded down by labor and snubbed by "superiors."

But everybody acquainted with the situation knows that as "a refuge for women escaping from polygamy," the whole concern is a glaring and palpable pretence. We will venture to say that not one of the poor creatures who have gone into the "Home" was influenced by it in the smallest degree in relation to polygamy. It was nominally designed for "dependent women who renounce polygamy and the children of such women, of tender age." And it was represented to Congress that with such a home here, women living in polygamy would be glad to "renounce" it and flee to the "Home" for refuge. It was the baldest kind of deception, and the four persons who entered the place did not "renounce" polygamy any more than women utterly opposed to it before the "Home" was thought of may be said to renounce it.

The inviting character of the concern ought to be well advertised in Utah, as an inducement to plural wives, who only ask that they may be left in loving and peaceful relationship with their husbands and children, to abandon their homes so as to go and drudge for a livelihood and the comfort of a corps of lady officers in a Workhouse pretending to be an "Industrial Home."

We understand that the Governor and his Democratic associates in the Board of Control are not responsible for the present condition of affairs. Republican members are in the majority and they run things as they desire. It is not likely that the thing will prosper. Too much falsehood and deceit were attached to its inception to give promise of

harmony to its workings and public benefit in its results. There is not the slightest need for such an institution in this Territory as it pretended to be in its plea for money, and those who may be induced to enter the portals of its rented house will be a totally different class from that purporting to require its benefits.

The true character of the whole scheme and the condition of its present establishment and its affairs, ought to confront Mrs. Newman or any other applicant for public funds, when the begging box is again presented for another dip from the national treasury or private donations from unsophisticated persons easily duped by any tale about the polygamous women of Utah.

A BUNDLE OF ERRORS.

"THE DESERET NEWS, the official organ of Mormonism, publishes an editorial declaring that 'those who have plotted to destroy the liberties of the Mormons have played their game and lost.' It asserts that the test oath prescribed by the Edmunds-Tucker act does not trench upon the belief in polygamy nor prevent the defense and advocacy of this belief. It urges the Mormons to take the oath required, and to refuse to answer any other interrogations on the part of those in charge of the registration of voters. In defense of this position it quotes from Senator Ingalls' speech upon the new measure, and also from the decision of the United States Court that the civil government does not interfere with the profession or propagation of principles except when those principles 'break out into overt acts against peace and good order.' This doctrine of the court is, of course, unimpeachable. The new law is directed, not against the Mormon belief, but against the practice of polygamy. A citizen of Utah has a perfect right to believe that this law ought to be changed, but he has no right to violate it. The Edmunds-Tucker bill was directed against that 'more saintly' part of the Mormon Church which practices polygamy. It declares that polygamy is a crime, and shall be treated as such, that children born of any other than the first wife are illegitimate, and that no one shall vote or serve as a juror unless he takes an oath to obey and enforce the marriage laws upon which American society is based. It is encouraging to note that the polygamous leaders among the Mormons are bitter in their denunciations of the new measure. It is very doubtful whether it will serve its intended purpose of destroying the power of the polygamous hierarchy, to whom, as a rule, the non-polygamous Mormons are entirely subservient."

The foregoing appears in the columns of the *Christian Union* of March 31st. The first part is all right. The position taken by this paper on the voting question is in accord with the rulings of the court of last resort and is, as stated, "unimpeachable."

But the latter part of the foregoing article is a bundle of errors. It shows that the editor of the *Union* has fallen into the same slipshod manner of treating Utah questions as the editors of secular papers. It is a great mistake to suppose that the new law is directed against that "part of the Mormon Church which practices polygamy." It was designed by its promoters against those who do not practice polygamy. All the members of the Church living in the practice of plural marriage were disfranchised by the Edmunds Act of 1882, and the prosecutions possible against them are conducted under that Act.

This law disfranchises all the women voters of Utah, and some of them were qualified to vote if living in polygamy. It is monogamous and single women who are deprived of the ballot at one stroke by this unjust and inexcusable measure. It was directed then, against "that part of the 'Mormon' Church which does not practice polygamy." So with the oath required of male voters. All the practical polygamists were disfranchised five years ago. The new law was intended by its original concoctors to deprive those members of the "Mormon" Church who do not practice polygamy, of the right to vote, serve on juries and hold office. But the oath which was finally provided for was not worded to suit these conspirators; that is why we said they had "played their game and lost."

The *Union* is mistaken throughout its description of the provisions of the new law. They are more appropriate to the Act of 1882. It is evident the editor has not studied, or has forgotten the details of the measure he has written about. It certainly does not contain any provision making "children of all but first wives illegitimate." And its reference to "polygamy as a crime" is merely incidental, not direct, the provision to that effect being in the former Edmunds Act. How strange it is that writers on the "Mormon" question, both religious and secular, will not take the trouble to inform themselves concerning it so as to write correctly and intelligently!

"The power of the polygamous hierarchy" we suppose refers to the influence of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, though the appellation is unsuitable, we have no "polygamous hierarchy." The intention of the enemies of the Church was, no doubt, to destroy it as well as its power, but that is something that neither they, nor Congress, nor even the "Christian" journals of the United States are able to ac-

complish. The power of God, which is the strength and influence of the Church, is beyond legislation and out of the reach of the deepest laid conspiracy. It is on that we rely, and we are sure it will prevail, no matter what may be brought to bear against it. And we assure the *Christian Union* that it is to that and not to any human force or domination that the Latter-day Saints are "entirely subservient."

WHO SHOULD TAKE THE OATH.

Those in Office Who Did It Ran Before They Were Sent.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL DISAGREES WITH THE FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 1, 1887.

Hon. A. B. Carlton, Chairman Utah Commission, Salt Lake City:

Sir—I have the honor to enclose herewith a copy of an opinion of the Attorney-General, dated the 31st ult., upon certain questions arising under Sec. 24, act of March 8, 1887, submitted to him by this Department, in pursuance of the request contained in your letter of the 8th ultimo.

Very respectfully,
H. S. MULDROW,
Acting Secy.

THE OPINION.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, March 31, 1887.

The Secretary of the Interior:

Sir—I have considered your communication of the 17th of March, 1887, and the accompanying letter, thereto referred to, from the chairman of the Utah Commission and the Governor of the Territory of Utah, presenting, for an opinion, certain questions arising upon the 24th section of the act entitled "An act to amend 'an act to amend section 5352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes,' approved March 22, 1882."

The first question asked is, "Are the officers in this Territory (Utah), who were commissioned and holding office prior to the passage of said act, required to take said oath?" meaning the oath prescribed by the 24th said section.

In my opinion this question should be answered in the negative. It is true the law declares the oath required to be "a condition precedent to the right to hold office in or under said Territory," but it also declares that the officer shall take and subscribe the oath before entering on the duties of his office," words which, of themselves, in my opinion, have a strong tendency to show that it was officers thereafter to be elected or appointed who were in the mind of Congress.

If it was intended that the law should affect officers in commission when it went into operation it is hard to understand why Congress omitted to provide for the contingency of a failure or refusal to take and subscribe the required oath, such as by declaring the recusant's office vacant and the manner in which the vacancy should be filled. Furthermore, if Congress had intended the oath requirement to apply to officers already in commission, we must presume it would have provided either that the law should not go into effect until a time within which it could be made known in all the Territories, or that the oath should be taken and subscribed within a certain time after the law went into force, thus preventing the serious doubts that might arise as to the validity of official acts performed after the statute took effect but before its provisions could be known by the communities affected by them, if it should be held that the oath requirement applied to officers in commission when the act became operative.

Now, this failure of Congress to guard its legislation with respect to the official oath, in some such way as has been pointed out, and the express provision, already adverted to, that the oath shall be taken before the officer "enters on the duties of his office," and the consideration that the officers in commission when the act went into force had been holding office under the act of the 22nd of March, 1882, (22 Stat. 30) which contained a provision that no bigamist, polygamist or person cohabiting with more than one woman, and that no woman cohabiting with any such person in any Territory or other place under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States should be entitled to vote or be eligible for, or entitled to hold any office of honor, trust or emolument in such Territory or under the United States—all go to show that, in the absence of language compelling such a sense, it would be unreasonable to attribute to Congress the intention to give the act a retrospective effect as to existing officers without any adequate reason for resorting to a mode of legislation which is never regarded with favor.

When the act of 1887 was passed there was not the same state of things in the Territories as existed when the act of 1882 was passed, a state of things which made it necessary to put in the latter act a provision vacating all registration and election offices. On the contrary, the act of 1882 had been in force within less than a month of five years when the new law was passed, and it was but fair to assume that persons having the qualifications to hold office required by the act of 1882, and in office under that act, when

the new act of 1887 went into operation, were in sympathy with that act, and could be relied on to carry out its provisions.

It is clear, then, to my mind, that I would be doing violence to this law as well as shaking public faith in various official proceedings if I held it to have a retroactive operation.

The second question is, "If such officers in this Territory (Utah) are required to take the oath, what would be the consequence of their failure to comply with the requirement?"

The answer to the first question renders an answer to this question unnecessary.

The third question is, "Are the Federal officers, as the Governor, Utah Commissioners, Secretary of the Territory, etc., to take the oath?"

The new law (Sec. 24) makes the oath "a condition precedent to the right to hold office in or under said Territory," and, in my opinion, applies as well to the officers referred to, who were thereafter to be appointed by the United States to offices in the Territory as to the officers holding under and by appointment thereafter of the Territorial government. This meaning is called for by the use of the particles "in" and "under" in the law, the former being understood to refer to officers appointed by the United States to perform duties in a Territory and the latter to officers appointed by a Territorial government itself.

The disjunctive particle "or" that comes between the two words "in" and "under," as well as a known rule of interpretation, requires that each of those words should have its own proper force. This I have endeavored to give it.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

A. H. GARLAND,
Attorney General.

Twelve million acres of land have been rendered uninhabitable in Australia in consequence of the depredation of rabbits. Fifteen million dollars have been vainly expended in efforts for their extermination. It has been estimated that one pair, under favorable conditions, will increase in two and a half years to 2,000,000. It is perhaps needless to add that the Australian farmer is discouraged wherever they gain a foothold.

The *Peoria Journal* says: Mrs. Rhube Carman, of Pearsall's, Long Island, is sixty-four years of age, has eight children and a score of grandchildren, weighs two hundred pounds and yet for sixty years she has not eaten more than two ounces of food a week. One son who still lives with his parents, says he never saw his mother eat a mouthful of food in the twenty-seven years of his life. Sometimes she goes a week without eating; once or twice she has fasted a month at a time, and when she feels particularly ravenous, two bites of bread and butter, washed down with a few sips of weak tea, furnishes her with an abundant and satisfactory repast. Her case is well authenticated, and is interesting from a scientific standpoint, to say nothing of its economic results so far as her worthy lord's pocketbook is concerned.

Poems by Chaucer were known and read before the writer had reached his 12th year, and Leigh Hunt made a stir at the age of 13.

R. R. Wreck.—The following account is given of the accident which delayed the Central Pacific train on Monday last, near the Nevada line:

"As the train was coming through a twenty-foot cut a wheel flange on the second engine broke, which threw the forward part of the train from the track. The mail car was thrown over on the engine and literally smashed. The end of the express car was thrown up on the embankment and the baggage car was broken up. There were seven passenger coaches, but none of the passengers were injured. A tramp, who was stealing a ride between the mail and express cars, had both legs broken, and his injuries may prove fatal. Engineer Cox and fireman Armstrong crawled out of the wreck, slightly bruised, and were sent to the Sacramento hospital. Their escape was considered a miracle. The mails were badly damaged by water."

MUNN & CO. PATENTS

ESTABLISHED 1846 NEW YORK

After Forty years' experience in the preparation of more than One Hundred Thousand applications for patents in the United States and Foreign countries, the publishers of the *Scientific American* continue to act as solicitors for patents, caveats, trade marks, copyrights, etc., for the United States, and to obtain patents in Canada, England, France, Germany, and all other countries. Their experience is unequalled and their facilities are unsurpassed.

Drawings and specifications prepared and filed in the Patent Office on short notice. Terms very reasonable. No charge for examination of models or drawings. Advice by mail free.

Patents obtained through Munn & Co. are noticed in the *SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN*, which has the largest circulation and is the most influential newspaper of its kind published in the world. The advantages of such a notice every patentee understands.

This large and splendidly illustrated newspaper is published WEEKLY at \$3.00 a year, and is admitted to be the best paper devoted to science, mechanics, inventions, engineering works, and other departments of industrial progress, published in any country. It contains the names of all patentees and title of every invention patented each week. Try it four months for one dollar. Sold by all newsdealers.

If you have an invention to patent write to Munn & Co., publishers of *Scientific American*, 361 Broadway, New York.

Handbook about patents mailed free.