

run on the range until they are three or four years old, and to render all such stock liable to be sold because the owners were not known to the constable would work loss on numerous citizens upon whom no fault rests.

The bad consequences of a literal and thorough execution of the provisions of sections 2 and 3 need not be dwelt upon at length in order to be comprehended. In some precincts thousands of head of stock would be sold, whose owners have more or less knowledge of and care over them, and which are not estray stock at all in any reasonable sense of the term. For reasons apparent from what has been said above, we regard these two sections as inoperative, and would advise constables to be very cautious in acting under them.

It remains to be seen what the result of practical operations under the law will be; but aside from sections 2 and 3 we believe it will work satisfactorily, and that it meets every constitutional objection made to the old law. The procedure under it is simple and easily understood. It does away with pound-keepers entirely, and authorizes a man on whose land trespassing animals do damage, to distrain, (that is to seize and hold in his own possession) such animals until the damages are paid, instead of turning them over to a poundkeeper. He must properly care for the animals, and if he knows the owner, and if the latter lives within five miles of the place where the animals are distrained, he must be notified. If the damages are not paid within forty-eight hours after the animals are seized, the party injured must begin a civil action in the justice's court of that precinct, by filing a sworn complaint, the form of which is given in section 5.

From that time on the case is in the hands of the justice's court, whose procedure is prescribed by the law. That the expenses may be made as light as possible, the justice may charge only half the fees allowed in other cases. In the simplicity and justice of its provisions, and in their practicability, we believe the law will prove an excellent one, except as noted in regard to sections 2 and 3.

BISMARCK'S SUCCESSOR.

GENERAL VON CAPRIVI has suddenly come into prominence, as successor to Prince Bismarck. He is necessarily an object of interest.

and as but little is known of him, the following biographical sketch will doubtless be perused with interest:

George Leo von Caprivi de Caprara de Montecuculi is the full name of the man whom the young Emperor has called to step into the shoes of Bismarck. The name would lead one to believe that he was a descendant of the great general, the Count of Montecuculi, the associate of Prince Eugene and the great Earl of Marlborough, the man who is credited by tradition with the now famous utterance that three things are necessary for war, of which the first is money, the second money, and the third more money. But there is no connection between Caprivi and the two living branches of the Montecuculis. Gen. Caprivi is just such a man as the young soldier-emperor would be likely to select. He is a soldier, what the Germans call "schne dig." That seems to exhaust what is known about him to the world in general, whatever the Emperor may know of him privately. Caprivi has never been prominent in any diplomatic capacity. He is at present chief of the admiralty, holding himself the rank of vice admiral, and has occupied that position since 1883. The great progress of the navy of the German empire during those years and the well known personal interest of the young Emperor in that branch of the service may partly account for his sudden and entirely unexpected promotion over the heads of those who have grown old in the diplomatic service and who were trained under the Bismarck regime.

Caprivi was born February 24, 1831, in Berlin, the son of a high judicial officer. After graduating from one of the "gymnasiums"—preparatory colleges—of the capital he went into the military service April 1, 1849, joining the Kaiser Franz Guard Grenadiers. In 1850 he became second lieutenant, having in the meantime gone through a course at the military academy, and was made first lieutenant in 1859. He obtained a captaincy in 1861. He went through the war of 1866 in the Prussian army with the rank of major. In 1870 he was made lieutenant colonel, and after the Franco-Prussian war became colonel in 1872 and was placed at the head of a department in the ministry of war. He was major general in 1877, commander of a brigade of infantry at Stettin in 1878, and of a brigade of the guards in Berlin in 1881. In December, 1882, he was transferred to Metz as the commander of the Thirtieth division, that being a most responsible post owing to the then unsettled condition of affairs at Alsace-Lorraine, of which Metz is the principal fortress. In March of the following year, upon the resignation of Stosch, he was placed at the head of the admiralty, being promoted for that purpose to the rank of a vice-admiral and becoming a member of the cabinet. His choice created a great deal of dissatisfaction among naval officers. Gen. Batsch, who was next in rank to Gen. Stosch, resigned in consequence of the slight put upon him, but consented to remain in office at the request of old Emperor William. Gen. Caprivi remained at the head of the navy until June, 1888, when he retired in consequence of some disagreement in relation to matters of organization. The emperor then conferred upon him the Grand Cross of the Red Eagle and placed him in command of the Tenth army corps, which is stationed at Hanover. This position he held at the time of his present appointment.

ANTI-CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.

HISTORY has repeatedly demonstrated the fact that when any class of the people living under a government are denied the rights guaranteed under its constitution, the safety of the whole is jeopardized. The wrong acts as a leaven which, if justice is not speedily done to those which are disabled, gradually permeates the entire body politic. Froude lays this down as one of the prominent teachings of history, citing, as a striking instance in point, the downward phase of the career of ancient Rome.

On this basis we have insisted that the persecutive processes inflicted upon the Latter-day Saints would be applied to other religious bodies, and that the treatment of the "Mormon" people would be cited, as a precedent in justification. While predicting that the withholding of naturalization from members of the Church in Utah, and the disfranchisement of the same class in Idaho would be followed by demands for the application of similar treatment to other religionists, we hardly imagined that a brisk agitation in that direction would begin so soon as it has. It has started, however, in unmistakable shape, as will be seen from an article in this issue comprising a large number of anti-Catholic arguments and statements, about to be issued in pamphlet form and widely circulated.

The arguments wrongfully used against the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are now employed against the Catholic Church. It is an interesting recitation, containing numerous pronounced quotations, all of which are intended to show that a Catholic cannot be a good citizen because his allegiance to the government of this republic is subordinate to that which he gives to the Romish priesthood. It is claimed that the Catholics are therefore a "menace to American institutions."

It is held that as the "Mormons" are debarred from naturalization, and a portion of them from exercising the elective franchise, so ought the members of the Catholic Church. It is even urged that an anti-Catholic oath be prescribed for the devotees of that faith, showing that the treatment inflicted upon the Saints is bearing its legitimate fruit. So will the agitation sprung by the Boston Committee of One Hundred.

Those who perused our article of our present issue, written before we