THE CONCESSION.

THE clear and unequivocal testimony which was given yesterday by Hon. F. S. Richards, before Examiner Harkness, let considerable light into the character of the arrangement that has been denominated "a compromise." The statements made by that gentleman harmonized exactly with those of Mr. Le Grande Young in his evidence.

It is placed beyond doubt by what has been enunciated that the so-called compromise was, in reality, no compromise at all, being a one-sided affair. It has brought conspicuously forward a point which we have all along been making, to the effect that the sole aim of the parties pursued has been to obtain a final decree, which was repeatedly asked for and as repeatedly, on various technicalities, refused. What has been termed "a compromise" was entered into by the defendant, because that was the only method by which the other side could be brought to an agreement to allow a final decree to be entered to enable the case to be carried to the Supreme Court, where the object in view might be reached. It has been called "a compromise" all round, because it had to take some name; but that was a misnomer.

Suppose a gentleman known in this region of country as a road agent sets out on a business venture in pursuance of his profession. He meets a stage coach and presents at the head of the driver a double-barrelled shotgun and says, "Hand out that treasure box or you will lose the top of your head!" The driver rejoins, "I would prefer to go on to the next station and see whether we cannot have this difficulty between you and me arranged." The gentlemanly agent answers, "No; the treasure box, or you cannot go any further." Seeing that there is no alternative, the hapless driver hands out the valuables.

Surely such a transaction would hardly be designated "a compromise." It was "fish or cut bait."

The Receiver and his attorneys made a demand of the defendant to hand over to Mr. Dyer certain property, amounting to about $25,000 more than the Church possessed. To accede to this "unconscionable" demand was the only means by which the defendant could reach the next station. It will be seen then that instead of the Receiver and his attorneys being liable to censure from the cormorants who have instituted the proceedings against them, those "active politicians" should, to be consistent, call a meeting and pass in relation to them a hearty and unanimous vote of thanks. They have been guilty, according to the evidence, of the very opposite of what the "active politicians" charged them with. They have been in the same business as they themselves have been desirous of engaging in.

The understanding of the counsel of the defendant has been and is that the consummation of the arrangement which has been called a compromise meant a cessation of efforts to seize other property. It is understood, as enunciated by Mr. Richards, that such was the view of the acting Attorney General. That high official has not manifested the unreasonable and grasping genius that has been displayed in such a glaring way locally.

It appears that the matter of the Washakie farm was brought up in conference on the subject with the Solicitor General. When it was explained to him that that tract of land was used for the purpose of "humanizing Indians," he expressed himself to the effect that the property named should stand as it is for the present. The ground for this position was that it could not be utilized for a better purpose.

In view of the proceedings of the "active politicians" who have evinced such deep anxiety to take away from an "intensely religious" people their property, would it not be well to establish a farm or some public institution whose express object shall be the "humanizing" of that class? They need "humanizing" very much. Those who undertook such a gigantic labor would find the task more difficult than the reformation of the simple savage of the desert. The civilized anti-"Mormon" savage is less susceptible to "humanizing" influences than he.

POLITICAL JUGGLERY.

IN THE incipient stage of the side-show scramble after "a large amount of property taken from a Church," we expressed our views in relation to its true inwardness. The opinion of the NEWS on this matter was enunciated in an article that appeared in the issue of November 30th. In consequence of what transpired Feb. 14 in the investigation before Examiner Harkness, a part of what was stated at that time will bear repeating.

The following is an excerpt from the article in question:

"Mr. Hobson struck a keynote in that respect, when he broadly intimated that political ax-grinding had more to do with the matter than a love for the interests of education. Weight is given to this idea when it is considered that although excessive fees had been asked for, the granting of these demands was in the hands of the court, in whom the would-be intervenors do not appear to exhibit much confidence.

"The political phase of this proceeding is also borne out by the fact that the filing of Judge Zane is in the nature of an assault upon the honesty of the Receiver and his attorneys, and necessarily of the Attorney-General of the United States. In view of recent political events, is it too much to expect that there should be a disposition in certain quarters to both produce and hasten desired official changes? Is it out of the way also to have an idea of the possibility that when it rains official porridge certain parties should be standing ready with their dishes top-side up? Why the Republican organ which has gone neck and heels in support of this latest phase of the robbery of a Church has already nominated Judge Zane and others for certain federal offices in this Territory. Is it otherwise than to be expected that efforts should be made to float the candidates into the seats for which they have been named?

"Men who have occupied positions of trust and emolument find it exceedingly inconvenient to be dropped out. Judge Zane has discovered this. He said as much during his presentation of his side of the question in court now considered. He has been hurt, and doubtless feels some degree of resentment."

The truth of the foregoing is being gradually but slowly exhibited. If Judge Powers had been permitted to interrogate Mr. Whittemore, who as an attorney has been in the employ of the trustees, and Captain Bailey, one of the trustees adjudged in contempt, he doubtless would have proved what he stated was his intention to show had he not been prevented by adverse rulings of Examiner Harkness. We direct the attention of our readers on this department of the subject to what transpired in the investigation Feb. 14.

Judge Powers asserted that if allowed he would demonstrate that the whole movement was entirely of a political character, and that the pretended solicitude for the protection of the school fund was the veriest hypocrisy; that the trustees whose names appeared upon the petition for intervention were simply catspaws manipulated by certain