vest themselves of. He has made the greatest of promises to all those who are kind to the poor, and who impart of their substance to them. This book, the Doctrine and Covenants, contains more allusions in the early revelations to this than to any other subject. Read those revelations and you will find how much the Lord endeavored to impress upon the Church in the early days, and He has ever since, the importance of taking care of and dealing kindly with the poor. We have done a good deal, more than any other people, but there is much yet to be done in this direction. We should remember the words of King Benjamin on this subject. After dilating upon the duty of him that hath towards them that hath not, King Benjamin says: "Perhaps, thou shalt say, the man has brought upon himself his misery, therefore I will stay my hand, and will not give unto him of my food, nor impart unto him of my substance that he may not suffer, for his punishments are just. But I say unto you, O man, whosoever doeth this, the same hath great cause to repent; and except he repent of that which he hath done, he perisheth for ever, and hath no interest in the Kingdom of God. For behold, are we not all beggars? Do we not all depend upon the same being, even God, for all the substance which we have; for food and for raiment, and for gold, and for silver, and for all the riches which we have of every kind? And behold, even at this time, ye have been calling on His name and begging for remission of your sins," etc. This subject we should think about. When dealing with our fellow-men let us deal justly with them I may say of myself personally that I have endeavored to avoid trading on that account. I think it a bad thing for prominent men especially to engage in this business; for the temptation is great, if a man has ability in this direction, to take advantage of his weaker brother. I think we should avoid these things; and instead of desiring to take advantage of our brother, we should aim to benefit him as far as we can, giving him the benefit of our knowledge and skill. In doing this the blessings of God will rest down upon us.

I pray God to fill you with His Holy Spirit, and to preserve you from the evils that abound in the world. I want to say in closing, you need not be afraid of the enemy hurting you; there is no power on earth or in hell that can hurt this people; we can only hurt ourselves, and the danger of hurting ourselves lies in our taking a wrong course. Remember this, and let it be a consolation to you. God bless you. Amen.

Mrs. Squire, wife of the new Senator from Washington, is a handsome woman. She assisted her husband at Olympia. She has a remarkably fine face and is a very polished lady. She has about $100,000 in her own name. She was a Remington, being a daughter of the inventor of the typewriter and rifle.

LEGAL AND LOGICAL.

In the Third District Court on Monday, Jan. 20th, 1890, Judge Anderson delivered a decision involving the heirship of offspring born out of legal wedlock. It appeared in full in the NEWS on the day following. The claim of George H. Cope, son of the late Thomas Cope, deceased, by a plural wife, to a share in the distribution of the residue of the estate, was opposed by Janet Cope and Thomas Cope, lawful wife and son of decedent. The case came up on appeal from the Probate Court, George H. Cope being the appellant.

Judge Marshall had decided that the law of 1876, which gave all surviving children of a decedent the status of heirship, is invalid, because it is in conflict with the Congressional law of 1862, that statute having been enacted for the suppression of polygamy.

Judge Anderson affirmed the decision of the Probate Court, adopting the same line of reasoning, holding that the statute of 1862 annulled all Territorial statutes that encouraged polygamy.

Probate Judge Bartch gave a decision in a precisely similar case March 4th. It was in relation to an application of the children of the late Orson Pratt by his plural wives, for a share of their father's estate. Harmel Pratt, the administrator of the estate, opposed the application, while I. M. Waddell and B. W Driggs, Jr, represented the applicants. It was admitted that these applicants were the children of Orson Pratt by his plural wives and that he recognized them as his children during his lifetime.

The decision of Judge Bartch was the antithesis of that rendered by his predecessor (Judge Marshall) and by Associate Justice Anderson. He held that the law of 1876 is valid and that the applicants are entitled to a distributive share of the estate.

No decision could be more clearly right than that given by the present Probate Judge, while, per contra, no opinion could be more preposterous than the ones mentioned which preceded it upon the same question. The highly seasoned absurdity of Judge Anderson's alleged reasoning to the effect that the local statute of 1876 was invalidated by the national law of 1862 because it encouraged polygamy must be apparent when the Edmunds law of March, 1882, is considered in connection with that position. Here is an extract from it:

"Section 7. That the issue of bigamous or polygamous marriages, known as Mormon marriages, in cases in which such marriages have been solemnized according to the ceremonies of the Mormon sect, in any Territory of the United States, and such issue shall have been born before the first day of January, Anno Domini eighteen hundred and eighty-three, are hereby legitimated."

If the odium of encouragement of polygamy attaches to the Territorial statute, it fixes itself equally upon the Edmunds measure, enacted expressly for the suppression of that marital system. Thus the latter act would be asserted as in conflict with its alleged solitary object and with itself. It does the same thing in relation to the offspring born outside of lawful wedlock as did the Territorial law—gives them the status of heirship. It went still further: it gave them the quality of legitimacy.

The position taken by Judge Marshall and Associate Justice Anderson is a legal absurdity on its face. The section of the Edmunds law quoted legitimates the offspring of plural marriages born previous to January 1st, 1883. Heirship and legitimacy are inseparable. It appears as if the two functionaries last named had forgotten the existence of the Edmunds act, or at least its special provisions. If this be not the case, it is possible that they preferred to swim with the prevailing current without reference to legal or logical consistency, to say nothing of the first principles of justice, whose administration is due to every man woman and child, whether he or she, be Jew, Gentile or "Mormon." While this is the right of all, without respect to age or condition, that species of contravention of the requirements of justice, presumed to govern the scales held by the blind goddess, which tends to take from children that to which they are clearly entitled, has an aspect of peculiar enormity.

We have, because we considered him at the time deserving of it, criticized Judge Bartch with some severity for what we deemed uncalled for expressions used by him outside of his official capacity. We are as ready to extend to him, or any other man, congratulation when he does the proper thing. While it was no more than his bounden duty to decide as he did, in these days of official degeneracy, with two decisions of a directly opposite character on the same question involved confronting him, it was to his credit that he elected to stand upon the law and logic of an important point, and told injustice and prejudice to get behind him.