

which he was very "clear," or on his argument on the main question. As the argument of the Solicitor-General covered a great deal of legal acreage, as to what was its central or main question might be considered doubtful. He dwelt upon the sending of an army here by President Buchanan. Was that made the main question, and will that influence the court in making up the decision he anticipates? True the statehood business and Buchanan's blunder do not seem to be connected with what Judge Zane has characterized as the taking of "a large amount of property from a church," but we would like to know just what Moccasin McBride's estimate of the Supreme Court of the United States is.

Had the writer of the letter to the paper by which he swears given any evidence that "Jenks's argument" had caused him to take a few shares of stock in "this church suit," he might have been credited with being in a somewhat similar position to that of a fellow who was placed upon trial for the commission of a crime. At the opening of the proceedings he knew he was a guilty man, but after hearing the argument of his counsel he became convinced of his own innocence. The logic of facts in his possession melted before the influence of sophistical reasoning.

But did Mr. McBride ever take stock in the Church suit? The fact of the matter is that he and his ilk are responsible for it. They clamored for the legislation that produced it. His two associates—Baskin and West—were in Washington while that infamous statute—the Edmunds-Tucker law—which takes a "large amount of property from a church" was on the tapis, and put forth all the power they possessed to have it pushed through. But stealing even from an unpopular church is not popular; hence it is common for those who assisted to bring about the consummation of their wishes to say, "I never took much stock in this Church suit," and at the same time secretly rub their hands in great glee over the progress of spoliation.

With the "active politicians" that have kept up the ceaseless agitation that has rendered it possible to "take a large amount of property from a church," spoliation, political and material, has been the solitary objective point toward which they have industriously worked. To say at this late date, "I never took much stock in this church suit," and then

express an anticipation, which is parent to the desire, of a people being robbed of their hard earnings is altogether too thin.

A PERFIDIOUS MEASURE.

IT APPEARS that Governor Stevenson has signed the law passed by the Idaho Legislature disfranchising "Mormons." It is presumed that this is the measure which provides that the Latter-day Saints be deprived of citizenship of the United States, and for the readmission to that status of those who sever their connection with the Church for a series of years, on their taking a religious test oath.

The governor tries to take the curse off his action in attaching his official signature to the abominable thing by stating in a message to the Assembly that the opinion of many eminent lawyers regarding it is to the effect that it is "illegal and unconstitutional."

He might have added that such is and must be the view of every person who has an ounce of comprehension of the genius of American liberty and institutions. In effect he stated that such was his own opinion, but preferred that the matter should be carried through the courts. That means that a people should be robbed of rights as dear as life pending the slow and tedious action of the courts when the wrong should be nipped in its incipency.

Suppose a law should be passed by a legislative body providing that a portion or class of the people should be despoiled of their goods by another class—the disfranchisement law recently enacted by the Idaho Legislature is no less infamous—would it be competent to hold that it would be preferable to let the matter take its course in the courts to preventing the consummation of the perfidy?

How much nobler a part it would have been for Governor Stevenson to have declined to endorse the villainous measure and returned it to the Assembly unsigned, accompanied by a message embodying a quotation from the Federal Constitution, forbidding the application of any religious test, together with a quotation from the United States statutes respecting the naturalization of citizens. Instead of acting upon what appeared to be his own conviction in relation to the late legal monstrosity enacted to rob an honest people of their dearest rights, he has participated in perpetrating one of the most barefaced legal outrages on

the record of any civilized country on earth. It will cast eternal disgrace upon all who have taken any part in formulating or enacting it.

It is indeed to be regretted that a man so naturally honorable and good as Governor Stevenson should have considered it needful to ignore his own convictions by making an unwarrantable concession to a senseless and malicious popular clamor.

BOULANGER'S TRIUMPH.

THE immense majority received by General Boulanger in the Department of the Seine Jan. 27 sets all doubts at rest as to how or where he stands with the people of France. Others may be President of the Republic, since that official is elected by the French Congress, but so long as he retains his present hold upon the masses, they will hold a "barren sceptre in their gripe," and exercise authority that will be so theatrical as to almost provoke a smile of derision.

Of course the Department of the Seine is but one out of many divisions in which representatives are chosen; but it is the most populous, wealthy, and presumably best informed of all; and besides, the General has been chosen from other departments, quite recently from that of the Nord (North), and his candidacy which culminated yesterday was admittedly a test of his strength and the people's will regarding his policy. He has more than confirmed this by announcing, shortly after the result became known, that he would not occupy the seat from the Seine, but that from the Nord. He can do pretty much as he pleases under the circumstances, and few there be now who will undertake to say him nay.

The allied powers need no longer hang in suspense as to what the dominating influence in France is. It is the policy of Boulanger—Peace with honor, not peace at any price, with the *ravanche* (revenge) party held in check only so far as to prevent them from being aggressors; the dignity of France at all hazards and the restoration of Alsace and Lorraine when the opportunity arrives, to be the watchwords. The sentinels on the border will probably be increased, but they would amount to no more than so many wisps of straw in the track of a flood, at least for the time being. If an outbreak should come. The first dash would be for Metz and Strasburg, and it would surely be so impetuous and