ferent men and would assuredly make trouble for any one who gave information regarding him.

Here was a fiue state of affairs, truly! An officer of the law thwarted in the exercise of his duty through a whole community being terrorized, by the man wanted, into abject silence regarding him! Surely this was a case in which the heavy hand of the law should have descended with emphatic force, but it was not to be so. When the defendant was ready he came to Salt Lake and gave himself up.

The complaining witness employed special counsel in order that the case might be pressed, and even this counsel was informed that he was placing himself in jeopardy, the defendant being a vengeful man and oue who would wait for a favorable oppportunity to take an opponent at a disadvantage. This, however, counted for nothing.

A jury was empanelled and the case went on to trial, the prosecution being vigorously conducted with such material as it had, this being much less than it should have been for the reason that no one seemed to want to testify against the accused, those who did so showing decided reluctance and having at times to he cross questioned in order to elicit what little they did claim to know about the matter.

The trial lasted the greater part of two days, and one who was present informs us that the prisoner's guilt was so plainly made out that finding a verdict to that effect seemed to he only a matter of form. Imagine the surprise, not to say consternation of the prosecution's side at least, on being confronted with an acquittal in a very few minutes after the jury went out! There was the defendant's victim with the marks and bruises all over his face, themselves mute and expressive witnesses of guilt, yet the defendant was "not guilty!"

We mention this case in particular because it suggests again what everybody who studies already knows, that our jury system is not sufficiently effective, in a majority of cases, for the ascertainment and accomplishment of justice. It is because of this that many lawyers argue that matters of fact as well as of law should be determined hy an able, impartial and incorruptible tribunal, composed of men learned in the law; then the holding of communities or parts thereof under a reign of terror, would all at once be found an unprofitable business. That fact alone, separated from any specific offense, should be enough to justify the intervention of the courts, because when such a condition of things prevails, everybody's rights, instead of those of only one or two persons are infringed upon.

The law is or ought to be good enough for all classes, and those who usurp any of its functions ought to be dealt with severely. It is such cases as this that provoke mob violeuce, and thus that lawlessness is increased which should in the first instance have been suppressed or punished.

RESULTS OF INDIGESTION.

AN OMAHA physician is the author of a recent statement that there is more of civilizatiou counected with victuals than most people imagine. Civilized man cannot live without cooks, of course; and the man of medicine goes on to say that if we fiud a man that lives without dining, we ought to watch him, for if he does uot steal our money he is apt to make it very severe for our peace of mind.

This may all be very true, yet the idea embraced is not strictly original, having been advanced in one form or another several times and generally accepted. But it does seem as though the question might have been kept out of politics, or rather, politics kept out of it. Not so, however. The M. D., in the course of a long article in the *World Herald* shows, or at least alleges, that the guberuatorial trouble in Nebraska is the outgrowth of a case of dyspepsia or something similar. He says:

"Do you know what is at the bo tom of all this Thayer-Boyd muddle? Thayer's indigestion is all there is to it. He can't think right, because he always has the devil to pay in his stomach. The ancients, you know, had the opinion that the mind had its seat in the stomach. They were not far from right, after all. The firebox is just as important a part of a steam engine as the boiler is. Here's a pun that's a good deal of a chestnut; but it's a great truth. It is asked: Is life worth living? The answer very properly is: That depends on the liver. A man with a good digestive apparatus wants to live. He never commits suicide. He sees every rainbow and thinks the world great stuff."

THE REFUNDING BILL.

A CORRESPONDENT asks for information relating to the Refunding Bill passed by the last Congress, and he also wants to know whether it was not lobbied through, in the interest of political attorneys. As to the latter part of the query, of course Democrats will contend that the bill was all a piece of political party jugglery, while Republicans will maintain that it was solely in the interest of justice and equity.

The history of the case will go a long way towards sustaiuing the Republican claims for the bill.

The question of the refuuding of the Direct Tax money has been a long time before Congress. President Cleveland vetoed a bill similar to that passed by the last Congress. Of the latter, the Chicago *Daily News* says:

"The active agency in securing its ultimate adoption and approval was a lobby composed of attorneys hired with contingent fees by some of the States, and probably by some individuals who expect to be beneficiaries. The attorneys have no ostensible interest in the distribution of the fund, for the States are expressly forbidden to pay them any of the money, but, as was recently remarked by an ex-governor of South Carolina, one of the States which employed attorneys in the matter for a contingent fee, this inhibition only raises a question of bookkeeping. The State will pay none of the fund to their agents, but they will make their promises good out of other funds."

However, a glance at the history of the case will help in arriving at a conclusion, as to the justice or injustice, honesty or dishonesty, of the Refunding bill passed by the Fifty first Congress, and approved by President Harrison.

What is known as the Direct Tax law was approved August 5, 1861. This law provided for the annual collection of $20,000,000 from all the States and Territories including the District of Columbia. It provided for levying the tax on the value of real estate, and apportionment to States and Territories to be made according to population. From this tax, public property, both State and National, was exempt. Homesteads to the value of $500, and private property already exempt by State laws, were also exempt from the Direct Tax. The internal revenue assessors were empowered to adjust and equalize valuations in their respective States, and also apportion to each county its quota.

Towards the close of 1861, collection in the Southern States was out of the question. However, it was decided, that collection be made as soon as possible, with 6 per cent added for interest. As time advanced, the chances of collection grew less in the South. In the fall of 1862, another law was passed imposing a fine of 50 per cent on landowners who refused to pay, also subjecting delinquent lands to forfeiture. But a discount of 15 per cent was also provided for the States which paid their apportionments from the State treasury. This, many of the loyal States did, and availed themselves of the discount.

The collection of the tax, however, did not progress very well, and the annual system was suspeuded. The total amount collected was about $15,000,000. The refunding bill passed by the last Congress provides for the giving back to each State and Territory the amount collected under the law of 1861. It remits and relinquishes