

the laws so that such special privilege may no longer exist.

President Harrison is said to be strongly in favor of annexation; we believe President Cleveland is not opposed to it, and it seems that an overwhelming majority of the people actually demand it. This is certainly the case on the Pacific slope.

A CRITIC TREED.

In no respect is the present age more superficial than in the matter of its reading. Whether it be poetry, history, fiction, literary bric-a-brac or what not, the generality of readers have nearly always something else on their minds, or something else to do, or but little time to spare from one cause or another, and thus the "reading" amounts oftener than otherwise to a hasty glance over a few of the pages, but not always to so much as even that. It is related of an English critic that he recently contributed to a literary paper an alleged review of "The Queen of Sheba," a volume by Thomas Bailey Aldrich. The critic said it was like the author's other poems. An American critic at once protested against such a conclusion for reasons which seem to be incontestible, and this brought forth the defense by one of the Englishman's friends that he meant the poem was worth no more than other poems. The soundness of the American's position, however, will scarcely be questioned by the reader after being advised that "The Queen of Sheba" is not a poem at all nor a series of poems, but is a novel in prose!

This circumstance prompts the sarcastic *News-Record* of Chicago to observe that "it will doubtless occur to many literary men that it is a very good plan not to pass an opinion on a book without a study of the title-page, or at least without inquiring of some trustworthy friend whether the volume contains poetry or a discussion of rules for whist. The precaution may seem simple and timorous. But it would have saved Mr. Andrew Lang, for instance, from his little imitation of Don Quixote's adventures with the windmill."

THE ASSAULT ON MACKAY.

John W. Mackay is about the last man in the world who would have been thought of by those who know him as the target for an assassin. He is immensely wealthy, but has not been exclusive, miserly or selfish with it all; on the contrary, his record of good deeds quietly performed is a long one, and the encouragement he is said to have given to those who seemed to him to deserve it would if published make a volume of no mean proportions. And he lacks that haughtiness and disdain which characterize nine out of ten men who own more than the generality of their fellows, being as affable and accessible now as when his sole possessions were his wages as a miner. True, his family live in a rather aristocratic if not ostentatious manner beyond the sea, their mode of life and place of abode being somewhat antagonistic to the democratic

spirit of the land in which they got their money; but that is altogether a matter of taste, something with which they alone have to do. There is nothing of that kind about Mr. Mackay himself, nothing, so far as we have heard, to justify anyone in harboring resentment against him; and it is a safe assertion that his assailant was one of those narrow-minded cranks who are opposed to others' having money which they will not divide with everybody who demands it.

THAT AMNESTY AGAIN.

In the case of the United States vs. Thomas Pierpont, in the First district court at Provo, the defendant objected to being sentenced on what seems to us sufficient grounds. The charge was adultery alleged to have been committed with a plural wife, and the claim made by Mr. Pierpont's attorneys was that the amnesty proclamation of President Harrison covered the case, the defendant's offense having occurred prior to the time specified by the Executive as the one subsequent to which the amnesty would not take effect. The prosecution demurred to this and Judge Blackburn yesterday sustained the demurrer, holding that adultery was not included in the cases pardoned. This again raises the question as to what and whom the pardon does reach. Of course the case will come up to the Supreme court and then the interpretation so much needed, apparently, will be had; perhaps the Provo jurist had this in mind when he made his ruling.

OPPOSITION WHICH DOES NOT OPPOSE

An Eastern paper recently undertook to "show up" the cigarette evil and also that the passage of prohibitory enactments in different states and territories had had the effect of restricting the market for those combinations of cigar stumps and partially masticated chews of tobacco. To this exposition of the subject the *San Francisco Chronicle* enters a demurrer. It claims that the charge that cigarettes are made of such materials is "as silly as the stock joke about cigars being made of cabbage leaves and brown paper." The better cigarette of today, it proceeds to show, "is just as much made of tobacco as is the finest cigar ever made in Havana, the only difference being that the wrapper of the cigarette is of paper instead of a particular kind of tobacco. The paper in the best cigarettes is especially prepared for the purpose of wrapping the tobacco, its basis being, in almost every case, a cotton fiber, and it would puzzle hygienists as well as chemists to say why, if at all, the smoke of burning cotton fiber, especially in small quantities, should be any more injurious than the smoke of that other vegetable product, tobacco."

It is sincerely to be hoped that no one claims that the smoke of prepared paper is more harmful than that of tobacco, for it certainly is not. Both are, however, harmful, and that is enough, and combined they are certainly not less so. Furthermore, it is

idle in any newspaper or any man to say that cigarettes are not made of refuse materials, and to judge to the contrary because of their appearance is but to exhibit a painful ignorance of what science can accomplish. Also, it is a fact which no amount of denial can overcome, that materials other than tobacco enter into the composition of cigars—not to their injury, perhaps, because in such a case the injury by association would be to such other ingredients. And the *Chronicle* simply dodges the question altogether when it insists that some people think a cigarette more harmful than a cigar and are mistaken about it. Surely, that is no argument going to show that either is not bad. An evil is not lessened because it exists in degree; the fact that one degree is much less than some other does not at all change the status of the case. Because murder is a higher offense than burglary, the latter is not justified thereby; it is a crime by itself and comparison with a greater one does not lessen or weaken it.

Nor will it do to accede to the *Chronicle's* statement that it "suspects" the majority of people think one cigarette worse than a whole box of cigars; because if it did think so it would show itself as being in a condition of profound ignorance regarding the bulk of humanity, who are mainly sensible and do not believe such foolish things. We must admit as a fact that a majority of them do not look upon tobacco in any form as especially harmful, more's the pity.

Our cotemporary continues:

The real truth is that the crusade against cigarettes has been brought about by the fact that children smoke them, their cheapness putting them within the reach of the average small boy, and because they injure boys, as tobacco in any form would be more than likely to do, it is assumed that the cigarette is harmful, *per se*, and that the interests of society and civilization demand its suppression and annihilation. The most active crusaders against the cigarette, it is to be observed, are those who have no practical knowledge of it, unless it be of its effects on growing boys, and who are so well content with their ignorance as to decline to make inquiry or investigation.

Suppose the cause of the "crusade" is as stated, is not that sufficient justification, pray? Surely it is bad enough for men to engage in a practice which gradually weakens every nerve in the body, without having its baleful work begin when the flesh and all the functions are tender and thereby more susceptible! We say, all honor to those legislatures which have gone so far in the direction of stamping out such an iniquity as they could! Would that their efforts were oftener turned in such a channel and less in those which excite political strife and social discontent!

The *Chronicle* concludes with a disclaimer of any intention to defend the use of tobacco, but it shows a peculiar conception of how real missionary work against an evil should be carried on, or else it is poorly skilled in the use of the weapons employed.

INSTEAD OF AN ordinary backward spring, the prospects are that we shall witness a reversed equinoctial somersault.