

legislate, because "it took a large amount of property from a church."

If this public admission means anything it means that the law, being on the border of that which legislators had no right to legislate upon, was, in the mind of Judge Zane, of doubtful constitutionality. It is a principle of common sense, and consequently of good law, that when there is a matter involving doubt, that doubt should invariably be thrown in favor of the party who is the object of pursuit. In this instance it was thrown by Judge Zane, according to his own admission, in favor of the pursuer.

He doubtless regrets having admitted as much, but he ought to be still more regretful that he acted in his judicial capacity in favor of a doubtful law which "took a large amount of property from a church." The necessity for throwing the doubt in favor of the party whose property it was proposed to take, in place of the party proposing to take it, is still more manifest when it is considered that there is not the least particle of dispute in relation to the fact that the latter had not the slightest proprietary rights in the premises.

In consequence of his deciding, while on the bench, in favor of the constitutionality of the escheating clause of the Edmunds-Tucker law when its validity was a matter of grave doubt in his mind, Judge Zane wants no scandal connected with it, with special reference to his own name. But does he not attach that scandal to his name himself, by admitting that he decided as constitutional a law whose chief purpose was to "take a large amount of property from a church," when the constitutionality of the act was a matter of doubt with himself? If he did so—and his own statements seem to convey that meaning—he could scarcely perpetrate an act that would be more scandalous and wrongful in its character, the degree of injustice being placed beyond question by the fact that the deed was done while the eyes of the performer were open to its enormity.

From this standpoint, a profession of patriotic probity and anxiety to prevent the illegal squandering of "a large amount of property taken from a church," by those through whose hands it passes in the process of escheatment, does not come with elegance or grace. Had he, in view of his expressed theory upon the doubtfulness of the law under which wholesale robbery is being perpe-

trated, insisted upon the large amount of means involved being placed back into the hands of those who earned and donated it to the Church, he would have been entitled to respect. His professed probity and anxiety to have others keep their hands away from the people's means would have had some kind of a foundation to stand upon. As it is, his overweening anxiety looks like a baseless and slender fabric. If there is incidental robbery under the law, past, present or prospective, is he not in part responsible, on the ground that he decided to be constitutional a law providing for the taking of "a large amount of property from a church," when its validity was doubtful in his own mind? Why should he object to what he holds to be robbery on the retail plan, when he took a hand in forwarding the scheme for the wholesale seizure?

AN IMPORTANT EVENT.

THERE ought to be great excitement throughout the country at an event of stupendous importance that transpired yesterday at Indianapolis. Fred. Simon, the Jewish milliner, of Salt Lake, called on General Harrison, President-elect of the United States, for the purpose of aiding the coming chief executive in shaping his policy in relation to Utah.

It is not often that a prospective President of the United States is treated to such a distinguished honor and tendered such advice as was offered by our fellow townsman. It may be a matter of surprise that Fred. should have come down from his exalted perch and called upon General Harrison and should have interested himself in a matter of such small moment as that which he represented. In explanation, it may be stated in justice to this great and good little man that he was probably in Indianapolis for the purpose of transacting business of gigantic importance to the human race—the purchase of a stock of ladies' corsets, underwear and a job lot of the latest spring bonnets.

Heretofore the business of calling upon the President elect has been largely monopolized by millionaires. Fred. evidently concluded that the milliners should also have a representation in that line; hence his call and proffered advice.

There is one thing which we are not advised of in the dispatches, and therefore are not certain that it occurred—whether Fred. put forth any

personal claims to a seat in President Harrison's cabinet. If not, the omission may have been because he had not yet made up his mind with regard to which portfolio he would prefer.

There is but one incident associated with later phases of General Harrison's career that appears to be in any way equal in importance to the introduction to him of Mr. Fred Simon; that was the presentation to the General, some time ago, of three ten cent bunches of Utah celery, the advantage being slightly in favor of the celery.

Would it not be well for some one to ascertain when Fred will arrive in this city, that he may be appropriately met at Ogden or Evanston and escorted here by a deputation of leading citizens? How would it do to greet him at the Utah Central depot with a brass band and place him at the head of a torchlight procession?

A KNAVISH MEASURE.

IT SEEMS that the threat made by some of the members of the Idaho Legislature to the effect that it was intended to pass a bill during the present session of that body that would discount all other anti-"Mormon" measures, was not without foundation. The nature of the act that was thus foreshadowed was a measure providing for the taking away of the citizenship of all members of the Mormon Church, and the readmission to citizenship of those of them who had severed their connection with the church for a period of years.

It appears that such a measure is actually in preparation, and that the Legislature of Idaho will take action upon it. It is even believed that it will pass that body. If so the alternative will be left a discerning public whether it shall regard the members of the Idaho Assembly as an aggregation of idiots or a convention of knaves. It would be impossible to separate them from one or the other of these inferences.

It goes without saying that the Idaho Legislature has no more to do with establishing or abolishing the status of citizens of the United States than has the King of Dahomey. Those are matters that are necessarily of national control, and that Idaho is not the Republic of the United States ought to be clear even to such characters as compose its legislative body, which they seem anxious to transform into a circus. No matter what measures may be passed in