

whom he refers to as holding Utah in "a thralldom as obnoxious as that of African slavery or Russian serfdom?" If he means either or all of these, the people may brand him what he is. If he does not, but means the United States government that kept Utah in Territorial vassalage, then we say his description is so much overdrawn as to amount to falsehood. Or does he mean some slave-driving or autocratic power of which we do not yet have any conception?

The main fact in this matter remains in the same relation as before. In the first speech the NEWS quoted from, the right of acknowledging the supremacy of Deity was denied by the speaker; his letter of explanation does not modify this point, but adds a denial to hold higher allegiance to some one else, which is not a point in the controversy, so far as the NEWS is concerned. There is now the additional feature of declaring man-made governments (for none others exist in temporal form) as co-ordinate with the church, which is a distinct and direct denial of the divinity of Mormonism as the Church instituted by God Himself, and which is given divine authority in all Church matters, but which is not authorized, and does not attempt, to dominate or infringe upon the State. But it does claim and will exercise the inalienable right to defend itself. And we hope the gentleman who is in this "fight," or "struggle," will remember that perchance he has made a grievous mistake, and has looked too much to one side, and that not the one which recognizes that the highest law for man is to love the Lord with all his might, mind and strength.

We have no desire to invoke or prolong any controversy; but when it comes to "suppliatry," to call it by no other name, we submit that a man who does what the gentleman has done to bring into disrespect, if not disrepute, the Church and its leading officials, and then gets up in ward Fast meeting, as he is said to have done yesterday—the very day when his letter was sent to the morning newspapers—and testifies to the divinity of the mission of the Prophet Joseph Smith, the truth of the Gospel, and to Presidents Young, Taylor and Woodruff being the authorized successors of the Prophet in the divine calling of presiding over that Church on earth, he is, to say the least, in no position to make many accusations as to the sincerity or consistency of other people.

NO MOBOCRACY.

It is reported that some of the members of the Legislature, on visiting their homes since the election of a United States senator was accomplished, have been treated with displays of mobocratic anger bordering upon violence, and amounting to serious disturbance of the peace. The reason given for such treatment is that the recipients of it did not vote as the mobocrats desired them to, during the balloting for United States senator.

Is it then, true, that a political faction exists in Utah which holds it to be proper, or even justifiable, to mob individuals who do not obey its wishes in political matters? Is such a thing

to be tolerated in our fair young State? Will such a faction win to its support, or the support of its candidates, the better elements of our population?

We have heard a great deal lately about what the people want, or rather about what certain individuals have said the people want. Do they want mobocracy to become an element in Utah politics, and do they want the sacred right of suffrage dominated in its exercise by mobocratic methods? Let the people pause and think. Let them reflect on the spirit that is being displayed by certain political partisans, and then ask themselves if it will be good for them or their posterity to drink in that spirit.

The fact that members of the Legislature have done that which the mobocratic element did not want them to do, and that they refused to do what it demanded of them, is pretty good evidence, without investigating matters further, that they took a right course.

OFFICER AND COMMISSION.

The following comes from Cannonville, Utah, under date of January 26, 1897:

Through the columns of your esteemed paper please answer the following question:

S. A. J. contends that if he qualifies for the office of justice of the peace by filing bonds, taking the oath of office, etc., and though he may never receive a commission, that his acts as such justice of the peace will to all intents and purposes be legal and valid. J. M. D. assumes the position that the mere fact of filing bonds and subscribing the oath of office is but an *ex parte* qualification—in other words, but a preparatory step to the legal and complete qualification of the justice of the peace; and to entitle the officer to legally perform the functions of his office he must be commissioned by the Governor; then he is fully and legally qualified, and without being commissioned his acts as justice of the peace would be null and void. SUBSCRIBER.

If a person qualifies for the office of justice of the peace all except receiving his commission, and is in full and undisputed possession of the records, etc., so far as concerns any other claimant to the office, then his acts as to litigants are valid, as those of a *de facto* officer. But a litigant could interpose a demurrer to such justice's jurisdiction, because of his not being duly commissioned, and a change of venue must be granted. If the justice for the preceding term were to refuse to turn over his records until a commission is presented, which he can do lawfully, then the person who proceeded as stated in the inquiry could not act, for the reason that he would not be actually in possession of the office.

BISMARCK'S DECLINING YEARS.

Of Prince Bismarck's present condition some idea may be formed from what he recently, according to reports, said to a visitor:

I feel weak and languid, but not ill. My illness is the want of the joy of life. My existence is no longer of any use. I have no official duties, and what I see as

an onlooker gives me no pleasure. Should I live longer it will still be the case. I feel lonely, I have lost my wife, and as regards my sons, they have their own business. With growing age I have also lost interest in agriculture and forestry.

The pathetic utterance is an endorsement of the observation made away back in antiquity by the royal author of the Ecclesiastes:

What profit has a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun? I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit. And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit, for in much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

Great has been the life-work of the distinguished German, but it has evidently not given him a satisfaction that can fill his declining years with peace and happiness. To enjoy these in life's evening, when the shadows become deep and dark, a man's life-work must be calculated for eternity. That alone gives full satisfaction, when the vanity of all earthly things appears in its stern reality.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

Some months ago the question as to whether an appeal to the State Supreme court would lie from an interlocutory order by a district court, was decided in the negative by the higher tribunal, which based its decision on the language of that clause in the State Constitution governing the subject. The decision occasioned much discussion and some disappointment among prominent members of the bar, and at the meeting of the Bar association held Monday it was proposed to attempt to secure a constitutional amendment correcting the injustice litigants often suffer under the present rule. A bill looking to the same end is pending in the Legislature. Appeals ought to be allowed from other than the final judgments of district courts, and it was a serious mistake in framing the Constitution to prohibit them.

It was also proposed, in the Bar association meeting, to amend the State's organic law so as to make necessary only one reading of a bill in each house of the Legislature, before the vote on its final passage. The wisdom of such an amendment is open to question. It would facilitate the passage of hasty and ill-considered legislation, and no sufficient reason is apparent why each bill should not, before final passage in each house, go regularly through the three stages known as first, second and third readings.

A third amendment to the State Constitution, discussed by the lawyers, was one to exclude all evidence tending to show that a bill was not properly passed by the Legislature, if a copy of it, duly signed by the presiding officer of each house and the Governor, has been filed with the Secretary of State. Such an amendment would make a bill so signed and filed the law of the land, and would