

support an efficient police force. My saloon friends tell me that on Wednesday their trade was exceptionally brisk. The spiritual good no man, as a mere citizen, has any concern in. We, as citizens, are trying to boom the population of Salt Lake City, and not that of the several quarters and galleries of heaven; for this latter we have churches. For the former it is business and politics to look out. And as business and politics do not intermeddle with the church, we would scarce tolerate church intermeddling with them.

"I am afraid that when it comes to church prejudice the ordinary man ought to be defined as a creature without backbone. If the protests and angry comments upon this matter of Wednesday's closing were bravely given and before the event, a most proper rebuke to such high presumption would so have been given that no other city would ever again have been imposed upon with such methods. But all owing to our lack of backbone Salt Lake has lost probably the opportunity of its days of gaining for itself the name of independent courage, and like its frail sisters of the Coast it will become another white feather in the cap of a man who, while earnest and capable, is in no way remarkable. Respectfully,

MOSES P. JACOBSON.

SALT LAKE CITY, Sept. 15, 1892.

PERNICIOUS EFFECTS OF CHEAP FICTION.

SOME appropriate and pungent remarks were lately made upon the pernicious effects of cheap works of fiction by Judge Depew, of the Supreme Court of New Jersey. The occasion was the conviction of a sixteen-year-old boy named Robert Fales of murder in the first degree. After referring to the nature of the literature the boy had been accustomed to read, the Judge said:

"I never saw a copy of one of these novels until I saw it during the trial of the case, when several were produced. It is apparent that it is the most pernicious literature that can possibly get into the hands of children. I am not aware of any law that would warrant the indictment of any of the books that I have seen, but at the next term, if I can find any of those books that come within the scope of the law, I shall ask the grand jury to indict. I find from information that upward of twenty persons in this city are engaged in the sale of this sort of literature, and that it is sold to boys and girls—schoolboys and schoolgirls. And I have also obtained an estimate from a very authoritative source of the relative ages of persons who are brought before our police courts for offenses involving attempts to rob, stealing, and crimes of that character, and I will take the opportunity of mentioning the figures now. Persons charged with larceny combined with breaking and entering, or entering with intent (that is high crime), under the age of 10 years, 30 per cent.; between 10 and 23 years, 60 per cent.; making 90 per cent.; over 23, 10 per cent. For simple larceny, which involves the same grade of crime, being petty or grand larceny according to the amount, under 18, 60 per cent.; between 18 and 23, 30 per cent.; over 23, 10 per cent.—cases of a simple larceny being considerably the most numerous. It is safe to say that of the persons charged with some form of stealing, over 60 per cent. are under the age of 18 years."

Every intelligent and upright citizen in the country shares the views of Judge Depew on this important subject.

SILVER IN INDIA.

THE International Monetary Conference is still an unknown quantity. London and Dresden are now talked of as probable places for holding it. In the former city the discussion of the silver problem is earnestly carried on in the financial press. The situation in British India is also engaging attention. It is admitted that disastrous effects are being produced by the depreciation of silver and the irregularity of Indian exchange upon trade between England and the East.

In India public opinion is clamoring loudly for reform. Native merchants and traders are joining the European residents in the agitation for reform. Sir David Barbour, who is the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Indian government, says:

"I have no hesitation in saying that a common standard of value for England and India is absolutely essential to the well being of this country; and that by far the best and safest method of attaining so desirable a result is, to the best of my judgment, the adoption of the system of double legal tender by international agreement. The continuance of the present state of things is ruinous to Indian interests; the fluctuations in exchange affect our trade most injuriously; the theory that the evil effects of such fluctuations can be eliminated by the exchange banks is not supported by facts. For example, a merchant in Calcutta may simultaneously buy piece goods in Manchester, sell them in India, and fix his exchange; if exchange rises say 20 per cent. before the goods are paid for in India, the Indian purchaser finds that others can import the same goods 20 per cent. cheaper and undersell him to that extent. In such case the Indian trader either suffers a ruinous loss or he breaks his engagement and refuses to take delivery."

He goes on to say that fluctuations of exchange under the present system are causing immense injury to the country. The progress of road-building is retarded, and general distrust prevails among capitalists as to embarking on any enterprises, and all because of the fear of further depreciation of silver. He states that almost any ratio between gold and silver would be gladly accepted if it were only permanent and stable.

"Bradstreets" remarks that this statement coming from such a source has made quite an impression in England. But the organs of the bankers and money changers still insist that the clamor in India comes from a few European merchants and opposes any reform in the present currency system of India. Public opinion there begins to take a different view, and the question is raised whether by a union of natives and Europeans on this issue a political awakening may not take place which ultimately would assume the shape of a pronouncement for autonomy.

BRITISH PREMIERS.

THE recent political change in England revives interest in similar events which have occurred in that country during a century or so. The following is a list of the changes in the responsible heads of administration of the government since 1773:

1. Dec. 23, 1783, William Pitt, Conservative.
2. March 17, 1801, Henry Addington, Conservative.
3. May 15, 1801, William Pitt, Conservative.
4. Feb. 11, 1806, Lord Greenville, Liberal.
5. March 31, 1807, Duke of Portland, Conservative.
6. Dec. 2, 1809, Spencer Perceval, Conservative.
7. June 9, 1812, Earl of Liverpool, Conservative.
8. April 24, 1827, George Canning, Liberal.
9. Sept. 5, 1827, Viscount Goderich, Liberal.
10. Jan. 25, 1828, Duke of Wellington, Conservative.
11. Nov. 22, 1830, Earl Grey, Liberal.
12. July 18, 1834, Viscount Melbourne, Liberal.
13. Dec. 26, 1834, Sir Robert Peel, Conservative.
14. April 18, 1835, Viscount Melbourne, Liberal.
15. Sept. 6, 1841, Sir Robert Peel, Conservative.
16. July 6, 1846, Lord John Russell, Liberal.
17. Feb. 27, 1852, Earl of Derby, Conservative.
18. Dec. 28, 1852, Earl of Aberdeen, Liberal.
19. Feb. 10, 1855, Lord Palmerston, Liberal.
20. Feb. 25, 1858, Earl of Derby, Conservative.
21. June 18, 1859, Lord Palmerston, Liberal.
22. Nov. 6, 1865, Earl Russell, Liberal.
23. July 6, 1866, Earl of Derby, Conservative.
24. Feb. 27, 1868, Benjamin Disraeli, Conservative.
25. Dec. 9, 1868, William E. Gladstone, Liberal.
26. Feb. 21, 1874, Benjamin Disraeli, Conservative.
27. April 28, 1880, William E. Gladstone, Liberal.
28. June 24, 1885, Marquis of Salisbury, Conservative.
29. Feb. 1, 1886, William E. Gladstone, Liberal.
30. July 26, 1886, Marquis of Salisbury, Conservative.
31. Aug. 15, 1892, William E. Gladstone, Liberal.

It will be observed by the foregoing that there have been thirty-one different administrations in a trifle over 108 years. Sixteen of them have been Conservative and fourteen Liberal. The Conservatives have held office sixty-seven years and the Liberals forty-one years. Mr. Gladstone, as we stated a few days ago, has held office three times previous to his present incumbency, and Pitt, Melbourne, Peel, Russell, Derby, Palmerston, Disraeli and Salisbury twice each. William Pitt was Prime Minister nearly nine years, the Earl of Liverpool nearly fifteen years, Mr. Gladstone something over ten years and Lord Palmerston a trifle over nine years. Neither of the others reached seven years, while two of them held the office less than one year each.

We have lately received inquiries on the subject, and we believe the foregoing fully answers them.

MADISON, Wis., Sept. 20.—Arguments were begun in the supreme court in the gerrymander case today, Colonel Bird and George Green presenting the arguments against its constitutionality. Ex-Senator Spooner will be heard tomorrow.