

EDITORIALS.

PHOTOGRAPHY IN COLORS.

THE art of producing a correct reflex of the human countenance has wonderfully advanced since the time when Daguerre captured the rays of the sun and made them do the work of the artists' palette and pencil. The silhouettes which at one time were hung upon parlor walls for portraits of relatives and friends are now looked upon with ridicule, and the expensive and glancing Daguerreotype that displaced them is discarded for the far superior photograph. A rather funny story is told of a lady and her maid and a silhouette. The lady, who has a dark complexion, was showing the girl a silhouette portrait of her grandmother, remarking that it was a very good likeness. The maid looked at it for a moment in mute astonishment, and then said:—"Well, ma'm, I've often wondered where you got your very dark complexion, but I didn't know that your ancestors was blacks."

But although modern photography is such a vast improvement over the old style of popular likeness-taking, it lacks one thing to make it perfect; that is, the reproduction of colors. The lips in an untinted photograph always have a ghastly look, and the absence of color in the face is a serious defect very seldom improved by the artist's brush, unless at considerable expense and executed by a thoroughly skilful hand.

We have long expected the discovery of some method of photographing in the natural colors of the object reproduced. Old hands in the business have informed us that the thing is impossible. But this is an age when that word is almost obsolete. The progress of human ingenuity and the discovery of previously unknown and undreamed of agencies, have developed possibilities that if suggested a few years ago would have been thought superhuman. We notice that a step has been made in the direction of this perfect photograph by two French artists who have succeeded in reproducing colors by photographic process, through dyeing layers of coagulated albumen. They submitted to the Paris academy of Science two photographic proofs of a painting in water colors along with the original, showing the exact reproduction of the details and colors. Three photographs of the original were taken, one through a liquid orange screen, another through a liquid green screen, and a third through a liquid violet screen. For the image obtained through the first screen a red color bath was employed; for that produced through the second screen a blue bath, and for that effected through the third screen, a yellow bath.

This may not be exactly the thing desired, but it is a movement towards it, and we see no reason to doubt that the time will come when the reflection held by a mirror while the original is present, will be fastened permanently by means of chemical process yet to be perfected and that thus a real picture of our friends will be obtained, which, if not in every case "a thing of beauty," will be indeed a "joy for ever."

"ITS A POOR RULE, ETC."

THE Sacramento Record-Union justly criticizes the leading English papers for their ignorance of American affairs, and after giving sample paragraphs from London papers illustrating this lack of information, remarks:

"It is also to be remembered that the writers who make such amazing mistakes about the United States take the utmost pains to be correct when they are discussing the affairs of Tunis and Tripoli, or some such insignificant part of the world. The fact that the United States is inhabited by English-speaking people makes it easy enough to ascertain what is doing here, to Englishmen."

The profound ignorance thus vely properly rebuked has its country part in America. There is scarcely a journal in the United States which takes up the "Mormon" question that has a correct understanding of the subject. The reason is, editors catch up the rumors and fabrications which are sent abroad by the bitter enemies of the "Mormons," and do not take the pains to find out

the facts. They are like an anti-"Mormon" writer in this city, who, in making some absurd remarks about the Book of Mormon, confessed: "We have never read the Book of Mormon; God forbid that we ever should!"

It may be said in excuse that newspaper writers have no time to spare in studying a religion which everybody looks upon as a humbug. But this is no excuse at all for those who write about it. If the subject is of sufficient importance for frequent reference and continual attacks, it is important enough to investigate. And an understanding of "Mormonism" or Utah affairs can never be obtained from preachers of hostile faiths, from those who are plotting to gain possession of the Territory and its finances, or from persons who are the hired scribes of either of these parties. "Mormon" doctrines, customs, objects and intentions can only be correctly learned from the "Mormons" themselves.

If the ignorance of English papers on American affairs is worthy of stringent criticism, that of American editors on "Mormon" affairs, right in their own country, is, in our view, none the less shameful and deplorable.

LOOSE LEGISLATION.

A GREAT deal of fault has been found by some would-be-thought wise ones with Utah legislators, because they have framed enactments in such a way that unprincipled lawyers and biased judges ignorant of law can distort them out of their evident common sense meaning and divert them to the opposite of the plain intent of the framers. Daniel O'Connell, the famous Irish agitator, used to say there was never an Act of Parliament made but he could drive a coach and four through it. And we do not believe that any law can be worded in such a way that professional law-finders cannot construe it so as to render it abortive, if they can only find a person on the bench sufficiently stupid or malicious to adopt their pettifogging constructions.

But according to Professor Wayland, of the Yale Law School, legislation that is capable of various interpretations is common even in the oldest States. He complains of carelessness in this respect in every State in the Union, and proposes as a remedy what might be called a supplementary or preliminary Legislature, "to consider all projects for public laws, and give audience to all persons who wish to be heard for or against such measures," and then draft bills for the Legislature to adopt. There are many objections to this which we shall not stop to discuss, and also to the suggestion by others who perceive the evils of loose legislation, of the employment of trained experts to frame bills for passage by legislative bodies. Lawyers are not always the best kind of men to make laws, for their business is in a great degree dependent on double meanings and the possibility of opposite renderings. But we merely wish to show that what is complained of as something peculiar to Utah is common all over the land, and we are of the strong opinion that no body of legislators could be organized who could frame an enactment that in a Utah court would be impossible to be set aside. The only remedy for such contingencies is a fair and capable judicial tribunal without prejudice and without partizanship.

ABLE TO WAIT.

THE Omaha Herald says:

"New Mexico and Utah should be the next full grown stars in the American constellation."

Quite right with the exception of the order of admission. Utah has prior claims to New Mexico. It is more populous, more advanced, better governed, has fairer prospects and has been ready for statehood for many years. Nothing hinders its admission but dense ignorance of its real condition and senseless prejudice against the religion of its people. The monstrous, and frequently absurd fabrications of a few government pap-suckers and others interested with them in keeping up the territorial form are the chief cause of the opposition to Utah's admission into the Union. But we have no particular anxiety

on the subject. To offset the disadvantages of the unrepresentative territorial system with its place-making for political pensioners, there is the absence of expense to the people, the Government paying the bills. We can stand it as long as the rest of the country can.

The citizens here have sought admission as a State many times since the year 1849, but have had the cold shoulder turned to them, and this Territory has been made the asylum for hungry office seekers with a claim on some dignity at the seat of government. However, we have managed to get along quite well in spite of these disadvantages, and can continue just as long as Uncle Sam chooses to close his eyes to the facts, opens his ears to senseless calumnies, and puts his hands into his pockets to find the cash to pay the territorial bills. Utah is ready for Statehood any time, but can wait quietly and enjoy herself pretty well as she is.

THERE'S ROOM ENOUGH FOR ALL.

SOME people have an idea that the world is over-crowded and that something ought to be done to check the increase of population. This idea receives disgusting and murderous practical application in New England society, and is cherished by a great many females of professed refinement and decided aversion to the "Mormon" doctrine of plural marriage. One or two children to a family is all that they can tolerate, and the means adopted to prevent further additions are too base to more than hint at in a generally circulated newspaper. But that the idea of the world's imagined overcrowding is altogether erroneous, may be seen from the following paragraph which we clip from the columns of the New York Graphic:

"There is a great portion of this planet which is not yet finished and fenced in. We have 710,688,000 acres of available land not yet surveyed, but open to settlement, and 734,951,000 acres surveyed, but not yet taken up. This is exclusive of Alaska, where we have a domain vast in extent and possessing great value. But England has still more virgin land than we. In the Australian colonies she has 2,000,000,000 acres of land never yet touched; in Cape Colony 52,000,000 acres all ready for settlement, but with no settlers; in Natal, Ceylon and the West Indies 14,500,000 acres, and in Canada probably something like 1,500,000,000 acres of unoccupied and very fertile lands. Here is a vast heritage belonging to the English-speaking people of the world—a heritage large enough to give a farm of 160 acres to 31,325,000 families of five persons each, or to 156,625,000 persons. The time may come when the world will be too crowded with people, but that time is evidently not very near at hand."

SHAMEFUL PRACTICE IN CRIMINAL COURTS.

THE arrest and conviction of James Hope, for burglary in San Francisco is a credit mark to California. Hope is a malefactor of wide notoriety in the East, where he has been engaged in many important bank robberies, and has escaped justice several times through legal technicalities. This time he was taken almost in the very act. He was arrested in a closet in the upper part of the building in which a banking business was conducted below. A hole had been cut in the floor of the closet, to gain access to the safe underneath, and a complete burglar's outfit was captured with the prisoner. There could be no reasonable doubt as to his guilt.

But the lawyers employed for the defense kept the court and jury two weeks fooling over the case, badgering witnesses, abusing the detectives, interposing technical objections and making ridiculous arguments. Such proceedings help to bring upon the legal profession the contempt of honest people and to cast doubt upon the veracity of its members. In this respect the manner of conducting criminal trials in England show up in favorable contrast to that of this country. No nonsense is permitted there, and a barrister who would attempt to attack officers and black-guard and bully witnesses in the fashion in many parts of the United

States, would soon be silenced by the Court, as well as bring upon himself a very unsavory reputation.

As a sample of the foolery and waste of time with a witness frequently exhibited in American "Temples of Justice," we quote the following from the Hope case as reported in the Chronicle:

The prosecution examined J. F. Heston:

"Do you know of any facts regarding the occupancy of 520 Montgomery Street?" asked Mr. Darwin.

The witness stared vacantly at the counsel and opened his mouth.

"Mr. Darwin put the question in another highly intelligible form:

"Are you aware of or do you know of any acts regarding the occupancy of 520 Montgomery Street?"

The witness stared harder than ever at his interrogator.

"You don't quite understand the question?"

"I—I—don't think I do," said Mr. Heston.

"Suppose you change the question," suggested his Honor.

"Regarding the occupancy of 520 Montgomery Street, what acts are you aware of?" asked the counsel.

Mr. Heston took a frantic pull at his long beard and glared at the counsel.

"I can't tell what you mean," said he. "Now as to Mr. Mastick,"

"Hold on," shouted Mr. Foote.

"Never mind Mr. Mastick," shouted Mr. Coogan.

"That will do," roared Mr. Bramham, leveling a threatening forefinger at the demoralized and affrighted witness. The hapless man turned for comfort to the Court.

"Answer the question, sir," said his honor, severely.

"I—I—cant," gasped the terrified witness.

Mr. Darwin changed the question, and the witness, by a terrific effort, grasped the idea, and described how he had been repairing the building for 25 years. He stated that Mr. Sather was the occupant of the building.

"Do you know what Mr. Sather's business is," asked Mr. Foote.

"Yes—a banker."

"I ask you Honor," said Mr. Foote, "to compel the witness to answer the questions as he is asked them."

"Do you know what Mr. Sather's business is?" asked his honor.

"Yes—a banker."

His honor cast a hopeless look at the witness.

"I asked you if you knew Mr. Sather's business."

"I do. He's a banker."

Again his Honor's eyes were raised to the ceiling despairingly.

"Can you answer yes or no?"

"I—guess—I can."

"Can you?"

"I can."

"Well, you know what Mr. Sather's business is?"

"Yes. He's a—"

"Never mind what he is. Do you know?"

"I do."

"Well, what is it?"

"He's a banker."

One of the jurors during recess, thinking that some knowledge of the burglarized building would help him to an understanding of the case, visited the premises and took a look at them. For this he was roundly abused by the defendant's counsel, who demanded the discharge of the jury, on the ground that this jurymen would be prejudged. In the plea for the defense, one of the attorneys argued:

"Unless it can be shown who was in possession of the building, it must be held, according to the fundamental rules of pleading, that James Hope entered his own house."

Another attorney on the same side described the model detective as "a merciless fiend, whose mission in life is to put up jobs on innocent men and send them to the State prison."

"A detective is lower than the lowest of animals, which ever that is. Why, gentlemen of the jury, a sheep-killing dog should not be convicted on the testimony of detectives."

"It isn't at all unlikely that the detectives themselves put up a job with some one to rob the bank and divide the proceeds, and finding it necessary for some reason to convict James Hope, inveigled him into the building and there arrested him."

The purgatory through which witnesses frequently have to pass in

order to assist in furthering the ends of justice has a great effect in hindering sensitive persons from giving information against criminals. Admission to the bar ought not to mean license to abuse any one in court or out of it, and it appears to us that the presiding Judge ought to protect witnesses from evident attempts to perplex and bewilder them, and preserve the dignity of the court by preventing libellous attacks upon officers, witnesses or any other persons so frequently made by glib-tongued and scurrilous professional pleaders.

There is no reason why a lawyer should not be as much of a gentleman in court as in private life, and it is the spirit of a coward which prompts a man to take advantage of one who is placed for the time being almost at his mercy.

JUSTICE BADLY WARPED.

THE foolish young men who robbed a railroad train and were captured and convicted, received a very severe sentence, according to the dispatches. They were each condemned to seventy years imprisonment, being found guilty of a number of counts in the indictment against them.

On the same day this stringent sentence was passed, the notorious Dr. Buchanan of Philadelphia, who made a business of selling diplomas to unfledged medical pretenders, by which he amassed a fortune, and who concocted a plan to make it appear that he had committed suicide by drowning, so as to escape the penalties of the law which he had outraged, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment and a fine of a thousand dollars.

While the wide discrepancy in the respective judgments was entirely in favor of the bogus diploma swindler, his crime was much greater and more serious in its effects upon society than the offense committed by the condemned young men. Thousands of unqualified persons were by his agency sent forth among the people, bearing the credentials of efficiency, to kill or cure as chance might happen; to deceive all who might be brought under their influence, and to physic the people without skill or any proper medical training.

In a year the old rascal will be free to go into any other scheme of roguery that he may desire. The payment of a thousand dollars will be a small matter to him after the harvest he has reaped, and he can then laugh at the law and the world. It appears to us that there was either an excessive severity in one case or a too tender leniency in the other, or both. Also that the American method of punishing crimes by a mere money penalty is carried to great an extreme. True, in Buchanan's case imprisonment was added to the fine. But the term is very short when compared with the magnitude of the offence, and it often happens that a fine is imposed for grave infractions of the law without any imprisonment whatever.

There may be some excuse for this in newly-settled regions where the means of taking care of convicts are meagre and unsafe, but in places where jails and penitentiaries of ample proportions are erected, law-breakers should not escape with a fine that in many instances amounts to little or no punishment.

In the two cases under consideration, the great disparity between the sentences is remarkable, and while in the first the punishment appears excessive and unusually severe, considering that it was the first offense of the prisoners, in the other it is totally inadequate to the crimes committed, covering a period of twenty years and extending to thousands of acts with consequences the evil of which no one can calculate.

TRIALS FOR HERESY.

MANY public journals take a very unsound position on the heresy trials which have not been infrequent of late. In several denominations cases of expulsion of preachers have occurred for teaching doctrines contrary to the articles of faith or written discipline of the church to which they belonged. The expelled ministers generally meet with journalistic sympathy, while the church officials who investigated the charges are exposed to newspaper criticism and treated to vigorous language condemnatory in tone and often vio-