

for the purpose of wrongfully prejudicing another, or to injure public trade, to affect public health, to insult public justice, etc.; a plot.

The same authority gives this as the meaning of "conspiracy:"

"Agreement or concurrence for some end or purpose, as of persons to commit a crime, or of circumstances, causes, etc., to some result, conspiracy, agreement, harmonious operation."

Conspire is rendered thus:

"To agree by oath, covenant, or otherwise, to commit crime; to plot together; to plan."

If Mr. Webster is right, we agree with him entirely, as against the position of the Oneida County, Idaho, jury, and Judge Berry—then, to reconcile with that fact, the verdict and the decision on *habeas corpus*, Mr. Samuel Davis must be regarded as "a host of himself." He must be much in little, several persons and yet one at the same time. Otherwise how could he enter into a conspiracy, an agreement, and harmonize with others to commit some alleged offense against the law?

It is probable that when this instance of a man entering into a joint combination with himself to damage the commonwealth of Idaho is brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, the latter will get a glimpse of the anti-"Mormon" judicial circus that has been performing in one of the Territories now aspiring to Statehood. It will prepare them for the consideration of the anti-constitutional test oath statute, whose validity is involved in the Davis case on appeal on *habeas corpus* proceeding.

However, after all, the conspiracy business could not have turned out better than it has to bring about a final settlement, one way or the other, of the leading points of the Idaho anti-"Mormon" and quasi-judicial crusade, inaugurated and conducted for the attainment of political ends.

#### PENITENTIARY APPROPRIATION.

Congress appropriated \$100,000 to be expended in improvements at the penitentiary. Among these are the following: The purchase of twenty acres of land with water right contiguous to the site of the building, the building of a stone wall to enclose two acres of ground, a new residence and office for the warden, guards' quarters, an addition to the present cell-building of similar size to the present one, a building for a chapel, a hospital and a women's department. All that has been done with the appropriation thus far has been to purchase the before mentioned twenty acres of land with water right, at a cost of a fraction less than \$5,000. Consequently, of the appropriation there remains to be expended \$95,000, which we un-

derstand to be ready for use on call. There may be some reason for the intention of the government regarding the additions to the penitentiary being delayed that we are not aware of. It would probably be interesting to the public, however, to know why the money is not being used. Its disbursement for the purposes of the government would contribute its quota in maintaining business activity.

#### THE PHILOSOPHY OF PAIN.

HUME, the English historian and noted skeptic, wrote: "If God would have prevented pain, but could not, he is not omnipotent; if He could have prevented it, but would not, He is a malevolent being." This sort of reasoning is specious but not deep. It takes with a certain class of skeptics, and puzzles superficial readers and persons unaccustomed to analytical reasoning. But though the first proposition it contains may be correct, the second is transparently fallacious. The uses of pain are not taken into account, nor is the question of the possibility of benefits from pain considered.

God may have been abundantly able to prevent pain and yet have permitted it for a benevolent purpose. Pain may be a valuable educator. It may be punitive and even in that sense beneficial, as leading to reformation and perfection.

There is another point to be also considered. It does not appear that pain was a creation of Deity or that it was originally inherent in man.

The Biblical account of the bringing forth of all things in the beginning declares that, when they came from the hand of the Creator, they were pronounced very good. It also appears that if man had remained under the conditions which environed him in his innocent estate he would have suffered no pain. But, from choice, he violated the law of his being and so brought upon himself the natural consequence of transgression. Pain resulted from disobedience to laws that if obeyed would have kept him from suffering. There would have been no pain to him, if there had been no sin in his conduct.

It will perhaps be argued by the skeptic, that the fact of man's deviation proves a defect in his constitution, a disposition to do that which resulted in pain. But the answer to this is, man was made a free agent. That is, good and evil, which are co-existent, were both

before him. He had the privilege of choice. His will was free. The power to do good or to do evil, on his own volition, was not a mark of imperfection in man's essential nature, but the very sign and stamp of his possible perfection. If he had no volition he would have been but a human machine. Without free agency punishment for sin would be unjust, and reward for righteousness would have no foundation to rest upon.

Nature, which some people laud and worship in preference to Deity, carries in its operations the very same consequences as those that are attached to the revealed Divine law. Compliance with its laws brings pleasure, violation thereof brings pain. This is recognized by devotees of Nature as eminently proper and beneficial, because it is preservative. Humanity is warned by pain of the danger of destruction which is the inevitable result of continued infraction of Nature's laws. Why this should be considered benevolent in impersonal Nature, but malevolent in personal Deity, is one of the peculiarities of skeptical reasoning, the logic of which we fail to perceive.

Legal penalties for crime are recognized as necessary in human government. Why should they not also be essential to the Divine economy? And if punishment for sin is proper in a moral or spiritual code, why should not pain be proper as punishment for violation of the laws of physical life? And if so, why should the Divine being who institutes such regulations be therefor denounced as malevolent?

Pain not only has its uses as a preserver of human existence, by its reminders of the consequence of transgressing established provisions, but it is valuable for its discipline. It cultivates the virtues of patience, endurance and humility. It aids in the redemption of fallen man and his elevation to the state in which there is no pain because there is no sin. It teaches the good of right action by demonstrating the effects of wrong-doing.

All things have their opposites. And it is by contrast that we learn and appreciate the joys of existence. If there were no pain, how could we experience and fully sense what pleasure is? If there were no darkness, who could comprehend the immense benefits of light? If we never tasted of death, how could we enjoy all the possibilities of perpetual life?

It is an imperfect and vain philo-