

trifle weak, and is hungry as well. The latter want supplied the former condition passes away, and the patient feels relief.

Of course it must not be thought that stomach-rinsing is a cure-all, though it may reach the seat of trouble and aid in correcting many disorders of the human body. In some affections it has been tried without avail. Yet the beneficial results that have followed it in some instances show that it possesses a virtue in some cases of illness. There is no patent on warm water and a rubber tube, and when its use effects the cleaning of the fire-box or stomach of the human engine, the ills that come from its being clogged up are consequently removed. We are not especially inclined to recommend the remedy, and cannot speak of it from personal knowledge. We can, however, heartily endorse the suggestion of a medical friend, that every person should endeavor to masticate his food thoroughly and take sufficient exercise to have it all assimilated, and thus—since prevention is ten times better than the best kind of cure—reducing to a minimum the danger of being visited by stomach disorders.

NOT THE "MORMON" WAY.

Not only in statements published in this city, but more frequently in correspondence from here published in outside newspapers, there has been of late a good deal of malicious falsehood and sentimental drivel about the desertion of plural wives and their families by husbands and fathers, who put forth their duty to the laws of the country as a pretext for thus ignobly relieving themselves of the care and responsibility which such relations had imposed upon them. The NEWS has not felt called upon to take up these stories and brand them as they deserve, for the reason that there was at best but the flimsiest foundation for them, and every reasonable person in Utah knew them to be essentially untrue. The frequent quotation and repetition of the scandalous falsehood, however, cannot be permitted to go on indefinitely without protest and denial. And when it happens, as in a correspondence from this city to the *Chicago Tribune* now before us, that the reportorial fancy has fairly revelled in atrocious mendacity, it is time that lies should be stigmatized as such, so that those who might be innocently misled by them may be able to accord them the treatment that known fabrications are worthy of and usually receive.

It is a singular fact that no matter what the "Mormons" do or try to do, they are invariably the subject of some souls' complaining. To writers for the press especially have this people been a veritable mine of sensation, hypocrisy and cant. We were criticised if we pursued a certain policy, and were criticised when we abandoned it for some other; we have been blamed if we did, and blamed if we didn't; until in sheer disgust at fickle men's shifting views, if such had ever had influence with us at all, we would have been justified in doing as we pleased and sending public opinion whirling to the bowwows.

Now, as to this charge of deserting plural wives and leaving them and their families in destitution, the NEWS has only this much to say: it is a sin neither counseled or permitted by the Priesthood, nor practiced by any Latter-day Saint in good standing in the Church. Every Mormon knows that no law can be enacted to absolve a man from the duties of supporting and caring for those who have these sacred claims upon him. No man with the least spark of honor would seek to evade responsibilities of this kind incurred under other conditions. With the Saints, religious duty as well as human honor constitute a pledge that cannot be ignored. Members of the Church have needed no instruction on the subject, and need none now—least of all from those who, as above stated, scan their conduct with a microscope to discover something to find fault with. That all men having plural wives and families are the soul of honor and the ideal of integrity is a claim we shall not attempt to make; but we cannot be contradicted in the statement that the almost universal rule and practice is that such men do provide for and cherish the wives whom the law may prevent them from living with, and do support the children from whose association changed conditions may have more or less cut them off. The contempt which the entire community would feel for a father who acted otherwise is a penalty which no man would wish to incur. Still more unlikely is it that a man who values his standing in the Church and the good will of his fellow-members and those who preside over him, would care to invite the odium that with this people attaches to a recanter, a coward, and a sneak. Fortunately, Mormon husbands and fathers are not made of that kind of stuff. If there is one of this sort, we do not happen to know of him. We trust there are none, and are certain there can be but very few. In view of this statement of the case, will not our super-critical contemporaries—whose extreme anxiety that we tread bravely the path of duty and steadfastness is sometimes as ludicrous as it is contradictory—do us the credit to say that the Mormons are not in the habit of deserting anybody?

MEXICAN LAND GRANTS.

A decision of the United States court of private land claims, made at Tucson, Arizona, on Friday afternoon, March 30, is of great interest to those connected with Mexican land grants, and especially to a large number of settlers in southern Arizona who have settled on the lands in question. There was an area of about 73,000 acres in dispute between the settlers and the claimants under grants from the state of Sonora and the Spanish officials of the Mexican republic.

Three of the grants in question were of the first class named. They are the San Rafael del Valle, made in 1833, 18,000 acres; Babacomari, made in 1832, 36,000 acres; and the Nogales de Elias, made in 1844, 10,000 acres. The claimants under these grants relied on the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which confirmed all previous grants by the government of Mexico, therefore

the court dealt with the validity of the claim under Mexican law. In 1854 Santa Ana, who was dictator in Mexico from 1853 to 1855, declared that all grants made by the states or provinces of Mexico and not specially confirmed by the general government were void. The claimants to these lands under the Sonora grants insisted that the treaty referred to was a confirmation and recognized the validity of the grants. The court, however, held otherwise, and decided that, while Santa Ana's decree was eight years subsequent to the treaty, it affected the grants previously made by Sonora, and, in declaring them void, vacated the claim of the grantees.

Another grant is known as the Sonita, made in 1821, for 9,000 acres. It was issued May 15, 1825, by Juan Miguel Riesgo, commissary general of the treasury of public credit and war of the republic of Mexico for the state of the west. The proceedings to secure this grant were instituted May 29, 1821, and completed November 12, 1821, when the purchase money was said to be paid. This latter date would be the time of perfecting the title, if it had been done. The claimants urged that as Mexican independence was not established until 1824, the grant of the Spanish officials, under which the title was issued by Riesgo, was valid. The court, however, held differently. The declaration of independence was adopted March 1, 1821, and under the revolution which followed, the City of Mexico was evacuated and the provisional government, composed of a regency of five and a legislative body, was established in the capital city September 27, 1821. As the Mexican republic succeeded this, and the Spaniards never regained control, the court holds that the Spanish officials were ousted in March, and therefore any title based on their sovereignty in May to November following was void, although the contest was continued and did not result in the ejection of the Spanish officials until a subsequent date.

The settlers on the disputed lands are highly elated over the turn in affairs and at the logic by which the court reaches its conclusions. It is the general opinion that any appeal to the United States Supreme Court must result in favor of the settlers, as in the first three grants the decision of the claims court upholds the general government of Mexico in interpreting its own procedure, and in the other the rule always maintained by the United States in its own history, that the Declaration of Independence, and not the date of success through the revolution, was the inception of the exercise of governmental power by the republic.

BISMARCK'S BIRTHDAY.

The saying that whosoever commences his earthly career on the first day of April—All Fools' Day—must necessarily be himself a fool—that, is, more conspicuously so than other mortals—must have originated before the time of Prince Bismarck, or suffered conspicuous denial since; for that distinguished mortal, born April 1, 1815, is one of the last to whom any—