

cians that now disgraces it. There can be no decent reform in their presence. They will never vote for the abolition of any abuse that gives them power or patronage, nor for any amendment to the Constitution that will give the people the censorship over the Senate."

MR. WM. W. BURTON, of Ogden City, returned from a business trip to Wyoming and Colorado Territories a few days ago, whither he had been, on behalf of the Co-operative Mercantile Institution, to dispose of wheat and flour. He was very successful in selling wheat, but found his flour almost unsaleable. The wheat was an excellent article, and from it the millers of Colorado made a very superior quality of flour, samples of which Mr. Burton brought back with him. We were curious to know why flour made by the Utah mills was not as marketable as that manufactured in Colorado. We suspected it might be on account of an anxiety to obtain the business of grinding it there; but he assured us that an examination of the flour had convinced him that, for the manufacture of white, merchantable flour, the Colorado method of grinding was superior to that of Utah.

Every person will perceive, after a moment's reflection, that it would be far more profitable for the Territory to have the wheat made into flour here and to ship it to market than to ship the wheat, and thus furnish grinding to mills in other places. Mr. Burton saw this, and upon becoming satisfied that his flour was really inferior in color, &c., he devoted some time to the examination of the causes. He learned that it was not the superior machinery of the Colorado mills which made the difference in flour there; but it was the method of preparing the wheat for grinding. Our wheat is very dry. If flour manufactured from it in the ordinary way by our mills be closely examined, especially if subjected to a magnifying glass, numerous minute particles of bran will be discovered, which have passed through the meshes of the bolt with the fine flour. These spoil the color of the flour and, though not objectionable to many persons for family use, lower its quality in the market, and if sold at all, it is at a low figure.

The remedy for this is to soak the wheat before grinding. This is the process adopted in Colorado. Mr. Burton informs us that this is done by some of our millers; but he thinks they do not soak it sufficiently. When wheat is properly subjected to this process, the bran is easily separated from the kernel, and it has not the chopped-up appearance of the same article ground from dry wheat. Another advantage of this method of treating wheat is, the yield of flour per bushel is much larger than from dry wheat.

This is a subject that ought to be of interest to every farmer, miller and merchant in the Territory. We can raise as good a quality of wheat as can be produced in any country. We have expensive mills, and good millers, and we should have flour of as fine a quality as can be produced in any land. But our flour, as we have often been told, will not bring the price in market which flour made elsewhere commands. This is not the fault of the wheat; for its appearance calls forth praise from eastern millers and dealers, but the fault lies in the manufacture. This should be remedied. We are now brought into competition with eastern and western mills. There are many reasons why our manufactures and products should compare favorably with theirs. Probably there are mills in Utah which make as good flour as can be manufactured in any country. We do not wish to disparage them. But we speak of facts which are brought to our knowledge, and hope their publication will have the effect to arouse a healthy spirit of emulation in our millers, and that they will not be content until as fine a quality and as large a quantity of flour will be produced out of a bushel of wheat here as anywhere else in the world.

THE Sunday question appears to be in agitation in Montana. H. H. Prout, of Virginia City, makes an "Appeal" to the people, of that Territory, through the *Montanian*, in behalf of a more respectful observance of Sunday as a day of rest. He reasons upon the influence of Sunday traffic upon the rising generation. Children naturally imitate their elders, especially in the matter of Sunday observance, and where the Sunday is not properly observed the children acquire a certain

social untidiness, and the edge of the moral appetite is sadly blunted. Says Mr. Prout—

In going to the Sunday school, they often leave their home in a stir of ordinary business as great as on an ordinary day. As they pass along they see parents and superiors in society lounging or earnestly and busily buying or selling. If they reach the church and school, they thus must go through a crowd of indifferent people, and those persons, too, whom perhaps they are bound by the very commandment to respect and imitate. Is it wonderful if the poor children loiter in the way, and soon drop off from school altogether, and are found on Sunday wherever there is an opportunity for amusement? An untidy, slovenly moral habit is the inevitable consequence. And the parents and the leaders in society cannot wonder; are, indeed, by the necessity of the case, responsible.

Mr. Prout says a word also for the fathers and mothers. Many of them need Sunday rest, for relaxation both to spirit and body. He thus appeals for Sunday rest for the mothers—

Most earnestly do I lift up a word of appeal in behalf of wearied mothers, that they may not longer be required to bear a burden made over-heavy by a popular habit that is doubtfully right. Let the gallantry which throws graceful homage round the female character in the public walks, take note of the drudgery which keeps home bright by toil that never ceases, and even when the Sunday sun rises is not gladdened. Chivalry that is worn publicly, and renders homage publicly, but forgets and consigns its object to the doom that knows neither relief nor rest, cannot be held worthy of profound admiration.

Mr. Prout contends that the merchant, the miner, and the mechanic equally need the Sunday rest, and that one can not reasonably and will not ask the other to sacrifice Sunday on his account. Mr. Prout puts the pith of the question thus—

The question is this: Shall a small minority establish the Sunday habit which allows the children to be vagrants, and makes of the mothers and mechanics, drudges in a community of hundreds? Or shall these hundreds establish for themselves, and for the young and the hard-working, a beneficent and orderly habit of systematic rest?

That's the point. The majority are not interested in making Sunday like a common workday. When that is done, it is only for the pleasure, convenience, or accommodation of a few, a small minority, not the best citizens either, and the whole should not suffer for the supposed benefit of that few.

THREE American women, ladies of course, according to the *London Times*, were recently "mobbed" in Edinburgh, that is, they appeared in the streets late at night dressed very "fashionably," or in "costumes only worn in carriages in Europe," and, although late, essayed to visit Holyrood Palace. Returning they mistook the route, stopped to inquire, attracted attention and eventually a crowd, and as everybody rushes to a crowd the crowd swelled and swelled to the size and assumed the complexion and character of a mob, until the ladies felt embarrassed, annoyed and apprehensive. Two policemen procured a cab and the ladies were driven to their hotel, the mob following and remaining sometime at the doors and near the building.

The *Cincinnati Times* thus comments upon matters of this kind—

Nowhere in the world have women the privilege of going out when and where and in what manner they please, and, provided they behave themselves, having perfect immunity from inconvenience and insult, as they have in America. It is one of the great drawbacks to our young women abroad that they cannot go out unattended. American girls would like to promenade the Boulevards in Paris as they do Broadway in New York, or Fourth Street, Cincinnati; but they find this not permissible. Shop girls and grisettes are the only young women who dare do this. Correspondents say that the Avenue Josephine, a new and broad street, where there are few carriages and life is quiet, is the only thoroughfare in Paris where young ladies are seen alone. Not long since a couple of young ladies, who had gone to Paris with their father, could not realize that

they could not take a walk and see the city if they chose. One morning, soon after their arrival, the old gentleman had business with his banker, and the two girls were left alone. Previously they had gone out with friends, or American residents. This day no friends made their appearance, and they determined to go alone. They tried it. Their lodgings were not far from the Champs Elysees, so they donned their hats and made for the avenue. Ere they reached it they heartily wished themselves at home, and once on it they people stared at them and spoke to them, a crowd began to follow and call out to them, and at length in tears they sought protection in a shop, where they were followed by the police, while the crowd gathered about the doors and windows. The shopkeeper, enraged at the sight, and fearing loss and injury to his goods, forgot his suave French manners, and berated them soundly. Unfortunately, they could not talk French, and but for the kind offices of an Englishman, who happened in the shop, would have fared worse than they did. He, however, took them under his protection, and saw them safely to their own door.

With Parisian street conventionalisms we are not perfectly well acquainted, but within certain well known bounds and generally understood proprieties, the public streets of cities and towns in Britain are as safe as any in the world, in no country is personal liberty greater or more absolute, and in no country are even ladies more free from annoyance by aggressive crowds.

One thing, however, we may observe, the British are much addicted to staring at anything odd or extremely unusual, and this propensity is apt to be carried to such a pitch that it becomes rudeness. Another thing, foreigners in America are readily distinguished from natives, and Americans in England are as readily distinguished from "Britishers." The *Liverpool* newsboys seem to know an American intuitively and are forward in pushing upon him the "New York Herald, sir?" We saw, in the University city of Oxford, an American gentleman instantly pointed out by a countryman. Americans, gentlemen and ladies, generally manifest a "loudness" of apparel, manner, and style, that is in marked contrast with the sober, almost sombre, dress and carriage of the British. Ladies of loose reputation are in the habit of dressing "loudly" and assuming a free and easy and even demonstrative manner, but not so ladies of good reputation. In this case in Edinburgh, the crowd must have been attracted out of rude curiosity by the uncommon spectacle of three "loudly" dressed ladies parading the streets late at night, and not going about as if they were on their usual business, and it is to be feared that the crowd did not entertain the highest opinion of them. The conventional customs of the streets, as well of the house, should be observed by visitors to foreign countries, and then little or no annoyance need be apprehended.

"DEGRADATION of women" is one of the favorite stock expressions of those who make it part of their business to talk against the peculiar institution of the "Mormons." How any man, acquainted with the social system of the civilized nations can make invidious comparisons reflecting on "Mormonism," so far as the degradation of the sex is concerned, we never could comprehend; but with the inconsistency of those irrationally opposed to anything they will do so, and they sometimes refer to nations in which polygamy has long been practiced to sustain their diatribes.

Mr. J. Farley, an English author, has just written a book entitled "Modern Turkey," in which, as might be expected, the practice of polygamy by that people is referred to. One notable feature in their system, Mr. Farley says, is the utter absence of the "social evil" and adultery, both of which are acknowledged by Christians themselves to be so fearfully prevalent amongst them. On the subject of adultery and its punishment, Mr. Farley has the following, which is well worth a perusal, and especially by those whose tongues are so glib in railing against the practice of plural marriage:

"It requires four witnesses to convict a woman of adultery; but as the honor of woman constitutes the principal element of Mussulman society, that honor is naturally guarded by the severest penalties of the law as well as of public opinion. The punishment for adultery is death. While this doom, however,

is recorded against infidelity, it stands rather as the expression of public abhorrence than as a law which is to be carried into execution. The annals of the Ottoman empire record but a single instance of punishment for adultery inflicted by an indignant multitude or rabble, who gathered stones at the wayside to cast at the adulteress. If a woman amongst the Druses, however, be guilty of conjugal infidelity (an occurrence which is extremely uncommon), she always pays the penalty with her life. The husband sends his wife back to her father's house, and, with her, the khanjar or dagger which he had received on his marriage, but without the sheath. This notifies her dishonor, which attaches, not to the husband, but to the wife's relations, and can only be washed out with her blood. The father and brothers sit in solemn judgment on the wife at her husband's house, and if the evidence be sufficient, her doom is pronounced. A father's love is of no avail, a mother's shrieks cannot stay the hand that strikes, nor a sister's tears mitigate the punishment. The executioner, generally the eldest brother, severs the wife's head from her body; and the tanoor, with a lock of her hair steeped in blood, sent to the husband, testifies that punishment has been inflicted."

LOCAL AND OTHER MATTERS.

FROM THURSDAY'S DAILY, JUNE 27.

THE SHOOTING CASE.—The case of the People vs. Oliver C. Obey, for the killing of C. L. Dolson, was before Justice Clinton this afternoon. There was some difficulty at the commencement of the case on account of the absence of witnesses, none having been subpoenaed. After the expiration of probably an hour and a half, however, two witnesses were brought into court and the examination proceeded. The first examined was Mr. W. W. Angel, who testified that he was in the post office close to Obey and Dolson when the shooting was done, and was close by when the latter was pronounced dead by Doctors Hamilton and Tait.

Dr. R. S. Knode, another witness, also testified that he saw the shooting. He knew that the man who was shot was a tall person and the one who did the shooting was of smaller stature, but he would be unable to identify either of them. Witness was a stranger in this city, only having been here a few weeks. He saw the shorter man of the two fire three successive shots into the tall one's back. The examination of this witness was proceeding when our reporter left the court.

TOO MANY OF THEM.—Salt Lake City is at present flooded with more than her proportion of low grade lawyers, and no one acquainted with that class of professionals would do otherwise than admit that they are anything else than a blessing to any community. They "must live," and their way of obtaining a livelihood is not always what might be termed legitimate. Suppose we give an instance: A transient gentleman some time since purchased a suit of clothes from a party in town promising to pay when he received a sum of money from a certain source. The money was received, after bank hours, in the form of a draft, and payment for the clothing was postponed till the following day. A limb of the law, being aware of the facts, in the meantime thought he could make a few dollars by getting up a case. He persuaded the gentleman from whom the clothing was purchased that the purchaser intended to put out for other quarters immediately, and, on these grounds, a charge of attempting to defraud, &c., was entered and the gentleman in question was arrested. As a matter of course, the charge was not sustained and the defendant was accordingly dismissed. The lawyer, however, had gained his point so far; he conducted the case for the affiant, and, we presume, got his fee. He was not content with this, however, for he afterwards went to the gentleman against whom the charge had been preferred and endeavored to persuade him to commence suit against the other party for damages or some such charge, and offered to conduct the case for him for a consideration. The offer was, of course, refused.

We cite the above as a sample of the doings of a certain class of persons who endeavor to exist by preying upon their fellows, and of which this city has a very large representation at present. We do not allude to this subject with any desire to throw reflections on the legal profession, or those legitimately engaged in it. The calling is of itself an honorable one, and the bar of this city can boast of a number of gentlemen engaged in it who would do credit to any bar in the Union, but the pettifoggery, mischief-making, bumbling class of lawyers are certainly no ornament to society. It would conduce to their own and their country's good if they would leave their present occupation and engage in one more fitting to their capacities. To be an able and successful lawyer requires more brains than a great many who essay the profession possess.