

King, by having an amount in dispute, and thus leaving unincorporated the question in litigation.

"I can get that kind of hay," once said a wag and well known limb of the law, on a certain occasion, as a load of timothy passed along the street. "Why, how's that?" was the query. "By simply laying claim to it and getting the matter arbitrated," he replied; "the arbitrators will be sure to split the difference and I'll get one position." This was an exaggeration, of course, but it illustrated the althod and improper method of settling such difficulties that is not infrequently adopted.

To deal out even-handed justice requires not only acuteness of intellect, but firmness of mind, decision of character and an unbiased sense of fairness and equity. The idea of trying to please both parties, or either party, ought never to be entertained by a judge or arbitrator of any kind, civil or ecclesiastical. In settling differences between brethren, whether as arbitrators, teachers or as a court, the rights of the parties, the square, straightforward and undeviating course of truth and righteousness ought to be pursued, without fear or favor or sentimentality.

The feelings of the parties or their friends ought to cut no figure and exercise no influence in a question of right. Mercy must not rob justice. Equity, facts and figures must not head to wishes and opinion. Clear, honest, unbiased judgment should follow, and feeling ought not to be a factor in the decision. When a fair decision is rendered, kindness and gentle persuasions may come in to temper the rigid claims of equity and soften the demands of exact justice.

There is some difference between the rules required to settle disputes and those that should govern adjudication upon transgressors. Motives and chances and palliations that may be considered in the latter, do not enter so largely into the adjustment of the former, and allowances that might be made in pronouncing penalties, could not be permitted rightly to affect decisions involving rights of property.

If a plaintiff is found to be entitled to his claim, it ought to be allowed without flinching or subterfuge. And the Michigan judge who recognized this principle and exposed wrong doers to the consequences of their actions, is entitled to the thanks of the public and laudations of all lovers of rectitude and square-dealing.

It appears that in twenty-two of the latter there are 308,000 more women than men. This means a much larger population of unmarried women than appears by the figures. For, it is an undisputed fact that there are large numbers of men who do not marry. Many of them think they cannot, because of circumstances, and many more will not because they do not wish to incur the expense and bear the responsibilities which are attached to wedlock. This throws an immense body of unmarried women upon the community, and tends to increase the volume of those social evils that are the curse of modern Christendom.

In those portions of the country where the males are in numerical excess of the females, it will be found, on investigation, that there are large numbers of unmarried ladies. And this is usually true, whether the territory is natural to women, although it brings to them so much more care and suffering than to men. They have a tendency in that direction. It is born in them and belongs to their organization. Women who have no inclination to marry are rare exceptions, and there are only enough of them to prove the rule of disposition. The blame of their spinsterhood rests upon the stony or timid bachelors who will not marry, and not upon the women themselves.

One eastern journal suggests that the Territories in which so much bachelorhood preponderates might establish a local equilibrium by "making a rail on the neighboring Mormons." This idea springs from the conviction that the cause about our affairs. That editor will be surprised to learn that according to the latest authorized census, Utah has over six thousand more males than females. So, according to this, there are no "surplus women" in Utah to spare to the surrounding Territories.

And even here, where matrimony is supposed to be the principal business or common diversion, there are large numbers of young women who have no husbands and who seem to be single blessedness. Marriage does not seem to depend so much upon the equality or inequality of the sexes as upon the disposition of the "lords of creation" to couple up with the ladies. Go where you will, unless it is in some mining camp, or other region where the circumstances and surroundings are such as to exclude women to a great extent, and you will find plenty of opportunities for men to marry, if they are so inclined.

The rightfulness and practicability of plural marriage do not rest upon the question of the relative numbers of males and females in a State or Territory, or any other such question. The affinity must be considered in the matter. The way ought to be open for every woman to marry who chooses to unite herself to one of the opposite sex. Wifehood and maternity are her natural aims. No woman is truly happy or fully satisfied until she has achieved both in honor. Laws that prevent this are barbarous and inhuman. And if so many men refuse to embark upon the sea of matrimony, that thousands of women remain disconsolate upon the barren and sandy shores of spinsterhood, the way should be made clear for the ladies to double up, if they can't find "a man all to themselves," and if they are suited it ought to be nobody else's business.

If we had our way in this world—which we do not at present expect to get—we would throw the gates of matrimony wide open, and put huge barriers in the way of illicit commerce between the sexes. Marriage should be promoted and encouraged, while sexual vice should be repressed and punished. And there should be no such thing as "surplus women" in any part of the country.

The world is out of joint on the marriage question, and society needs a thorough renovation from top to bottom. Redistribution, either of property or of the sexes is impracticable. But the means of obtaining all that is sufficient for a comfortable livelihood should be open to all honest men, and of reaching the full object of her being to every virtuous and marriage-fitted woman.

**EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.**

A DEBENTURE has taken a very sensible view of the course of a jury in its court, in a case involving a breach of contract. The plaintiff sued to recover the sum of \$300, the contract price of some work performed. The jury found for the plaintiff, but brought in a "compromise" verdict for \$200. A new trial was granted by the judge, in granting the application, denounced the action of the jury as despotism and unlawful. There was no such sum in the complaint, and the plaintiff was entitled to have the sum specified in the contract. The judge said: "No such despot power is conferred to any tribunal as that of making contracts for litigants outside of the contracts they have made themselves."

This "compromise" fashion of settling money disputes is generally wrong and unjust. Ever since Solomon proposed to settle the quarrel between the two women as to the ownership of a child, by cutting it in twain and giving half to each contestant, arbitrators and tribunals of various kinds have imagined they exhibited equal wisdom with the great Jewish

king, by having an amount in dispute, and thus leaving unincorporated the question in litigation.

"I can get that kind of hay," once said a wag and well known limb of the law, on a certain occasion, as a load of timothy passed along the street. "Why, how's that?" was the query. "By simply laying claim to it and getting the matter arbitrated," he replied; "the arbitrators will be sure to split the difference and I'll get one position." This was an exaggeration, of course, but it illustrated the althod and improper method of settling such difficulties that is not infrequently adopted.

To deal out even-handed justice requires not only acuteness of intellect, but firmness of mind, decision of character and an unbiased sense of fairness and equity. The idea of trying to please both parties, or either party, ought never to be entertained by a judge or arbitrator of any kind, civil or ecclesiastical. In settling differences between brethren, whether as arbitrators, teachers or as a court, the rights of the parties, the square, straightforward and undeviating course of truth and righteousness ought to be pursued, without fear or favor or sentimentality.

The feelings of the parties or their friends ought to cut no figure and exercise no influence in a question of right. Mercy must not rob justice. Equity, facts and figures must not head to wishes and opinion. Clear, honest, unbiased judgment should follow, and feeling ought not to be a factor in the decision. When a fair decision is rendered, kindness and gentle persuasions may come in to temper the rigid claims of equity and soften the demands of exact justice.

There is some difference between the rules required to settle disputes and those that should govern adjudication upon transgressors. Motives and chances and palliations that may be considered in the latter, do not enter so largely into the adjustment of the former, and allowances that might be made in pronouncing penalties, could not be permitted rightly to affect decisions involving rights of property.

If a plaintiff is found to be entitled to his claim, it ought to be allowed without flinching or subterfuge. And the Michigan judge who recognized this principle and exposed wrong doers to the consequences of their actions, is entitled to the thanks of the public and laudations of all lovers of rectitude and square-dealing.

It appears that in twenty-two of the latter there are 308,000 more women than men. This means a much larger population of unmarried women than appears by the figures. For, it is an undisputed fact that there are large numbers of men who do not marry. Many of them think they cannot, because of circumstances, and many more will not because they do not wish to incur the expense and bear the responsibilities which are attached to wedlock. This throws an immense body of unmarried women upon the community, and tends to increase the volume of those social evils that are the curse of modern Christendom.

In those portions of the country where the males are in numerical excess of the females, it will be found, on investigation, that there are large numbers of unmarried ladies. And this is usually true, whether the territory is natural to women, although it brings to them so much more care and suffering than to men. They have a tendency in that direction. It is born in them and belongs to their organization. Women who have no inclination to marry are rare exceptions, and there are only enough of them to prove the rule of disposition. The blame of their spinsterhood rests upon the stony or timid bachelors who will not marry, and not upon the women themselves.

One eastern journal suggests that the Territories in which so much bachelorhood preponderates might establish a local equilibrium by "making a rail on the neighboring Mormons." This idea springs from the conviction that the cause about our affairs. That editor will be surprised to learn that according to the latest authorized census, Utah has over six thousand more males than females. So, according to this, there are no "surplus women" in Utah to spare to the surrounding Territories.

And even here, where matrimony is supposed to be the principal business or common diversion, there are large numbers of young women who have no husbands and who seem to be single blessedness. Marriage does not seem to depend so much upon the equality or inequality of the sexes as upon the disposition of the "lords of creation" to couple up with the ladies. Go where you will, unless it is in some mining camp, or other region where the circumstances and surroundings are such as to exclude women to a great extent, and you will find plenty of opportunities for men to marry, if they are so inclined.

The rightfulness and practicability of plural marriage do not rest upon the question of the relative numbers of males and females in a State or Territory, or any other such question. The affinity must be considered in the matter. The way ought to be open for every woman to marry who chooses to unite herself to one of the opposite sex. Wifehood and maternity are her natural aims. No woman is truly happy or fully satisfied until she has achieved both in honor. Laws that prevent this are barbarous and inhuman. And if so many men refuse to embark upon the sea of matrimony, that thousands of women remain disconsolate upon the barren and sandy shores of spinsterhood, the way should be made clear for the ladies to double up, if they can't find "a man all to themselves," and if they are suited it ought to be nobody else's business.

If we had our way in this world—which we do not at present expect to get—we would throw the gates of matrimony wide open, and put huge barriers in the way of illicit commerce between the sexes. Marriage should be promoted and encouraged, while sexual vice should be repressed and punished. And there should be no such thing as "surplus women" in any part of the country.

The world is out of joint on the marriage question, and society needs a thorough renovation from top to bottom. Redistribution, either of property or of the sexes is impracticable. But the means of obtaining all that is sufficient for a comfortable livelihood should be open to all honest men, and of reaching the full object of her being to every virtuous and marriage-fitted woman.

**EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.**

A DEBENTURE has taken a very sensible view of the course of a jury in its court, in a case involving a breach of contract. The plaintiff sued to recover the sum of \$300, the contract price of some work performed. The jury found for the plaintiff, but brought in a "compromise" verdict for \$200. A new trial was granted by the judge, in granting the application, denounced the action of the jury as despotism and unlawful. There was no such sum in the complaint, and the plaintiff was entitled to have the sum specified in the contract. The judge said: "No such despot power is conferred to any tribunal as that of making contracts for litigants outside of the contracts they have made themselves."

This "compromise" fashion of settling money disputes is generally wrong and unjust. Ever since Solomon proposed to settle the quarrel between the two women as to the ownership of a child, by cutting it in twain and giving half to each contestant, arbitrators and tribunals of various kinds have imagined they exhibited equal wisdom with the great Jewish

king, by having an amount in dispute, and thus leaving unincorporated the question in litigation.

"I can get that kind of hay," once said a wag and well known limb of the law, on a certain occasion, as a load of timothy passed along the street. "Why, how's that?" was the query. "By simply laying claim to it and getting the matter arbitrated," he replied; "the arbitrators will be sure to split the difference and I'll get one position." This was an exaggeration, of course, but it illustrated the althod and improper method of settling such difficulties that is not infrequently adopted.

To deal out even-handed justice requires not only acuteness of intellect, but firmness of mind, decision of character and an unbiased sense of fairness and equity. The idea of trying to please both parties, or either party, ought never to be entertained by a judge or arbitrator of any kind, civil or ecclesiastical. In settling differences between brethren, whether as arbitrators, teachers or as a court, the rights of the parties, the square, straightforward and undeviating course of truth and righteousness ought to be pursued, without fear or favor or sentimentality.

The feelings of the parties or their friends ought to cut no figure and exercise no influence in a question of right. Mercy must not rob justice. Equity, facts and figures must not head to wishes and opinion. Clear, honest, unbiased judgment should follow, and feeling ought not to be a factor in the decision. When a fair decision is rendered, kindness and gentle persuasions may come in to temper the rigid claims of equity and soften the demands of exact justice.

There is some difference between the rules required to settle disputes and those that should govern adjudication upon transgressors. Motives and chances and palliations that may be considered in the latter, do not enter so largely into the adjustment of the former, and allowances that might be made in pronouncing penalties, could not be permitted rightly to affect decisions involving rights of property.

If a plaintiff is found to be entitled to his claim, it ought to be allowed without flinching or subterfuge. And the Michigan judge who recognized this principle and exposed wrong doers to the consequences of their actions, is entitled to the thanks of the public and laudations of all lovers of rectitude and square-dealing.

It appears that in twenty-two of the latter there are 308,000 more women than men. This means a much larger population of unmarried women than appears by the figures. For, it is an undisputed fact that there are large numbers of men who do not marry. Many of them think they cannot, because of circumstances, and many more will not because they do not wish to incur the expense and bear the responsibilities which are attached to wedlock. This throws an immense body of unmarried women upon the community, and tends to increase the volume of those social evils that are the curse of modern Christendom.

In those portions of the country where the males are in numerical excess of the females, it will be found, on investigation, that there are large numbers of unmarried ladies. And this is usually true, whether the territory is natural to women, although it brings to them so much more care and suffering than to men. They have a tendency in that direction. It is born in them and belongs to their organization. Women who have no inclination to marry are rare exceptions, and there are only enough of them to prove the rule of disposition. The blame of their spinsterhood rests upon the stony or timid bachelors who will not marry, and not upon the women themselves.

One eastern journal suggests that the Territories in which so much bachelorhood preponderates might establish a local equilibrium by "making a rail on the neighboring Mormons." This idea springs from the conviction that the cause about our affairs. That editor will be surprised to learn that according to the latest authorized census, Utah has over six thousand more males than females. So, according to this, there are no "surplus women" in Utah to spare to the surrounding Territories.

And even here, where matrimony is supposed to be the principal business or common diversion, there are large numbers of young women who have no husbands and who seem to be single blessedness. Marriage does not seem to depend so much upon the equality or inequality of the sexes as upon the disposition of the "lords of creation" to couple up with the ladies. Go where you will, unless it is in some mining camp, or other region where the circumstances and surroundings are such as to exclude women to a great extent, and you will find plenty of opportunities for men to marry, if they are so inclined.

The rightfulness and practicability of plural marriage do not rest upon the question of the relative numbers of males and females in a State or Territory, or any other such question. The affinity must be considered in the matter. The way ought to be open for every woman to marry who chooses to unite herself to one of the opposite sex. Wifehood and maternity are her natural aims. No woman is truly happy or fully satisfied until she has achieved both in honor. Laws that prevent this are barbarous and inhuman. And if so many men refuse to embark upon the sea of matrimony, that thousands of women remain disconsolate upon the barren and sandy shores of spinsterhood, the way should be made clear for the ladies to double up, if they can't find "a man all to themselves," and if they are suited it ought to be nobody else's business.

If we had our way in this world—which we do not at present expect to get—we would throw the gates of matrimony wide open, and put huge barriers in the way of illicit commerce between the sexes. Marriage should be promoted and encouraged, while sexual vice should be repressed and punished. And there should be no such thing as "surplus women" in any part of the country.

The world is out of joint on the marriage question, and society needs a thorough renovation from top to bottom. Redistribution, either of property or of the sexes is impracticable. But the means of obtaining all that is sufficient for a comfortable livelihood should be open to all honest men, and of reaching the full object of her being to every virtuous and marriage-fitted woman.

**EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.**

A DEBENTURE has taken a very sensible view of the course of a jury in its court, in a case involving a breach of contract. The plaintiff sued to recover the sum of \$300, the contract price of some work performed. The jury found for the plaintiff, but brought in a "compromise" verdict for \$200. A new trial was granted by the judge, in granting the application, denounced the action of the jury as despotism and unlawful. There was no such sum in the complaint, and the plaintiff was entitled to have the sum specified in the contract. The judge said: "No such despot power is conferred to any tribunal as that of making contracts for litigants outside of the contracts they have made themselves."

This "compromise" fashion of settling money disputes is generally wrong and unjust. Ever since Solomon proposed to settle the quarrel between the two women as to the ownership of a child, by cutting it in twain and giving half to each contestant, arbitrators and tribunals of various kinds have imagined they exhibited equal wisdom with the great Jewish

king, by having an amount in dispute, and thus leaving unincorporated the question in litigation.

"I can get that kind of hay," once said a wag and well known limb of the law, on a certain occasion, as a load of timothy passed along the street. "Why, how's that?" was the query. "By simply laying claim to it and getting the matter arbitrated," he replied; "the arbitrators will be sure to split the difference and I'll get one position." This was an exaggeration, of course, but it illustrated the althod and improper method of settling such difficulties that is not infrequently adopted.

To deal out even-handed justice requires not only acuteness of intellect, but firmness of mind, decision of character and an unbiased sense of fairness and equity. The idea of trying to please both parties, or either party, ought never to be entertained by a judge or arbitrator of any kind, civil or ecclesiastical. In settling differences between brethren, whether as arbitrators, teachers or as a court, the rights of the parties, the square, straightforward and undeviating course of truth and righteousness ought to be pursued, without fear or favor or sentimentality.

The feelings of the parties or their friends ought to cut no figure and exercise no influence in a question of right. Mercy must not rob justice. Equity, facts and figures must not head to wishes and opinion. Clear, honest, unbiased judgment should follow, and feeling ought not to be a factor in the decision. When a fair decision is rendered, kindness and gentle persuasions may come in to temper the rigid claims of equity and soften the demands of exact justice.

There is some difference between the rules required to settle disputes and those that should govern adjudication upon transgressors. Motives and chances and palliations that may be considered in the latter, do not enter so largely into the adjustment of the former, and allowances that might be made in pronouncing penalties, could not be permitted rightly to affect decisions involving rights of property.

If a plaintiff is found to be entitled to his claim, it ought to be allowed without flinching or subterfuge. And the Michigan judge who recognized this principle and exposed wrong doers to the consequences of their actions, is entitled to the thanks of the public and laudations of all lovers of rectitude and square-dealing.

It appears that in twenty-two of the latter there are 308,000 more women than men. This means a much larger population of unmarried women than appears by the figures. For, it is an undisputed fact that there are large numbers of men who do not marry. Many of them think they cannot, because of circumstances, and many more will not because they do not wish to incur the expense and bear the responsibilities which are attached to wedlock. This throws an immense body of unmarried women upon the community, and tends to increase the volume of those social evils that are the curse of modern Christendom.

In those portions of the country where the males are in numerical excess of the females, it will be found, on investigation, that there are large numbers of unmarried ladies. And this is usually true, whether the territory is natural to women, although it brings to them so much more care and suffering than to men. They have a tendency in that direction. It is born in them and belongs to their organization. Women who have no inclination to marry are rare exceptions, and there are only enough of them to prove the rule of disposition. The blame of their spinsterhood rests upon the stony or timid bachelors who will not marry, and not upon the women themselves.

One eastern journal suggests that the Territories in which so much bachelorhood preponderates might establish a local equilibrium by "making a rail on the neighboring Mormons." This idea springs from the conviction that the cause about our affairs. That editor will be surprised to learn that according to the latest authorized census, Utah has over six thousand more males than females. So, according to this, there are no "surplus women" in Utah to spare to the surrounding Territories.

And even here, where matrimony is supposed to be the principal business or common diversion, there are large numbers of young women who have no husbands and who seem to be single blessedness. Marriage does not seem to depend so much upon the equality or inequality of the sexes as upon the disposition of the "lords of creation" to couple up with the ladies. Go where you will, unless it is in some mining camp, or other region where the circumstances and surroundings are such as to exclude women to a great extent, and you will find plenty of opportunities for men to marry, if they are so inclined.

The rightfulness and practicability of plural marriage do not rest upon the question of the relative numbers of males and females in a State or Territory, or any other such question. The affinity must be considered in the matter. The way ought to be open for every woman to marry who chooses to unite herself to one of the opposite sex. Wifehood and maternity are her natural aims. No woman is truly happy or fully satisfied until she has achieved both in honor. Laws that prevent this are barbarous and inhuman. And if so many men refuse to embark upon the sea of matrimony, that thousands of women remain disconsolate upon the barren and sandy shores of spinsterhood, the way should be made clear for the ladies to double up, if they can't find "a man all to themselves," and if they are suited it ought to be nobody else's business.

If we had our way in this world—which we do not at present expect to get—we would throw the gates of matrimony wide open, and put huge barriers in the way of illicit commerce between the sexes. Marriage should be promoted and encouraged, while sexual vice should be repressed and punished. And there should be no such thing as "surplus women" in any part of the country.

The world is out of joint on the marriage question, and society needs a thorough renovation from top to bottom. Redistribution, either of property or of the sexes is impracticable. But the means of obtaining all that is sufficient for a comfortable livelihood should be open to all honest men, and of reaching the full object of her being to every virtuous and marriage-fitted woman.

**EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.**

A DEBENTURE has taken a very sensible view of the course of a jury in its court, in a case involving a breach of contract. The plaintiff sued to recover the sum of \$300, the contract price of some work performed. The jury found for the plaintiff, but brought in a "compromise" verdict for \$200. A new trial was granted by the judge, in granting the application, denounced the action of the jury as despotism and unlawful. There was no such sum in the complaint, and the plaintiff was entitled to have the sum specified in the contract. The judge said: "No such despot power is conferred to any tribunal as that of making contracts for litigants outside of the contracts they have made themselves."

This "compromise" fashion of settling money disputes is generally wrong and unjust. Ever since Solomon proposed to settle the quarrel between the two women as to the ownership of a child, by cutting it in twain and giving half to each contestant, arbitrators and tribunals of various kinds have imagined they exhibited equal wisdom with the great Jewish