

else the person may know; and to such an extent is this fatally delusive idea cultivated that among the "higher ranks" marriage has become merely a fashionable event, in which the responsibilities, the pursuits and the objects for which largely the union of the sexes was ordained, are quite lost sight of in the quest of pleasure, artificial happiness and the stilted deference of a select few who are oblivious to the fact that there is any such thing as work in the world. It is the prevalence of such a state of things that makes so many bachelors and causes so many who are not to wish they were. The theory that the man and woman are to be helpers, encouragers and, in the full sense of the term, co-partners, is scouted if mentioned, and its practical application is, of course, nil.

This is surely drifting a long way from the original design; the beauties of nature and the triumphs of manhood seem lost sight of in the desire to be gaudy, languid, fashionably ill and altogether lazy, with no accomplishments that are useful, relying entirely upon wealth and hired labor, and this unnatural state of existence is what many female matrimonial candidates look forward to and even demand. No wonder that the possession of a few of the attainments which make men and women equal to the hardships and trials of life, so that when the luxuries and bounties come they can be the more thoroughly and thankfully enjoyed, makes the possessor an object worth seeking, getting and keeping.

Those who would, however, exclude the fine arts altogether and cultivate nothing but the drudgery of the kitchen and the practices of the menial, go to the other extreme. It is as necessary that enjoyment prevail at times as that work should be performed. In observing either, it is not at all necessary to neglect the other. The more accomplished and refined the inmates of the household, the more happiness will be found there, and this means accomplishments of a general nature. Less artifice and more reality, less affectation and more education, the ability to make a fire or paint a picture, to know how to prepare a meal or to render the latest aria without a flaw—these combined make up an ideal household genius. An utter deficiency in either of the conditions cited makes of matrimony a hazardous experiment; but if one or the other had to be omitted from the calculation, it would perhaps be preferable that the useful and pressing arts be retained; the others can in an emergency be got along without, but they are like flowers in a garden—everything seems to look, feel and taste better by reason of their presence.

REMOVAL OF REGISTERED VOTERS.

THERE seems to be some confusion of mind in regard to the legal voting place of electors who have moved from the precinct in which they were registered, since the date for the rectification of the registration lists. It has been stated that such persons have lost their right to vote in any precinct.

This is manifestly absurd. The law is made for the protection of citizens not for the destruction of their rights. At the time of the regular registration, it is the duty of the registration officer in each precinct to see that the names of voters who have moved from his precinct are stricken off the list, and that voters who have moved into his precinct are placed upon the list. In case he fails to do this, or removals take place shortly after the revision, voters removing from one precinct to another can appear before the registrar and have the list corrected, providing this is done before the revised list is completed and filed with the clerk of the County Court.

But suppose a voter has moved from the precinct in which he was registered since that time, and is therefore unable to get his name transferred; does he lose his right to vote? Certainly not. But he must vote in the precinct where he is registered, for the simple reason that only registered voters can cast their ballots and the law requires their names to be checked on the registration list. If they should offer their ballots in a precinct on the list of which their names do not appear, the judges of election would have to reject their votes. But if they appear and offer their ballots in the precinct where they are registered, the judges of election can not reject their votes on the ground that they have moved from the precinct since the revision of the list, because there is no law for such rejection.

A challenge would not hold in such case, because challenges must be for statutory cause. An oath has been required of the citizen, and that contains the declaration that he "has resided in the Territory of Utah for six months then past, and in the precinct for on month immediately preceding the date hereof." His residence after the date when he took the oath and preceding the election, is another matter entirely. He can be challenged for non-residence in the precinct before taking the oath, as he is prosecuted for perjury if he took it falsely. But if he moves out

of the precinct where he registered, after the filing of the list with the County Clerk, there is no way to make the transfer on the list until the next revision, which will not occur until next year.

It is clear, therefore, that such voters must cast their ballots in the precincts where they were registered, and that no one has the right to hinder or obstruct their voting. If such obstruction is attempted, the offender is liable to prosecution, and any judge of election aiding in the obstruction can also be prosecuted and sued for damages as well.

What the law may be in some other Territory or State has no bearing on the election laws of force in Utah. Persons who cite them as regulating our local affairs, simply display gross ignorance. The Utah Commission has been quoted as authority for views different from the tenor of the law. But no such expressions have come from that body officially, so far as we have heard, and we do not believe there has been any such enunciations either privately or publicly.

Let every voter go to the polls on Monday next, the first day of August, and be sure to vote in the precinct where his name appears on the registration list. And let him also be sure to vote the ticket he wishes to sustain, and not be deceived, or hindered, or bamboozled by any "Liberal" trick or trickster of any name, station or profession. Registered voters have legal rights, and they should be prepared to exercise and maintain them inviolate.

THE PRESS ON UTAH'S STATEHOOD.

WE give to our readers to-day a few more editorial comments on the question of Statehood for Utah, which seems to have as much interest to people outside of the Territory as to our own citizens. We are pleased to note that such papers as speak in favor of the movement give the subject thoughtful consideration, while in almost every instance its opposers treat it with a flippancy, disregard for facts and repetition of absurd remarks copied from other journals, that cause wonder and disgust at the volume of ignorance in editorial circles.

The Omaha Herald of July 12th has the following under the head of "The Utah Constitution":

"It is evident that the Utah question will demand as much attention in the next Congress as in the last, although in a totally different shape. The Utah Commission has decided to permit the submission of the constitution adopted by the late convention to a vote at the general election to be held Aug. 1, next. This has been protested against by the Gentiles as being without authority of law and outside the powers of the commission. They have taken steps to send a strong remonstrance to the President, but it is probable that he will not interfere. The question was settled in the case of Kansas more than thirty years ago, that the people of a territory were entitled to a fair vote on a constitution when they chose to ask it. In the case of Utah, all the voting machinery and all the supervision of elections are in the hands of a federal commission, but that does not necessarily deprive the people of their right to vote. As the constitution to be submitted is the work of Mormons, it will undoubtedly be carried."

With the presentation of this constitution in Congress next December, the discussion of Mormon affairs will be reopened and its range will undoubtedly be comprehensive, as its treatment will be exhaustive. It will be strongly opposed in the Senate on the ground that the Mormons cannot be trusted. But as Dakota will be there with renewed persistence, it is not improbable that compromise and not merit will decide both questions by the creation of two new states.

As The Herald pointed out a few days since, the constitution adopted in Utah provides that the section forbidding polygamy shall not be changed except by consent of Congress and the President. Should the Mormons, after gaining power as a State, disregard this compact, there still would be recourse to the United States Supreme Court, under that clause of the national constitution which guarantees to every State a republican form of government, and doubtless that court would hold that polygamy was not in consonance with republican institutions.

The Omaha Bee of July 18th has a long editorial on the subject and as it calmly and fairly discusses the question from an important standpoint we copy the article entire:

"The action of the constitutional convention of Utah, recently held, has attracted wide-spread attention, and the movement it inaugurated for giving the territory statehood is receiving extended discussion by the press. Very generally this is not favorable to the movement, notwithstanding the fact that the convention took what upon its face is a most distinct and positive attitude against bigamy and polygamy. Each of these practices is declared by a section of the constitution adopted to be a misdemeanor and is forbidden; severe penalties being prescribed for a violation of this section. In order apparently to more forcibly attest the sincerity of the convention, composed, it should be said, wholly of

Mormons, it is provided that the section shall be operative without the aid of legislation, that the offenses prohibited by it shall not be barred by any statute of limitation within three years after their commission, and that the power of pardon shall not extend thereto until approved by the president of the United States. It is further provided that this section shall not be amended, revised or in any way changed without the approval and ratification of congress, which shall be proclaimed by the president, and if not so ratified and proclaimed the section shall remain perpetual.

But this seemingly plain and straightforward action, which on its face does not suggest anything in reserve, is delayed by the Gentile population of Utah to be a trick, and this view is generally accepted. It is maintained that since such an attitude is wholly inconsistent with a chief tenet of the Mormon Church, its assumption by members of that Church cannot be regarded as sincere, those telling it believing that as soon as Statehood should be secured, the constitutional provision could be disregarded by the Mormon officials who would be in the control of all departments in the state government, the national government being then powerless to interfere. Private expressions of members of the convention are quoted to sustain this view, and the general spirit and policy of the church are cited to show that no confidence whatever can be placed in anything proceeding from or directed by that influence. It is said that the cardinal object of the church is to secure political power, for which purpose it is ready to make any promises or concessions that may be asked, but having obtained which, it will keep its agreements only so far as its interests require it should. The non-Mormons having declined to take any part in the convention, the results are naturally assumed to have been directed by the church authorities.

It is quite possible that there is some warrant for the distrust with which the action of the convention has been received, but it may fairly be doubted whether in dealing with the question of the admission of Utah as a State Congress should be asked to go below plain and palpable facts to seek out possible motives, or be required to consider assumed designs which are as likely not to have as to have existed. It is possible to be to the last rational degree hostile to the whole system and policy of the Mormon Church and yet see that there might be circumstances under which Congress, following the well defined line of its constitutional duty, might not properly take cognizance of these. The duty of congress is to admit to statehood any territory having a sufficient population for the election of a representative in congress, when a majority of the people of such territory ask to be admitted, the only condition required by the Constitution being that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." This condition is undeniably political, and unless it could be shown that the conduct and policy of the Mormon church are unrepugnant, congress would doubtless hesitate to create a precedent by making them a reason for refusing statehood, as the gentiles of Utah demand. If plural marriages are unrepugnant, as well as unchristian, the people who support that system cannot be given the rights of citizenship under a state organization; if they are simply the latter they cannot properly have any weight in determining the question of statehood.

With regard to what might follow statehood in the case of Utah, that is a matter which must take care of itself, subject to the operation of the forces and influences which the new order of things would inevitably produce, or which are certain to come in time. The idea that the government is at all likely to be tricked into its embarrassment or disadvantage by a few thousand Mormons who are opposed by 60,000,000 of people is one that a little calm reflection is likely to dismiss as bordering on the ridiculous. It might happen that for a brief time the Mormon control in the state government might tolerate a lax execution of the fundamental law against bigamy and polygamy, but at best their power would not be long continued, while it is not improbable that these people, who, at least seem not to be entirely fools, would see for very potent reasons it would be wiser to respect the compact they had themselves drawn. In any event we cannot see any good ground for the exaggerated fears which the Gentile population of Utah and those who echo them profess to entertain in this matter. In other words we do not think the nation would be in any serious danger from the few thousand Mormons in Utah in case they become citizens of a state instead of a territory.

The question of making Utah a state will, however, be immediately influenced more by considerations of policy than of equity. If the democrats conclude that they cannot justly continue to deny statehood to Dakota they probably will not hesitate to make a trade that will give them Utah and perhaps the republicans would not reject a proposition of this kind. The Mormons evidently see this opportunity and are preparing to take advantage of it."

The Boston Transcript of July 21st, after explaining the situation and giving both sides of the controversy, and showing that the "younger element" cannot afford to undergo ostracism

forever for the sake of a doctrine that they scarcely practice at all and only mechanically accept, goes on to say:

"The Utah Mormons, apart from their odious marriage doctrine and its effects upon them, are an admirable people. They have literally made the desert bloom as a rose, and have filled their own Territory with a prosperous and, for the main part, peaceable people, overflowing, too, into the neighboring Territories. The way in which they have perfectly assimilated their foreign elements, and created a homogeneous community, bent, with a remarkable union of purpose and endeavor, upon getting the most out of the soil, governing themselves without any disorder or any visible friction or conflicting interests, is certainly remarkable. So far as their Territory is concerned, they have solved the Indian question by taking, from the start, just the friendly and honest position our own government ought to have taken. They have no trouble whatever with the Indians; they are on the best possible terms with them, and yet they have found no difficulty in getting every reasonable concession that they have asked. They have shown great practical wisdom in their internal affairs."

HE SHOWED THE "WHITE FEATHER."

CONDUCT OF THE COLONEL OF NEW YORK VOLUNTEERS ON THE APPROACH OF DANGER.

At the meeting held in San Francisco on the night of June 9th, 1851, when the first "committee of vigilance" (as known by such name) organized in America, there were present those who fully realized the responsibility and importance of the step about to be taken. Their seeming duty lay counter to the regular course of law. Plainly, they proposed to break the law, and in so doing lay themselves open to punishment by the law. In the eyes of the law, they were about to become offenders of as deep a dye as any they proposed to punish, though from very different motives.

But according to Hubert Howe Bancroft's "Popular Tribunals," vol 1, just published, there were also present young and inexperienced men, who did not know what they were about to do; and the sage tutor to these was the whilom Colonel Stevens, commanding the New York Volunteers which company, when disbanded, furnished many of the ruffians that infested the city. These mettlesome innocents the mettlesome old Colonel set about to instruct. It suited well the eternal fitness of things, that he who had brought hither New York vagabonds should now hang them. Feelingly he spoke to his former associates, calling to mind past dangers and privations in common shared; but recalled to things present, stern duty swelled the breast beneath the well buttoned army coat, and the severest of military airs wreathed the features of the ire-luminated face.

"There were those both at this and at subsequent meetings," says Mr. Bancroft, "who were more ready with their tongues than with their sword. Upon this occasion the doughty colonel concludes an address brimful of nervous energy with these words: 'And mind you, let there be no skulking! Let there be no skulking now!' But when the bell summoned to actual danger and responsibility, and the more timid looked for their brave commander, he was nowhere to be found; though there was made diligent search, even to the sending to his house for him, he failed to put in an appearance. Then certain profane youth, filled with merry contempt, took from a white fowl its whitest feather, and carefully enclosing it in an envelope addressed it and sent it to the brave talker."

"Very different was the conduct on this occasion of Mr. Brannan, to whom the highest praise is due. Peculiar as he was in some respects, I cannot but regard his connection with the first vigilance committee as the brightest epoch in his eventful life; and so long as society holds its course in San Francisco his name should be held in honored and grateful remembrance. With the most cheerful recklessness he threw his life and wealth into the scale; anything and everything he possessed was at the disposal of the committee free of any charge."

PIONEER DAY AT PROVO.

The fortieth anniversary of the entrance of the pioneers into the valley of the Great Salt Lake was commemorated with appropriate services in the Stake Tabernacle at Provo. The choir rendered soul-stirring music and prayer was offered by chaplain W. H. Brimhall.

President A. O. Smoot spoke on behalf of the pioneers. He said that forty years ago he was not with the pioneers but was close behind them. Forty years ago, on July 24th, about one o'clock in the afternoon, the pioneers entered the valley of the Great Salt Lake, through what is known as Emigration Canon, crossing the Big Mountain and down the Little Mountain, and through the canon into the Great Salt Lake Valley; and that evening there was a speech delivered by President Brigham Young on the present site of the Temple. There is a great deal of important work attached

to the entrance of the pioneers into this goodly land; the Lord revealed to Joseph Smith some few years prior to the Saints leaving Nauvoo that they would find a resting place in the far distant west—a region at that time unexplored and unknown. Joseph made the attempt to come to this land, but he was not permitted to leave the vicinity of Nauvoo; he started with a few of the authorities to cross the Mississippi River and located in the bluffs of Iowa; he pitched his tent there and while in preparation to start, there were a number of Saints and leaders in Israel who followed him to his camp and besought him to return to Nauvoo; some accused him of being a coward and he turned to Nauvoo and was martyred. After his death President Young carried out the programme. At Council Bluffs in what was then the Territory of Iowa, they stopped for winter and called the place Winter Quarters. The government of the United States finding that there was a body of men in the wilderness not knowing whither they were going, sent an officer to visit them and raise from their midst 500 soldiers of the strength of their camp. President Young at once called upon the camp and furnished the men who were sent to fight with Mexico. They left their families in the land of their enemies as emigrants to cross a trackless desert, driven from their homes, leaving their beautiful city of Nauvoo, and all at the mercy of their ruthless foes. The Saints traveled across the plains in the path Joseph had marked out. In the spring of 1847 they left Winter Quarters, near what is now the city of Omaha, and made their way, like Abraham of old, not knowing where they would stop. They contemplated settling in Upper California or Oregon. On the 24th of July, 1847, the Great Salt Lake was reached; the people arrived there and from that time to the present it has been a day the Latter-day Saints have taken pride in celebrating. The speaker told of the early hardships, the failure of crops, the barrenness of the soil, the crickets and the difficulties that had to be surmounted, and how God had blessed His people and brought them peace. He had overruled everything for the good of the Saints and He would continue to rule for the good of Israel. God would preserve them in the future as in the past and multiply them in the land.

Bishop M. Tanner, a member of the Mormon Battalion, recounted the principal features of the memorable trip made by them.

J. R. Twelves sang, "The Song of the Pioneers."

John B. Milner delivered the oration.

R. T. Thomas spoke in behalf of the early settlers.

Toasts and sentiments and singing completed the exercises, at the conclusion of which the assemblage dispersed.

\$1,000 REWARD for any medicine in the world that will cure a bad case of itching, Ulcerated and Bleeding Piles as well one fifty-cent box of Dr. E-mail's Magic Balm of Healing Ointment. It acts as a soothing lubricant, absorbs the tumors and allays the intense itching at once as nothing else will. No pile cure ever acquired so large a sale in so short a time. Sold at every drug store, or sent by mail. Address: Zion's Co-operative Mercantile Institution, Salt Lake City. 27 Cleveland, Ohio, January 21, 1887—Send me five gross E-mail's Magic Balm soon as possible. This will make nearly one hundred and fifty dozen I have bought since July 15, 1884. I now sell more of your Balm, or Ointment, at retail over my counter than of all other balms and ointments combined. It sells better than any medicine I have in my store.—S. P. Churchill, 30 Euclid Avenue. d&w (1)

Down With High Prices!

30 TO 70 PER CENT. OFF ONE THOUSAND DIFFERENT ARTICLES Sold Direct to Consumers.

The "Little Detective," \$3.00 L. D. Postal gives Postage in CENTS. Weighs from 14 oz. to 25 lbs.

FAMILY SCALES, 240 lbs., \$5. Platform Scales, \$11 to \$20.

Forges and Blacksmiths' Tools. Farmers' Forge, \$10. Forge and Kit of Tools, \$25. Farmers can do odd jobs, saving time and money. Anvils, Vices, &c., &c.

WAGON SCALES. Only manufacturers in America using nothing but the best of English Steel for bearings of all scales: 2-Ton (6x12) \$40. 3-Ton (7x13) \$50. 4-Ton (8x14) \$60.

Beam Box and Brass Beam with each Scale, 500 other varieties. Also Trucks, Wheelbarrows, Corn Shellers, Feed Mills, Copy Presses, Money Drawers, Clothes Wringers and all Hardware Specialties.

SAFES OF ALL SIZES. No. 4, weight 1,100 lbs., \$50.

SEWING MACHINES, PRICES REDUCED FROM \$65 TO \$10.

A beautiful Machine, perfectly finished, improvement on the Singer pattern, Black Walnut Furniture, containing a full set of latest improved Attachments. Warranted perfect. Save money. Send for Circulars.

Chicago Scale Co., 151 S. Jefferson St., Chicago, Ill.