

THE SANITARY ORDINANCE.

THE garbage ordinance is passed again at last. The Mayor will do well to take time in critically examining it. Two garbage districts are organized, which may be perfectly right. From one of them—the business district, the removal of garbage and ashes is to be at the expense of the city. From the other it is to be at the expense of the owner, agent or occupant. Is this an equitable provision? Or does it not give special privileges to one class of the population? Why should not the city remove the ashes and garbage from the whole city as well as from the part that is specially designated?

"No house slops, rubbish, ashes or garbage shall be deposited," within these garbage districts "except as herein provided for," says the ordinance. But while it provides for a metallic vessel with handles, for receiving ashes, etc., in the business district, it provides none whatever for the other and much larger district. Therefore, in all that extensive district ashes cannot be deposited at all. What, then, is to be done with them?

But a suitable vessel, free from leakage, is to be provided for "every building" in the larger district, as a receptacle for all garbage and liquid refuse that accumulate on the premises, to be emptied not less than once a week, except in winter, when it is to be emptied every two weeks. As no other deposit than this is lawful, slops and garbage are to be kept to stink in this "vessel," whatever it may be, till it is removed to a place designated by the Board of Health.

A person may haul away garbage and refuse with his own team, provided he gets a permit from the Board of Health, but cannot hire a neighbor or friend to do it, unless that person is engaged in the business of such removal, and has the word Scavenger and the number of his permit painted on black ground, in white letters, on each side of his wagon bed.

These are some of the notions in the ordinance that we hope will be scanned by the Mayor before he affixes to it his official signature. There has been considerable improvement over the first draft of the bill, which was an ungrammatical absurdity. A measure of so much importance ought to be made as specific and understandable as possible, and there should be in it no class legislation.

SOCIETY AS IT IS.

A SORT of apology for some of the ways of society which right moralists denounce, is made by a lady in the columns of the September *North American Review*. We will not quote at any great length from the article, but merely give the annexed extract:

"Society never pretends to be a teacher of morality. That is the office of religion and of law. Society contents itself with making scapegoats of such of its members as outrage public opinion by being found out. An obvious example is the case of any woman known to have broken the law of purity. Religion forgives her. Society never forgives her.

It forgives her partner in sin, without even requiring that he shall sin no more; but for her it has no pardon and no palliation. For socially it is not a question of relative guilt; it is one entirely of social considerations; and Society's verdict is in accordance therewith. There is a redundancy of women; they are less important than men; they are more easily hit and are not liable to strike back; therefore, through the women, society makes testimony to the fact that it wishes to recognize the moralities it has been powerless to enforce. It cannot always be virtuous, but it can occasionally sacrifice a young kid, or send some poor scapegoat into the wilderness of its oblivion. This, truly is not the code of the Holy Scriptures; but then the social code is not divine, it is human. And it is perhaps well that the two differ, else the lower might debauch the higher; and it is better for humanity to have some ideally high standard, though they never reach it, than one so low that it may be reached every day."

The rank injustice that runs through this frank explanation of the moral code of "Society" must be evident to every reader. There is something foully rotten in a social order that is regulated by such a standard. Suppose it is a good thing to reject that which religion condones. Should not that rule work both ways? Is not the male libertine at least as vile as the woman who shared his guilt? If she is to be cast out as unclean, why should he be welcomed into the inner circles when known to be equally contaminated?

It is right for society to set a high value on female purity. Even though it be only in appearance, it is good as far as it goes. But the hypocrisy that winks at sin which is known but not exposed, is less contemptible than the villainy which embraces lechery that is found out, when it is blazoned on the male transgressor in as glaring lines as mark his weaker victim.

The society that "never forgives a woman," is not Christian society. It is not truly civilized. It is barbaric in this thing, and is shocking in its savage and unrelenting vindictiveness. And this is exhibited brutally in the recognition of the "redundancy of woman;" in the idea that "they are less important than men;" and that they are "not as liable to strike back." If this is not barbarism what can it be justly called?

It is better, no doubt, "for humanity to have some ideally high standard," than so low a standard that common people can reach it without effort. But is that a high standard which tramples on an erring woman and exalts the vicious man who cased her to err? Even if the coward's plea "the woman tempted me" is accepted in palliation, is not the fallen man on as low a level as the partner of his fault? And if so, what sort of a high standard is that which makes him fit for the most select society of both sexes, and casts her away never even to be forgiven?

Society governed by such a moral code is a dirty thing, to be despised by the pure and condemned by the just. No apology for it, even from a pen of a gifted woman, can clear it from the foul stains which are acknowledged to blotch it, and the mockery of virtue with which it welcomes vice, provided it is personified in the male, and not the female sinner. Such society is built on a corrupt foundation and is therefore doomed to fall.

THE LIFE OF PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR.

THE "Life of John Taylor" has just been published by the firm of George Q. Cannon and Sons, and fills a gap in "Mormon" literature. It is a handsome volume of four hundred and sixty-eight pages, beautifully bound and lettered, and containing ten illustrations finely executed, and the portrait of President John Taylor as the frontispiece. These are all well executed, and the steel engraving of the subject of the work is a striking and pleasing likeness. The letter press is first class and the whole mechanical work deserving of praise.

The literary ability displayed in the book is also to be highly commended. The volume is from the pen of Elder B. H. Roberts and he has treated his theme in an able manner. The interest of the reader is maintained throughout. The life of President Taylor abounded with incidents of uncommon import. They are presented in forcible and pleasant style. The language is simple yet eloquent, and not overloaded with rhetoric. The early connection of Brother Taylor with the Church, his ordination to the Apostleship, his missions to England and France, the tragic scenes at Carthage when he was so severely wounded while the Prophet and the Patriarch were slain, his journalistic labors, his championship of truth and liberty in various ways, his legislative work, his travels in various regions, his accession to the Presidency, his sufferings during the crusade, culminating in his death, are all related in a manner that enchains the reader's attention and fixes in the mind the character of this man of God who lived and died in His service.

There are so many remarkable events and circumstances in the life of President John Taylor that we cannot even allude to them in this brief review of the work. But we recommend it to the Latter-day Saints and all who take any interest in "Mormon" affairs or the history of Utah. A chart of the entire family of President Taylor closes the volume. It is an excellent work, and we congratulate Elder Roberts on his success as a biographer and historian.

A PECULIAR CONTROVERSY.

A PRESS dispatch announces that Charles H. Peck, commissioner of the New York State bureau of labor and statistics, has been placed under arrest. He is charged with having removed from his office and destroyed circulars and statistics supplied him by manufacturers and others from which to compile a report, the object of which was to exhibit the effect of the McKinley bill upon trade. The report showed favorably for the McKinley bill. An exchange says on this point:

"The period covered by the commissioner's investigation included the year immediately prior to the enactment of the McKinley law and the year immediately following its going into operation. The statistics upon which his conclusions are based were supplied by over six thousand representative and leading business firms of the State. The facts show that there was a net