

Geo. H. Bloom, furniture dealer. Lindauer, Wormser & Co., general merchandise. Information regarding our people can be given by these gentlemen on application to W. C. Spence, President's office, Salt Lake City. Good rates to Deming and return, by rail, can be had.

In moving to this country it is useless for people to bring stoves, furniture and all heavy articles. They can be bought as cheap in Deming or El Paso as in Utah.

In regard to cattle and horses, I would say only bring what you need on the way, as they can be purchased here much cheaper than in the United States. Thus payment of duties may be saved and much trouble avoided, as on the free list are allowed only animals used in teams. Duty on the extra animals is as follows: Geldings \$40, mares \$20 and cows \$3 each.

Those expecting to get advantage of the free colonist list under the Mexican Colonization and Agricultural Co., or not, had better leave their teams at or near Deming, and come here to arrange for and make a list of their outfit and articles they are bringing. At the custom house here by doing this expense and much trouble may be avoided.

Postage from the United States here is the same as in that country. It is not safe to send registered letters or others of value through the mails, as they are so unreliable. All money or articles of value sent to friends here should be addressed to them at Deming.

One advantage we have in this place for kitchen gardens and home orchards is the adaptability of windmills for irrigation purposes. The water being near the surface, and plenty of wind coming across the mountain, from the ocean, make it much cheaper and more convenient than ditch water. In fact we expect to utilize this power for grist and other mills in preference to steam. Those using windmills for irrigating gardens have had the best results. Cheap wind-mills can be bought at Deming and brought in free of duty.

W. DERBY, JR.

COLONIA DIAZ, June 1st, 1890.

THE SAN JUAN COUNTRY.

President F. A. Hammond, of San Juan Stake, called at our office on June 14, and made a statement for publication with reference to the question of the proposed removal of the Southern Utes into Utah. Remarking upon the fact that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs (of which Senator Dawes is chairman) had reported adversely thereon, and that this virtually signified the killing of the bill, Brother Hammond said he particularly desired it to be understood that the people of San Juan never wanted to give up their lands at all, but as the government had expressed a wish to have it pass into the hands of the Indians, the settlers did not want to place any obstacles in the way of the transfer. Seeing that they held no titles to the land, they were

willing to yield it up to the government upon receiving proper compensation.

He further states that the general feeling of the people of San Juan is that the government should, in fairness, compensate them for the improvements which they have effected there. The settlers have no wish whatever to vacate the land, and would only do so at the direction of the government. That was the position which he himself took before the Senate and House committees at Washington. He insisted that the government should act promptly in this matter one way or the other, and so relieve the settlers of San Juan from the suspense in which they had been so long kept through the action of the government. If the land was not required for the Indians, "then," says President Hammond, "let the Secretary of the Interior re-open it for us and survey it, so that we may perfect our titles to it."

The Utes cannot, he asserts, understand the slothful way in which the government is acting in the case, they themselves having done everything they could to effect a ratification of the treaty. The settlers of San Juan fully expect that unless speedy action is taken much trouble will arise with the Indians, who are becoming impatient. On the other hand, the people of San Juan would be only too glad if the government would withdraw and allow them to perfect their claims. All doubt and anxiety would then be set at rest.

MRS. FRANKS' ANSWER.

Mrs. Nellie Franks on June 10th filed her answer to the complaint made by her husband, ex-Deputy Marshal Franks, who sues for a divorce. Judge Powers is the defendant's attorney, and her answer is as follows:

Now comes said defendant and answering plaintiff's complaint on file says:

First—That she admits that the plaintiff is a resident of Salt Lake County and Territory of Utah, and that he has been for more than one year last past; and that the plaintiff and defendant were married, but adds that there is an error in said complaint as to the date of said marriage.

Second—She admits that two children were born to said parties and that their names and ages are correctly stated in said complaint and that they are both living with this defendant.

Third—She denies that during all the time of their married life plaintiff has conducted himself in a prudent and faithful manner, ever mindful of the duties of a husband and father, unless the ideas of said plaintiff as to what constitutes fidelity and prudence are exceedingly peculiar. This defendant has always insisted and believed that a faithful husband leaving all others should cleave only to his wife, and her understanding of a prudent man, and especially of a prudent husband, has been other than one

who would launch his flirtations in the face of his family, as it will hereafter appear said plaintiff has done. She admits that said plaintiff has been a reasonably good provider for his family so far as his means would allow, but avers that the mere furnishing of food and drink is but a small portion of the duty of a husband; that in addition defendant has been entitled to his unbroken affection, to his protection as a husband and to his faithful adherence to his marriage vows.

Fourth—She denies that for two years last past she has without cause or provocation on the part of the plaintiff treated him with cruelty to the extent of causing him great mental distress. She avers that he is a large, strong, bold and healthy man, and that she is a small, frail and delicate woman; she denies, as alleged, that she has an ungovernable temper which she in nowise attempts to govern, but that she has borne and forbore until patience has ceased to be a virtue; that the plaintiff is of French extraction and is possessed of all the excitability of that race. She denies that she has cruelly accused him, the said plaintiff, of infidelity, and has continuously accused plaintiff of being actuated by bad motives in all his acts, but, on the contrary, she avers that for months, running into years, she has been compelled to quietly endure the knowledge that the plaintiff was expending his means and lavishing his affections upon one Carrie Lindsay, who had usurped in plaintiff's thoughts the place which belonged to this defendant. She denies that she has been finding fault with everything about the house continuously whenever he would be present, and she denies that she assumed hysterical fits in outbursts of anger, pretending that she was dying. She admits that her health has been injured and that her heart has been broken and that her nerves have become unstrung and that her life has been made miserable by the conduct of the plaintiff, and at times there seemed to be so little in this world for her to desire to live, that she has wished and prayed that this life might end. She denies that she ever attempted to drive the plaintiff from home or demanded that he should procure a divorce, or asserted that she would unless he did. She feels that the plaintiff must have been impelled by a sense of humor to insert such a charge in his complaint, for she could no more drive the plaintiff or force him to do anything that he did not desire to than she could carry her house on her shoulder. She denies that her conduct has been as alleged for the last two years past, in the presence of strangers as well as in privacy, but on the contrary she avers that whatever ill report has come to the plaintiff concerning his marriage relation has been caused by his own public acts and conduct. She denies that her conduct and abuse have become unbearable or made his life a miserable burden; and she denies that by reason of acts and conduct, alleged in the complaint, plaintiff and de-