

that society has done for the agriculturists during its existence. And at the very fair referred to the premiums for farm development and agricultural interests generally were specially increased, to the detriment of some other departments, that the tiller of the soil might make his exhibit more than "a side-show." Prof. Mills's alleged "side-tracking" of agriculture by the fair directors is another sample of economizing the truth.

Then he attacks the recommendation of the society for a State board of agriculture to take charge of fairs, and says:

The great drawback to such boards, as a rule, is that they become places that can be used to get rid of more or less warring politicians. And in all agricultural or industrial affairs the politician becomes the most obnoxious beast of prey. To obviate this I believe it would be best to elect this board from districts, for it would then be closer to the people than it would be were it appointed.

The public spirited men of Utah who have served in the management of fairs without compensation or hope of reward other than the knowledge of doing good to the whole people, and at financial loss to themselves, surely will appreciate this reference to "warring politicians" and "obnoxious beast of prey." But this is only a subdued specimen of the fair and kindly spirit which characterizes the address. Then right on this, Prof. Mills wants the board to be thrown into the pool of politics at elections. We trust he is not figuring to be returned as a "warring politician" or an "obnoxious beast of prey." Further, he wants each member of the fair board to represent the agricultural interest. We opine that the farmers of Utah are too just and honest to desire the exclusion of the stockgrower, the manufacturer, the miner, or any other interest of magnitude.

Prof. Mills also spoke upon irrigation; and in this connection we will refer to his letter. Our position is that the rule which has prevailed in Utah as to title to the right to use water, should predominate in the State. Upon the irrigation discussion Mr. Mills writes:

I defy the News to show where I have attacked any man or any man's character in this discussion.

There have been numerous places and occasions, one being the inuendo in the speech from which we have quoted. But we will refer to an incident which the professor may have forgotten, though it occurred since the News suggested that it was not proper to unjustly assail men who had proved themselves true to the people here to a vastly greater extent than he has had opportunities of doing. Over his own signature, Mr. Mills, in the Logan Journal of Dec. 28, attacked what he calls "the great irrigators" who compose the Irrigation association. He goes on to describe some of them as follows:

One is a member of the board of directors and one is a shareholder in one and the same great corporation of Utah; one is the president of another great irrigation corporation.

And so on with others. Mr. Mills has the response to his defiance from his own pen; and it reveals that there is something in the domain of ethics

that he might study with profit. It will not do to beg the question by saying, as he does: "As far as I remember, there has been no man's name mentioned except my own." An assault on Governor Wells would be no less a direct attack because he might be described as the Governor-elect of Utah instead of mentioning him by name. Prof. Mills's subterfuge in this respect is cowardice which, as a young man who intends to make Utah his permanent home, he ought to cast aside along with the other unenviable attributes displayed in his speech yesterday and on other occasions. We hope this plain language will aid him to repentance; for there is much for good in his character if he does not smother it with bitterness.

One more word to the professor and to Utah farmers in general. What good is to be expected from the declaration that the farmers are a "prey to all other classes?" etc. Are the farmers making friends of those who are thus assailed? Does it do any good to call one's neighbors bad names and thus alienate them? Surely there is nothing to be gained for agriculturists by antagonizing everybody else. If the farmers want legislation in their behalf, and they should receive fair and generous treatment in this regard, it is not likely to be gained by arrogance and insolent speeches as readily as by joining in perfect harmony with others for the good of the whole. No benefits will accrue from raising a quarrel which is as needless as it is unpleasant; and it ought to be abandoned at once in the farmer's own interest.

THE CONSTITUTION of the United States, framed by inspiration of the Lord of Hosts: Utah is now completely under its protecting wing!

WOMAN AND SCIENCE.

The modern development of the equal suffrage cause has had its effect upon scientists, until now we have a scientific view of woman's rights set forth by the distinguished German anatomist, Prof. Waldeyer, of Berlin. The professor's paper, read before the recent meeting of the German Anthropological congress, was received not only without a word of contradiction or protest, but with emphatic applause, thus indicating the views of all the members present.

Dr. Waldeyer advances the proposition that, in reviewing the evolution of organisms, the higher the genus and the species the greater is the difference between the sexes. He says that in some of the animal creation the male is only a wretched parasite as compared to the more highly developed female, and admits that here and there among mankind there are instances of a similar class. But he insists that this is not the general rule, which is that in the human race as a whole the male has a much more developed muscular and bony system than the female, and has more serious claims to

be classed as the more powerful machine. In support of this statement he cites the differences in the index finger, the teeth formation, the skull, the weight of brain, and other distinctions which are observable from birth. The most memorable difference, however, and that which to this eminent anatomist appears decisive as regards the question of woman's sphere, is the difference in blood. To speak scientifically, the cubic centimeter of blood taken from a man is found to contain on an average 5,000 red blood corpuscles, whereas the same quantity in a woman has no more than four and a half thousand. It is well known that these red blood cells are absolutely indispensable to the processes of animal life; they constitute the very quintessence of existence. On this showing, vitally and dynamically, a woman is but nine-tenths of a man. From this scientific conclusion, the German anatomist holds that equal suffrage is inconsistent with the nature of woman as scientifically demonstrated. Whatever she is given in this line should be, he thinks, within closer limits than those which bound the sphere of man, and should be of an order that under no circumstances can interfere with her activity as a culture-bearer within the family circle.

This scientific substantiation of woman's necessity in recognizing man as the head in government will be a decidedly sweet morsel to those who antagonize equal suffrage, although if they adopt it they may have to concede to woman the right, on a scientific basis, to vote the same as a man, thus giving her an agency in choosing who shall rule over her, while claiming that politically, as scientifically, the office-holding or ruling function should be retained with the male. It will now be in order for some equal suffrage anatomist, if there be one, to point out, as a counterbalance to Professor Waldeyer's showing, that woman has some organic advantages for the higher position which man does not possess.

CONSTANTINOPLE'S TREASURES.

In the memoirs of the French author Mery, a conversation which he had with an English diplomat about Constantinople over sixty years ago is recorded, and it is not without interest at this time, as showing that the contention about the Turkish capital may not always have been without an element of greed, considering the immense treasures supposed to be literally buried in the ancient city by the Bosphorus.

Mery expressed surprise that England should be so hungry for so poor a bone as Turkey, whereas the English diplomat smiled and said, it is, of course, neither the wealth nor the poverty of the country that is any consideration to England, but since you have brought this question up, do not forget the immense hidden treasures in the Turkish capital. Every time a sultan dies, his remains are laid