

ognition of the secular law. The law of man cannot dissolve them. They are sacred, binding and perpetual. The secular law has presumed to step in and declare them invalid, and also to punish the men who have contracted them. But the sacrament by which they were solemnized holds itself as beyond the touch of the civil law. It is "an establishment of religion," with which the state is forbidden to interfere. It is one of the things of God, which are above the reach of Caesar.

The principle is the same in both religious organizations, though the practice may be different. Catholicism enjoins celibacy in priests and nuns. "Mormonism" permits plural marriages to its priesthood under certain restrictions. But the marriage relation is held by each to be under ecclesiastical instead of secular direction, and its contract or separation, so far as its own members are concerned, to be under the discipline and government of the Church. Yet Catholicism may fulminate its decrees and provoke faint opposition, while the similar claim of "Mormonism" stirs up the nation to anger and sets the world ajar.

Well, perhaps the time will come when people at home and abroad will see that there is nothing in our system designed or calculated to hurt them in the least, and intolerance will become so subdued that they will conclude to let both the Latter-day Saint and the Catholic worship and serve God according to the dictates of conscience, and none will dare to make them afraid. But there will have to be a big struggle first, and so we may as well stand ready to endure whatever shall intervene.

MRS. LOZIER AND MR. EDMUNDS.

SOME stir has been made in eastern circles, over the correspondence between Mrs. Clemence S. Lozier, Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Association, and Senator George F. Edmunds of Vermont. Mrs. Lozier having expressed her opinions pretty freely on the meanness and injustice of that clause in the new Edmunds bill proposing to disfranchise the women of Utah, Mr. Edmunds addressed a letter to the lady, in which he said:

"If you and your associates understood the state of things in Utah, I am sure you would support instead of oppose the provision to relieve the women of Utah from the degradation of voting as their Mormon masters require."

Mrs. Lozier, who seems to be pretty well posted on the question, responded with a caustic letter, which has partly appeared in several papers, but either garbled or mutilated or spoiled by important omissions. It is worth producing in its entirety, and will be found in full in another column.

It is a severe arraignment of the Green Mountain sage and his fanatical followers. It may be laughed at as the angry language of an offended female, but there is more in it than can be silenced with ridicule. It contains truths which go straight to the point. There is no reason why the women of Utah should be deprived of the elective franchise. The proposition to take away the ballot from all "Mormon" voters, male and female, though an extension of the intended wrong, is far more logical and consistent than the attempt to rob the women of their rights. The pretext offered for the contemplated injustice to the women, can be applied just as much to the men. Indeed it is used against them by the few who are plotting for the spoliation of Utah.

Mr. Edmunds alleges that the women vote "as their Mormon masters require." The same is said of the men. And if it is right to deprive the women voters of the franchise because liars put forth that pretense, it is equally right to disfranchise the men voters on the same allegation.

Mr. Edmunds presumes that the ladies opposed to his scheme do not understand "the state of things in Utah." But everybody familiar with the situation knows that it is Mr. Edmunds who is ignorant of the subject and the people against whom he supports adverse legislation. The proof of his ignorance is branded on his bill. He has a clause in it to abolish marked ballots in Utah, when there are no such ballots to abolish. It provides for the repeal of a law that has no existence. Other clauses are for the repeal of other provisions of Utah law that are not upon our statute books. If these are not demonstrations of his misinformation what can they be called?

It is upon this false basis that Mr. Edmunds predicated his proposal to take the ballot away from the women, and, as understood, now endorses the movement to take it away from the men also, provided they are members of the "Mormon" Church. So when he twits the ladies of the Woman Suffrage Association with their lack of understanding, he should first be sure that he is not himself in the dark. He has been stuffed with the stories of the rascals who are plotting to rob this Territory, and, in his egotism and cold conceit, he thinks he knows it all, while his followers blindly take the cue from his lead, and, the blind leading the blind, they are ready to fall into the ditch of their folly, injustice and wrong together.

Mrs. Lozier may be technically in error in regard to the "God-given right" of suffrage. Voting is legally

considered to be a privilege rather than a right; as a power conferred by legislation, not a natural, inherent right born in the citizen. Whether this is morally and theoretically correct is yet an open question. If the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are inborn and unalienable, as declared in the Declaration of Independence, and that no one in this free land has the hardihood to deny, it seems reasonable to conclude that the ballot is an equal right of every citizen, to enable him or her to exercise and preserve that liberty and secure that happiness to which every one is entitled. Wise statesmen have declared that they who have not the ballot are slaves to those who hold it. With this view of the case the ballot is a right rather than a privilege, although laws have been enacted to restrict it, and courts rule in the light of those laws. It does not follow, because the courts are practically unanimous in the view that the elective franchise is a privilege, that the doctrine is morally and intrinsically right.

But this is certain. Even if the voting power is but a privilege, when once conferred and exercised according to law it becomes a vested right. And if women obtain it and use it, their rights are equal in the premises with those of male voters. And, as Mrs. Lozier argues, "it cannot be disturbed without a flagrant breach of settled principles of law." The argument applies to women voters as much as to men voters. Sex does not affect the principle. The rule works both ways.

The intimation concerning the probable opposition of the Woman Suffragists to Mr. Edmunds' ambitious projects is not to be despised. As we showed in a recent article, the members of the New York association have succeeded in defeating several candidates for State offices who were antagonistic to their movement. They can wield a powerful influence in that State, to say nothing of other parts of the Union. Without the vote of New York, no candidate can gain the Presidency under present political conditions. The women will take care that he has a small show for the suffrages of that State. It is improbable that he will even get the nomination, and if he does, he cannot be elected if the Woman Suffrage people get after him with their sharp sticks.

The "polygamy" cry cannot affect this question of robbing the Utah women of the suffrage. It is used all the same, but it has lost its power. It is too well known that all persons, male and female, connected with polygamy are already disfranchised, and that the project to deprive the monogamous and unmarried ladies of Utah of the right to vote, is but a pretext in the interest of adventurers and robbers, who are using the opponents of woman suffrage to effect their ends. The rascals are learning this, and so they are changing their tactics, working now for the disfranchisement of all members of the "Mormon" Church, without regard to sex or matrimonial conditions. They thus avoid the woman suffrage entanglement, but they plainly show their hands and appear to every person with natural vision as a band of schemers, working for that political power by chicanery and deceit which they can never hope to gain by lawful and legitimate methods.

Meanwhile we are pleased to see the interest which intelligent women, like Mrs. Lozier and others of the Association in which she shines as a leader, take in the cause of their sex, unbiased by the ignorant prejudice that blinds statesmen and sways the multitude.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE SENATE.

THE long-drawn-out debate over the Duskin removal, in the Senate of the United States, has at length come to an end, being decided on party votes; and as the Republicans have the majority in the upper chamber they were adverse, of course, to the Democratic Administration. But they only amount to a small degree of obstruction. The effect will not be of any very great importance. The President has taken a stand which he well considered before action, and he is not made of the stuff that readily backs down in the face of opposition.

Senator Edmunds has not made much over his attack upon the President. It appears that he opposed the nomination of Duskin himself when the name was first presented, and while he has been trying to force the President to produce the papers and reasons leading to his removal, the man's term of office has run out and the office is rendered vacant without his removal. Of course this does not affect the principle of the right of the Senate to demand papers, or the right of the President to remove for cause without accounting to the Senate for his action. But it makes Edmunds appear rather ridiculous, in basing his argument upon a dead issue and in reference to a case in which he has acted inconsistently.

It remains to be seen how far the Senate will carry out in practice the principles on which it has decided the President to be in fault. The nominations made in place of removed officials may be rejected. But as soon as the Senate adjourns the President can re-appoint the same persons, and although the Senate may again reinstate them, the President has the advantage of power and if he so desires can have his way in spite of the temporary

obstructions thrown in the path by the Senate.

We think the President is right in trying to raise the Executive authority above the level of mere party expediency. The idea that Republicans cannot serve under a Democratic Administration, and vice versa, and that on a change of party supremacy there must be a complete change in all the offices in the gift of the Government, seems to us entirely erroneous. Fitness for the position should be the great recommendation, and when a Republican is performing faithfully the duties of an office, we see no good reason why he should be removed simply to make way for a Democrat. Office should not be conferred by way of reward for political service but on the same principles that govern employers in business and in private life.

However, the other system has prevailed more or less for a long time, and the Democratic party, having had no chance at the public tests for a quarter of a century, it was natural that on the accession of a Democratic President the hungry expectants should look for a pretty clean sweep of Republican suckers and a general opening for their impatient opponents. And as party triumphs cannot be won without party support, and that is stimulated in many quarters by the hope of gain, it is to be expected that party wishes and demands will prevail above sound principle, and changes will be wanted and acceded to on the lower and more sordid motive.

In trying to act upon higher ground, President Cleveland has run against a big stump, and while disgusting many Democrats has put a whip into the hands of the Republicans, who are not slow to use it for all it is worth.

MRS. HAYES' PROTEGE.

THIS is how the Providence, Rhode Island, Star dismisses the case of the removed "noblest Roman," etc.

Big, fat Eli H. Murray, who was appointed Governor of Utah at the special request of Mrs. Hayes, by her husband, has resigned, to the intense disgust of the Salt Lake Tribune and the partizan clique who have grown rich in Utah on an original capital of hatred for everything Mormon. Governor Murray was at one time part owner of the Louisville Commercial, and is now largely interested in Western mining enterprises.

REFINED WORK OF "AMERICAN GENTLEMEN."

THE vilest paper on earth, sometimes called the Tribune, of this city, in addition to publishing all the tid-bits of scandal that male and female gossips gloat over with a salacious relish, and the personal and private conversations which sneaks and informers can pick up and repeat, gives occasionally to the public letters that are inadvertently dropped in the street or stolen by some of its hired Panj Prys.

The creatures who manipulate the low-lived concern do not seem to understand that they are exposing their own shame by such conduct, nor that it is beneath the conduct of any gentleman to expose private letters to other persons, to the public gaze. They seem to imagine that anything dropped in the street is theirs or common property. An honest man will try to find the owner of an article he may pick up in the street. A decent man would try and discover the person to whom a letter is addressed that may fall into his hands. It is only the sneak thief who will appropriate to his own use property that does not belong to him, without seeking to learn its owner and restore it. And it is only the scurviest kind of a cur that would take a private letter plainly addressed to another, and instead of forwarding it to its owner, not only read it himself but publish it to the world to injure both the writer and the person addressed.

These remarks are occasioned by several dirty tricks of this kind resorted to by the Tribune people, and particularly by the publication of a private letter from Franklin, Idaho, to a gentleman of this city and said to have been found in the street. Investigations made by the Salt Lake Herald have elicited the facts that the letter was duly mailed at Franklin, but was never received by the gentleman to whom it was sent. This raises a very important question. Did the Tribune get the letter direct from the Postoffice, or how? Was it put by mistake in the Tribune box, and, if so, by what right was it opened by the Tribune people? If it was dropped by a carrier, and found as claimed, why did the Tribune scribes open a sealed letter addressed to a gentleman not connected in any way with their disreputable establishment? Look at it as you will it was a disgraceful and unmanly act, worthy only of one whose moral sensibility has been drowned in befuddling potations, and who has no more appreciation of common prudence than to betray his own vulgarity and lack of good breeding, openly and with boasting.

The gentleman whose private affairs have thus been exposed to the public gaze should institute inquiries, with the view to an explanation of the manner in which a private letter has been taken from the Postoffice by one to whom it was not addressed, and

spread upon the pages of the most infamous sheet that was ever issued from the press.

"WHAT'S IN A NAME?"

THE name of Cannon seems to act on the court officials here as a red flag on a mad bull. Any one who hears that name had better beware, or he may be pounced upon at any moment unawares. We are not sure that this may not incidentally apply to every person by the name of Gunn, which may be hastily taken for some connection of the hated cognomen.

Mr. George M. Cannon, the County Recorder, is the latest victim to this insane rage. It appears he has held a brief conversation with a man drawn as a juror, but not yet chosen to sit upon the case on which comment is said to have been made. When this fact was learned in court, Mr. Cannon was at once arrested and held in his own recognizance to show why he should not be committed for contempt. Another juror acknowledged to having had a conversation with some person in a similar way, but no action was taken on that. It was not "a party by the name of Cannon," so it did not matter so much. Probably it was not a "Mormon," so it did not signify at all.

Mr. Cannon is a quiet, gentlemanly young man whom no one would accuse of lawlessness. He cannot be assailed for polygamy, so this shallow pretext is taken advantage of to bring him within the lines of the law. Really, is not the Chief Justice descending a little too low in this absurd irritation at a name, and this extreme vindictiveness against a family?

SUNDAY OUTRAGES UPON CITIZENS' RIGHTS.

Does Marshal Ireland attend to continue these Sunday raids upon the homes of unoffending citizens? Last Sunday houses were invaded by his hirelings under the pretence of hunting for witnesses, but no one they wanted was found. Are peaceable people to be thus disturbed on the Sabbath day, by rough men who say they are authorized to look for witnesses? Is it not time that something decisive was done to stop this ungodly and lawless work? It would not be endured in any other part of this alleged free country, and in England would be stamped upon at the first attempt. It is disgraceful to all engaged in it. There is no necessity for it, and it ought not to be permitted. Proper steps should be taken to have this matter investigated, and the rights of citizens defined and maintained. People are not going to bear the lawless raids upon their privacy unresisted much longer; and lawful steps should be taken at once to arrest them, or violence will settle it in a manner not anticipated. It is to avoid this contingency that we urge a cessation of these disgraceful doings or else action to bring the subject to a test.

A VERY LAME EXCUSE.

THE publication in the Tribune of a private letter from Franklin to Mr. Alfred Best of this city which that gentleman never received, remains unexplained notwithstanding the excuses that have been offered by the Postmaster and the paper. Mr. Lynch states to the Herald that the letter was not lost through the fault of his office. The Tribune says the blame was not with the Postoffice nor the clerks. It claims that the letter was brought to the Tribune office without an envelope and with the address then off. All this is a very thin way of crawling out of the responsibility of publishing a private letter that came into other hands than those for which it was intended.

Taking the "explanation" as though it were true, which few people who know the depths of Tribune trickery and mendacity will believe, the whole business was dastardly and without excuse. Both the sneak who found (?) the letter and took it to a newspaper office for publication instead of to the Post Office or the owner, and the double sneak who spread it before the country, are entitled to the contempt of every civilized being. The Tribune scribe pretends that by publishing the letter it was brought to the notice of the person to whom it was written. As if that could not have been done in an honorable manner, by announcing the possession of the letter and the name and address of the person who wrote it, supposing the name and address of the person to whom it was written had been torn off. And if the discovery of the owner was the object in view, why was the finder not interrogated in regard to the name, etc., that he tore off the letter?

We regard this dirty act of the Tribune creatures as even lower and viler than the manufacture of the "Bishop West" letter and other of their similar blackguard fabrications. If this had been even alleged to be the work of "Mormons," would not the Prosecuting Attorney and the grand jury have been diligently at work before this to discover the facts in the case? We think

so. But who believes that either Mr. Dickson or any one else authorized to move for an investigation will take a step under the circumstances? All the same, every decent man and woman in the community will reckon up the status of the low-lived beings who have thus exhibited their own degradation.

AN EXCELLENT STEP.

THE determination on the part of the city fathers to give good drinking water to the thirsty inhabitants of the beach land which constitutes the northern portion of the city, is worthy of all commendation. When people are practically without such a necessity to health and life as pure water, and a supply is attainable at a price far below the value of the boon, there should be no question upon the subject. In such cases it is nearly as inhuman to press priority and vested rights, as to interpose similar obstacles in reference to fresh air, if it were possible to fencol that essential to the general well-being. Here is the question first in point of consideration: "Is the supply adequate for all, if those deprived of a needed share are accorded it? That point has not been doubted. The propriety of giving the relief follows as a natural sequence.

We congratulate our fellow citizens of the dry bench on the closefess of the prospect for their relief. The transaction consummated by the late Mayor and Council in purchasing a large tract of land contiguous to City Creek has hastened the attainment of an object so long and earnestly desired. The present Chief Municipal Magistrate and Council are to be commended for bringing at so early a date the consummation of so important a matter for which their predecessors in office laid the foundation. The step is one of decided importance. By it property on the "bench" will be enhanced in value, while, still more important life will be made more pleasant to the people who dwell in that heretofore undesirable section of the city.

Did you Sup-

pose Mustang Liniment only good for horses? It is for inflammation of all flesh.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING A book of 100 pages, the best book for an advertiser to consult, he has experienced or otherwise. It contains lists of newspapers and estimates of the cost of advertising. The advertiser who wants to spend one dollar, finds in it the information he requires, while for him who will invest one hundred thousand dollars in advertising, a scheme is indicated which will meet his every requirement, or can be made to do so by slight changes easily arrived at by correspondence. One hundred and fifty-three editions have been issued, sent, post-paid, to any address for 10 cents. Apply to GEO. P. ROWELL & CO. NEWS-PAPER ADVERTISING BUREAU, 10 Spruce St. (Printing House Sq.), New York.

THE BUYERS' GUIDE is issued March and Sept., each year. 216 pages, 8 1/2 x 11 1/2 inches, with over 3,500 illustrations - a whole Picture Gallery. GIVES Wholesale Prices direct to consumers on all goods for personal or family use. Tells how to order, and gives exact cost of everything you use, eat, drink, wear, or have fun with. These INVALUABLE BOOKS contain information gleaned from the markets of the world. We will mail a copy FREE to any address upon receipt of 10 cts. to defray expense of mailing. Let us hear from you. Respectfully, MONTGOMERY WARD & CO. 227 & 229 Wabasa Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

HAIR REMOVED From any part of the body in FIVE MINUTES, without injury to the skin, by EPILATOR DEERFLORIN POWELL. Mailed (freely applied) for \$1.00. Send pamphlet FREE. Reliable of Druggists. ASK FOR IT. Don't be put off with same. Price also, 9 C. EPILATOR, P. O. Box 1202, Philadelphia, Pa.

PATENTS MUNN & CO., of the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, continue to act as Solicitors for Patents, Caveats, Trade Marks, Copyrights, for the United States, Canada, England, France, Germany, etc. Hand Book about Patents sent free. Thirty-seven years' experience. Patents obtained through MUNN & CO. are noted in the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, the largest, best, and most widely circulated scientific paper. \$3.00 a year. Weekly. Splendid engravings and interesting information. Specimen copy of the Scientific American sent free. Address MUNN & CO. SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN Office, 231 Broadway, New York.