

dates for office, but would leave him entirely free and untrammelled to choose for himself, without pressure from them.

To say that the members of the non-Partisan committee, by the adoption of this pledge, disfranchised themselves, made themselves ineligible for office, or deprived themselves of any of their rights as American citizens, is utterly absurd. The pledge was intended to leave the Mayor free from the pressure of influence exerted by the committee, but it was never intended to prevent him from choosing as one of his official associates a member of that committee, should he see fit to do so.

The Mayor has nominated a member of the non-Partisan committee as head of a city department, but he did so without being asked to do it, either by the nominee himself or any of the latter's colleagues of the committee. It was the Mayor's own spontaneous act. Hence no pledge has been broken in the making of this appointment. This will clearly and sufficiently appear as soon as the pledge that was actually given is examined and applied in accordance with its letter, spirit and intent. The attempts that are persistently being made to wrest and expand this pledge so as to give it a meaning and make it cover ground never designed by those who made it, are dishonest, contemptible and doomed to failure. In saying this much, we do but repeat that they are strictly in line with the usual methods of machine politics which has, unfortunately for the city, been introduced into its government.

AN UNFAIR CHARGE.

The announcement that the management of the International Transmississippi Exposition at Omaha has determined to charge the State of Utah at the rate of fifty cents per square foot for the space its exhibits will occupy in the buildings for mining, agriculture and manufacture, gives rise to feelings of surprise, disappointment and—it is not too much to say—resentment. When the Utah Legislature was asked for an appropriation to defray the expense of making a creditable showing for the State, and out of a depleted treasury responded by adding \$8,000 to the already heavy burdens of the taxpayers, the feeling of genuine approval shared by the progressive and patriotic part of the community was in no way clouded by a hint that as much space as the State would reasonably require would not be given gratis; and the announcement to the contrary is a very disagreeable "after-clap."

Purely out of loyalty to the West, a number of our prominent citizens, notably the Governor and influential officials of the State and its chief counties and municipalities, urged upon members of the last Legislature the desirability of sending from Utah a worthy contribution to the great exhibition; and in the same spirit that body responded by making the appropriation named. Preparations for a creditable exhibit have been carried on in good faith, but they have received a serious set-back in the news which comes from Omaha that \$1,500 of the amount given by the Legislature will have to be taken to pay for the 3,000 feet of space reserved for Utah.

Last year the State had a costly Jubilee celebration, the expense of which was largely met by private subscription. This summer—in four months from now—we are to have in this city the International Mining Congress, which must be provided for in the same way. The prospect of raising funds by this method to supplement the amount provided for the display at Omaha, and particularly to meet this

unexpected demand of the exposition authorities, is very gloomy. The purses that are the best filled and the inclination of the most generous will have been pretty well drained and exhausted by the time we get through with these local demands of our own.

While it may be proper enough to charge private parties who have products and commodities to advertise or sell, for the space they occupy, there appears to be no such justification in the case of the exhibit of a state whose purpose in taking part in the exposition is purely patriotic, and due to a loyal pride in seeking to make the affair a success. Every dollar at the disposal of the Utah commissioners will be needed to make the exhibit from here at all creditable as compared with those from some of the neighboring states, which not only have more to expect in the way of benefits, but have larger sums, both public and private, to devote to the purpose through having escaped the severe strain upon their financial resources which has been felt by us in the causes above indicated. To reduce this amount by \$1,500 as is now intimated, will be to cripple the thing so seriously that local interest is in danger of being estranged from the exposition wholly and altogether.

RUSKIN ON JUDAS.

According to John Ruskin there is more hope for the man who betrayed the Savior for money than there is for many of the modern worshippers of Mammon. At least this seems to be the view, intended to be conveyed by the following caustic paragraph written by the great essayist and critic:

"We do a great injustice to Iscariot in thinking him wicked above all common wickedness. He was only a common money lover, and like all money lovers, didn't understand Christ—couldn't make out the worth of Him or the meaning of Him. He didn't want Him to be killed. He was horror struck when he found that Christ would be killed; threw his money away instantly, and hanged himself. How many of our present money seekers, think you, would have the grace to hang themselves, whoever was killed."

"THE FREEDOM OF WOMAN."

In four states of the Union women have equal suffrage with men, and in twenty-eight they vote at school elections, while in nearly every state there is modern legislation conferring upon them enlarged rights in respect to property, the power to sue and be sued, etc. These results have been achieved by dint of persistent and enthusiastic effort, and by a gradual growth of the "woman's rights" idea.

There are few men now, even among those who oppose the extension of woman suffrage, who would vote to deprive the sex of the ground it has gained after so long a struggle, and place it back where it was when the contest for equal rights at the polls began just half a century ago. But it is unquestionably true that there has been a development accompanying and keeping pace with woman's political advancement which is to be profoundly regretted; and it is rapidly becoming more and more marked. One of its catch phrases is "the freedom of woman."

Madame Clara Neymann is a prominent platform speaker who frequently treats themes germane to the idea conveyed by this phrase; albeit that idea does not appear to have been very distinctly defined. She is spoken of in terms of praise by the Woman's Tribune of Washington, D. C., where she recently

delivered an address upon the subject: "The marriage ideal in the light of woman's freedom." She is thus reported by the Tribune:

"The delicate nature of this problem," she said, "makes its discussion and treatment very difficult, indeed. And yet," she continued, "taking a broad outlook, and approaching it with reverence, looking upon it from a philosophical and religious standpoint, the treatment cannot fail to strike the keynote in the heart of suffering humanity. We often suffer because we are ignorant and despair of a remedy. Yet there is no evil in this wide world for which the remedy does not exist somewhere. Marriage must take on a new form; it must represent the new ideal of life if it would serve humanity and the race. The old idea of marriage was founded upon physical attraction. The new will be based upon soul union. We can easily account for the prevalence of divorce and the constant increase of unhappiness in family life. It is because our ideas have changed without a corresponding change in civil and ecclesiastical laws. The new spirit of our age must find expression in our institutions before harmony can be restored. The freedom of woman, the sacredness of her personality, must find recognition before marriage will assume a new dignity and power."

The speaker did well to characterize her subject as delicate and difficult to treat. What "change in civil and ecclesiastical laws" must be made in order to conform to the changed ideas of the time? What are "the freedom of woman" and the "sacredness of her personality" which "must find recognition before marriage will assume a new dignity and power"? Are not these expressions dark hints at something the speaker had not the courage to advocate frankly? If not, what is their significance?

The simple fact is that there is associated with the workers of the woman suffrage movement a class of women who are restive under the restraints and obligations of the present marriage system, even under the laxity which it has during recent years acquired, and who desire to see brought about a "change in civil and ecclesiastical laws" that will make still lighter, or remove altogether, those restraints and obligations. In this connection they talk of "soul union" and "the sacredness of woman's personality."

The meaning intended to be conveyed, expressed in plain English, is that marriage laws, civil and religious, should be so relaxed as to remove the difficulties now experienced by married persons who wish to change conjugal partners. In the opinion of this class of women, marriage has lost its former sacred and stable character, and ought to be made by law a matter of pleasure or convenience, to be deemed no more binding nor permanent than are other social or business relations. Should such ideas actually become legalized, the result would be a system of promiscuity between the sexes which would obliterate the home and go far towards destroying the race by preventing the birth of children. The woman who frequently changed husbands would not if she could, and could not if she would, bear children.

The air is full of rumors of war, and recent years have been signalized by inventions designed to make war deadly to a degree never dreamed of by former ages. But there is no peril hanging over the human race in these, the closing months of the nineteenth century, which more imminently threatens its very existence than does the onslaught which "modern thought" is making upon the institution of marriage. Much of the philosophy of the time is meretricious and adulterous through and through, and teaches noth-