get rid of them, so they marry without love. An evil arises out of this, more ghastly than can be described. The marriage of *convenance* is a recognized social institution abroad. In England, in this nineteenth century, the women of the upper middle classes adopt it without acknowledging it. However we may affect to deny it, there is a vast amount of married unhappiness in all classes. The fault is sometimes ascribed to the present degeneracy of women and sometimes to the deterioration of the men. The fault really lies in our social system, which gives a woman neither work nor money, and obliges her to sell herself before she has lost her only salable commodities—youth and beauty. As there exists four 'superfluous women' to one man, the female has no choice, while the lordly male has the greater number from whom to pick and choose."

The facts contained in the foregoing will be very unpalatable to the fanatics who are bent on suppressing a system which gives promise of an effectual remedy for the evil complained of, which is far more serious than most people are willing to admit. In newly settled regions, in mining camps and other places where the love of adventure or the desire to search for wealth out of the beaten paths of society lead men to congregate, and where the conditions are not attractive to the gentler sex, the term "superfluous women" may be entirely out of place. But every observer must have perceived the disproportion referred to by the *National Review*, not only in communities where the women largely outnumber the men, but where the numbers are about equal and even where the male population exceeds that of the female.

For, it is a fact that wherever you go, with the exceptions named above, the number of marriageable women met with is remarkable. Girls arrive at a marriageable condition earlier than boys. Many men will not assume the responsibilities, cares and expenses of the matrimonial state. Others think themselves unable because of circumstances, or are unfitted by their own sins and follies, to contract the marital relation. And the consequence is a superabundance of unmarried, or as the *Review* calls them "superfluous women.

The gentler sex are, as a rule, disposed to matrimony. A woman who from choice, with suitable opportunities to honorable wedlock, refuses to enter the matrimonial state is an anomaly. She is a *lusus naturæ*. The make up, tendency, instincts and promptings of womanhood lean towards connubiality and maternity. Women, with very rare exceptions, would marry if they could. And when they do not, it is not because their inclinations are averse to the relation, but because obstacles of some kind stand in the way. Holy Writ says woman was made for man, and this is the voice of Nature as well as the word of God.

A social system which does not make provision for this undeniable condition of affairs is not only imperfect but radically wrong. Laws which prevent millions of marriageable women from filling the measure of their creation, are cruel and unwise. There should be no compulsion upon the union of the sexes, but there ought to be sufficient liberty to enable all that would marry and are not incapacitated, to assume that position honorably.

If every man of proper age was compelled to marry, there would, in many parts of the world, perhaps, be few unmarried women. In others, there would still be "superfluous women" because of their preponderance in numbers. In the census of every country all the male persons are counted as well as the females. The count includes soldiers, sailors, and men of various occupations tending to celibacy. If they and other non-marrying males were cast out of the reckoning, what a vast number of "superfluous women" would appear in marriageable statistics! Even in the United States, which are not to be spoken of in the same breath with Europe on the score of a preponderance of women, the numbers of girls without beaux to be met in every city, and especially at watering places and pleasure resorts, are startling and give rise to reflections of a serious character.

The incompatible marriages that are contracted in every country are fruitful sources of misery and crime. They not only breed unhappiness between the parties but sow the seeds of evil in the offspring of those ill-assorted unions. Thus society is affected detrimentally in the present and in the future. And the root of the wrong lies, in the majority of instances, in the lack of opportunities to agreeable matrimony afforded women, who accept of offers that are not congenial to the heart, and have the effect of crushing the tenderest and most sacred impulses and desires planted in the soul of woman by Deity for the holiest of purposes.

"The fault really lies in our social system," says the *National Review*, and it is right. Man has assumed to make laws and fix regulations in opposition to God and Nature. Exclusive and stringent monogamy is a modern blunder. It originated in conditions that seemed to necessitate it for the time, and grew up with Pagan Rome to be fastened on countries dominated by apostate Paganized Christendom, and perpetuated among the nations that are all measurably affected by its influence. To fix upon all people a rule that started when men had to make incursions into a neighboring State to steal women enough for a wife apiece, is the height of social absurdity. Regulations that might perhaps be suitable for society where the male element predominates, are totally unsuitable to communities where there are so many "superfluous women."

So-called "Christendom" is cursed with evils arising from the celibacy imposed upon millions of women, unless they fall into relations that are dishonorable and which breed disorders that are both social and physical, and that lead to misery and death. But in its egotism and self-sufficiency it refuses to reform, and blindly boasts of its own virtue and excellence while teeming with vice and smoking with the fumes of impurity. And it forges fetters and smites with pains and penalties those who point out the way, by precept and example, by which redemption may come from its disorders.

The Biblical system of marriage comprehends both the monogamic and polygamic conditions. Neither invades the domain of the other. They existed together fraternally from the earliest times for ages. They could prevail side by side to-day under wise regulations. All men are not equal in person or qualities. Equality before the law is not equality in nature. Some men are unfit for matrimony altogether. Others should have but one wife. Others again might and should have more wives than one, for abundant reasons that might be given and some of which will suggest themselves to thoughtful and reasonable minds. This would be proper for them, of great advantage to their wives, and beneficial to society. The way should be open to every woman to honorable wedlock. This is impossible in many nations under the present shackled social system, which sets up barriers to God's method of union between the sexes and lets humanity run loose in the direction that leads to death and the Devil.

We do not pretend to say that the world is prepared to-day for the establishment of polygamic liberty. The system which has caused so much stir against the "Mormons" does not contemplate anything of the kind. It is a strictly religious institution under strictly religious regulations, and only intended for men having the Holy Priesthood and who are worthy of its privileges and fit for its obligations. But we do say that the prevalent system is wrong and unsuitable to the conditions of mankind to-day, and we believe the time will come when a radical change will be found essential, and that before a perfect social system can be established on earth, prejudices which now take the form of fanaticism will have to be dissipated, and laws that now interpose between millions of women and honorable matrimony will have to be repealed, and mankind will have to learn God's marriage laws which were given of old, and which were in accord with the nature, constitution and requirements of His sons and daughters in the flesh in their varied capacities and conditions. His plan will be found to be the best, and He has never yet proclaimed to humanity, "Thou shalt have no more wives than one."

LAWFUL AND UNLAWFUL BOYCOTTING.

THERE is lawful boycotting and boycotting that is unlawful. People may agree not to buy goods at a certain establishment or a class of establishments, and to refrain from patronizing an individual or class of individuals, for any cause that may seem to them sufficient. But they must not prevent other people from transacting business with the person, firm, institution or class which they have determined to boycott. Workmen may agree not to labor for an individual or company or on any but the terms of a compact. But they must not obstruct others who wish to do what they have determined not to do. Employers may combine against the demands of employes and make stipulations not to employ certain persons or classes of persons. But they must not hinder orther employers from taking a contrary course.

The distinction comprehends the difference between the liberty which means true freedom, and that liberty which leaps over its own bounds and leads inevitably to bondage. In exercising our own freedom we must take care that we do not infringe upon the freedom of others. A man has the legal right to utilize his own skill and muscle where he finds legitimate opportunity, or to withold it unless he has contracted for its use. But he has no right to do anything to hinder another man from working where he will not or for a price that he declines.

The boycott troubles arise from losing sight of this distinction. Properly and legally exercised, the boycott may be used to great advantage, for the accomplishment of landable ends. Improperly and unlawfully exercised it becomes a weapon for evil, assailing personal rights, infringing upon individual liberty and disturbing the peace of society. These are evils that cannot be tolerated. The strong arm of the law must be invoked against the instrument that creates them. Unlawful boycotting must go.

The Supreme Court of Connecticut has recently passed on this question, and pronounces the kind of boycotting we have here denounced a conspiracy which is punishable by the laws of the State. In the course of the Opinion the Court made use of the following language, which all promoters of unlawful boycotting would do well to ponder upon:

"It seems strange, in a country in which law interferes so little with the liberty of the individual, that it should be necessary to announce from the bench that every man may carry on his business as he pleases, may do what he will with his own so long as he does nothing unlawful and acts with due regard to the rights of others, and that the occasion for such an announcement should be, not an attempt by government to interfere with the rights of citizens nor by the rich and powerful to suppress the poor, but an attempt by a large body of workingmen to control, by means little if any better than force, the action of employers."

GOING BEYOND THE LAW.

"THE law cannot touch him, but powder and ball shall." That was the exclamation of the mobocrats who plotted the murder of Joseph and Hyrum, the latter-day martyrs for the everlasting gospel. It embodies the sentiments of the chief promoters of all the violent assaults upon the Latter-day Saints. It would materialize into substantial action to-day, but for the fact that, locally, the "Mormons" outnumber their unprincipled enemies and have superior strength. Physical force cannot be brought to bear, but trickery and scheming take its place. The law, fairly interpreted and impartially administered, will not touch the masses of the "Mormons," and therefore ulterior measures are resorted to for their injury. Some temporary advantages may seem to accrue to our foes thereby, but, as in the case of the sacrifice of the Prophet and Patriarch, the ultimate results will prove of incalculable benefit to the cause assailed.

In framing special legislation against the "Mormons," the spirit of the national Constitution has had to be violated or the object intended could not be nearly approached. And in the execution of those laws, which are themselves infractions of the supreme law, unheard of constructions have had to be invented and unprecedented practices resorted to in order to accomplish the desired purpose. This has been patent to all keen observers during the latest anti-"Mormon" crusade.

The scene in the Third District courtroom on Monday was a further example of this disposition to exceed the law and override its explicit provisions. The questions propounded by Mr. Dickson to the jurors on their *voir dire*: "Are you a member of the Mormon Church?" was unlawful. So were others, such as: "Do you believe it right, according to the law of God, that a man may have more than one wife at the same time?" "Are you willing to take an oath that you will not hereafter, at any time, obey that law of the Church?" "Are you in good standing in the Church?" "Do you accept or reject any of the teachings of the Church?" "Are you willing to take an oath that you will not hereafter, under any circumstances, preach or teach polygamy or plural marriage?" These and many other similar questions put to the jurors were outside of any law, and the District Attorney had no legal or moral right to propound them.

In our opinion the proper course for the jurors would have been to decline answering them from the first. No juror can be legally questioned as to his membership in a church, nor as to his acceptance or rejection of a tenet of faith. Neither can he be required to express his willingness or unwillingness to obey a law of God, or to take any other oath than that provided for in the new law for voters, jurors and office-holders. No juror can be compelled to answer such questions as these we have copied from the examination of jurors which Judge Zane permitted and sustained in the Third District Court on Monday. They need not have been answered, pro or con.

The jurors were ready and willing to take the oath provided for by law, but not the oath fabricated by Mr. Dickson. He had no right either to make a new oath or to ask a juror whether he was willing to subscribe to the illegal fabrication. And Judge Zane was as much, or more, in the wrong in countenancing and assisting the improper inquisition. Every juror rejected for his unwillingness to take any other oath than that required by law was unlawfully excluded from the panel, and this cannot be successfully controverted. If there is any law requiring or permitting such tests as were put to "Mormon" jurors on Monday, let it be cited and we will admit our error. But no one knows that there is no such law on any statute book in this or any other country better than the Judge and Attorney who rejected jurors on the tests thus imposed.

The provision excluding jurors for belief that it is right for a man to have more than one wife or to cohabit with more than one woman, in Section Five of the Edmunds Act, is strictly limited to "any prosecution for bigamy, polygamy or unlawful cohabitation." The movement on Monday was to exclude "Mormons" from jury service for the term in all cases, both civil and criminal. And it gives just occasion for many surmises, not at all to the credit of those engaged in the scheme.

It is such distortions of the law that the "Mormon" people justly complain of. It is only by those means that their enemies obtain the powers to oppress and wrong them under color and pretence of law. And it is just such improper proceedings, as we understand it, that the Administration rejects as representing its policy. The Government desires to see the laws enforced, not exceeded, nor perverted, nor outraged, nor turned into engines of persecution against any church, system or class of citizens. The whole judicial crusade against the "Mormons" under the Edmunds law has been a succession of excesses, and the proceedings on Monday were so wide a departure from statutory provisions that they cannot be sustained by a solitary precedent or a single respectable argument.

The organ of the Leaguers in general and of Dickson and Zane in particular, desires the Utah Commissioners to take the same "view of the case" as the Attorney and the Judge, and argues that if there was nothing wrong in Dickson's questions, there would be nothing wrong in "the putting of the same questions by the registrars to men who desire to register as voters." We understand that desire, and the public will not be slow to discern the purpose that lies skulking behind the movement. But unfortunately for those who wish to obstruct the registration and to exclude "Mormons" from the polls, both the Edmunds Act and the instructions of the Commissioners to the registration officers in pursuance thereof and of the new law, stand broadly in the way of their designs.

The Edmunds Act says concerning the Commission:

"*Provided*, That said board of five persons shall not exclude any person otherwise eligible to vote from the polls on account of any opinion such person may entertain on the subject of bigamy or polygamy, nor shall they refuse to count any such vote on account of the opinion of the person casting it on the subject of bigamy or polygamy."

The Commissioners, in their latest circular, after stating the statutory disqualifications, which prohibit from voting persons guilty of the offenses named in the new law and those who have not taken the prescribed oath, make the following remarks on this matter:

"The Commission is of the opinion that the above specifications include all the disabilities to which electors are subject under the laws of Congress, and, that no opinions which they may entertain upon questions of religion or church polity should be the subject of inquiry or exclusion of any elector."

This is sufficiently explicit and covers all the ground. If any registration or election officer, leagued with the scoundrels who want to steal the Territory, attempts to impose any requirements in excess of the law, let the offense be reported at once to men who will see that citizens are protected in their rights, and that the official violator of the law, by exceeding its bounds and obstructing its electors, is proceeded against for his crime.

The attempt of the organ at argument on this question turns entirely upon an "if." *If* there was no "wrong in Mr. Dickson's questions." Yes, but there was a great deal of wrong in them. They were wrong because there is no law to justify them. Jurors were debarred from taking the oath provided for by law, because they were not willing to take another and entirely different oath for which there is no law. A test of this may be found in the fact that after the persons who were not rejected passed the test imposed, no such oath as Mr. Dickson premised was presented to them, because there was no such oath to present. It only existed in the mind of Mr. Dickson and the Court. It is not in the Edmunds Act nor in the new law. And as the District Attorney was bound by law in the examination of the jurors, what he did was wrong for it was in excess of the law.

We caution registration and election officers not to follow the bad example of a dismissed official, nor to take the dangerous and vile advice of the organ of mischief. If they do they will get into more serious trouble than any of their ill-advisers would care to help them out of. They had better not go beyond the law. Serious consequences depend on this, both to them and the people, and we are in earnest in this word of warning. There is no excuse for such a course as the chief conspirators would like to see taken by reckless registrars, and those who attempt to follow it will deeply regret their folly.

Let the laws take their course. There are bad provisions in them and many sections are to be condemned by the just. But while they are enforced like other laws, and are not made the vehicles of persecution instead of prosecution, and those who administer them keep within their legitimate limits, there will be no formidable obstruction to their enforcement. But they must not go beyond the law or they will themselves become criminal, and if legal technicalities prevent their punishment by process of the courts, there will be found a lawful way by which they can be reached, so that they may learn the needed lesson, that officers of the law must keep themselves within the bounds of the law.

PARNELL'S PREDICAMENT.

THE dispatches yesterday contained startling statements in relation to the position of Charles Stuart Parnell immediately following the Phœnix Park murder. It will be remembered that at that time, Parnell wrote a letter committing himself and his partisans to a condemnation of the atrocious deed, and thereby disarming much of the hostile feeling naturally directed against Ireland and the Irish. Recently the London *Times* has been publishing damaging statements against Parnell and his cohorts, calculated to overthrow the law-abiding attitude they have for some time assumed, and as an absolute "clincher" (or what it considers such) prints an alleged autograph letter from Parnell to Egan shortly after the murder, in which it appears that the condemnation of that bloody deed was merely a matter of policy, directed by a desire to hold the political scales level until the greater weight could be placed on the Irish side. Parnell has now been heard from, and his partisans are at work, one of them being now engaged in the task of comparisons and other expert duty, while the Irish statesman himself flatly repudiates the whole thing, and so does his American lieutenant, Egan. Parnell calls attention to certain facts and things making it altogether improbable on the surface of the question that he wrote or knew of such a letter being written as that published by the *Times*, and this morning, to add to the weight of his disclaimer, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, one of the most influential newspapers published in Great Britain, after reviewing the case, demands that the editor of the "Thunderer" be sent to the clock tower as a punishment for his transgression. It is also noteworthy that the *Times* is alone in its support of this most extraordinary proceeding.

Parnell was never better or worse situated, as the case may be, than now; if the letter proves to be "a weak invention of the enemy," he becomes at once more prominent and stronger than ever; but if it should be shown to be genuine, his cause is gone and he will be dragged down to the lowest depths of infamy. Appearances at present favor the former result.

Arrested.—Porterville is a quiet settlement in Morgan County. Samuel Carter is Bishop of the ward. The deputies visited Porterville this morning at 5 o'clock and arrested Mr. Carter on a charge of unlawful cohabitation. Before Commissioner Black, to-day, Mr. Carter pleaded guilty. His bonds were fixed at $1,500, and security was furnished by W. G. Child and John Seaman. Mr. Carter's second wife was placed under $200 bonds.—*Ogden Herald, April 19.*

Serious Accident.—Sister R. E. Driggs, of Pleasant Grove, who is in town purchasing goods for her millinery store gives us the following account of a serious accident at at place.

About five o'clock last evening Miss Victoria Rogers, daughter of Dr. R. M. Rogers, aged about 18 or 20 years, while riding upon a horse was thrown violently to the ground, alighting upon her head. She was very badly bruised about the temple and eye and rendered unconscious. A messenger was immediately dispatched for Dr. Pike, of Provo, but he not being able to attend, the services of Dr. Hardy were secured, who labored all night and up to the time of our informant leaving this morning, in trying vainly to revive the injured girl. The doctor fears that it is a case of concussion of the brain and has grave doubts about her recovery.

—Last week, Wednesday, Austin Merrill, who lived at the head of Boulder Creek, near Shoup, Idaho, was killed by the accidental discharge of his revolver, while he was in the act of taking a drink from a creek.