DESERET EVENING NEWS.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

VOL. XV. SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH TERRITORY, THURSDAY EVENING, MAY 11, 1882 NO. 145.

CHICAGO TRADE.

A. H. WALKER, Worcester, Mass. J. W. OAKLEY Chicago, Ill.

WALKER, OAKLEY & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

LEATHER.

BOSTON, 61 High Street. CHICAGO 179 & 181 Lake St.

KEITH BROTHERS,

Manufacturers and Jobbers of

HATS, CAPS, FURS & MEN'S FURNISHING GOODS,

BUCK GOODS, Etc., Etc.

245, 247, 249 and 251, Madison Street,

CHICAGO.

AN ARTICLE OF WORLD-WIDE RENOWN

FAIRBANK'S PURE REFINED LARD.

Ever used always desired in the Future.

TRY IT.

N. K. FAIRBANK & Co.,

CHICAGO.

For Sale by Z. C. M. I. and its Branch Houses and Dealers Generally. d103 1y

STAR HORSE NAILS!

POLISHED OR BLUED.

Will hold a shoe on Longer than any other. We Guarantee our Nails to be Equal in Quality and Durability to any made.

Made from the Best Norway Iron, Finished Already to drive, by the

UNION HORSE NAIL COMPANY.

CHICAGO.

For Sale by Z. C. M. I. and its Branch Stores. d103 1y

E. S. VANDERBURGH, WM. LEMMER.

JOHN C. NEEMES & CO.,

MANUFACTURING

CONFECTIONERS

28, 30, 32, & 34 MICHIGAN AVENUE,

CHICAGO.

Our Goods are kept by Z. C. M. I. its Branch Houses and dealers generally in the Territory. d103 1y

ESTABLISHED 1850.

Palmer, Fuller & Co.,

Wholesale Manufacturers of

Sash, Doors & Blinds,

MOULDING,

Mantels, Fancy, Church Finish, Stairs, Stair Railing, Balusters, Newels, Etc.

CHICAGO, Ill.

Our Goods are constantly kept in Stock by the largest Lumber Dealers in Salt Lake City and Ogden. Price Lists and Moulding Books sent free upon application. d103 1y

HAZARD POWDER!

Constantly on hand a complete stock of this well known and justly celebrated

GUNPOWDER.

BLASTING, KENTUCKY RIFLE, HAIR LAWN, DUCK, ELECTRIC, FUSE.

For Sale by Z. C. M. I. and all the Principal Stores in the Territory, and by M. B. CLAWSON, Agent.

O. I. C.

UTAH'S FAVORITE.

WILLIAMS' LIGHTNING CODE.

DOCTORS' TERROR POOR MAN'S FRIEND.

Z. C. M. I. General Agents, Salt Lake City.

For sale by all dealers throughout the Territory.

W. A. WILLIAMS, Prop'r. Corner First East Street, Ogden.

J. I. CASE PLOW CO.

RACINE, WIS.

Greeting to the People of Utah:

For the last three years our STEEL PLOWS, CHILLED PLOWS, SULKY PLOWS and HARROWS, have been thoroughly tested in your country, and we are proud of the flattering commendations of them that have come from you to us. It has always been our aim, and will be in the future, to make nothing but what is FIRST-CLASS, and that we will thoroughly guarantee. We heartily appreciate your trade and solicit its continuance. You will find a full line of our PLOWS with our General Agent, J. W. LOWELL, of Salt Lake City and Ogden, and his numerous local Agents throughout the Territory.

Yours Very Sincerely.

J. I. CASE,

Plow Company, Racine, Wis.

ROYAL

BAKING POWDER

Absolutely Pure.

This powder never varies. A marvel of purity, strength and wholesomeness. More economical than the ordinary kinds, and cannot be sold in competition with the multitude of low test, short weight, alum or phosphate powders.

Sold only in cans. ROYAL BAKING POWDER CO., 106 Wall Street, New York.

NEW YORK TRADE.

BATES, REED & COOLEY,

IMPORTERS AND JOBBERS OF

Silk and Fancy Dry Goods

Including a full and complete line of

Prints, Ginghams, and Domestics,

343 345, 347 Broadway, 91, 92, and 94 Leonard Street, NEW YORK.

DUNHAM, BUCKLEY & CO.,

IMPORTERS AND JOBBERS OF

DRY GOODS,

NOTIONS,

WHITE GOODS, Etc.

No. 340 Broadway, NEW YORK

J. H. BRADLEY. d1y

TEFFT, WELLER & Co.,

Importers and Jobbers of

DRY GOODS,

320, 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, BROADWAY,

NEW YORK.

Represented by

G. H. Goodridge, Ben Freedman.

d31 3m

B. W. MERRIAM & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF AND DEALERS IN

LOOKING GLASSES

OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

No 577 BROADWAY,

NEW YORK.

For Sale by Z. C. M. I.

HEMPHILL, HAMLIN & CO.

CARPETING,

FLOOR OIL CLOTHS DRUGGETS MATS ETC.

342 & 344 BROADWAY,

NEW YORK.

Our Goods are kept by Z. C. M. I., and its Branch Stores.

CLARK BROTHERS.

Formerly Draper, Clark & Co.

HAT WAREHOUSE.

622 & 624 BROADWAY,

and 156 & 158 CROSBY ST.,

NEW YORK.

A. W. FABER'S

STATIONERY ARTICLES & ARTISTS' MATERIALS.

MAY BE HAD AT

Z. C. M. I.,

Gold Pens and Pencil Cases, Penholders, Rubber Goods, Lead Pencils, Etc.

THOS. M. ARGALL & CO.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

MENS' AND BOYS'

CLOTHING.

820 BROADWAY,

NEW YORK.

JNO. E. COWLES.

PECK BROS. & CO.

MANUFACTURERS OF

BRASS & PLATED WORK FOR GAS & STEAM

JOBBERS IN

Plumbers Materials.

72 BEEKMAN STREET.

NEW YORK.

Refer by permission to David James, Salt Lake City.

BRINCKERHOFF, TURNER & CO.,

109 Duane St., NEW YORK,

Manufacturers of and Dealers in COTTON SAIL DUCK, "Woodberry," Drabs, "Palmetto" and other favorite brands, all numbers—Hard, Medium and Soft

DUCK FOR OVERALLS, BLUE, BROWN, OR IN THE GREY.

COTTON CANVAS of all numbers—4 to 160 inches wide, for Deck, Car, Trunk and Wagon Coverings, Machine Aprons and Belting, &c., constantly in store and made to order.

Agents for U. S. Bunting Co., "Standard" Ensigns, by the Case or less quantity.

These Goods can be obtained at Z. C. M. I.

USE

CLARK'S TRADE O.N.T. MARK SPOOL COTTON.

GEORGE A. CLARK,

SOLE AGENT.

The BEST and MOST POPULAR Sewing Thread of Modern Times.

BEWARE of IMITATIONS.

A Complete Assortment FOR SALE BY Z. C. M. I.

Branches and Dealers Everywhere.

UTAH CONTESTED ELECTION CASE.

(*Continued.*)

Mr. Jones, of Texas, said:

Mr. Speaker: In the time allowed me I shall not be able to notice or discuss all of the many interesting questions of constitutional law involved in this debate. I shall, therefore, select such as seem to me most salient and give them such consideration as my ability and the limited time will permit.

It is not denied that Mr. Cannon was duly elected, receiving some 18,000 votes to about some 1,600 votes against him. It is not questioned that these votes were legal. So that the only question before the House is whether he is laboring under any disability or disqualification on account or which he is denied or should be denied a seat on this floor. Touching this vital inquiry, I shall call attention to the qualifications established or prescribed by the Constitution for members:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

It is admitted in the report of the majority that Mr. Cannon possesses all of these constitutional qualifications. The rule is familiar to the House that the qualifications thus prescribed by the Constitution exclude all others; in other words these are all the qualifications that can be required for members of this House. The old familiar rule, "the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other," in its application to this particular section or clause of the Constitution is expressly recognized and affirmed by Mr. Story in his treatise on the Constitution. There is no question about that. It is not pretended that Congress can either add to or take from these qualifications. It is, however, or has been in this debate insisted that Congress may, in the exercise of its constitutional prerogative to judge of the elections, qualifications, and returns of its own members, apply other tests or require other qualifications in a Delegate from a Territory.

Congress has the prerogative or exclusive privilege to judge, not to enlarge or to contract or to diminish the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution. The power is clearly one of judgment, one of ascertainment, and not one of creation. The House can neither enlarge nor diminish in so far as its members are concerned. But it is maintained by some gentlemen that this constitutional provision has little or no application to a delegate coming from a Territory. Why not? Is not the reason the same? Congress cannot certainly require greater qualifications in a Delegate, in an inferior, in one occupying a less important position upon the floor than a member. To do so would in itself be a travesty on constitutional law. You cannot erect a standard for a delegate different from and more exacting than the one by which you propose to be ruled yourselves. It not only involves a legal sophism, but it involves self-reproach for a member of the United States Congress to stand up here and say, "I am good enough to represent my constituents, but some man hailing from a Territory is not good enough, though as good as myself, to represent his." Here in that same breath we have it that the people in the Territories are better than those in the States, when it serves your purpose; and yet the breath is not cold before you tell us that the people of the States are really better than those in the Territories, and ought to have better men to represent them in the United States Congress. And yet gentlemen attempting to maintain the sophism by which they sustain themselves in this particular case, do not get through their pretended arguments before they tell us the people in the Territories have no rights we are bound to respect.

Now, then, it being conceded that Mr. Cannon possesses all of these constitutional qualifications, let us see if he does not possess all the qualifications required by the acts of Congress in respect to the Territory of Utah.

Gentlemen tell us this is a new question, as if it were here for the first time in its original character for our consideration, and yet the very same gentlemen who tell us so go back and trace our legislation for thirty years in respect to this very Territory and this very question.

Was not this question before Congress when it passed the organic act of the Territory of Utah? And what is that organic act? Has it any binding force or effect upon the people of the United States or upon this Congress? Can you treat it in any other light than a charter government for that people? Here is an organic act; you passed it and that people accepted it. It is in the nature of a legislative contract, and is binding on all parties, and certainly repealable by neither except with the agreement and by the consent of the other.

This is no new question in American history. George III and the British Parliament thought that our fathers when they were living under colonial and chartered governments had no rights beyond their will. But Jefferson and Madison and Washington and others of our early fathers believed and maintained that men are born with inalienable rights, of which they cannot be deprived by the usurpation of their rulers.

This, then, is not a new question. It was before Congress in the act organized the Territory of Utah. Congress incorporated into that act no disqualification as to polygamy they recognized the fact then that there was in Congress an absolute want of power to do so. They organized the only government, in so far as this particular feature of the case is concerned, that in their judgment they had the power to organize. They recognized the people as having right to life, liberty and property.

Yet gentlemen here would tell us that they have none; that we can tax them without representation; that we can deny them representation on this floor. We are told that Delegates represent nobody here; that they amount to nothing; that they cannot vote. Granted; but have we as Americans yet to learn the potency of the right to speak, the power of the voice of a representative who speaks for his people? Do not gentlemen recognize the fact that it is the bulwark of our institutions that the people, whether of State or Territory, may bring their cause here, and if not heard, then by way of appeal they can go from Congress to the grand tribunal of the whole people of the United States? Yet you would deny them that right lest in asserting their own rights they might forsooth reproach you for their violation. Congress did not incorporate into the organic act any such provisions as are now insisted upon.

Take the Forty-third, the Forty-fourth, the Forty-fifth, and the Forty-sixth Congresses; at times republican and at times Democratic. Yet the right of this people to be represented by a Mormon was recognized by all. Now, we are told that the presence of a Mormon on this floor will offend the dignity and sensibilities of certain men and women living elsewhere; hence, we must commence a crusade against Mormonism.

Gentlemen, are you in earnest in that? It is said that you may judge a tree by its fruit. Now, if you are in earnest and really want to extirpate polygamy, the way is easy and the constitutional method plain. What is that? Why, just gather together thirty or forty thousand of you and go out there and settle. They cannot hinder you from doing so, and then you can settle this question.

The Forty-third Congress had this question before it, and the Forty-fourth Congress, and the Forty-fifth and the Forty-sixth. It has passed the crucial test of all of them in a constitutional point of view, and they all decided that there was then no existing law, no such disqualification of polygamy as now contended for by gentlemen on the opposite side of this question. Congress, by acquiescing, by receiving the delegate, is now, if there can be any such thing upon the unbridled power claimed by this Congress, estopped from interposing and exacting for the first time a qualification hitherto unknown either to the Constitution, to the law, or to precedent.

The present Congress admits that; there is no question on that subject. Why hurry through in hot haste at the present Congress what is known as the Mormon bill, except to reach Mr. Cannon's case? Everybody knows that. You admit that the law and the Constitution sustained Mr. Cannon's right to a seat on this floor. And in order to overreach him you introduced this bill, known as the Mormon bill, and passed it in order to accomplish by indirect means what you could not effect directly. Now, is there a lawyer on this floor who does not know that what cannot be accomplished directly cannot be accomplished indirectly? Can you evade, and thereby defeat the Constitution of the country?

It is maintained by some gentlemen that this act of this Congress changes materially the attitude of this case. It is maintained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Beltzhoover] that for the first time we have polygamy confessed by Mr. Cannon. Now, does not everybody know that it was just as well known by general notoriety as a thing could be known? Did Mr. Cannon ever deny it heretofore? And now because the man was too honest, too frank, to deny the truth, but came up boldly in his manhood and admitted it, did not put the country to any trouble to prove it, that is seized upon as conclusive evidence of guilt.

Now, was he guilty of any offense, any legal offense? I will inquire about that by and by. He had taken his wives before the act of 1832.

Mr. Beltzhoover. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Jones, of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. Beltzhoover. Has the gentleman ever read the report of the committee on elections of the Forty-third Congress in the Cannon and Maxwell case?

Mr. Jones, of Texas. No, sir, I have not.

Mr. Beltzhoover. Then I would suggest that the gentleman should not make the assertion that Mr. Cannon did not deny that he was a polygamist.

Mr. Jones, of Texas. I say that he did not deny it then.

Mr. Beltzhoover. He did deny it.

Mr. Jones, of Texas. Denied that he ever had been married?

Mr. Beltzhoover. In the contest which Mr. Cannon had with Mr Maxwell, in the Forty-third Congress, (1874,) he denied most emphatically that he was "living with four wives or living or cohabiting with any wives in defiant or wilful violation of the law of Congress of 1862." He denied that he was then "living, or had ever lived, in violation of the laws of God, man, his country, decency, or civilization, or of any law of the United States." These broad denials on the very issue which was the chief one involved in that contest doubtless had a great deal to do with the finding in Mr. Cannon's favor.

Mr. Jones, of Texas. Very well. It is now stated that the case has been materially changed, that he admits—admits what? He does not admit that he has violated any law. He does not admit that he has been convicted of any offense. The fact that he admitted it in the Territory where he was directly amenable to the law and subject to prosecution in case of guilt shows a consciousness on his part that he was not thus liable.

The fact about it is that his polygamist errors, or whatever you please to term them, all took place before the enactment of the law of 1862. Will any gentleman pretend that Mr. Cannon could under that law be convicted and punished for an act which when done was not a crime?

The gentleman from Pennsylvani (Mr. Beltzhoover) says there is nothing that Congress cannot do in its treatment of the people of the Territories. But it seems to me that on this point he has read to very little profit the decisions of the Supreme Court if he has not been informed that, with all our legislative power, we cannot, to save our lives, make a law *ex post facto* in its nature or even impairing the obligation of contracts. In the celebrated case of Hepburn vs. Griswold, involving the legal-tender question—a case with which members of the bar are all familiar—the Chief-Justice, delivering the opinion of the court, grouped not the powers of the Government in order to show that it could do thus and so, but actually grouped in the inhibitions by the Constitution upon the powers of the States—for what purpose? To show that by the very nature and genius of our Government *ex post facto* laws and laws impairing the obligations of contracts have no part or place in our entire system. The Federal Government cannot exercise the power to pass any such law. There is no authority, either State or national, that can by any act passed to-day make that which was done yesterday a crime.

The eighth section of the act of March 22, 1882, has been referred to. Let me read it:

That no polygamist, bigamist, or any person cohabiting with more than one woman, and no woman cohabiting with any of the persons aforesaid deper bed in this section, in any Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, shall be entitled to vote—

That does not affect votes heretofore given—

at any election held in any such Territory or other place—

Not heretofore but hereafter held in such Territory or other place—

or be eligible for election or appointment to—

Not in the past but in the future—

or be entitled to hold any office or place of public trust, honor or emolument in, under, or for any such Territory or place, or under the United States.

Now, in construing this provision I submit that the general and well known rule that all statutes are to be construed so as to give them operation in the future, applies in this case. No statute can be construed as having a retroactive or *ex post facto* effect, even where there exists power in the legislative body to give it such effect, unless it be made so by express and unmistakable language. Now, apply that rule to this eighth section, which, it is claimed, works a change in the character that this case presents to us. Under the application of this rule the whole argument falls to the ground.

But accepting the confession which this argument implies of your inability to reach this case in any other mode, let us concede that the law-makers intended to do just what you claim has been done—to reach Mr. Cannon and impose upon him a disqualification on account of polygamy; can you do it? Have you done it? Is not the law, if so construed, necessarily *ex post facto*? Was not Mr. Cannon duly elected to this Congress? Did he not acquire by virtue of his election a vested right of property in his office? Can you deprive him of it, except by due process of law? Is it true, as you affirm, that the people residing in the Territories have no protection whatever? Is it true, as you affirm, that the ægis of American liberty does not cover those poor, helpless people out there? Is it true, as you maintain, that when a man, invested in his own State with all the rights of American citizenship, happens to transcend the territorial borders of the State sovereignty, he loses his stature as a man and forfeits his rights as an American citizen. Why, sir, this idea reverses the whole theory of our government. Our fathers thought that governments were organized to conserve and protect the innate, inherent rights of man; yet you reverse that principle, and in these Halls, familiar in the past with the teachings of Douglas and Clay, and other illustrious men, you gravely tell us that the people of the Territories have no rights whatever that we are bound to respect. Why, gentlemen, we are retrograding; we have got away back of 1765.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr Beltzhoover] had better go a little behind the history that he read, when he undertakes to deny these people the right of representation. He could even go to the English Parliament and get valuable lessons from the Earl of Camden. When the same power was claimed for the British Parliament over the American colonies, what was the response of that noble lord? He maintained that whatever is a man's own is his own absolutely, and no one has a right to take it from him without his consent; whoever attempts to do so does him an injury; whoever does so commits a robbery. Whenever you undertake to deprive the people of Utah of the right of representation, of the right of a voice in their own legislation, however wayward they may be, you do those people an injury, and if successful you rob them, not of rights which you gave them, but of rights which they received from nature and nature's God.

Now, then, if Mr. Cannon was elected, and that is the main point I wish to impress upon this House, he is entitled to his seat. He has not been, as I maintain, and I think the intendment of this section clear in support of that view, deprived of it by this act of Congress. If the act had so intended, it is unconstitutional, and therefore inoperative. He is not in any view of its construction, deprived of his right, and the logical conclusion is that he cannot be excluded without abolishing the office of Delegate from that Territory. I say, then, to gentlemen on the other side of this House, in all fairness, let them meet this question as it confronts them. Let them meet this question fairly. Here it is: Mr. Cannon is supported by his constitutional right, by his legal right. You find the Constitution and laws of your country and his country, however widely you differ in your religious views, are the same. You find them confronting you. They stand between you and him. They are opposed to you. The spirit of our Constitution and laws is opposed to you, to say nothing of their express language.

What are you going to do? What shall we do? That is the grave and solemn question for us to decide. Will we do as our predecessors have done, recognize this right, the right of representation in the people of the Territories, the right of Mr. Cannon to come here and voice their interests, to represent them in asserting their rights, in communicating to Congress such information as may be deemed necessary in their treatment, or will you ignore these rights?

Here you are brought in front of the Constitution itself. You cannot get around it and you cannot get over it. There is no escape. There is but one alternative: you must either admit Cannon or you must trample the Constitution of your country under your feet.

I do not propose at this time to undertake to discuss, or even to state the constitutional questions involved as affecting the rights of the people in a Territory. It is not a new question. I accept as true that construction of the second clause of the third section of the fourth article of the Constitution in reference to the power of Congress over the Territories, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Beltzhoover]. Under that clause of the Constitution Congress has the power to do what. To dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

I submit to any fair minded man whether both the legal and grammatical intendment of this language is not unmistakable. Does not the qualifying word "other" in its relation to the subject place Territory in the same category with property? I submit that the plain intendment of the language, the word "other" referring back to territory, puts it in juxtaposition with property.

I will not now repeat what to my mind has been the unanswerable argument of Case and Douglas on this question. I desire to affirm that I believe, as they maintained, that the power here given is limited to property as land in the Territories. At the time the Constitution was adopted the Territorial government had already been provided for the Northwest Territory. The first Congress under the Constitution of the United States passed an act confirming the Territorial government in its relation to the new Government, succeeding and supplanting the old. That is all it did. They elected and sent their representative to Congress; they chose their representatives and lawmakers under it. Here we have, then, I may say, taking it in its historical relation and bearing, a direct expression of the sense of those who framed the Constitution.

The history of their struggle with British power was too fresh in the minds of our fathers for them to assume that the people who inhabited the Territories had no rights. They recognized in their brothers residing in a Territory the same capability, the same right to treat, regulate, and control their own affairs that they had so recently asserted for themselves. That is part and parcel; as it were, of the Constitution itself. The clause "to make all needful rules and regulations," &c., to which I have just referred, was intended to and did give Congress power to establish a system of land surveys, to dispose of and regulate the sale of public lands. At that time it might be reasonably supposed Congress was not looking to the acquisition of further territory, but Congress was empowered by the Constitution to make treaties and declare war, and under the power to make treaties Congress could acquire territory—this very Territory of Utah. In the execution of that power it did acquire this Territory.

(*To be continued.*)

NOTICE.

ALL PERSONS KNOWING THEMSELVES to be indebted to the Estate of William Hopwood deceased, are requested to call at Philadelphia Restaurant, 64 Main Street, and settle immediately.

d137 10d ELIZABETH HOPWOOD, Administratrix.

WATSON BROS.,

STONECUTTERS & BUILDERS.

TOMBSTONES, MONUMENTS, MARBLE MANTELS, IRON MANTLES, GRATES & HEARTH STONES.

South Side of South Temple Street, little East of Eagle Gate.

WM. PETERSEN

—THE—

BUTCHER.

1225 First South Street, Second Shop from East Corner,

Dealer in all kinds of MEAT in season. Meat ordered by Telephone will receive prompt attention to the satisfaction of patrons. All kinds of

SAUSAGES

A SPECIALTY. d14

COMMUNION WINE!

Having purchased the Altar Wines made under the immediate supervision of the Rev. P. J. Kaiser in the vineyards of His Grace, Archbishop Alemany, at the Old Mission San Jose; also the Wines made for

ALTAR PURPOSES

Out of Col. Hooper's cellars at Sonoma, we herewith respectfully offer them to the clergy and others desiring an absolutely pure wine, made with the utmost care, and guaranteed of the vintages represented.

ARPAD HARASZTHY & CO.,

530 Washington St., San Francisco, Cal.

[*S. F. Monitor Aug. 25 1881.*]

The vital importance of having pure Altar wine for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is a matter which always gives the greatest concern to the Rev. Clergy, who are also aware of the difficulty experienced in procuring really pure wine by those living in remote regions from grape-producing localities. This difficulty, however, has now been entirely overcome, and every priest throughout the Union can rely upon procuring really pure wine for altar use through the long-established and thoroughly reliable house of Arpad Haraszthy & Co., 530 Washington street, in this city, who have made arrangements with Rev P. J. Kaiser to be the sole agent in this city for the sale of all the wines made at the extensive vineyards at the Old Mission, San Jose, as well as the altar wine made by Col. Hooper at Sonoma. The firm of Arpad Haraszthy & Co. guarantee the perfect purity of these altar wines and are prepared to ship them in portable packages, in any quantity desired, and so put up that they will stand all the severities of any climate during consumption. We think the enterprise of the house of Arpad Haraszthy & Co. is worthy of being encouraged, and we hope the Rev. Clergy throughout the Union will avail themselves of this excellent medium in order to secure for Divine service one of the most essential auxiliaries to its proper celebration.

REV. DEAR SIRS: Referring to our circular, we herewith annex copy of letter addressed to Rev. P. J. Kaiser by the Most Rev. Archbishop Alemany of San Francisco, Cal.

ARPAD HARASZTHY & CO.

ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL, 628 California Street, SAN FRANCISCO, July 19, 1881.

The bearer, REV. P. J. KAISER, having to spend some time in the East, for motives of health, may have occasion to speak to those desirous of procuring a pure article of pure wine.

To all such I would say, that the wines made directly by himself or under his direction, are pure and genuine.

For some years he has had under his charge for me the Diocesan Vineyards of the Old Mission, San Jose, Cal. And these Vineyards he has quite renovated and brought to a state of considerable perfection; therefore I know the wines to be pure and genuine. I have given other letters to wine growers more or less complimentary, but none so strong as I would desire to make THIS, as in no other case did I have so good means of knowing.—And what I say for Father Kaiser's wines, I would say for his Olive Oil produced at the same place.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH S. ALEMANY,

Archb. of San Francisco, Cal.

The wine is sold in original packages under seal, just as it leaves the vineyard. With such endorsement it may be relied upon for family and medical purposes. Family trade supplied by the bottle or cask, by

GEO. A. MEEARS,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL,

LIQUOR DEALER,

11, 13 & 15 SECOND SOUTH STREET,

SALT LAKE CITY,

SOLE AGENT

FOR THE TERRITORY OF UTAH.

GRIST MILLS,

TENTS, PLOWS, MOWERS, TONGUES, HARROWS, SCRAPERS, LAWN MOWERS, WAGON TIMBER, VICTOR CANE MILLS, AMERICUS CIDER MILLS, ASSORTED SIZES BELLOWS, IRON BEAM RAILROAD PLOWS, SULKY AND WALKING PLOWS, HAZARD'S CELEBRATED POWDER,

SAW MILLS

AND

STEAM ENGINES,

MORRISON

PLOWS,

Etc.

BOLTS, BELLS, SLEDGES, REAPERS, HAMMERS, THRESHERS, FEED CUTTERS, PORTABLE FORGES, SULKY HAY RAKES, THE SMITH PURIFIER, IMPROVED HOWE SCALES, FULL SUPPLY PLOW POINTS, WESTERN WHEEL SCRAPERS, WOOD BEAM RAILROAD PLOWS

"EUREKA" SMUTTERS AND BRUSH MACHINES.

"ECONOMY" ERTEL'S PORTABLE HAY PRESSES.

COATES' LOCK LEVER SULKY HAY RAKE.

Agricultural Implements of All Kinds.

PLANET JR. SEED DRILLS, WHEEL HOES & CULTIVATORS.

EMPIRE MOWERS and REAPERS.

THE VERY BEST QUALITY OF

FARM WAGONS A SPECIALTY,

AT

H. B. CLAWSON'S,

1214 and 1216 South Temple Street, Corner Main St.,

SALT LAKE CITY.

NEEDHAM & SPRINGER.

NEEDHAM & SPRINGER.

DEALERS IN

DRY GOODS

AND

GROCERIES.

FAMILY TRADE

A SPECIALTY.

NEEDHAM & SPRINGER.

NEEDHAM & SPRINGER.

SAW MILLS & ENGINES!

Manufactured by the J. CASE THRESHING MACHINE CO., than which no firm in America has a better reputation for

FIRST CLASS WORK.

Portable Saw Mills, any size, either SINGLE or DOUBLE.

Engines, 12 Horse, 16 Horse, 20 Horse and 25 Horse Power, either mounted on SKIDS or on WHEELS.

Call at my Depot and examine Samples; you will pronounce them the neatest and best rigs you ever saw. Send for Price List and Terms.

THE J. I. CASE PLOW CO'S.

PLOWS!

CHILLED PLOWS, all Sizes;

STEEL PLOWS, all Sizes;

SULKY PLOWS; HARROWS.

I have handled the Case Plows for two years and said but little about them, as I desired to see them thoroughly tested before recommending them to the Public, I now say that their STEEL PLOWS are EQUAL TO ANY, and, in my opinion, their CHILLED PLOWS, SUPERIOR TO ANY.

Private Purchasers and Co-operative Stores will find it to their interest to buy these Plows, which are taking the lead in the Market.

I also still handle the universally popular

AVERY GANG & SULKY PLOWS & CULTIVATORS.

CONSTANTLY IN STOCK,

Seed Drills and the Ladow Disc Harrows.

A number of parties who have used them near Kaysville, pronounce the Ladow Disc Harrow, the greatest Labor Saving Implement for putting in Grain they have ever seen.

I have a very Large Stock of RAILROAD CONTRACTORS SUPPLIES, such as SCRAPERS, GRADING PLOWS, TENTS, HARNESS, Etc. Also,

Fish Bro's Wagons and Carriages, McCormick Machines, Wagon Stock and Hardwood Lumber.

STEEL BARB FENCE WIRE.

SEND FOR PRICE LISTS.

JOHN W. LOWEL Salt Lake & Ogden.