

ilities for manufacturing every species of glass produced anywhere. For instance: There is sand immediately adjacent to this city which is almost pure silica, running as high as ninety-seven per cent. of that material. Experts state that it is not exceeded in quality for glass-making purposes by any other sand obtained elsewhere on the globe.

The fact of comparative quality is susceptible of demonstration. There has been placed in the hands of Secretary Meloy, of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, a small quantity of sand used in one of the finest glassware manufacturing establishments in the world, situated in the city of Edinburgh. There articles of the most exquisite designs are turned out, the show windows where they are displayed, at the corner of Princes and West Register streets, being points of popular attraction to throngs of people passing in the vicinity.

In addition to the leading ingredient of sand, the other materials are equally abundant. The chemicals required in the manufacture of glassware can be obtained from the waters of Great Salt Lake. If chemical works were established they would be profitable in themselves as well as being a valuable adjunct to glass-making.

All the machinery connected with the manufacture of glassware, even of the most intricate description, is exceedingly simple and, considering the nature of the business, comparatively inexpensive. The necessary skill can be readily obtained, including an expert at mixing the materials, which is a very important part of the business. There are skillful workmen whose services could be secured without difficulty if this branch of manufacture were established.

This may, on account of the stringency of the local money market, be deemed an inopportune time for advocating such an enterprise as the one referred to. It is appropriate, however, to draw attention to the subject, with a view to inducing capitalists to, as soon as practicable, engage in a business that will, we are convinced, prove, at some time, a veritable bonanza.

### CARDINAL MANNING ON MARRIAGE.

CARDINAL MANNING has been thinking over the marriage contract in its relations to the female labor question, and here is a part of his findings:

"A woman enters for life in a sacred contract with a man before God at the altar to fulfil to him the duties of wife, mother and the head of his home. Is it lawful for her, even with his consent, to make afterwards a second contract for so

many shillings a week with a mill owner, whereby she becomes unable to provide her husband's food, train up her children or do the duties of her home."

He further declares that it is no question of the lawfulness of gaining a few more shillings for the expenses of a family, but of the breaking a prior contract the most solemn between man and woman. "No arguments of expediency," he says, "can be admitted. It is an obligation of conscience to which all things must give way."

This expression from an uncommonly learned Catholic celibate will count simply as very good evidence that a man believing as Cardinal Manning does, that perpetual bachelorhood was one of the purposes of his particular creation, should refrain from talking of matters that immediately concern wives and babies. It simply shows that however profoundly such a man may discourse upon God and His works in the abstract, he cannot venture much of an opinion upon the living relations of God's human creatures without running great risks of being ridiculous.

There is no mistake about the solemnity of a wife's covenant to perform the domestic duties of the household. But what of that reciprocal covenant which the husband makes to provide the household with food, clothing, fuel, etc., all of which he may and may not furnish? And when he does not, then comes to the wife, who may have been faithful to her vows, that which is more trying than the terrors of death to a true woman—a household of hungry and freezing children, with nothing within her reach to relieve their wants. What is the use of bachelor priests prating to such a woman about her marriage covenant to "provide food" (we suppose, of course, he means the cooking of it) for her husband? What promise or covenant of that kind will or should ever come between a mother and her suffering offspring?

This is not sentimentality. It is truth in its severest features and obligations. The cardinal is good enough to make is perfectly understood that his admonitions are intended particularly for the women who go to the mills to earn bread. It is reasonable to assume that women who choose such an occupation do so in response to the conditions we have described. Suppose they should accept implicitly Cardinal Manning's idea, that "no arguments of expediency can be admitted" in conflict with that sacred vow to "keep house for her husband." It would put about a million families in the fix of having not only nothing to eat, but no house to keep.

A contemporary very pertinently

asks of the cardinal why he does not make his admonition more general. If the women who through misfortune or neglect are induced to earn the family bread in the mills violate a sacred covenant in thus neglecting the kitchen and the nursery, what are the millions of women doing who with no excuse save a craving for indolent pleasure leave their household cares to other hands? They likewise have vowed to "provide their husbands with food," and yet they require him to employ others to perform the duty while they enjoy themselves.

But there is no profit in carrying the absurdity further. We have only to repeat, in conclusion, that men who believe and live after the pattern of Cardinal Manning should avoid talking much about the duties of motherhood.

### COMMISSIONERS CARTER'S VIEW.

THE action of Land Commissioner Carter in recommending the ceding of arid lands to the States and Territories where they are located, will greatly strengthen the work of the Memorial committee who will go to Washington to represent the Irrigation Congress. The resolution which they will present, does not ask for the ceding of this land, but that it be granted in trust, which being a more amiable request than that suggested by Commissioner Carter, an opportunity will be afforded the Committee to spring the question of Western generosity and back it up with the testimony of this friendly official who has asked in our behalf more than we have had the assurance to ask for ourselves.

Commissioner Carter in his report to the Interior gives the following estimate of the unclaimed lands which might be regarded as arid:

"In Arizona, 55,061,005; in California, 52,299,490; Idaho, 33,781,851; Montana, 74,372,769; Nevada, 53,689,524; Oregon, 39,220,151; Utah, 35,428,987; Washington, 20,401,691; Wyoming, 50,842,434."

In recommending that this vast domain be ceded to these respective States and Territories the Commissioner says:

"While the swamp land grant States may have been indifferent and unwise in dealing with a grant which was but an incidental matter, the desert land grant States could not afford to thus deal with a question of vital importance. Indifference would court adversity, and recklessness would bring ruin. When a proposition of this gravity is submitted to any organized body of American citizens directly interested in its wise consideration and solution, they will consider wisely and act well."

It is noteworthy that among those most loyal to Western interests there is a strong diversity of opinion on this ceding proposition. The San Francisco