on the basis that the workers are unable to detect between substance and shadow, reality and sham. This can be readily seen even by a cursory examination of the document, aside from a close analysis of it.

The precious paper asks the municipal corporation of Salt Lake City, through its business agents the Common Council, to enter into a boycott connected with the erection of a public building. Those who made such an asinine proposition are either lacking in the rudiments of common sense, or are purposely asking the injection of an ingredient into a contract that would necessarily invalidate it. It would be so held by a court of equity acting under the rules of that procedure.

The petition also asks for a violation of the prominently declared principles of Powers and his party "the letting of contracts for public work to the lowest responsible bidder." This attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the union Workingmen is contemptible and it is difficult to understand how the latter can view it in any other light than that of an insult.

This attempt to offset the failure to fulfil "Liberal" promises of "Salt Lake work for Salt Lake workmen" is diluted weakness. The petition itself admits it by omission. Nothing is said against the flagrant violations by the "Liberal" Council of the rosy promises to Salt Lake workmen, made by the party before the February municipal election; hence the petition says by its silence on that subject—"the street sprinkling may continue to be done by Omaha people, the pipes, hydrants, and other materials used by the city may continue to be imported in place of being manufactured at home, because this course is profitable to the manipulators. But, in order to cover the track of broken promises we will ask that an impracticable condition be injected into the contracts connected with the erection of one particular building."

If the workingmen of Salt Lake are susceptible of being caught by such flimsy subterfuges we have rated their intelligence and penetration too high. But we think we have not been mistaken.

The petition also puts the council in a bad light, as by it they also are relegated to the role of the senseless. Even if what the Salt Lake *Tribune* asserted when it said, "The fact is, there are some bad men in the Council," be true, they are surely not prepared to make themselves notorious throughout the country, by doing something that probably has never yet even been suggested to any public corporation in the land. Neither do we believe that Powers and his fellow-petitioners had the remotest idea that those intrusted with the transaction of the public business of this city would enable them to "ever pray" by attempting to grant what they asked.

The record of the "Liberal" party thus far in this city regarding "Salt Lake work for Salt Lake workmen" has proved to be a will o' the wisp, and the disingenuous petition embodied in this article only serves to further illustrate the phantasmagorical character of their hollow pretenses in that line.

The mass of Salt Lake workmen are not the consummate ignoramuses they are evidently estimated to be by Powers and his co-adjutors, and let us continue to believe that the Common Council will not overstep the line which divides mental equilibrium from insanity.

THE DUNLO DIVORCE CASE.

THIS notorious divorce suit recently occupied a good deal of attention throughout the civilized world. A cotemporary thus briefly and correctly sums up its merits:

"Lady Dunlo was formerly Belle Bilton, a London music-hall singer of irregular life. Lord Dunlo is the son of the Earl of Clancarty and is also a person of irregular life. When the young sprig of a wornout aristocracy married the music-hall singer, with full knowlege of her profession and her way of life, the alliance was a perfectly equal one, with the balance of merit rather upon the woman's side, inasmuch as she had at least worked for her living, while he had never earned an honest dollar or eaten an honest dinner.

But the Earl of Clancarty deemed his son's marriage a *mesalliance*, and, in the ancestral robber spirit of his class, he set about sacrificing the woman—who seems to have been blameless as a wife—to the arrogance of his caste pride. With malignant ingenuity he made his son abandon his wife and leave her helpless and without means of livelihood in London, and set a watch upon her to see into what appearance of evil her distress, of his devising, might lead her, hoping thus to secure the annulment of the marriage. The son had not manhood enough left in him to resist or to defend his wife from the plot to destroy her.

"At the trial of the divorce suit no blame of any kind was fastened upon the woman. If there had been, every robust mind would still have said that the malignant Earl and his characterless son were not entitled to profit by a wrong of their own procurement. In fact no wrong was proved. Lady Dunlo is still Lady Dunlo, and her husband can be held for her support.

"It is well. The noble house of Clancarty will not be disgraced by the union of its heir with Belle Bilton, the music-hall singer. Its character sank far below that possibility when an Earl capable of such a conspiracy against a woman became its head."

AGREES WITH JUDGE BLACKBURN

THE Denver *News* has an article on the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Utah in the case of the heirship dispute connected with the estate of Orson Pratt, and which affects the rights of the children of plural wives as inheritors of their fathers' estate. After defining the basis of the controversy the *News* says:

"The case turned on a very simple question. There was no dispute but that the children had a right to inherit under the Territorial statute of 1852. The contention was whether the act of Congress of July 1, 1862, repealed the Territorial statute, or whether it did not. The court held that it did, and so decided. But Judge Blackburn held that if it did, it was only by implication, which construction could not be affirmed by a court. After commenting on the statute of 1862, he continued:

"I am strengthened in this opinion by the act of Congress of 1882, called the Edmunds act. Section 7 of that act shows that it was not the intention of Congress to disinherit polygamous children, for it says all polygamous children born before the first day of January, 1883, shall be legitimate, making it clear that in the mind of Congress nothing was intended by the act of 1862 to disinherit polygamous children. The act of the Legislature of Utah says nothing about polygamous children; it only says illegitimate children. But the act of Congress goes further, and says that polygamous children shall be legitimate. If, therefore, the Territorial law, by inference, encouraged and countenanced polygamy, much more did the law of Congress—and that idea cannot be entertained for one moment."

"The case will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, and its importance arises from the fact that polygamous children have been allowed to inherit in Utah ever since 1852, and until the passage of the Edmunds law in 1882.

"Judge Blackburn is evidently right. If the law of 1862 repealed the Territorial statute of 1852 there would have been no necessity for the act of 1882. The language of the act of 1882 makes it clear that Congress regarded the Utah law as in force, that it also regarded the custom as encouraging polygamy, and hence it fixed a date after which the children of plural wives could not inherit. The plain implication is that up to that date they had the right of inheritance, otherwise the act of 1882 would have been unnecessary and superfluous. The high standing of Senator Edmunds, who was the author of the act of 1882, as a lawyer also confirms this view of Judge Blackburn as the correct one. That the opinion of the court will be reversed admits of little doubt. If it now be announced that the act of 1862 annulled the Utah act of 1852, and for all these years the children of polygamous wives have had no right of inheritance, utter confusion will follow in land titles and much wrong and injustice be accomplished.

CAIRO, Aug. 11.—There were 126 deaths from cholera at Jeddah yesterday and 108 at Mecca.