

THAT THOMAS CANARD.

OUR readers will remember the sensational Thomas case, which went the rounds of the American press only a short time ago. Thomas and his family were said to have escaped from Utah, where his life was threatened if he would not join the "Mormon" Church. This persecution was alleged to have taken place at Scofield, which is about 115 miles from Salt Lake City. The papers stated that Thomas jumped into the Detroit river, under the impression that the "Mormons" "still pursued" him, and his widow and children were helped to Wales by contributions from sympathizing travelers.

We exposed the story by the affidavits of both "Mormon" and non-"Mormon" residents of Scofield, who avowed that no such pressure was ever brought upon Thomas, and by the statement from New York that the whole Thomas family, the "suicide" included, had sailed for the old country.

Now, we are in receipt of a communication from Scofield containing the substance of a letter from Wales with further particulars, which are as follows:

"Thomas Thomas and wife and baby arrived safe on Saturday evening, March 28th, 1891. When he got out of the cars to look after their baggage he was left behind, and on his arrival at New York he found that three of the children had been taken on to the ship by another party going to Wales, arriving at Liverpool on the 16th inst., and were taken care of all the way to the town of Aberdare, Glamorganshire, South Wales, which caused a great deal of talk among the people in the country who wondered what was the cause of the family leaving Scofield so suddenly.

"Mr. Thomas found his wife in the hospital at New York and was delayed until the 18th inst. There he received a telegram on the arrival of the children after a very rough passage. Mr. Thomas and his wife and baby had a splendid voyage. He said that he had to sell his watch and revolver for food on his way to New York after the family, as his wife had all the money on her person all the way. On their arrival in Wales, hundreds of people had gathered around the depot. The occasion was one that caused all kinds of rumors."

The people of Scofield are justly incensed over the stories that have been set afloat about their attempting to coerce people in religious matters. They are liberal minded and progressive citizens, and it is certain there was not the slightest foundation for the tale of "Mormon" persecution, which was doubtless invented by the same Detroit reporter who made up the fiction about the suicide of Thomas.

So, far we have seen no correction of the falsehoods circulated by the press of the country concerning this matter, and we do not expect that our contemporaries east, who promptly pub-

lish any absurd untruth about the "Mormons," will make any attempt to give their readers the facts in relation to the Thomas canard.

RIGHTS OF MARRIED WOMEN.

A RECENT decision by the English Court of Appeals has caused much surprise in legal circles. It is received with delight by the fair sex, but John Bull, who has for centuries considered it man's right to dominate and do about as he pleased with his wife, is in a state of alarmed indignation. The London lawyers, too, are aroused and look upon the ruling as a startling innovation. In this country it is viewed as both sound and sensible.

The court holds that a husband has not the right either to imprison his wife or compel her to cohabit with him against her will. This would seem to be a very plain proposition to an American, and one that would need very little argument in its support. But the old common law of England made the wife so subordinate to the husband that she had very small personal rights, and her identity was almost lost in that unity which was the common law theory of wedlock. So eminent an authority as Lord Mansfield held, judicially, that "A husband has power and dominion over his wife and may keep her by force within the bounds of duty, and may beat her, but not in a violent manner."

No wonder that under such views of male marital authority, brutal men have beaten their wives in the Old World and have escaped legal penalties for their violence. But this new ruling will inaugurate a new order of things for suffering wives. The *Law Times* regards it as "a charter of personal liberty of married women." It is certainly in line with movements for the redemption and elevation of woman and with the sentiment of modern times in relation to the sex.

But the question as to its strict legality is open to discussion. That it is right no one ought to dispute; that it is law many will be found to deny. The *London Law Journal* says: "Perhaps never in the history of judicial decisions has authority been so boldly overruled and disregarded." And the *Solicitor's Journal* avows that, "for the first time in English history a wife is at liberty, immediately after going through the ceremony of marriage in church, to desert her husband and without excuse condemn him to a life of celibacy."

The ruling is regarded as so revolutionary as to require legislation to restore the rights of husbands, and the Lord Chancellor had to announce in

the House of Lords, so as to answer inquiries on this matter, that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce a bill "giving men power to imprison their wives." We should think not. Whatever authority might have been derived from the old common law, an attempt to establish it by statute, in this extreme form, would arouse the indignation and also the ridicule of the whole civilized world.

It is time that the barbarism and slavery embodied in the common law relating to the status of married women were abolished, both in practice and in theory. And a few more such ruffings as that of the Court of Appeals, supplemented by some statutory provisions establishing the rights and liberties of woman, would be an improvement upon the English system and not be out of place in some parts of these free United States.

THE OLDEST REPUBLIC.

NESTLED among the Pyrenean mountains, between France and Spain, is the oldest republic now in existence. If the average reader were asked about it, it would turn out, that he was, probably, unaware of such a place. The name of it is Andorra, and it dates its establishment from the days of Charlemagne. Its area is about 300 square miles. Its population is estimated at about 12,000.

Away back in those early days when Charlemagne was the Napoleon of Europe, he marched against the Moors of Spain. In this expedition the Andorra people helped him considerably. In return he declared the little province a free State, and it has so remained ever since, a period of 1,100 years.

The republic is governed by a sovereign council of 24 members, chosen by the people, and the council elects one of its members to be chief executive for life. In the choice of the judiciary France has something to say, and also the Bishops of Urgel.

The little republic comes before the world in a peculiar way at the present time. M. Blanc, who runs the Monte Carlo gambling halls, and who pays \$600,000 a year to the local prince for the privilege, has been refused a renewal of his license. This man Blanc now proposes to buy the republic of Andorra and there establish his gambling concerns. It is said that he is being aided by the French in his new project.

If he succeeds, the unfortunate people of Andorra will soon find their primitive simplicity a thing of the past. Their little republic will become the