

THE DISPOSITION OF "MORMON" CHURCH FUNDS.

It is rare that any thought is displayed by the American press over questions that relate to "Mormonism" and Utah affairs. A few papers express opinions, and these are caught up by others and repeated, parrot-like, until they are echoed by most of the country sheets, without any apparent effort to weigh them or give them close attention.

For example here is the Oakland, California, *Times* commenting on the examination before Master in Chancery Lousbrourow, and siding with the Government plan for the disposition of "Mormon" Church funds because, "the 'Mormon' Church should certainly be able to take care of its own poor and needy and charity begins at home." This with an explanation of the case and the propositions on both sides is borrowed from the San Francisco *Post*, which gives the particulars and conveys this sentiment, arguing that "as for the churches, the 'Mormons,' like the Methodists or Roman Catholics, or any other religious body, should take care of them [the poor] for themselves." The lesser papers copy the notion without reflecting upon it, and therefore fall into the same absurdity.

It would seem that even a small gleam of reason would show that the seizure of this property and its diversion from its intended uses, would have the effect of preventing the "Mormon" Church from "taking care of its own poor," and of giving other churches, and people of no church, the use and benefit of funds to which they never contributed a cent.

Do not the *Post* and its echoes understand that this personal property was contributed by members of the "Mormon" Church for the uses of that Church alone? That one of the principal uses was the support of "its own poor?" That if "education is charity" and "charity begins at home," then the educational purposes to which these funds should be put, if they would be best devoted to educational purposes, should be the education of the "Mormon" children, and not those of Methodist, Roman Catholic, infidel or any other persuasion?

Are the editors of the country stricken with mental infirmity whenever they attempt to touch on the "Mormon" question? They talk so much nonsense and become so illogical, that it really looks as though they lose their common sense when they approach this subject.

It is clear that the property in ques-

tion—the personal property of the "Mormon" Church as a corporation—does not belong to the Government. It does not belong to the Methodist church or the Roman Catholic church or any other sectarian body. It does not belong to the Territory of Utah. It does not belong to any court. Whose property is it, then?

The Church corporation is dissolved by act of Congress—something new under the sun of the United States, but the Church is not dissolved. The property belongs to it now of right just as much as it did when it was incorporated. The ecclesiastical body remains though the form of the legal corporation is gone. The property belongs to the unincorporated body, to the people in the aggregate who compose the organization, precisely as it did before the arbitrary and unusual legislation declared its corporate powers at an end.

The "Mormon" Church wants to take care of its own poor with its own funds. It simply asks for the use of its own money that its charity may "begin at home." And it is willing to render a strict account of its disbursement for lawful uses the very nearest in character to those for which it was originally intended.

This is in accordance with what the Supreme Court of the United States decided should be done with these funds. It is the only just method of their disposition. To take any part of them from the "Mormon" people, members of the Church, and devote it to the use and benefit of others, will be robbery, no matter whether it is done by the order of a court or by act of Congress.

Let the press of the country look at the facts and the equities of this causes, and not echo foolish remarks made without full reflection by any journal, however influential. Polygamy cuts no figure in this matter. Apart from its entire discontinuance, the question to be decided is outside of it altogether. The point is, shall the "Mormons" use their own money for the benefit of their own poor and their own children, or shall it be filched from them and devoted to other uses, and to other people who have not contributed to it and who have no more claim upon it than the "Mormons" have to the funds of any Catholic or Protestant church in the world. In deciding this or commenting upon it, editors ought to be consistent enough at least not to advance arguments which refute their own propositions.

A newly discovered oil field in Pennsylvania produces 52,000 barrels daily.

WHAT DID IT MEAN?

THERE has been considerable inquiry as to the purport of the question in reference to Callahan, propounded by Attorney Reilly to the defendant Daggett, in the recent unsavory case which has gone to the grand jury. The mysterious murder of Callahan is still fresh in the public mind, and the peculiar question sprung upon Daggett and as suddenly dropped, being utterly irrelevant to the case before the Commissioner, has led many people to imagine that the defendant must have been implicated in the crime, or that the attorney had some intimation that he was or the question would have not been asked.

From what we can learn, there is no foundation for this suspicion against Daggett, and it looks as though the query was put simply to prejudice the court and the public against him. If so, that was not justifiable and is not the practice of respectable members of the bar. If there is anything known to the attorney that would lead to the discovery of the murderer or murderers of Callahan it ought to be made known to the officers or to the grand jury. If not, the matter was very much like the paltriest kind of pettifoggery.

The public would be glad to see the mystery over Callahan's fate cleared up, but will not approve of jests about it or theatrical displays just for forensic effect, even at the expense of a man as much under a cloud as Daggett is at present.

"A REPUBLIC OR ANARCHY."

IT is only a short time since Brazil was in the throes of a revolution. The result was that the then Emperor, Dom Pedro, a very mild gentleman, by the way, was deposed and left the country. While the disturbance was at its height Dom Pedro's opponents asserted that the government should be a republic, or there would be anarchy. There should be no more emperors.

We ventured the opinion at the time that Brazil was not far from being troubled with an attack of anarchy, even if a temporary alleged republic should be established. This idea was based on evidence given by the Brazilians that there is no kind of rule that will give them satisfaction. A sort of republic was inaugurated, but it has been short-lived. Martial law prevails at present, with every indication that out of the present situation a dictatorship will be set up.

From this crownless despotism anarchy will be almost certain to ensue. A country which cannot endure