

## SALT LAKE COUNTY EDUCATIONAL CONCERNS.

We have received a copy of the programme of the Salt Lake County Teachers' Summer Institute, whose sessions open in the University building at 10 a.m., on Monday, June 14th, and close on the 23rd. The table of exercises is elaborate, and we are therefore unable to present it, for want of sufficient space. It is a good one, however, embracing that class of subjects eminently proper to be digested by the members of the organization. They have been placed in hands, so far as we are able to judge, that will insure their thorough and intelligent treatment. The Summer Institute is a worthy movement, and it has our best wishes for success in the attainment of its presumed object—the better qualification of its members for the important duty of instructing the young.

There is considerable room, comparatively speaking, for advancement in educational matters—with special reference to District schools—in Salt Lake County. We are bound to speak in a comparative sense, because it is somewhat humiliating that this section of the Territory should in that important particular be behind some of its sister counties; notably Utah and perhaps Cache. Salt Lake should lead the van, but there are at least two counties ahead of it in the condition of the district schools. Every effort to bring it up at least shoulder to shoulder with the most advanced should meet with favor and encouragement. A capable and progressive corps of teachers will work wonders. Many of those engaged in the profession are all that could be desired, while some are not as efficient as could be wished. The system under the new school law requiring teachers to obtain certificates annually from the Board of Examination is a good one, and affords that body an opportunity of eliminating from the profession those who are not adapted nor qualified for it. The duty is both important and delicate, but all its labors should be performed with an eye single to the public good—the interests of education in improving the condition of our district schools. If there has been a too lavish or reckless issuance of certificates, the effects of such a course should be rectified as early as practicable.

In treating upon this subject we cannot but express our admiration for the enterprise and energy which are being displayed by the County Superintendent, W. M. Stewart, who is both indefatigable and ingenious in the discharge of his duties. Being himself a capable practical teacher, he is exceedingly anxious to have his field of official operations in a more advanced condition. His efforts should be aided on every side. One drawback has been the apathy of many parents of school children, not belonging to that class of people who imagine that when they send their little ones to the school house their educational duty toward them is at ended to. They should, on the contrary, visit the schools, take a direct interest in the care and progress of their children while there, and use an influence in favor of securing the best teachers and general facilities that can be commanded.

Great care should be taken in the selection of trustees. Those who accept of the important office and never look inside of a school house during session hours, and who manifest no interest in educational progress, should not be elected for a second term. They are unfit for the position. They are but blocks in the way. The absence of pecuniary remuneration for the performance of the duties of school trustee is a lame one. The financial status of the post is understood at the time of acceptance, and the person who undertakes the office is under a conscientious moral obligation to discharge its duties as well and faithfully as if he were the recipient of a round salary.

Trustees should be careful in their selection of teachers. Those who would entrust the charge of a school to a teacher for any other reason than the latter's general fitness for the position commits, morally speaking at least, an official malfeasance. Relationship, friendship, acquaintance or any other personal consideration should sink before the pervading interest of the public weal.

## HOME RULE DEFEATED.

The defeat of the Home Rule bill for Ireland in the House of Commons on Monday, is a crushing defeat to the great statesman who has set his heart upon the liberation of Ireland, as the crowning work of an active and useful life. But it may be the presage of a grand victory. An appeal to the country may work a bloodless revolution in Parliament and thus prevent a sanguinary revolution in Ireland. Should Parliament be dissolved, Gladstone may yet be vindicated by the return of a majority of members pledged to support his policy, when the measure now rejected, with such modifications as the debates upon it

have shown to be necessary, may be adopted by the Lower House if not by the Peers.

Another course is open. By the resignation of the Premier a new ministry may be formed, who may formulate a scheme that the Parnellites will support. This, however, is exceedingly doubtful, as the only Liberals who are likely to take the lead, outside of the followers of the Grand Old Man, are committed to measures that Parnell's cohort would not sustain. A Conservative Government has no prospect of success under present conditions, therefore a dissolution and an appeal to the country seems the most feasible movement to make.

If this expedient is resorted to, Great Britain will experience one of the liveliest political excitements that has stirred its political heart for many years, while Ireland will fairly bubble over with patriotism, Nationalism and Orangism. In a few days we shall know what course is to be adopted, and news of the next move will be awaited with interest.

## THE OBJECT IN VIEW.

A Tribune special from Washington on Tuesday said, in relation to the Tucker-Edmonds anomaly, "A prominent Democrat said to-day: 'Of course we are for Tucker's bill. Don't you see that it creates a lot of offices not under the civil service?'"

That is a statesmanlike and moral view to take of the measure, is it not? But it shows the motive that actuates the average politician. "Spoils" is a small word, but it expresses the grand summum bonum in view of much political exertion, the anticipated reward of a vast amount of explosive "patriotism."

Offices to be filled by Democrats will sanctify many an infamous proposition in many a democratic mind. And it is just so with the opposing party. The opportunity it will give for gifts of offices will prove a glittering bait to catch votes for the new anti-"Mormon" bill, and this, with the added prestige that "pitching into the Mormons" will give to members seeking re-election, will gain for it support that would be denied on an examination of its many demerits.

The offices to be filled by appointment are the goal of the local anti-"Mormons" ambition. In the language of Managan: "What are they here for? Not for the offices?" What have they been scheming and lying and putting up their money for but the offices? "The suppression of polygamy?" Pshaw! What do they care for that? Hear them talk: "Polygamy be damned. We want to break down this united Mormon vote. Let the Mormons go out of politics, and we don't give a—ud for polygamy." This is common anti-"Mormon" talk.

All the legislation that has been worked for has this end in view—the offices. They mean control of the Territory. They mean, in anti-"Mormon" hands, increased taxation, pillage, plunder, jobbery and spoliation. The so-called "Republic of Tooele" ought to be enough to warn the most rabid "Gentile" who has any property or material interest at stake, what the change contemplated in the latest proposed legislation signifies.

When "the offices" are the chief object in view of men chosen to make laws for the country, what more can be expected than many of the measures that are wiggled and worked through Congress in aid of ambition and corporate and individual greed? The confession of the "prominent Democrat" is highly significant, and is indicative of the character of many "statesmen" who are patriots for revenue only.

## FOR THE PROTECTION OF FARMERS.

A BILL has been introduced in Congress designed to protect the farmer against the encroachments of the stock-breeder. Its intention is excellent, but its effects may be in some places disastrous. It proposes to make stockmen responsible for damages committed by their animals on land and crops in the Territories, whether the latter are fenced or not and whether the laws of the Territory require fencing or not.

This is a sweeping measure, and though it may be endorsed by farmers who are not stock-raisers, it will work a hardship if it becomes a law, upon owners of "horses, mules, cattle, sheep and other domestic animals," in districts where the people agree to fence their fields and gardens, and who single the occupations of stock raising and agriculture.

In Utah there is a local option law, which is fair and equitable to all parties. The inhabitants of any district may decide by vote at the polls whether they will fence against stock or not. If they declare in favor of a fence, when damages are committed by animals where there is no lawful fence, nothing can be recovered. If done where there is a fence of the required proportions, the stock-owners are responsible for damages. If there is a no-fence regulation the stock-owners are just as responsible as they would be

under the proposed congressional legislation.

We think the matter should be left to the residents in each locality, who can determine what is best for them under the circumstances that surround them, better than any Member of Congress who does not understand the varied conditions of different districts. Farmers ought to be protected. But stock-raisers also have some rights, and a local option law will meet all the exigencies that may arise in either interest.

## A TERRITORIAL DELEGATE.

In the House of Representatives, on Tuesday, two unsuccessful attempts were made to report the amended Edmunds bill from the Judiciary Committee. It was out of the regular order and required unanimous consent to bring it forward. Delegate Caine objected, and so the report went over. On the second occasion the point was sprung that a Delegate could not object, and the Speaker took the question under advisement.

The position of a Delegate in Congress is peculiar. He is a member and yet not a member. He has a member's seat and draws a member's pay; he may speak as a member, introduce a bill as a member, make a motion as a member; but he cannot vote as a member, and, probably, may not object as a member. This, however, has yet to be settled. It might be argued that as he can offer a motion he can also interpose an objection. But as he has no vote, an objection which prevents the introduction of business out of the regular order may be construed as partaking of the nature of a vote, and be denied to a Delegate on that ground. Precedent will no doubt be considered in the matter, and if that favors the Delegate's position, his objection will prevail.

It is a singular sight in a popular Republic, to behold the representative of an organized community of citizens tied down and silenced in the National Legislature, when questions involving the liberties and rights of his constituents are brought to a vote. In a government whose powers are said to be wholly derived from the people, that laws can be enacted affecting the lives and property of thousands of matured citizens in the passage of which they are permitted to take no part, seems to be an anomaly and an inconsistency. Taxation without representation, government without the consent of the governed—gross violations of fundamental republican principles, proclaim the Territorial system a foreign element in the body politic, and stamp it as discordant, improper and unjust. The whole tyrannical arrangement should be forever abolished without delay.

## HOW THE "GENTILES" HAVE BEEN "OPPRESSED."

We notice that some papers are favoring the new Edmunds bill because it will relieve "the sufferings of the Gentiles" who have been so long "oppressed by the Mormons," and will take away all political power in Utah from the latter and give it to the former. We would like to know wherein the poor afflicted "Gentiles" have "suffered," and what has been their "oppression."

The "Mormons" came to this region when it was a desert. They have made it what it is. But for their agricultural, pastoral and manufacturing labors, none of the valleys of the Rocky Mountains that now teem with inhabitants would have been considered fit for human habitation. They established this Territory and opened the way for the settlement and organization of others. They were followed by so-called "Gentiles" who have profited by their pioneer work and many of whom have made fortunes in consequence. The "Mormons" are and always have been in the large majority. They have done no harm to newcomers, have interfered with no man on account of race, creed or politics, but have gone on in their own way minding their own business.

But a few restless adventurers, who always mingle with more respectable elements of Western society, have come here to disturb and make strife. Office is the object of their ambition. If they cannot secure profitable positions of that kind they feel as though deprived of a right. The "Mormons" have paid no attention to them. They have neither gratified their ambition nor purchased their silence. Rage and disappointment have been the result. They have remained in a hopeless minority, have done nothing to make their services desirable to the majority, but on the contrary by falsehood, abuse and continual plottings have made permanent the antipathies of the voters, and therefore have been kept out of places that they were not fit to fill but after which they lusted with inordinate avidity. The majority vote for their friends and will not vote for these, their enemies. All the dodges and expedients and subterfuges to which the venomous minority have resorted have therefore proved in vain.

This is the "oppression" under

which they have "suffered." Their numbers are too few to make any impression at the polls. Whose fault is that? If they could gain no following worthy of mention are the majority to be blamed? What obligations have the people here been under to put them in power? They have no special claims that are worthy of consideration. They have been on the same political plane as other citizens. They have had a free ballot. They have exercised free speech. They have selected their own candidates. And if they could not put their men into office, it was only through the "oppression" of a lack of votes. From this they have "suffered" in the flesh and the blame for it is laid upon the "Mormons."

The legislation over the prospects of which they and their friends are rejoicing, is designed to take away many existing rights of citizens and to give what will remain to the minority, excluding the majority from all participation in the local government. This is a fine thing for any public journal to applaud, is it not? Because the "Mormons" will not vote for "Gentiles," therefore the "Mormons" must not vote at all. Will the "Gentiles" vote for "Mormons?" Not if they know it.

"Well" it may be asked, "is not that simply turn and turn about? The 'Mormons' have had it their way and now the Gentiles are to have it their way." Stop a minute. These are not the facts. All the offices in the gift of the Government have been and are held by "Gentiles." "What has been left to the 'Mormons' have been simply the small local offices that pertain to their local affairs. If this is not a fair division, on whose side is the 'suffering?' Not on the 'Gentile' side, surely. And then it must be remembered that against the less than thirty thousand 'Gentile' population—stretched to the utmost imaginary figure, there are one hundred and fifty thousand 'Mormon' population; and how long is it since the principle has been established in American politics, that an insignificant majority shall fill all the offices and rule over the overwhelming majority of the citizens?"

But these anti-"Mormon" exultations are a little premature. The triumph of infamy has not yet been achieved. Better hold in a little. There will be time enough to throw up hats and shout, when the ill-gotten gains have been grasped. Some of the plotters may yet come to the wildest grief. It does not follow, even if the wrong is accomplished, that the minority will all be fools and pick out for the posts in their gift the strife-breeders and scoundrels who have worked for the revolution. They may have to "suffer" still. And when against whom will the cry of "oppression" be raised? If many "Gentiles" do not get thoroughly sick of "Gentile domination in the Territory of Utah if every it shall be established, past experience cries aloud in vain.

## PRACTISE AHEAD OF LEGISLATION.

The new Edmunds bill prepared by the judiciary committee, provides that a legal wife shall be a competent witness in polygamy cases, but she shall not be compelled to testify. The measure is one of the most radical ever offered to a legislative body. It is, however, in the particular above referred to, several degrees milder than the procedure adopted by the crusaders here

without the authority of law. Some time since District Attorney Dickson insisted not only upon the competency of the legal wife to testify in such cases, but that she should be compelled to give evidence against her husband. As usual, when Mr. Dickson pulled this string, Judge Zane, automaton fashion, jumped. As a natural consequence the two Associate Justices, Powers and Boreman, bobbed, and the outrage became an established custom in the courts. Neither of the three wearers of the ermine cares to be outdone by any other of them in carrying out any unscrupulous anti-"Mormon" programme.

One of the most singular exhibitions of judicial incompetency was given, on this point, in Oregon, recently, by his honor Judge Powers. The usual objection on the part of the defense to the placing of a legal wife upon the stand and compelling her to testify for the prosecution of her husband was offered. The Judge admitted that he had grave doubts about such compulsion being proper and legal. His opinion leaned the other way, but he would favor it now and let the Supreme Court of the Territory decide the question. The spectacle of a judge going against his own conceptions of the law, thus placing defendants at a disadvantage from his own admitted standpoint, because somebody else on the bench differed from him, is not edifying. It contributes to show that official's utter unfitness to be entrusted with the responsibility he holds, involving the rights and liberties of his fellowmen. He is erratic and fickle to a degree that is not often equalled in any of the walks of life.

The measure proposed by the Judiciary Committee, infamous though it is, confirms the fact of the illegal, unjust and monstrous proceeding in the District Courts, in compelling legal wives to testify in a prosecution

against their husbands. It is opposed to every principle of civilized jurisprudence.

## A PERFIDIOUS FALSIFIER.

The perfidy of the falsifier who sends defamatory dispatches from this city about the "Mormons," is so utterly unmitigated that if ever he should be struck with a scintillation of conscience he would certainly hate himself as heartily as everybody familiar with him and his conduct despises him. The Lizzie Boyd suicide case is still fresh in the mind of the local public, being a matter of a few days ago. The article in human shape who wires falsification from here, sent the following item to the Coast papers on the 4th ult:

"Lizzie Boyd died last night from poison, supposed to have been self-administered. The evidence before the coroner's jury to-day showed that the woman contemplated, if she had not consummated, polygamous entanglements with one Thurgood, whose wife, however, did not seem to take kindly to the arrangement, for she beat the girl and locked her up. There is considerable mystery about the affair."

The intent of the professional truth-economizer is unmistakable. His purpose was to create the impression that the case was one of "Mormon" polygamy, intended or consummated. He might as well have made the falsehood perfect and said so right out. People here are generally aware that the Thurgoods are non-"Mormons," and that Lizzie Boyd was one of those unfortunate whose conduct was such for some time before her demise as to entitle her to the former favorite encomium of the chief organ of the anti-"Mormons" in such cases. She was, according to the theory of that infamous sheet, "struggling upwards" out of "Mormonism." The relations of some of the parties named in the dispatch as connected with the affair were of that character, to use the language of District Attorney Dickson, "condemned by the Mormons."

## OFFICIAL PERSECUTION.

SHORTLY before the trials of a number of Latter-day Saints in the District Court at Blackfoot, Idaho, Fred. Dubois made a remark with regard to the character of the petit jury he had secured for anti-"Mormon" purposes. The attorney for the defense in a case of unlawful cohabitation had United States Marshal Dubois subpoenaed as a witness. He was asked, while in that capacity, to state whether he had made the remark alluded to. After a moment's hesitation he said: "Well, I guess I did say so." An idea of the character of his assertion regarding the complexion of the anti-"Mormon" trial jury and the purpose it was intended to serve was conveyed in a dispatch to the News at the time, but it was not given in full. We are now enabled to present it in all its naked and hideous barbarity. Here it is: "I have now got a jury that will convict every 'Mormon' brought before it on a charge of unlawful cohabitation, innocent or guilty." It would convict Jesus Christ Himself if He were brought into court on that charge.

Notwithstanding that a rabid anti-"Mormon" feeling is pretty general, Marshal Dubois' remark has been characterized by many people as most unchristianlike and disgraceful. Quite a number of non-"Mormons" profess disgust at his brutality and criminal perversions of official duty.

His statement should occasion no surprise as it is but the expression of what his official conduct has been throughout, and while he has been more outspoken than other officials engaged in the persecution of Latter-day Saints here and elsewhere, his mode of operation has not been greatly different from theirs. Every day their are croppings which show the real "inwardness" of the crusade being waged against an unpopular religious community.

U. S. Marshal Dubois' term of office will expire next month, his removal being a foregone conclusion. Had he and others of his class their just deserts, however, they would be forthwith officially decapitated sans ceremony, without reference to the expiration of terms of office. They are a disgrace to the nation which they are supposed to represent, and an open discredit to the human race. In speaking of the class to which they belong, the late Theodore Parker aptly says: "They pervert the law and spit upon justice with blasphemous expectation."

This fine Christian gentleman, who occupies a responsible office under this great government, anticipating his early removal from the position now held by him, is legging to be elected as Delegate to Congress from Idaho, at the election to be held in that Territory next November. Any community that would make such a choice of, and be truthfully represented at the seat of government by such a man as he has shown himself to be must be in a very pitiable plight. He doubtless hopes to climb in the position to which he aspires upon the anti-"Mormon" ladder. He will probably find, however—as many others have—to his chagrin and dismay, that the apparatus has a good many rotten steps, letting the person attempting the ascent down to his proper level with surprising suddenness.