

EDITORIALS.

"FINANCIAL METHODS IN UTAH."

"The Salt Lake Tribune finds some curious developments of Mormon financial and educational operations in the report of the Auditor of the Territory. It quotes the cases of several counties, which may be considered purely Mormon which have drawn from the Treasury for school purposes in the past two years amounts almost equal, and in some cases even exceeding, the entire revenue of those counties from taxes. On the contrary, it finds that in Salt Lake, Weber and Summit Counties, in all of which Gentiles are large property owners, the taxes amount to \$205,000 in round numbers, while they have received from the school fund in the same time, only \$92,000.

"The roughest part of this state of affairs is that, while the Gentiles are thus fleeced for the benefit of the Mormons, the schools to which they are made to contribute are not only notoriously bad, but are conducted in conformity with Mormon ideas of education. The main dependence of the Gentiles, in fact, is upon the schools maintained by the various Christian denominations in the Territory.

"The management of the finances of the Mormons, both in Territorial matters and in Salt Lake City, has always been a fruitful source of complaint on the part of the Gentiles. They assert that it is impossible to obtain any satisfactory account of what becomes of the money, and that for a great portion of it there is nothing to show in the shape of legitimate expenditure or tangible improvements. The impression is created that, by manipulation of the public funds, the Gentile population is made to contribute to the purposes of Mormon hierarchy. It might be difficult to prove these assertions, but, on the other hand, it is claimed that the Mormon officials are equally unable to demonstrate that the money collected is applied to the purposes for which it was intended."

The above is from the San Francisco Call. It shows how respectable journals not posted on Utah affairs are led into blunders, through depending upon a paper which purposefully and intentionally misleads the public, in regard to any subject which it touches relating to this Territory.

Supposing the figures quoted above to be approximately correct, what is there so "curious" or "rough" in the "development of Mormon financial operations?" The revenue law provides that three mills on the dollar of the entire Territorial assessment shall be used for the benefit of district schools. Is there anything "curious" about that? The only objection we have heard from non-Mormon sources is that it is not sufficient to establish free schools in the Territory. It is used only for the payment of teachers, but may be supplemented by a local option tax in each district, of not exceeding two per cent. on the taxable property. Thus any district that wants its schools supported entirely by taxation can have them, and those that want them partly sustained by tuition fees, can have that plan. It is left with the people to be taxed, how near to an entirely "free school," as it is called, their district schools shall be.

The amount collected for school taxes is included in the general tax, and is disbursed on orders from the Territorial Superintendent, as the law directs, according to the school population of each district. Thus, a school district does not receive an amount according to the sum of the taxable property therein, but according to the number of children of lawful school age. Is there anything "curious" in that? What more equitable plan for the purpose designed could be adopted? Is it not the same in effect in any State which supports its schools by taxation? That is to say, the district which has the largest school population gets the greatest amount of educational benefit from the taxes.

Then if Sanpete or Wasatch county, where the taxable property is not so large as in some other counties, receives a large amount of the school appropriation because of the great numbers of its children of school age, and Salt Lake and Weber counties, where the taxable property foots up higher, receive a smaller amount in proportion because they have a proportionately less number of children of school age, what is there wrong or "curious" or "rough" about it?

If it is wrong for a poor district to receive much help for education when its school population is large and its taxable property is small, then it is wrong for the rich man with few children to be taxed for the schooling of the many children of the poor man, and still worse to tax a man for school purposes who has no children at all. If the free school system by taxation were to be adopted fully and compulsorily in Utah, as the inconsistent objectors to these supposed discrepancies advocate, then those discrepancies would be much greater, and the wealthiest districts would pay much more for the benefit of the poorer districts, as they must do of necessity in every State in the Union where that system is in force.

The reason that Salt Lake and Weber counties contribute more to the revenue than Sanpete and Wasatch counties, is not because of "larger Gentile

property-owners," but because of larger business interests and the more valuable cities, railroad interests and other sources of revenue with which they are favored. The "Gentiles" are not "fleeced." Taxes are uniformly assessed. Ample provision is made in every county and city for redress of wrong or any incorrect or unfair assessment. Statements or insinuations to the contrary are wilful lies in those that make them, and palpable errors in those that copy them, for the law and the facts disprove them.

The statement that the schools supported in part by these Territorial taxes are "conducted in conformity with Mormon ideas of education," is also erroneous. There is no religion taught in them. The books used are "Gentile" books. The "Mormon" ideas of education embrace the inculcation of religious principles, and the exercise of a religious influence over the minds of the young, in connection with secular instruction. But they put aside those ideas in the conduct of the public schools for the reason that children whose parents have different ideas of what religion is, or should be, have equal rights to attend those schools. They are open to all. There is nothing taught there but what all might bear without detriment. Neither the Jew nor the Gentile need fear doctrinal danger to his children in the district schools of Utah. The Call has been deceived on this question as well as others.

There are no "Gentiles" who assert that "it is impossible to obtain any satisfactory account of what becomes of the money," except a few flimsy like the Tribune, and a few mud-headed echoes who do not know anything about it but what they hear from the other class. Detailed accounts of the receipts and expenditures of public moneys are duly and regularly published, and the public can learn, if they want to, the manner in which their taxes are disposed of.

The assertion that "the Gentile population is made to contribute to the purposes of the Mormon hierarchy" is the most transparent absurdity. No "Gentile" contributes a dollar for "Mormon" purposes unless he wishes to, and that is not of alarmingly frequent occurrence. The Call may well say "it might be difficult to prove these assertions." It would be not only difficult but impossible to prove them, because they are untrue. And every fair-minded "Gentile" in Utah who knows anything of the true situation, will confess, if he speaks at all on this subject, that the financial affairs of Utah are freer from crookedness, and are conducted on a more economical principle than in almost any part of the country.

Assertions may be made to the contrary, and vituperative accusations may be fulminated, but they are only the foul wind which is emitted through the Salt Lake Tribune, and the Call will always make a blunder if it credits anything that emanates from that mendacious source.

TROOPS IN CITIES.

The Chicago Herald has the following to say in regard to a proposition, sustained by some papers of that centre of socialism and dynamism, to establish a garrison there for the suppression of riots considered probable because of the existence of plots of secret societies:

"The appeal for a garrison as a menace of the people is the appeal not of cowardice alone, but of treason to the fundamental ideas of American freedom. It is worse than silly, for it would raise a power which, actively exerted in municipal affairs would speedily divest cities of all autonomy, and of all liberty. This country has had more than enough of the bayonet at the ballot box. There never has been a riot in Chicago which might not easily have been mastered by a cool and intelligent head of the municipality acting through the conservators of the peace. There never was a tumult in the streets of Chicago so serious as to call for the intervention of a standing army. Sensational newspapers have at times 'streaked the pale air with blood,' but there never has been and there is no reason for any but timorous and cowardly citizens to fear that there ever will be in Chicago legitimate food for the bullets of a garrison of the regular army.

The man who proposes to keep United States troops within call in order to prepare Chicago for what he may regard as a riot is a public enemy. If he cannot trust the people of this country and their institutions, which he appears to be incapable of appreciating, he had better instantly emigrate to some healthy despotism, and take up his residence in some garrison town, say of Ireland or of India.

Substitute Salt Lake City for Chicago in the foregoing, and it would be more strictly correct than it is as it stands. The only riot of importance that has ever occurred in this city was the tumult that occurred when City Marshal Burt, of honorable memory, was killed by a brutal negro in the street. And that was not an uprising that menaced the general peace or either public or private property. It was simply a lawless outburst of vengeance against the murderer. And it was quelled as soon as Mayor William Jennings ap-

peared on the scene and commanded the peace. The mob ceased its violence, the body of the negro which was being dragged away was left untouched and the crowd dispersed without further violence.

Every word of the Chicago Herald which we have quoted, has special application to the persons who moved for the location of troops in this city, and to the situation here. But we have seen no cause for complaint against the soldiers themselves. We have never said anything against them or their presence here which would reflect on the army, its officers or men in the ranks. It is the principle denounced in the above excerpt to which we object, and the misrepresentations and dastardly means which were used to accomplish a sinister purpose.

We commend the strictures of the Herald to the perusal and personal application of the parties whose craniums the cap will fit to a nicety.

RELIGIOUS TESTS IN LITIGATION.

The following petition, with a number of signatures and transcripts of the Justice's record attached, has been filed in the Supreme Court of this Territory:

The Honorable Supreme Court of the Territory:

We, the undersigned, residents of Plute County, Territory of Utah, living in the vicinity of the town of Marysville, respectfully state:

We are and have been personally well acquainted, for over four years last past, with Edward McB. Timoney, who was recently appointed a Commissioner of the Supreme Court of said Territory.

That during or about the month of March, 1882, he was held to bail to keep the peace before James Wiley, a justice of the peace of said county, for threatening to injure people.

That on the 5th day of January, 1885, he was arrested and taken before Mariner Smith, a justice of the peace of said county, on the charge of selling intoxicating liquors without a license; for selling intoxicating liquor on Sunday, and also to minors, and for keeping a gambling house. A copy of said proceedings is hereto attached.

That your petitioners do not think he is a proper person to hold the office of Commissioner of said court, and ask to have said appointment vacated. MARYSVILLE, Plute County, Oct. 5, 1885.

These are serious charges against an officer occupying a position which has been magnified into such importance as that of U. S. Commissioner. Against them is a statement of his attorney, C. K. Gilchrist of this city, to the effect that these allegations followed the commission of certain persons on the charge of unlawful cohabitation, and that the Commissioner has a good reputation; this is backed up by the following document, also signed by a number of citizens:

To the Honorable the Judge of the Supreme Court, Territory of Utah:

We, the undersigned citizens of Plute county, most respectfully state that we have known Mr. Edward McB. Timoney personally and by reputation for over five years. We believe him to be an honorable and upright man, fearless in the discharge of duty, and that no better selection could have been made to fill the responsible position you were pleased to place him in, as United States Commissioner. We are glad you appointed and most sincerely hope you will keep him where he is, as those who seek the revocation of his appointment are either Mormons or Mormon sympathizers.

The Supreme Court considered the complaint and the rejoinder, and set Monday, Jan. 25th as the time for Commissioner McB. Timoney to appear and show cause why he should not be dismissed from office.

From the defense set up in this case, it appears that there is a growing opinion that all that is needed when an official is accused of wrong-doing, or a citizen is prosecuted for criminal conduct, is to show that each of his accusers is a "Mormon," "while he is not." Being the reverse of the alleged recognized rule, that to ensure a conviction, it is only necessary to establish that the accused is a "Mormon," while the accuser "is not."

It will be observed that the charges against B. McTimoney are specific and definite, while his defense is vague and general. If a man holding an official position is a brawler, a threatener, or violator of the liquor law, a gambling-house keeper, etc., it is no answer to the charges that he has a good reputation among certain individuals, or that he has committed certain persons for alleged infraction of the Edmunds law, or that the parties preferring the charges and offering the proofs are "Mormons." These responses do not touch the questions or either of them.

This is the second case brought before the court, involving the creed of a complainant as a reason why a criminal should not be held accountable for his violation of law. It is alleged in the dirty Yearlan case that the complainant is a "Mormon," and the Justice to try the case is a "Mormon," while the defendant is not; and it is argued that he should therefore be kept from punishment.

In the McB. Timoney case the same plea is set up as a reason why he should not be expelled from the office which it is alleged he has disgraced.

The endorsement of ever so many citizens of McB. Timoney's reputation does not in the remotest manner affect his guilt. He may be a brawler, he may threaten peaceable citizens, he may be a gambling-house keeper, and everything with which he is charged and of which it is said he has been convicted, and yet be held in excellent repute among a certain class of so-called "respectable" people in this Territory. Indeed, a person may be guilty of the filthiness and lechery charged against Yearlan and yet be "half fellow well met" among the same class of people, who seem to see no wrong in a man except in the fact that he is a "Mormon." A "Gentile" may commit all kinds of lawlessness and licentiousness and be shielded and endorsed, if his accusers are "Mormons."

The Supreme Court has nothing to do with the religion or non-religion, the particular creed or opposition thereto, of any complainant or defendant, appellant or respondent. The merits of the case should be considered apart from any such considerations. And if it is true that Commissioner McB. Timoney has disgraced himself in the manner complained of, he ought to be dismissed from office if a thousand or any number of persons endorsed him, no matter if they are the bitterest "Mormon"-haters in the land, and regardless of the number, faith or status of his accusers.

The Supreme Court of Utah is put upon the test as to whether judicial cognizance shall be taken of the religious standing of parties in litigation. That is the interesting part of the two cases to which we have alluded and this constitutes their importance.

EXCESS OF OFFICIAL DUTY.

The raid on the Seventeenth Ward meeting house on Tuesday night affords the Tribune much room for mirth. It chuckles over the statement that one hundred or more gentlemen who attended the meeting "were met at the foot of the stairs by Marshal Ireland, who permitted them to pass out singly;" gloats over the actions of a fellow by the name of Mix who was "stationed at the rear with orders to stop and detain every man who came from the rear;" and gleefully relates how Mix stopped and "colored" Bishop McKee, an old gentleman of eighty years, saying "he'd find out where he came from," and how the Bishop was released when it was explained that he had left the building by the front door.

Now, will anybody pretend that all this was not an excess of duty? We have given the particulars as detailed by the Marshal's organ and apologist, which are not as bad by any means as the facts. But glossed over as they are, do they not manifest clear infringement upon personal rights. Cannot a peaceable assembly pass out of a building except "singly" and by the "permission" of his Mightiness, Mr. Ireland? Is it a crime to leave a building by any exit but the front door? Must respectable persons be stopped and "colored" by understrappers who have no warrant to arrest or detain them?

These incidents—only a part of the raid—were all in the nature of lawlessness. They are likely to provoke trouble and induce a conflict. Zeal, determination and vigilance are all right in an officer of the law, but citizens have rights that must be respected, and Jack's office had better see to it that they do not overstep legal bounds, or as sure as shooting, they will run against snags. If they refuse to take our timely caution, they can take what follows.

IT'S NO USE KICKING.

The Denver Tribune-Republican, commonly called The Hyphen says: "The President is quite likely to kick over the Mormon Church before he retires from office." Indeed, will the Hyphen inform us what business the Chief Magistrate of this great Nation with a big N has to do with kicking at any Church on the continent? We do not believe that the President is so foolish or fanatical as to attempt anything of the kind. But if he should lose that firm balance which is his great characteristic, enough to be carried away by the howling of hyphens and hypocrites, he will retire with a limping limb and the sorest toes he ever suffered from. And the "Mormon" Church will not be kicked over or injured, either. Whoever kicks at it will succeed like the fools who kick at a hat with a big stone in it. "And whoso shall fall upon this stone shall be broken; but upon whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder." That is written in heaven, and it will certainly be fulfilled on earth.

FREE STATES INSTEAD OF FETTERED SATRAPIES.

The opposition of Senator Vest and other Democrats to the admission of Dakota into the Union as a State appears to us a little inconsistent. We

can understand why Democrats do not look with favor upon an increase in the number of Republican States. But that is a mere party objection. It should disappear in the light of true statesmanship. One of the very foundation stones of the Democratic political structure is the right of local self-government. The people are entitled to this just as much if they are Republicans as if they were Democrats. And this they cannot enjoy under the oppressive, monarchical and unjustifiable Territorial system. Every Democrat, to be true to his principles, should labor to destroy it entirely. Every step to render it unnecessary and make it a thing of the past, to be forgotten with its anomalies and wrongs, should be stimulated and encouraged. It is an excrescence on the body politic and is out of harmony with our governmental system. It ought to be buried out of sight and smell.

The denunciation of Dakota for presuming to organize a State government, elect its officers and prepare for the duties and responsibilities to devolve upon it when Congress consents, is uncalled for and unreasonable. There is nothing rebellious or insubordinate in such a movement. It is not without precedent. Several States have been admitted after assuming this position. Dakota is perfectly justified. All that Congress has to do is to see that the new State has a republican form of government, and is in a condition for self-sustenance as a political body. The notion that a Territory cannot evolve into Statehood is fallacious. The power to form the State is in the people. They need no "enabling act." Congress may admit the State after it is formed. The subversion of sovereignty from the people to Congress is not democratic, it is monarchical. Congress is not the creator, it is the creature of the States and of the people.

The doctrine that Congress has supreme power over the Territories is not democratic. It has been acquiesced in by degrees. It is in conflict with the fundamental principle of the right of the people to regulate their own domestic concerns in their own localities. It is not to be found in the Constitution. It has been received by implication. And that is another heresy, diametrically opposed to democratic principles. According to these, our national government is one of defined powers, and beyond its stated limits it has no authority, everything not specified in terms being reserved to the States respectively or to the people. Congress assumed the power which it has exercised for many years, and when the matter came before the Supreme Court the make-shift theory was advanced that it was "too late in the day to question the power of Congress over the Territories." It should be never too late to right a wrong. The exercise of power does not render it lawful. The continuance of usurpation does not justify it. If the authority claimed for Congress over the Territories is not to be found in the Constitution, no such authority exists and the longer it is usurped the greater is the injustice and the more urgent the necessity for its removal.

The easiest and best way out of the difficulty is the abolition of the Territorial system. The time has come when it could be accomplished if statesmanship instead of party interest regulated the affairs of the nation. Dakota should be admitted as a State. Washington should enter simultaneously, with Northern Idaho attached. The people of that region want to be annexed, even if Washington is not admitted, and the geographical conditions recommend the project. Montana is knocking at the door of the Union, and Wyoming is modestly feeling its way towards the same portal. A judicious grouping of the remaining Territories could be made, which would go far towards disposing of the Utah difficulty.

The everlasting "polygamy" question, which has been magnified out of all sensible proportions, here comes in, not because it should cut any figure in the arrangement, but because it has been forced into national politics and boomed into a popular question. A clear head and a fearless mind could settle that matter in its political bearing, without any injury to the country or any portion of it, by additions and partitions for the establishment of States whose constitutions would be republican in spirit and unobjectionable in form. Free and sovereign States would then take the place of the satrapies that now form a standing disgrace to the nation and are jarring discords that impair its harmony.

Every true friend to the United States whose soul is not warped with party projects, sectarian bias, personal schemes or narrow crotchets, will add his mite of influence to effect this grand consummation. Let the powers of Government spring from ALL the people. Let there be no exercise of dominion but that which comes from the consent of the governed. Away with a political system that makes semi-serfs of hosts of good citizens, that violates the basic principles on which the government is founded, that opens the door to favoritism and paves the way to oppression, that denies the demands of the people, that stifles their voices, that governs them by force, that gives them no representation, that renders them abjectly subordinate to usurped authority and strips them of rights that should be the common heritage!

Let the Constitution be the supreme