

donated to the "Mormon" Church for religious objects to the support of the public schools, is a violation of the principle involved in this doctrine of the entire separation of Church and State. For, if it is wrong to devote the funds of the State to religious purposes, it is equally wrong to seize the funds of a Church and divert them to secular purposes. And it is remarkable that a greater protest against such a manifest injustice and departure from established rule, is not raised by the pulpit and the press of the United States. If it were not the "Mormon" Church that is directly affected by this attempt, it is certain that the whole country would be aroused against the wrong.

There is no desire on the part of the "Mormon" Church to blend itself with the State organization, to control it or to interfere with its functions. As we have shown many times heretofore, it claims no authority over the State, but its doctrine and theory inculcate respect for secular law and the independence of State authority from religious domination. Therefore, the proposition for the Amendment in reference to all the States will meet with no opposition from the "Mormon" people, who, we have no doubt, would vote as freely for it if they had the opportunity as any opponents of the union of Church and State that can be found in any part of the nation.

#### A SENSATIONAL SITUATION.

THE regular and special dispatches relating to the situation and prospects of the conflict between the Wyoming cattlemen and rustlers are of the most sensational and conflicting character. They ought to be taken with several grains of allowance. Both parties and their respective friends are presenting the questions involved from opposite standpoints. These relations are, of course, highly colored and pronouncedly one-sided.

There is one point of advantage, however, on the side of the rustlers as against the regulators that cannot be demolished—the latter, aided by an imported band of fighters, invaded two of the northwestern counties of the State for a lawless purpose and committed very grave offenses, including the taking of human life.

We decline to believe, unless the matter shall be made clear by indisputable proof, that the pay of the hired party of the raiders not only included a per diem while the invasion lasted, but also \$50 a head for every man killed by them. This is a proposition so barbarous that it is difficult to believe that intelligent and influential men in a civilized country would entertain it, to say nothing of engaging in it.

The rustlers and small ranch holders are asking the President to give them a hearing. It is not improbable that because Mr. Harrison directed the use of the military in the conflict, that the rustlers imagine that he is inclined to favor the cattlemen. This, however, is not necessarily the case. The object of the Chief Executive in responding to the call for military interposition was simply in the interest of peace and good order. He could take no other course consistent with the common

weal. Just as soon as the law can take its ordinary course, it will be demonstrated that the President will see, so far as his duty goes, that matters shall run in the usual and legitimate channels.

It is stated that the large cattle owners assert that they will see the stockmen out of their difficulty, and in carrying out this determination, will spare neither money nor effort. There is doubtless some truth in this report, as the conflict involves a question in which all the stockmen in the region of the difficulty are financially interested. In the struggle, one side or the other must give way. To those who are defeated will necessarily come consequential ruin. There is not room enough in Northwestern Wyoming for both classes—the rustlers and small ranchers combined, and the large ranch and cattle owners. In the long run the latter will probably have to give way, whatever may be the immediate outcome, as the entire west will eventually become populous. This will follow, as the operation of a natural law.

#### NEW ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION.

THE Geary Chinese exclusion bill is meeting with strong and intelligent opposition in the Senate. Among its opponents is Senator John Sherman. It appears from the discussion the measure has provoked that the bill prohibits the return of former Chinese residents who have gone to China on visits believing that they would be allowed to return, as would be the case under the existing laws. They include merchants who have left their businesses here. Those who oppose the Geary measure contend that this proposed prevention would be practical confiscation of the property of these persons, amounting to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Also that the provisions of the bill would be in violation of an international treaty, which cannot in honor be violated by a civilized nation.

These are strong points—peremptory confiscation of the property of people belonging to a country with which the United States are at peace, and a breach of international treaty.

There are sociological and moral questions connected with the increase of Chinamen in this country. There is a proper demand, as a matter of self-preservation, for exclusive legislation with regard to that nationality. It ought, however, in the main at least, to be confined to further additions to the population from the Chinese empire. It ought not to violate rights of property or obligations of treaties, both of which should be sacred.

Judging from the statements made with regard to the Geary bill, it would need but one clause to make it a most unmitigatedly sweeping measure—the expulsion from this country of the Chinese part of the population. The opponents of the new bill are pleading to have the limit of the present legislation extended so that it might remain for another series of years. This plea seems to be reasonable. The Chinese in this country are not at all prolific, and if exclusive legislation is made to apply only to new comers from the empire, the race would in

course of time dwindle away in the United States, and the question would settle itself by a natural process. In any event, the nation cannot afford to ignore the rights of the people of any nationality, including Chinamen.

#### THAT MONUMENT.

WE are pleased to note that the proposition to erect a statue to the late President Brigham Young is recommended by a number of influential and respectable papers, which, though opposed to "Mormonism," are able to recognize the value to the country of so sagacious and practical a leader of men as the pioneer whom the people of Utah delight to honor. We find the following in a recent issue of the *Denver News*:

"Whatever may be said of the Mormon Church, or its new abandoned practice of polygamy, which he did so much to establish, and which the News has persistently and consistently fought, it must yet be acknowledged that Brigham Young will always remain one of the great central figures of Rocky Mountain history. Indeed the organization and influence and policy of the Mormon Church are warrant for the statement that as an organizer and leader of men he will hold a prominent place in history. That we may believe his religion a delusion, and his polygamous teachings an outrage on decency and civilization, does not in the least detract from the remarkable character of the man, who undoubtedly possessed executive abilities of a wonderful order, which have impressed themselves upon Utah in a manner which will not soon be eradicated.

"That his name is venerated in Utah is perfectly natural, and it is fit that a statue should rise to his memory in order to perpetuate the name of a man without the mention of which the history of the West can never be written.

"Let Salt Lake City, therefore, be adorned with a statue of Brigham Young, who is entitled to honor as a pioneer, as a man who first taught what industry and irrigation could do in the valleys of the Rocky Mountains, and who established a Territory which is certain to become a great and prosperous State—rich in all the elements of material wealth."

It will be remembered by attendants at the General Conference that persons desiring to subscribe to the monument were directed to leave their donations with Judge Elias A. Smith at the Deseret National Bank. Also that a general subscription of one dollar was advocated. This ought not to be forgotten by the public. Many persons would no doubt be glad to give a larger amount, and there is nothing to hinder them exhibiting their generosity in this direction to any desired extent. But the public should not forget that gifts of one dollar or less if they cannot afford it, will be received at the place referred to. This is something that interests all classes and all parties.

The present prime minister of Norway, Johannes Steen, made a sacred promise a little more than thirty years ago, that he would work to convert Norway into a republic and he himself become her first president. He seems pretty near the goal of his ambition.