

and turn it over for the education of the children of the parents who have been robbed by the Church."

The property in question was not unjustly obtained, having been donated by members of the Church for benevolent purposes, including the support of the poor. For this reason there has been practically no pauperism among the Saints in the ordinary acceptation of the term. There has been no application of the means of the Church to pervert or defeat the laws of the country.

Those who donated the means have not been robbed of it by the Church; but suppose it should be admitted that such has been the case, in what position would it place the Gentiles of this community, should the proposal carry to devote the escheated property of the Latter-day Saints to the use and benefit of the common schools?

There is in Utah, especially in Salt Lake City and Ogden, a large and increasing Gentile proportion of population. It is made a matter of constant boast that that element is swelling numerically with more rapidity than are the "Mormons" in the particular towns named. These two cities would necessarily receive a large share of the confiscated property for educational purposes. Consequently the Gentile children in Utah would, according to the logic of the anti-"Mormon" organ, be largely indebted for their education to a fund which that paper says was obtained from those who donated it by a process of robbery, and seized from those who thus procured it by a similar method.

We hope there is no person on the earth professing to be a Latter-day Saint who would willingly suffer himself or his children to be placed in a situation so utterly base and humiliating as would be the case with the Gentiles and their children in Utah in the event of the hard earnings of the Mormons being devoted to a public school fund. Yet here is a public journal, and probably many of the people whose views it claims to represent, ready and eager for the consummation of this fearful self-degradation.

Perhaps it may be well, after all, that such a climax of self-abasement should be reached. If it shall be, and the non-"Mormon" children of Utah be educated by a process of theft with means which has been earned by the Saints, then whatever success in life is attained by the Gentile beneficiaries through the educational facilities thus

furnished can only be truthfully attributed, so far as the confiscated property shall go, to the poor, peeled and abused "Mormons." That will be the situation. There is no evading it. Let every Gentile hug the fact to his bosom that wishes to, but when the full force of it comes home to some of them, we imagine they will recoil from it. Otherwise they are unworthy the name of men.

The Edmunds bill in relation to the disposal of the confiscated property of the Church now pending in Congress does not provide that it shall be used for the educational benefit of the children of the people who earned the means and to whom it belongs. It proposes to use it for the education of the children of the non-"Mormon" population as well, and the latter have no proprietary rights in the premises, but must accept, should the scheme carry, a charity at the hands of the original donors, although it reaches them indirectly. The fact that the fund is seized under color of law against the protest of its real proprietors only makes the pauperistic position of a certain class of the beneficiaries all the more contemptible.

People who would descend to such a depth of abject dependency ought to continue to shout about the spirit of American independence and thus "assume a virtue," though they "have it not."

UTAH AFFAIRS.

THE Bloomington, Ill., *Bulletin* of July 7th contains an interesting communication from Salt Lake City and signed Will Condon. It starts out with some remarks about affairs with which the writer could not be familiar, as he claims to have resided only a year in the Territory, and in these he makes some mistakes, having gained his information (?) from "Liberal" sources. But in the main he shows himself a man of observation and sound judgment. We clip the following extracts from his letter:

Touching on the everlasting polygamy question he says:

"Nothing can be charged to the present daily practice of the church, except mere belief—abstract conviction—unless indeed there should be clandestine solemnization of polygamous marriages, a condition which some Gentiles suspect. At any rate very few Mormons have been arrested for entering the polygamous state during the past year. This fact is frequently cited by the Mormons, and the court records corroborate their statement. We cannot take from the Mormons the common presumption

which the courts give to murderers, namely, that until found guilty they are to be considered as innocent. Can not a Mormon teach and believe in polygamy as an abstract article of faith (not to be practiced) just as freely as can the Iowa saloonkeeper preach against the prohibition law and clamor for its repeal?

"I ask this question merely to show how unjust and unwise in precedent was the bill offered by Senator Cullom in the Senate for the purpose of taking from the Mormons the right to vote, merely because they belong to an organization which teaches polygamy, formerly as a practice but now as a mere doctrinal tenet."

"The Cullom bill has been properly rejected in committee, but several substitutes for it, on largely the same plan, are pending. If any bill disfranchising the Mormons indiscriminately is passed, such a bill as a law would be disastrous to the commercial interests of Utah, as in this Territory there are many mercantile and public enterprises in which both Mormons and Gentiles co-operate harmoniously, but which will be injured and hampered by a disfranchisement bill which reduces the Mormons to a political degradation on a level with that of the savage red man (not taxed) and the leprous, opium-smoking Chinese. The Mormons will not associate in commercial union with men who will try to so degrade them. A trampled worm will turn upon its tormentor in the spirit of resentment. Many of the Mormons are intelligent, progressive, and (I think) sufficiently patriotic to make as good citizens as the anarchists of Chicago and the venal dogs that sell their votes for money, not only in the great cities of our land, but even in Bloomington—that hub of culture—the Boston of Illinois. The Mormons are industrious, honest, law-abiding as a rule and some of them would grace the finest parlors of New York or Boston. When a stranger arrives here he sees nothing to distinguish Mormons from Gentiles—all seem to hustle along and contribute their share in building up in these valleys a new Denver—a city that will glisten like the new Jerusalem—encircled round about by limitless fields of grain and golcondas of precious ore. Against the procrustean device of Cullom—making all the same, I would quote the famous remark of Edmund Burke: 'You cannot indict a whole people.' The Mormons are not as good in many respects as they pretend to be, nor are they as bad in many respects as the rest of the world believes, and for this very reason they are pretty much like other people. Christendom points with horror at the polygamous life of the Mohammedan, and the followers of the crescent point back at the drunkenness, the marital infidelity and the polyandry of Christendom."

"This is a free country, but our freedom will be taken away gradually, first from one denomination and then from another, according to the caprice and clamor of the hour, unless we adhere closely to the traditions heretofore considered the bulwarks of the republic, no matter what the supreme court said of the Idaho test oath. Ex-Governor West, ex-confederate soldier, sent here as governor from Kentucky by Grover Cleveland, is a democrat in favor of disfranchisement, and yet he says Utah has made marvelous progress during the past three years. If so, why not let good enough alone under the present working of the Edmunds-Tucker law? Why try to avenge old wrongs?"