

## A RACE CONFLICT.

The race riot at Wabash, Mississippi, yesterday, and the trouble in Tennessee on Friday, are events for which the Southern States should always be prepared. A graphic account of the former bloody and ominous affair will be found in our news columns today, as well as a report of the latter, and these are interesting but convey nothing as between the races that is exactly new. They are something to be looked for and yet dreaded. It is safe to say that the same circumstances between white people of any ordinary community would scarcely have produced a personal encounter, let alone riot and blood shed. It is useless to discuss the question as to who is to blame in the matter, for on the reports as received, both and neither of the parties are responsible—both for resorting to so desperate a plan of settlement, and neither because impelled by an unseen monitor which either brings the Caucasian or African together as superior and inferior respectively, or as enemies—subtle, designing, sinister and watchful enemies.

The two races cannot long live together in peace, and since the Ethiopian is increasing in numbers in the South at a much greater rate than his white countrymen, and the latter are determined to dominate or fight, the wonder is that actual collisions are not more frequent. In this instance the dispatches announce that the end is not yet, that further trouble is ahead. There are no welcome tidings, but nothing more than might be anticipated, nothing more than what those who study the book of destiny and are informed upon the tendency of the times are looking for. To put it in the language of Shakespeare, "Thus bad begins and worse remains behind."

## "WISDOM IN GIVING."

The following reasonable suggestion are offered by the *Baltimore Sun*, under the above caption:

"The time is rapidly approaching when the question of gifts for relatives and friends will be uppermost in the minds of the people. It is a knotty question to many, chiefly because they have no settled principles to guide them. The presentation of gifts as a mere matter of custom or fashion can not, of course, be regulated by principles worthy of the name. But where gift-giving is the outcome of a generous impulse, and intended to be an expression of friendly regard, it can be freed from the restraints of artificial custom, and by consideration and forethought be made to serve its noble purpose. Everyone is limited in the amount of money which can be devoted to such purposes, and it is this limitation that is usually felt to be the chief obstacle to the gratification of one's generous impulses. But a sincere gift to a worthy recipient is not measured by its money value, but by the evidence it affords of thoughtfulness in its choice. When the family consultation is held, and the list of Christmas gifts made out, it is not unusual to have the richer offerings apportioned to those who have least need for them, leaving to poorer relatives and friends the things that seem to be more in keeping with their conditions of life. This is bad practice, and is a result of making gift-giving too much a matter of form. The needs and wishes of each recipient ought to be considered rather than the cost of the gifts themselves or their apportionment, according to the riches or poverty of the relative or friend who is to be remembered.

In a delicate way, but with the purpose of helping, the poor mother should be given something of real use to herself and her family, not a mere ornament or a thing of trifling cost, of which she has no need. On the other hand, the rich relative, who has no need for anything, should have his whims or tastes considered. If he is rightly constituted he will be more gratified by a trifle that displays thoughtful consideration of his tastes than a much more costly gift which he does not value. The first purpose of a gift is to afford gratification to a friend who is to receive it. That is of more consequence than its cost, whether great or small. If it can be made to help as well as gratify, such, for example, as the gift of a box of water colors to a young artist, it is all the better; but the essential feature must be the recognition of the tastes of the recipient, the gratification of his legitimate desires. Adopting this as the guiding principle, it may be found that the usual practice can be profitably reversed, and that instead of spending more money on rich relatives and friends than on the poor, one can do more good with the same money by reserving the more costly gifts for those who need them. There is something so delightful about thoughtful gift making from pure motives that it is a great pity any one should sacrifice such enjoyment by making it a formal matter. Gift-giving should either be spontaneous and cheerful or be omitted altogether. The sham of making presents merely in obedience to custom, without any feeling in the matter, is a practice of deception that reacts upon the giver.

## THE COLOR CONFLICT.

POLITICAL prophets are beginning to state without qualification that a war of races in the United States is inevitable. Not long since General Wm. T. Sherman, through one of the leading magazines, asserted that it would come, "as sure as there is a God in heaven." He also held that the war of the Rebellion would be an insignificant fact of history compared with it. It would be a war of extermination.

In many respects these utterances are but repetitions of what the Prophet Joseph Smith foretold nearly fifty years ago. He pointed to a time when such a conflict would arise subsequent to the war between the North and South, besides in general terms predicting a reign of lawlessness and mobocracy in the United States. The signs indicate the approach of such a chaotic time, as the current is running strongly in that direction. Of course calamity is always predicated upon the ground of the non-repentance of the people, repentance being the means by which it can be turned aside.

The recent outbreaks in Mississippi and Tennessee have revived speculations as to the probabilities of a war of races between the black and white people of the South. The general view is that such a conflict is inevitable, and that it cannot much longer be delayed. General Sherman says that if the black vote continues to be suppressed in the South, it cannot be much longer avoided, as that will tend to precipitate the terrible struggle. We think that if the black vote exceeds the white vote, then an unrestricted ballot will hasten the outbreak, for the reason that the whites will never submit to be dominated by the inferior race. What does this domination mean? Simply that black men will be the governors of States, mayors of cities, probate judges, shall sit in the legislative halls, make the laws and preside over the corporation business of cities; that the white people shall be the governed and the black the governing element of society. Such a state of things is impossible; therefore if the blacks outnumber the whites in voting power, and the votes are cast on color lines, the fires of extermination will be kindled at once. But so long as the superior race rules, whether it be by honest or fraudulent elections, a patched-up peace may be maintained between the two elements. Whenever the balance turns the other way, by any means whatever, the conflict is precipitated.

This renders the question more than usually appalling, because there appears to be no cure for it. To give the negro his legal rights would hasten what would be avoided; to deprive him of them will not prevent the struggle, because of his more rapid increase in numbers over that of the white man. It is a fact that will doubtless be interesting to the Latter-day Saints that the recent race outbreaks in the South have been in localities where mob violence has been specially directed against the Elders. The portion of Mississippi where the disturbance occurred is within a few miles of the place where Elder Richards disappeared—having in all probability been murdered—in August last, and where the brethren who were endeavoring to trace him up were mobbed. Where the Tennessee outbreak took place is about the same distance from Cane Creek—where a number of Elders and Saints were massacred by a mob on the 10th of August, 1884—as Salt Lake is from Provo.

## ARBITRARY AND DESPOTIC.

THE lower branch of the Idaho Legislature has passed a resolution prohibiting the correspondent of the *Herald* of this city from entering the legislative hall. An inhibition has also been placed upon the clerk of the house, preventing him from affording the *Herald* representative any facilities for gaining information concerning the doings of that body.

This is one of the smallest, most pusillanimous, and contemptible steps of the kind ever taken by a legislative body making any claim to self-respect. It is in line with the peremptory expulsion of members who were only elected by the votes of the people. It indicates beyond a reasonable doubt that the majority of the house of representatives of the Legislative Assembly of Idaho is comprised of persons who are out of place within the confines of a republic. They are evidently fitted by nature and education to dwell in a despotic empire such as that of the Russian Czar.

It is difficult to understand what these Idaho men "dressed in a little brief authority," and who are playing such fantastic tricks, expect to make by such a high handed proceeding. Their action in "abridging the freedom of the press" will do them more injury in the popular mind than would the publication of the legislative farces which such a body are liable to perform.

It will be in order now for a resolution to be passed for the expulsion of the *Herald* correspondent from Boise City during the present session of legislature.

A redeeming feature of this incident is the fact that the Council de-

clines to demean itself by following the suit of the house in this disgraceful proceeding; so it appears there is some dignity in the body as a whole.

## WHY THEY DID IT.

IN the face of the fact that the candidate for Lieutenant-Governor of New York received the great plurality of 22,000 and upward in the recent election, the State went for General Harrison for President by nearly 14,000 plurality. The World thereupon satisfied itself that 7000 Democrats had voted for him and determined if possible to ascertain the reasons for this change of front, by means of which President Cleveland was defeated. It thereupon addressed a letter through its own columns to the Democracy of the State, or that portion of it which went Republican, requesting from each a brief statement free from argument of the cause in each case for the individual's action. The replies were voluminous, too much so for publication, but eight columns of the *World's* issue of the 14th are devoted to them, and they are even more entertaining matter than were its replies from the governors of States concerning the purchase of votes, about a week ago. One of them is a jewel, as follows:

"You wish to know the reason why Democrats supported Harrison in preference to Cleveland.

My reason was four bright ten-dollar bills. I had rather have the money than to see Cleveland President. Now I know where my flour and coal are coming from. I have got the money to pay my bills. Yours truly, JOHN J. WHITEHALL, N. Y., Dec. 7."

The *World* proposes to have a fac simile of this letter published and will offer a handsome reward for the detection and conviction of the writer. It is a fine illustration of some men's conception of the citizen's first and most sacred franchise, truly. Making merchandise of the right of suffrage and boasting of it as though it were a meritorious action!

Here is another, containing some little information as to a disputed subject:

"As a Democrat who voted for Harrison, will say I was induced to do it by the representation that Cleveland was safe in any event, and Hill in danger. Through the intervention of a liquor dealer I and a Republican exchanged votes—he voting for Hill and I for Harrison. I don't know much about politics, but do know enough never to be uncoined that way again. I know other sap-heads who did the same thing. J. H. PURDOM, Albany, N. Y., Dec. 7."

One's reason was that the President is quite "too English, you know," and close by this is another to the effect that he had treated the English badly and Sackville brutally, and so on. It is all a curious but natural reflex of man's inner consciousness or lack of it.

## QUESTIONS ON THE SCHOOL LAW.

A GENTLEMAN of this city, over the signature of "Subscriber," writes as follows to this paper, under date of today:

As there seems to be a lack of information in the community upon many points pertaining to the school law, and as many of the districts are now holding meetings for the purpose of voting on the question of taxation for the erection of school houses, it would seem necessary that they should have a correct understanding on some points; and I therefore venture to request you to answer some of the most prominent questions likely to arise for the benefit of a great number of your subscribers.

1st. The law gives the trustees power to make an assessment each year of one-fourth of one per cent upon all the taxable property in school districts; for what purposes, and for what only, can this tax be used legitimately?

2. Can persons who have bought property in the district since the last assessment was made, and are now residing on it, be considered property taxpayers, and entitled to vote at a school meeting?

3. Who are entitled to vote at a meeting called by the school trustees upon a question of taxation to build school houses? The law says "resident property taxpayers." Does this refer particularly to the names as found on the assessment roll, or can it be construed to take in other members of a man's family, because they may own personal property in their own right and still not be taxed for it? Attempts have been made in the past to have this construction placed upon the meaning of the law; and hence it would confer a great favor if you would kindly consent to answer these questions.

4. Section 1915 of the Compiled Laws, 1888, which is section 4 of the school law, provides:

"Whenever it shall be necessary to raise funds to purchase, build, repair or furnish school houses, or for other school purposes, an estimate of the approximate cost thereof shall be made by the trustees, and the rate per cent may be fixed at any sum not exceeding two per cent per annum, as shall

be decided by a majority vote of the property taxpayers resident in the district, present at a meeting called for that purpose, to be assessed and collected as a special tax upon all the taxable property in the district."

Here follow provisions for graded schools, and respecting the challenge of votes, and the section closes with this proviso:

"Provided, The trustees shall have power to assess and collect annually a tax of one fourth of one per cent on all taxable property in the district without calling a meeting for that purpose."

The inference seems to us unavoidable that the fund arising from the one fourth of one per cent tax, which the trustees may levy at their own option, is designed to be used for any and all purposes which a fund might be which resulted from a tax voted by a school meeting. It may be used for any school purpose. A tax exceeding one fourth of one per cent can be levied only by the consent of a school meeting; but a tax not exceeding that rate may be levied by the trustees. There is a difference in the authority by which the taxes are levied, but no difference in the purposes to which the funds arising therefrom are to be devoted.

2. Yes. The owner of property in a district, who resides in that district, and who will have to pay the tax if one is decided upon, has a right to vote on the question of taxation. His liability to pay the tax is the essence of his right to vote upon the question whether it shall be levied or not.

3. Any person in the district who owns property liable to be taxed for school purposes, has a right to vote on the question of a tax. The fact that he has not hitherto paid a tax for any purpose does not affect this right. He may have just come into the district; or have just attained his majority; or have just come into possession of taxable property for the first time; yet he has the right to vote at a school meeting. In one sense it is the property in the district, not the people, which decides the question of the tax; and the property which must bear the burden of the tax is represented in the school meeting by its owners, be they male or female, citizens or aliens, new comers or old residents.

To say that the name of a given person must appear on the county tax roll before he can vote at a school meeting, is to say that he must pay a county and territorial tax before he can vote on the question of a school tax. What relation is there between a burden he has borne in the past respecting the county and Territory, and a burden he is liable to be called upon to bear respecting the school district? Is it just or philosophical to say that he must bear the first burden before being permitted to have a voice in consenting or objecting to the latter?

The section of the law above quoted contains the following provision:

"In case of a challenge of the right of any person to vote on said tax, the oath of said person as to qualification, his tax receipt for the past year, or a copy of the tax list showing that said person owns taxable property in the district, shall be received as evidence of such right to vote."

The phrase we have given in italic means, as we understand it, that any person who swears that he resides in the district and owns property therein which is liable to bear a portion of the burden of the tax proposed, is entitled to vote on that proposition. The protection of the community lies in the fact that, should he swear falsely, he may be prosecuted for perjury.

In conclusion, we repeat that, as we understand the spirit, genius and provisions of the school law, it contemplates that those who will have to bear the burden if it shall be laid on are the ones to decide whether it shall be laid on or not; and every prospective shareholder therein is entitled to a vote on the question.

## THE ACTORS' PROTEST.

Now it is the actors who are "kicking" against foreign importations and demanding protection—not incidental or horizontal or any such contrivance—but absolute and prohibitory. They want the contract labor law so amended that foreign actors will be embraced in its provisions, and not be permitted thereafter to overcrowd the business here, thus reducing salaries and making the occupation a hand-to-mouth struggle for an existence. The claim of the American actors is that their foreign brethren are accustomed to cheaper methods and poorer living, and that unscrupulous managers bring them on here for that reason; so the complaint is virtually that our histrions are being ruined by cheap English acting. This is novel, and may contain the elements of truth; but it sounds at first somewhat absurd. All for nearly all, the English actors that have gravitated this way have seemed to us rather high-priced, and in point of artistic merit they have generally been equal to the average. It is a decidedly new thing for one of the professions to complain of accessions, the rule being that among them the fittest survive.

We believe it was Rufus Choate who, when he announced to a friend that he intended to become a lawyer, and was

asked if he didn't think the ranks of the law were already overcrowded, replied: "There is always plenty of room at the top." And he went to the top. Let the actors do likewise, and not count on remaining forever in the ranks; then they will fare better and so will the theatre-going public.

## ANOTHER WOMAN SENT TO PRISON.

JUDGE BOREMAN has been guilty of another of those judicial excesses that are in our view among the most detestable features of a semi-religious crusade waged against an unpopular people. He has sent another woman to the penitentiary for contempt of court. In our view the act is so contemptible that if he had the power and were to exercise it to imprison all the people of Utah who learn the facts of this incident, and who do not hold him in high estimation as an excellent type of judgeship or manhood, the Salt Lake Valley would have to be roofed over to hold them. We are pleased to be able to make reference to the fact that Judge Zane, although possessing pronounced anti-Mormon proclivities, declined to do the very thing that has been done by Jacob S. Boreman, regarding whom it has been strongly believed that he is more of a Methodist exhorter than a fair-minded and impartial judge. It is also believed that he carries his religious antipathies on to the bench with him.

It will be observed by the nature of the questions which the witness declined to answer, that if replied to in the affirmative they would tend to criminate herself. That was the groundwork of her refusal, and if the law affords protection to witnesses it is in that particular direction, but the judge in this instance declined to throw that shield around the victim. The fact that he stated that he did not think the evidence would be used against her in a criminal prosecution was not sufficient. She was under indictment and the influence of her self-criminating testimony was almost sure to follow her to the trial and prove detrimental to her, and any compulsory process should she be under the necessity of testifying to her own injury. Besides the principle of self-crimination involved, it is a universally recognized rule of law that no witness should be compelled to testify in a way to render himself infamous.

As the climax of cruelty, Judge Boreman did not dismiss the grand jury by whom the questions were formulated, and who required the answers. That body expected to be dismissed, but they were held by the associate justice, and informed that they would not be dissolved before March 20, and might be called together previous to that date. It is notoriously understood that the reason for this action was either to bring the witness to terms or hold her in prison for as long a period as practicable. Of course had the jury been dismissed there would have been no body in existence to which the unfortunate lady could answer, and her dismissal would have been a matter of course. It is believed that had Mr. Boreman been more of a man than a "Mormon"-eating fanatic, he would have been pleased at having a clear opportunity to set the woman at liberty. It appears, however, that the opportunity to act contrary to magnanimity and common humanity was much sweeter to a seemingly warped and merciless soul like his.

## A Palace of Salt.

The people of Salt Lake City are contemplating the erection of a great "salt palace." It would be a structure that would lay in the shade all the ice and corn palaces ever constructed. The main part of the structure could be of the finest specimens of rock salt to be found in the quarries, uncolored, carved and artistically arranged, while the interior fittings should be of crystallized work from the lake on a grand scale. Such a palace should be permanent. If properly protected from the winter rains it could be made of the most unique and striking style of architecture; it could be made one of the wonders of the world. When lighted by electricity the structure would have all of the sparkle and diamond glitter of the great ice palaces, and with the difference in the salt palace's favor that heat would not melt or dim its glories in the least.—*Fire and Water.*

USE REDDING'S RUSSIA SALVE FOR BLISTERS, CUTS, BRUISES, FELONS, INSECT BITES. PRICE 25 CENTS.