DESERET EVENING NEWS.

DESERET NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY, LESSEES.

Monday, March 5, 1894

The DESERET EVENING NEWS is published every evening (except Sunday) at Salt Lake City, Utah.

TERMS: Regular Edition

The DESERET EVENING NEWS may be obtained on Monday and Friday of each week.

The DESERET WEEKLY is issued every Thursday.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily 1 Month	$0.85
Daily 3 Months	2.50
Daily 6 Months	4.75
Daily 1 Year	9.00
Daily to the Weekly	1.00
Semi-Weekly 1 Month	1.00
Semi-Weekly 3 Months	2.50
Semi-Weekly 6 Months	4.50
Semi-Weekly 1 Year	8.00
Weekly 3 Months	1.00
Weekly 6 Months	1.75
Weekly 1 Year	3.00

Payment to be invariably in advance.

The DESERET NEWS will be found on file at the office of Messrs. N. W. Ayer & Son, Newspaper Advertising Agents, Times Building, Chicago, and Tribune Building, New York, where contracts for advertising can be made.

The NEWS may be found on file at the principal Eastern News Stands and at all important hotels during the time after it goes to press.

All communications should be addressed to DESERET EVENING NEWS PUBLISHING CO., Salt Lake City, Utah.

SETTLE THIS MATTER!

There seems small reason to expect that the University of Utah will receive at the hands of the present Legislature any more than $40,000 for the next biennial appropriation. Members who cannot be accused of inability to advocate education at state expense argue that the resources of the Territory render necessary the reduction of all estimates about fifty per cent, and that the University must contrive to endure a like scaling down. When it is understood that at the conclusion of its present school year the University will owe $28,000, and that for the ensuing two years its net income from the territorial treasury would be but $12,000, the gravity of the case will be apparent. That sum is so ridiculously inadequate to its needs, that all hope of its continuance would seem to be futile—$12,000 would scarcely suffice for one department of it.

The NEWS cannot resist the opportunity to allude again, in this view of the case, to the matter of consolidation of the University and Agricultural College, which this paper was the first to advocate, and which we have ever staunchly supported. Every member of the Legislature, we believe, has become convinced that that idea is sustained by experience, economy, public welfare and common sense. We have yet to hear of one who will argue that separate maintenance is preferable on either of the grounds stated, or on the ground of educational advancement. Having contributed something toward securing unanimity of view on that all-important point, we have been content to cease further agitation of the subject. Least of all have we felt inclined to enter the controversy as to the place where the combined institution should be. It was enough for us to believe that the wisdom of uniting the two colleges had been demonstrated and accepted. We deemed it no part of our duty to take part in the sectional quarrel over the secondary matter of location. What has been said in these columns on this part of the question may be here earnestly repeated: If Salt Lake is the better place, combine with at Salt Lake; if Logan is the better place and offers superior inducements and advantages, combine both at Logan; but combine at any rate—somewhere.

The present aspect of the case is this: Territorial appropriations may probably be granted for the University, $40,000; for the Agricultural College, $15,000; total, $55,000. The latter institution is understood to have $16,000 on hand, and it will receive from Congress around $21,000. This makes a grand total of $147,000 for the two institutions—or, deducting the debt of the University, a net fund of $119,000. Now, in this there is nothing to warrant any extravagance in one institution if the two were merged into one, but it would suffice to keep the one running. If divided between two on the lines above indicated, it would compel one to starve to death while keeping the other tolerably hungry. The question accordingly resolves itself into this shape: There must be consolidation, or the state University must suspend. There is no evading that conclusion, solemn as it may be; and it is for legislators, having been made to agree with it, cannot now be made to grapple with it, they are either unworthy the confidence that has been reposed in them, or their convictions have been forced upon and swallowed up in their courage.

Again we urge, therefore, that consolidation be the watchword and the program. But at which point? Why, at Logan rather than not at all. At Logan anyway, if that is the better place? Surely no friend of education would prefer to see the University of one altogether than to see it survive in Logan. The NEWS has no such sentiment. The leading Territorial institution of learning must not suspend. If it is necessary to its continuance that it be removed from the capital, by all means let the removal take place. The Territory will still have it anyway, and whatever brings benefit and adds credit to the Territory brings benefit and adds credit to every part of it.

In the hope that the Legislature will act decisively and promptly in this grave matter, we echo the liberty of presenting once more the argument to be considered. If the College should be moved to Salt Lake, where, with the chief state building visible through that school going to ruins, there would doubtless be room enough, at least for the present, for both University and College, the latter would lose its nightly and splendid lamp and lodestone at Logan. If the University should move to Logan, where, with the expenditure of a comparatively small amount, accommodations could be made for both College and University, the latter would cede its valuable grounds and buildings in Salt Lake. In either case the property would revert to the city. As to which property—that in Logan, or that in Salt Lake—is the more valuable, we shall offer no opinion. An election to one or the other would probably complete all that is necessary for us to say on the subject. Logan has promised, we understand, that if the consolidation be effected at Logan, an absolute and unencumbered title to the property will be given the Territory—there being no agreement even that the institution must permanently stay there. Salt Lake has not yet been equally generous—though one perhaps would be in the matter were urged.

The NEWS gives this much space to the discussion of a well worn subject because of a conviction that the people of the Territory want the matter settled. They do not want any needless expenditure of their money, they do not want any more duplication of higher educational work, or the squandering of any more money through the influence of energies that always ought to have been concentrated. Moreover, they want every dollar that shall be appropriated to yield the greatest possible returns. Retrenchment is the motto of the hour, but retrenchment without enrichment may be suicidal. Economy and retrenchment both counsel that in this matter of advanced learning, there be harmony, consolidation, concentration. So say it we!

THE TEMPLE LOT SUIT.

The following additional pleadings in the decision of Judge Phillips of Kansas City, Missouri, regarding the Independence Temple lot suit, were received here on Saturday, March 3, but too late for publication in that day's issue:

In Judge Phillips' decision there, he states and cites papers are quoted to show that the Church of Christ (Temple lot) wanted rights and forced Church and the owner of the Temple lot. After the sitting of Smith at Gallipolis, O., in June, 1831, distinctions set in, and the Church split into factions. The new Church, above Joseph Smith, was established in Kirtland, O., another branch went with Brigham Young, and a third, the Hedrickites, remained a independent.

Incidentally to the decision Judge Phillips unconvincingly stated the Case Counsel, Herrick: "Among the queries of the Church, representing the Apostles, was Brigham Young, a man of excellent executive power and aggressive, if not autocratic. He had the greater portion of the Mormons to Salt Lake. From the middle-West sprang a powerful body known as the Salt Lake, or Utah, Church.

"There can be no question that Brigham Young's assumption of the presidency was a bold one. Smith, the Book of Doctrine gave Joseph Smith to be president of the Church. The book taught clearly that the succession should descend lineally, and gave the first born. Joseph Smith so taught, and before his taking off, publicly proclaimed it as his testament, and he was so understood. Young succeeded to the office on a point of departure from the law of the Church. The Book of Mormon pronounced the second sentiment against the cause of polygamy."

The Saints in these villages have naturally taken some interest in the legal proceedings regarding the ownership of that piece of property, on account of its connection with early Church history, and they will be somewhat surprised, because the bulk of the evidence of legal possession seemed to be on the other side, that the judge should give the property to the "Josephites," holding that title organization, according to certain "deeds, records and other papers," are entitled thereto.

But the judicial pronouncements been confined to this point, however, no further commentary on our part would have been called for. But the judge has gone out of his way to decide a question not understood to be at issue, and clearly not within his jurisdiction. What reference to the case at bar have the declarations against Brigham Young and the Saints in Utah? The question was simply as to the legal ownership of the piece of property known as the Temple lot. The Hedrickites claimed it by virtue of purchase and continued possession; and the "Josephites" as the successors of the original Church. This, at least, is the general understanding of the case. It would seem that the position of the former is the only one that had any claim to judicial recognition. If they could prove that they had legally bought the property, and had held it, it was theirs legally, whatever their views might be in the good county of religious denominations. At all events the position of the Church in these valleys was not before the court. And we need hardly say that the Saints are not in the habit of taking up and working the opinions of courts—local or any Missouri courts—as to the divinity of our principles and the authority with and preparation of the Church founded in 1830 by the champion Prophet.

Fortunately there are other means of ascertaining facts. The Saints have more than sufficient to stand on. Anyone who will read with impartiality the revelations on the subject — which Judge Phillips evidently has not and—or listen to the testimony of those who were once the intimate friends and associates of the martyred Prophet—which Judge Phillips evidently has not also denied himself—will find that the course of Brigham Young and the leaders named that followed was warranted and guided by God Almighty. The question of succession is an affair that not Joseph Smith alone did not run with any one else, but even with the revelations himself, as the Missouri judge seems to think. In the first instance it rests with God. He knows and and inspire and direct one and quality them for that high office. All ought to, but cannot and respect, prove this. And in the end the prophecy of one man, more called of God, pass with the people. The Church of God is not overturned but then consecrated. On both these principles Brigham Young was the successor of Joseph the Prophet. He was called of God, through Joseph himself, being the president of the Twelve and ordained by the Almighty throughout a most remarkable course. The power from on high rested on him to all his work, as it has rested on Joseph. The mantle of the first Prophet fell upon him as surely as the mantle of Elijah descended upon Elisha and Joseph, who was accepted by the great majority of the people, who had a testimony in their hearts that he was a Prophet of God.

In the face of these facts, the statement that Joseph had appointed a successor, unknown to the people, partakes of the element of absurdity. No one knew, better than Joseph that any appointment to office in the Church of God is to be sustained by the people. Rather, the claim itself was not put forth until some fifteen or twenty years after the martyrdom. (See what Judge Phillips says in the claim?)

The Saints in this regard look Temple lot in Independence, as they regard in a correct sense "the earth and the fulness thereof," as the Lord's, to be disposed of as He in His prudence may dictate. Certain persons apply particularly to that sacred spot, and they will all be finished in the Lord's own due time. For His plans and purposes are never known to have failed. There is no fear that the Church will submit to any legal mumbo-jumbo on the subject with the "Josephites" or any others. It has kept out of it hitherto, and probably will continue to do so. But when the time comes for the building of Zion and the Temple in Jackson County, the Latter-day Saints will be ready to perform the glorious work and the Lord will open the way.

EXIT GLADSTONE, ENTER LORD ROSEBERY.

With the resignation of Mr. Gladstone as the premier of the British government, one of the most remarkable men of this age passes to the back of the political stages of Europe. As his decision is more calmly considered, it becomes evident that there were reasons for it not yet known to the public. His last speech to the commons, in which he so vigorously defended the policy of the government, but even his ministers were amazed and troubled, gave no evidence of that growing infirmity, bodily or mental, which was supposed to be the real cause. Rather, the old warrior, in sounding his sword, did it in such a manner as plainly to indicate that he was still in the fight and that a change of tactics was necessary for the insurance of a more speedy victory. His farewell was a call to his party to rally and to direct a tremendous attack against the house of lords.

Archibald Philip Primrose, earl of Rosebery, the successor of Mr. Gladstone, although but 37 years old, has already had twenty-one years' experience in public life. He was born in 1847 and succeeded to the title and estates at the 5th earl of Rosebery in 1868. Since 1871 he has been active in the public constituency. In 1886 with Gladstone's return to power he became chief of the foreign office and during the last term of Gladstone's premiership he was minister of foreign affairs. In 1878 he married a daughter of Baron Rothschild, an event that brought him much wealth and some unpopularity, but on the whole he has succeeded in retaining the esteem of his own class and the confidence of the working classes, a fact which makes him one of the most influential men in the kingdom.

The new premier is said to possess a remarkable capacity for hard work. No amount of drudgery appals him, it merely he was anxious his state of knowledge of public affairs. With presiding over the London council for twelve months he attended 1,000 parish vestry meetings, 260 regular meetings of committees and at many industrial meetings, or nearly two meetings every day, and his hospital has attained a high degree of perfection. As a minister he is considered a brilliant orator. The following is quoted from a speech in the Hyde Park Corner, illustrating his power of humor and skill as a debater:

"In a recent speech at one of the Conservative clubs, Mr. Balfour said, 'If we could only know the exact strength in the world behind us we should be in a position to decide what we should do.' Whereupon a member of the opposing party rejoined, 'Take the strength of the Conservative party, take the strength of the Liberal party, take the strength of the Liberal Unionist party, and you will find the strength of the Conservative party is the strongest.' Upon which one of the Conservatives rejoined, 'Yes, we have the strength of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule majority.' Upon which the Liberal Unionist rejoined, 'Yes, we have the strength of the Conservative party.' Upon which the Conservative rejoined, 'Yes, we have the strength of the Liberal party.' Upon which the Liberal rejoined, 'Yes, we have the strength of the Liberal Unionist party