

March came into effect, and which created the city school board, that authorizes the payment of the taxes collected to the city treasurer; the city school board is not entitled to the custody of these funds, and has no authority to appropriate these funds to the various schools in the city.

There seems to be no difficulty upon that point; the law is quite clear that the taxes were to be collected as the old law provided, and if the new law is a valid one, then the right of the new school board to the control of these funds is clear.

It is true there seems to be some injustice in this; two of the school districts levied no tax at all; others levied a tax not exceeding one quarter of one per cent, and some a still higher one; the assessment was made under a law according to which the assessment was uniform and equal in the districts in which the assessment was made, and if the funds under the new law are appropriated for school purposes, there is no doubt in my mind but what the proper custodian of these funds now is the city treasurer.

The injustice will result probably in the appropriation of the funds; of course, if the funds collected for each district were appropriated for the benefit of the school in that district as it existed, appropriated for the benefit of the schools inside and within the limits of the old district, and for the benefit of the school district in which the taxpayers resided, there would be no injustice, but the injustice may result from the fact that they may not get the benefit of all of the taxes assessed and collected from them.

I am of the opinion that this question can not be reached here. The question is whether it should be paid to the city treasurer, and he is now the only lawful custodian of these funds. If they are wrongfully appropriated by him then the question will come up. But the school board is a public corporation; the whole of the trustees constitute an agency made use of by the public for the public good, to look after one class of the interests of the public, to furnish the people with schools; and it is an agency consisting of school trustees elected from the entire city; they are elected from the different districts, but when organized as a board they represent the entire city.

It seems to be necessary that the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to such subjects as this, that is, the subject of establishing and changing these municipal and school districts; and they should make such changes as the good of the people demands, as the population increases. But while this will work an injustice in some instances, still the power exists in the legislative department to make the changes, and, without considering this matter further, I am of the opinion that the writ should issue.

In the Third District Court Saturday, October 25th, Elias Kohn, a native of Russia, was admitted to citizenship.

UNCHRISTIAN RELIGIONISTS.

Editor Deseret News:

I have read with much interest Mr. Shearman's letter in the News of the 16th inst. One passage in it suggests a few words from my point of view. Mr. Shearman says:

"The performance of plural marriages has been abrogated. Are you [the opponents of the Mormons] any more satisfied than before? No. The cry is that this concession should have been made by actual revelation from God commanding its abolition. This is sheer hypocrisy. Had it been so announced you would have gloated over it as another instance of the hardness and blasphemy of the Mormon leaders."

Never was truer word written. The anti-Mormon press would indeed have "gloated" over a "revelation." But look at the inconsistency of the Christian (?) people who condemn the Mormons on account of their practice of polygamy, given up long ago and officially discarded now in obedience to national law. Those people who denounce Mormons on account of polygamy accept the Bible as the infallible word and will of God. But the Bible aids, encourages, teaches polygamy. Polygamy is therefore God's will. Those people are, consequently, demanding that God shall give a revelation at variance with His own will, which these very malcontents have accepted as their rule of faith and practice and the condition of their salvation from eternal woe.

If they could suppress their hatred long enough to look the matter squarely in the face they would see that they should transfer their fight from the Mormons to God and make Him the object of their wrath. If God is the author of the Bible, as those people claim, then God is the author of Polygamy; and if it is true that salvation depends upon the acceptance of the Bible as God's will, as those people claim with the Mormons, then this whole quarrel with the Mormons on account of polygamy has been wrong. Instead of passing laws against the Mormons, Congress should have enacted laws against God; should have declared Him the offender and criminal; should have proceeded to send some little deputy to arrest Him, hale Him to court, fine Him and lock Him up in the penitentiary! To punish those who have become law-breakers by obeying His will, when the condemnors and the condemned both accept that will as "supreme," is not only bad law, but the grossest kind of injustice.

In this fight against the Mormon people, popular Christianity has put itself on trial and, by its own conduct, it has proved itself a sham and fraud. It must either throw away its Bible or recede from its position on the Mormon question, all through. So long as they keep the Bible as the infallible word and will of God, Christians but demonstrate their hypocrisy in denouncing the Mormons. I commend this cup to their lips and assure them that, from their own standpoint, they must drink it, because if the Bible be the

will of God they cannot escape. This is a reason, in addition to those cited by Mr. Shearman, why the unholy strife should cease. Congress should either punish God and destroy the Bible or leave all people free to follow its teachings according to the dictates of conscience. Congress should either suppress all churches or leave all free. But now that the Mormon people have chosen to forego their practice of one part of God's will, in deference to public opinion, if that public opinion were honest it would greet the act with hearty good will and blush to carry its hatred longer upon its lips or in its heart.

CHARLES ELLIS.

SETTING OF CRIMINAL CASES.

The following setting of criminal cases was made in the Third District Court on Monday, October 20th:

NOVEMBER 24.

The People vs. Francis Armstrong et al., conspiracy.

The People vs. Wolf Goldberg and Harry Friedman, false pretenses.

The People vs. Nunday and Doel, grand larceny.

NOVEMBER 25.

United States vs. N. V. Jones, adultery.

United States vs. J. W. Wallace, adultery.

United States vs. Mary Dundas, adultery.

NOVEMBER 26.

United States vs. J. M. Krough, adultery and unlawful cohabitation.

United States vs. J. W. Snell, unlawful cohabitation.

United States vs. Nathan Hansen, unlawful cohabitation.

NOVEMBER 28.

United States vs. Lee Oweley, perjury.

United States vs. J. F. Free, perjury.

United States vs. Alex Toponce, perjury.

United States vs. Paul Hammer, unlawful cohabitation.

DECEMBER 1.

The People vs. John J. Stocking, perjury.

The People vs. Joseph Curtis, perjury.

The People vs. G. D. Schell, grand larceny.

The People vs. Henry Hoffheimer, abduction.

DECEMBER 2.

The People vs. Barbara Kuntz and Sebastian Kuntz.

The People vs. L. M. Lovendahl, appeal.

The People vs. William Maxfield, grand larceny.

The People vs. Yates and Berry, robbery.

DECEMBER 3.

The People vs. John Cavanaugh, grand larceny.

The People vs. George Stringham, appeal.

The People vs. Amanda Olson, murder.

The People vs. Albert Kern, burglary.

DECEMBER 4.

The People vs. Walter Walker, attempt to rape.

The People vs. Jonathan Matsby, appeal.

The People vs. John Flynn, grand larceny.

DECEMBER 5.

The People vs. W. J. Moss, murder.

The People vs. Robert Hoge, assault.

The People vs. Morris and Francis, appeal.

The Chinese bury their dead in the fairest spots of the land. They are extraordinarily devoted to the dead, and the labor contract of every coolie emigrant especially stipulates that in case of death his body shall be carried back to China, that his dust may mingle with that of his forefathers and join their spirits in the flowery kingdom. Otherwise he believes that his soul will wander amid strangers unknown and astray.—*Es.*