

under the influence of intoxicating drink, he drew his revolver and shot the object of his wrath.

The law provides that an act committed by a person while intoxicated is no less criminal on that account. But it also provides that when a motive, purpose or intent is a necessary element in the case, the fact of the defendant's intoxication may be considered in determining as to that motive or intent. This was doubtless done in the Dillon case, and aided the jury in arriving at their verdict.

The case was most ably conducted on either side, and gave evidence that in criminal law Utah is abreast of other parts of the country so far as the matter of talented advocates is concerned. The trial was prosecuted, impartially reviewed by the judge and watched with great interest by the public. And while it may seem that a severer penalty was demanded considering the effects of the crime, all things considered the verdict appears conformable to the statute.

This case makes a good temperance lecture. If Dillon had been a sober man he would not, in all probability, have committed this fatal act and stained his soul with the blood of a fellow creature. If he has the ordinary feelings and conscience of civilized humanity, this crime will always weigh upon his mind and be a source of grief and opprobrium. We say nothing of the business which his victim followed but that if he had been better employed he might now have been living in honor. It will be a glad day for the world when the hell-fire that inflames men's passions and brings about so much ruin and distress, will be quenched entirely by the floods of reason and intelligence which will some time surely spread over all the earth.

NOT MUCH OF A REFORM.

We have been requested by the New York Tax Reform Association to publish their platform, which is as annexed:

"1. The most direct taxation is the best, because it gives to the real payers of taxes a conscious and direct pecuniary interest in honest and economical government.

"2. Mortgages and capital engaged in production or trade should be exempt from taxation; because taxes on such capital tend to drive it away, to put a premium on dishonesty and to discourage industry.

"3. Real estate should bear the main burden of taxation, because such taxes can be most easily, cheaply and certainly collected, and because they bear least heavily on the farmer and the worker.

"4. Our present system of levying and collecting State and municipal taxes is extremely bad, and spasmodic and un-

reflecting tinkering with it is unlikely to result in substantial improvement.

"5. No legislature will venture to enact a good system of local taxation until the people, especially the farmers, perceive the correct principles of taxation and see the folly of taxing personal property.

"Therefore, we desire to unite our efforts, in such ways as may seem advisable, to keep up intelligent discussion and agitation of the subject of taxation, with a view to improvement in the system and enlightenment as to the correct principles."

There are no doubt many arguments that may be urged in favor of this platform, which is in principle somewhat similar to the Henry George theory, though not so radical and revolutionary. But we do not think the owners of land in the United States will consent to its adoption. It is evidently prepared in the interest of the bond-holders, stock-owners and capitalists. Why men who have accumulated or inherited fortunes not invested in real estate should escape taxation, we fail to understand. They should contribute their quota to the expenses of government, it seems to us, just the same as the land owner. That the capitalist should be exempt, and the farmer and house-owner be mulcted, justice does not approve. There are no doubt many reforms needed in the general methods of taxation, but we do not believe they would be greatly improved by the plan proposed. Let capital do its part in the payment of public expenses.

A GRAVE PUBLIC DANGER.

AN extensive scheme has been quietly set on foot which concerns all the people of this Territory. Chiefly it will affect the farming community. Very largely it will have a restrictive influence upon a number of prominent business men. Incidentally it will have a bearing upon Utah's entire population.

The project is this: A shrewd speculator, who has figured in some other local matters of finance, has entered into an arrangement with a number of the leading mill owners of Northern Utah, to obtain possession of all the grist mills, with a view to controlling the grain and flour market.

Papers have been drawn up in which the mill owner bonds himself, in a heavy sum, to execute a deed conveying his mill property to the speculator, six months from date at a price agreed upon. If the speculator sells the property to a syndicate which he represents, he is to receive five per cent. of the purchase price. If not, he is to pay the owner five per cent. and hold the option for six months longer.

During the time previous to the actual purchase the owner is to retain pos-

session of the property and continue his business as before. But when the conveyance is made, he binds himself not to engage, either directly or indirectly, in any flour-milling business in Utah, Idaho or Wyoming for a period of five years. He may take some stock, however, in the company or companies that operate the mills bought in by the syndicate or the speculator representing it.

We understand that several of our mill owners have signed the bond pledging themselves to this arrangement. Others have either given their word to do so, or have considered the matter favorably, while a few have held out, so far, but are threatened with the freeze-out process if they do not come into the combination.

The probable consequences of such a far-reaching project are not difficult to perceive. If the principal flour mills of the north, with their valuable water powers, pass into the possession of outside capitalists, organized to control the business, the mills in the south will be left to do but custom business—which does not pay alone—and cannot compete with the powerful company backed by English money at a low rate of interest, and will either have to come into the pool or very soon go out of the business.

Then the mill-owners who have parted with their property cannot engage in the flour mill business nor advance their money for that purpose, nor become interested in it in either Utah or Idaho or Wyoming for five years. This will practically give a monopoly of the flour trade to the syndicate, and the profits of the business will go where the capital comes from.

This means also that for breadstuffs, the people of Utah will be largely dependent upon this combination of foreign capitalists. True, some of our mill owners may take stock in the company, but of course they will not be permitted to own a controlling interest.

Will not the price of wheat and of flour be thus largely regulated by this syndicate? And will not this affect first the agriculturist—the producer, and next the purchaser of flour—the consumer? If so, the whole community will be affected and may be materially injured. This is, therefore, a matter that requires serious consideration.

We do not know whether it has gone so far as to place it beyond recall, or so as to make it necessary for those who have not yet signed the bonds to engage in this sell-out to strangers. But there should be grave reflection before this scheme is consummated. If disaster shall come