

spectively, should be determined, within certain limits fixed by law, upon a principle of local option. Upon this plan such counties and school districts as desire may have free schools, while such as prefer to have a portion of the cost of a child's education paid in the form of a tuition fee, may adopt that plan. This is the truly democratic theory.

The statement that "if any county is wealthier than its neighbors it is because other counties have contributed to its wealth, and therefore that it should justly bear its share of the public burden" is fallacious and misleading as here used. The fact is, much of the wealth found in the poorer counties has been contributed by the richer ones, by migration and overflow; and the claim of those poorer counties upon the richer ones for sufficient means to defray the greater part of the cost of schools in the former, does not appear to us to be founded in justice. Why not ask the richer counties to pay most of the expense for roads, bridges, prosecuting criminals, etc., in the poorer ones?

A three mill Territorial tax will probably pay about one half the cost of maintaining district schools in most of the outlying counties. This is giving a great deal to them from the wealthier ones, and the other half of the burden should be borne locally. It is, we believe, a fact that there are fewer families proportionately in the outlying counties who are really poor than in the wealthier ones. The population of the former almost universally own the homes they occupy and have constant employment by which they earn a livelihood. For the richer counties to be taxed to give them free schools is not equitable, and will appear still less so when it is remembered that when the rich counties pay a tax high enough to provide free schools in the poorer ones, they are themselves without free schools. The reason for this is that it costs a great deal more in the richer counties to maintain schools than it does in the poorer ones.

The illustration of a man having no children who pays \$25 to support a school, while the man who has several children pays but \$10, does not meet the point. The NEWS was not objecting to a condition which exists, but was objecting to a doubling process under which the first would have to pay \$50 and the other \$20. The State building illustration is also fallacious. That

structure when built will belong to the Territory as a whole, and each county will share and share alike, proportionately, in its use. It will not add to the wealth of this city nor this county, for it will not be taxable. The NEWS is willing that Salt Lake County should contribute towards the support of schools in poorer counties, but not beyond a certain limit. To tax this county to a degree which would give the poorer counties free schools, while it went without them, would be passing that limit.

The statement that "If the argument of the NEWS means anything, it means that the support of free schools by taxation is illegal," is misleading. It depends upon the manner in which the revenue is raised. If the method is one which flagrantly discriminates in the division of burdens and benefits, it would be illegal. But if the burdens and benefits were equitably adjusted, it would not be. Free schools might lawfully be maintained by a Territorial, county and district tax combined, justly and reasonably proportioned. But the legality of a Territorial tax which would be sufficient to maintain free schools in most of the counties, but insufficient to accomplish that result in the counties bearing the greatest proportion of the burden, would be open to serious question. For this reason we believe a Territorial tax of six mills would be unlawful.

#### LANDS IN COLORADO.

THE following "relating to lands in Colorado," passed the Senate on February 4th, as appears in the Congressional Record of the same day:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That actual and bona fide settlers on lands subject to pre-emption under existing laws within the late Uncompahgre and White River Ute Indian reservation, in Colorado, who have previously and elsewhere taken land under the pre-emption laws, may make entry of one quarter section of land within said reservation by paying therefor \$1.25 per acre, at any time after a bona fide residence on said land of two years, and within thirty-three months after filing declaratory statement therefor. Proof of actual residence and improvement of the land for not less than two years shall be made to the satisfaction of the register and the receiver, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

#### MONUMENT TO LAFAYETTE.

It is publicly announced at Paris that the monument to Lafayette, ordered some two years since by the United States Secretary of War to be executed by the French sculp-

tors A. Mercie and A. Falguiere, is now finished and will be sent to the United States as soon as it shall be accepted by Mr. Whitelaw Reid, U. S. Minister to France.

The monument includes the statue of Lafayette of grand dimensions, surrounded by the four principal French officers that took part in the war of American Independence; Admirals d'Estaing and de Grasse representing the navy, and the Generals de Rochambeau and Duportail the army. The pedestal is in marble and the figures are bronze.

#### THE AUSTRALASIAN MISSION.

The semi-annual conference of the Australasian Mission was held at Rakamangamanga, Waikato District, on January 10th, 11th and 12th.

At the general annual conference held in Hawkes Bay District last April it was thought advisable to hereafter hold two conferences during the year in order to give those who live at the extreme ends of the island an opportunity of attending these meetings, which otherwise would be impracticable, as the distance to be traveled would bring unnecessary hardships both to the Elders and the Saints in general. Accordingly it was decided to have general semi-annual meetings, one to be held in the southern and one in the northern part of the island, at such places as would be most convenient to the greatest number of Saints. It was therefore agreed by the natives, in whose hands the selection of the next place for meeting had been left, that Rakamangamanga, Waikato District, would be a suitable place for such conference.

Rakamangamanga is a pleasant little village, situated on the bank of the Waikato river, and on Jan. 7 the Saints began to come in from the surrounding districts. Several Elders also arrived on this date, and the balance on the afternoon of the 9th. All were received kindly by the natives and Brothers John S. Bingham and Charles Johnson.

The morning of January 10th dawned upon us with the freshness of climate peculiar to this region and at ten o'clock, in answer to the peals of our little bell, we assembled under the roof of a large rush house to worship God. There were present Angus T. Wright president of the mission, John S. Bingham, Ezra T. Stevenson, Orson D. Romney, Charles A. Johnson, Thos. C. Young, Boyd Stewart, George W. Davis, Jas. S. Nye, Ephraim Johnson, John H. Timpson, Heber S. Cutler, and Thos. C. Stanford, Milton Bennion, Oliver C. Dunford and wife, late from Utah, also about 200 natives and several European strangers.

The meeting was called to order by Brother John S. Bingham. After singing and prayer the assemblage was addressed by President Wright, who expressed his pleasure at meeting with the native Saints,