

interests have been in great measure in the hands of the railway managers; and this has never been more the case than at present. This is realized when we are reminded that if Utah could reach an outside market with her agricultural and industrial products without having to pay enormous tribute in the way of freights, matters might be very much improved here. In this respect it is common knowledge that the welfare of Utah has not been very dear to the railway heart; but that the policy has been to keep the people here in a state of business serfdom. For instance, our agriculturists are absolutely shut out of the coast markets with their surplus wheat solely on account of the exorbitant rates charged by the Southern Pacific. A host of other instances with agricultural and industrial products could be cited in the same line.

Then there is our coal interest. If in this Territory we could mine three-quarters of a million tons more annually than we do at present, what a vast amount of labor that would represent! If we could have a profitable outside market for this amount, how many millions would it bring to Utah in a decade! Yet this trade of 750,000 tons of coal annually which could be had with California is completely shut off by railway rates and manipulations, and that amount of foreign coal is used instead, to the injury of Utah business. And beyond this there is the local consumption. Everybody knows that we ought to have \$3 coal in Salt Lake, Ogden and Provo, and a proportionate price at other towns along the railways. Who prevents it? The railways. If a mine owner not in the railway men's coal combine attempts to reduce the price he is shut out and suppressed by an iniquitous doubling up of freight rates; and this city goes on and pays \$2 a ton more than she should on half a million tons of coal annually, while other cities and towns are no better off.

But how is the failure or success of the funding bill going to help or hinder us in these matters? If its success will fasten on us for another fifty years the burden that has been borne for a quarter of a century; or if its failure will relieve us within the next five years and bring equitable freight rates so that the farmer and the coal miner can get their product to an outside market, and so that coal can be shipped to our cities at the price it should be, the answer to the question is given. For the determination of these matters it is to the interest of Utah that due consideration be given to suggestions for a change. So far as the railways are concerned, there is no promise that the success of the funding bill which they support will cause the slightest variance in policy. If there is any relief in sight it must be on the other side.

Without being committed to either view of the case until after thorough investigation, it is only fair to ourselves to hear and weigh the arguments presented on so vital a topic. The opponents of the funding bill, who now have nearly a hundred thousand signatures to their petitions in the West, make this claim: If the bill is not passed then the government will take control of the Pacific roads and cause their operation upon a basis that will not discriminate against any sec-

tion of country; and as Utah always has been discriminated against in the matter of shipping her products, she has all to gain and nothing to lose. In the coal business all mine owners can enter the market with their output upon an equal basis, and not be shut out by excessive freight tariffs.

Again, say the anti-funding bill men: We want a direct road to the coast, and have talked of the Deep Creek line, which never has amounted to anything else but talk. With the Central Pacific track under government control all connections must be treated alike. A road from this city around the south end of Great Salt Lake, and within reach of branch lines to Deep Creek, would join the Central Pacific in less than 140 miles. That would give the through route desired. To build an independent road to California would cost \$20,000,000. The "fork" could be constructed for less than one-twentieth of that amount, and be just as satisfactory. With the funding bill passed this could not be accomplished in the next half century.

Thus it will be seen that in the items of the local coal supply and the direct route to the coast, aside from other considerations, there is sufficient connection between the funding bill and the vital interests of Utah to call for a careful examination of the matter. It would not be wise to pander to an anti-railway sentiment and go heedlessly into a movement antagonistic to the Pacific road; nor is it a fair thing to the people to permit the railway men to smother full and free discussion of the topic. We want to see Utah relieved from the unjust and oppressive railway discrimination that is holding her back in industrial development; and we want to find the quickest and easiest way to accomplish that result. For this reason we believe that every legitimate scheme which affords a prospect of success should be given thorough public investigation. In this respect the government dealing with the Pacific railways is our business.

AUTHORITY OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

The pastoral letter of the Catholic Bishop Watterson and the decision of Satolli, confirming the decree of the bishop, directed against liquor dealers professing Catholicism, are creating much uneasiness in circles interested in the strong drink traffic. The question is now discussed whether the intention is to throw the influence of the church against that traffic in real earnest or whether the pronouncement is merely for effect or for purposes not yet fully unveiled.

The fight dates from a few days before Thanksgiving last year. At the time a member of one of the Columbus societies told Bishop Watterson that preparations were made by the society for an entertainment and that beer and dancing were among the features. The bishop expressed his disapproval of the arrangement and obtained a promise that the objection-

able attractions would be eliminated. Notwithstanding this promise the beer and the dancing were indulged in, and the result was that the bishop refused to recognize the members of the society as having fellowship in the Catholic church.

Later, at the regular election, the society put saloon keepers in prominent offices. This was followed by a warning from the bishop, that if they were installed he would deprive the whole division of its rank as a Catholic society. This led to an appeal to Satolli, who upheld the action of the bishop. The society, fighting for the cause of beer, not yet satisfied, directed another appeal to the pope's representative, at the same time endeavoring to arraign the bishop before the national convention of the society—a proceeding unheard of in the history of the Roman church.

In his second decision Satolli lays down the general principle that it belongs to the duties of a bishop to find out what is good for the people of his diocese, and that he has power to command, forbid, counsel, or permit to be done whatever he may judge conducive to his own duty and the good of the church members. He further declares that Bishop Watterson's decree ought by no means to be subjected to the judgment of "every private individual or every assemblage of simple Catholics or citizens," and concludes as follows:

Therefore those things which the Right Reverend Bishop has commanded in his decree I approve, and I decide that they are to be observed; but, if they for the time being seem to hurt the material interests of some, they will have to be patiently borne for the good of the many and the honor of our Catholic church.

This decision and the premises on which it is based deserve the closest attention. It is evident that it vests the Catholic bishops with almost unlimited authority, or rather it reveals the vast powers entrusted to the discretion of those ecclesiastical officials. As to the liquor traffic it seems clear, according to this declaration, that any bishop who may find that the welfare of the diocese requires its suppression, he can prohibit it in all its forms so far as Catholic members are concerned, under penalty of the ban of the church. And he is responsible only to his superiors in office.

But is this authority limited only to the regulation of that traffic? It does not appear so, for when the papal legate lays down as a general principle that among a bishop's duties is that to find out what is good for the people and prohibit what he thinks is not good, it is evident that the gates are thrown wide open to dignitaries with episcopal authority to scrutinize every field of activity on which a citizen or society of citizens is engaged, be it mercantile, professional or political. It is a logical sequence from the principles laid down, that if a bishop fails to ascertain what is politically as well as morally good for his Catholic flock, and to "recommend" what in his judgment is good, he is negligent of one of his duties. It is hard to erase the impression that in the little tussle between the bishop and the liquor dealers an occasion was found to intimate to the