

duty of such counties to pay at least as much as they draw for school support, and on the other hand is the maxim which lies at the basis of all taxation for school purposes, namely: "The education of the child is the concern of the State." Is it the concern of the commonwealth as a whole, or of its subdivisions in a county and school district capacity? In some States this question is determined in one way, and by others in other. In view of conditions existing in this Territory we favor a small Territorial tax, distributed according to school population, but would have no objection to seeing the Governor's suggestion adopted; to the effect that a county having a population of over 10,000 should not receive more than it paid for school purposes. This, as the Governor suggests, would partly offset inequalities in assessments as between different counties, and the fact that "boom" prices are beginning to prevail in some counties but not in others is an additional necessity for some safeguard against excessive inequality in assessments. Under such an amendment to the bill, the weaker and poorer counties would continue to receive the same aid as heretofore, save that it would be increased in consequence of "booms" in the stronger and richer counties.

The remaining amendments suggested by the Governor relate to minor matters and defects, and vary in importance, none of them being of a specially vital nature. The Territory needs a school code very much, and the two "Liberal" members of the Council regard this bill as one that will meet the want. In this view they are seconded by nearly every People's Party member of the Assembly, and by the "Liberal" members of the House, barring the political objections they have urged against it. It would be a misfortune to the Territory were the bill to fail, but the responsibility for such a contingency would rest upon the Governor.

#### A PLEA FOR TOLERATION AND IMPARTIALITY.

WE have discovered something good and fair about the "Mormons" in the leading anti-"Mormon" journal of this city. It need hardly be said, however, that it does not proceed from the pen of one of its regular staff. On the contrary, it appears to be the product of a non-"Mormon" visitor to this city, who

views the situation here with a just and dispassionate eye. It is embodied in editorial comments designed to break its beneficent force. Fortunately its justice stands out with such prominence that it is not detrimentally affected by the sophistical verbiage by which it is surrounded. It stands like a mountain of truth in the midst of a patch of sterility. It appears over the *nom de plume* of "Commercial Traveler," and that our readers may judge of its quality we present it here:

"After reading in your valuable paper of Sunday morning a letter by Mr. Chas. Ellis, 'Concerning the Tithing House,' I ask the privilege of space to give the views of a stranger in reply, relying on your fairness *pro* or *con* this case. I am a stranger in these parts, traveling through on business, with an eye to observe and an ear to hear as I go along.

Mr. Ellis refers to Judge Zane's opinion of the Act of Congress as 'intended to deprive the Mormon Church of its power to that extent to maintain, propagate or perpetuate polygamy.' According to the foundation rock, religious liberty, on which this nation was founded and is built what right has Congress to deprive any Church of a portion of its property because it maintains a belief contrary to that of other churches? And if this Church does propagate beliefs which are wrong, why not confiscate all her property and prevent the peaceful, or otherwise, assembling together of her people? Did not Christ teach 'Judge not, that ye be not judged?' Then shall we disobey His injunction and persecute as we were once persecuted? What denomination but has cried out in the dark ages against persecution? And shall we return now to the usages of these black periods to suppress this people? Have we come to support religious oppression? Possibly Mr. Ellis will ask: 'Do you call Mormonism religion?' Who shall say? Jesus taught 'Judge not.' And did He not say, in answer to the question, 'Who will be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?' 'What is that to thee? Follow thou Me.' In the past when we were persecuted we did not believe that persecution was following Christ. He taught His religion and was persecuted for it; and shall we, teaching His religion, persecute those differing from us? Then what shall become of the Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc? All these believe in Jesus Christ, yet each believes on His teaching in a different manner. Now if the Spiritualists shall take up the eudgel for Jesus Christ against all who worship Him differently from themselves they will have a big job on hand. And then most other denominations believe Spiritualism tends to propagate ignorance. Shall all other denominations then join to confiscate what little property the Spiritualists have been able to get hold of, and still less they have been able to hold? This is not Christ's teaching.

Mr. Ellis says 'The Mormon system of tithing is not compulsory under civil law, it is true, but it is compulsory, nevertheless, and hence it is in violation of the Constitutional guarantee of religious liberty,' arguing that if the Mormon does not pay he is

'cut off.' (Then, in the name of religious liberty, he proposes to withdraw religious liberty from a people differing from him.) What will Mr. Ellis and his friends in Congress say to the compulsory feature of the Catholic church? 'Send your children to parochial schools or suffer a withdrawal of church sacraments. Follow all the commands of the church in giving money, in marrying, in confession, etc., or suffer the same penalty. What does the withdrawal of church sacraments mean? Excommunication, and, as a consequence, damnation. Many people pretend to believe the Catholic church a menace to the bulwark of our nation, 'The Public School.' Then let us not stop in the good work, but let us treat the Catholics the same as we are treating the Mormons, confiscate their property also, in order to deprive them of the power to maintain, propagate or perpetuate its dogmas.

"I do not believe that God will ever bless such an outburst of religious frenzy. Rather let us disseminate the truth through the church, disseminate knowledge through the public schools, and by all means known to the law stop and prohibit polygamy in any form, here or elsewhere. Punish false swearing, and by all known or discoverable means, apart from religious persecution, put down the power of the church to maintain, propagate or perpetuate polygamy.' But do not let us follow the maxim: 'The end justifies the means.' Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand.—Phil. iv: 5."

The foregoing is a strong and intelligently presented plea for religious toleration and equal treatment, and the paper in which it originally appeared is compelled to rush to its usual refuge in order to break its salutary effect. In place of argument it uses sophistry and misrepresentation. It holds up as a powerful point in its favor that the law under which "creed property" is confiscated has existed since 1862, and is applicable to all churches alike. As to what is meant by "creed property," we leave our readers to conjecture. But in reference to the applicability of the law, it is pertinent to ask why it has not been applied to other churches as well as to that of the Latter-day Saints. The genius of American institutions demands only that the law shall be equitable in its provisions but that its administration shall be of the same quality. In view of the fact also that the later law—the Edmunds-Tucker measure of 1887—was enacted to make a solitary victim of the "Mormon" church and except all other churches, the citation of the statute of 1862 in relation to the confiscation of creed property of all denominations beyond a certain amount goes to the wall as an argument.

The entire proceeding, legislative and judicial, is in conflict with the constitutional inhibition against the creation of an establishment of re-