

mixed from the beginning and what we gave undubitable evidences of afterward, and establishes the unreliability of *Tribune* telegrams and correspondence when they relate to Utah and her interests and affairs.

DISAPPOINTED.

ORLANDO W. POWERS is much disappointed, because the committees of Congress before which he appeared as champion of the "Liberal" cause, would not print, as part of his harangue, a pamphlet containing a speech he delivered during the campaign preceding the Salt Lake city election of 1890. The idea that such a mass of sophistry and figures perverted would be injected into his remarks before the committee, is characteristic of the Tuscarora Chief and his unlimited assurance. In one case he did not even file the pamphlet with the committee, but seems to have expected that they were so hungry for the stuff he ladled out to them as to cry, like Oliver Twist, for "more," and to hunt up his misty pabulum and palm it off upon Congress and the public as literary food for the present times.

The *Tribune* correspondent who has already been convicted of padding his dispatches for effect, has done his best for Powers so as to create the impression that his speech did great service for his party. But it is evident that the "Liberal" faction made a big mistake in sending two exceedingly vulnerable, if cheek-armored, representatives to Washington. And if the "Home Rule" bill should fail of passage, it is certain that it will not be through anything that was said by either Powers or Allen. And, further, the Powers pamphlet, will not be printed at government expense.

RELIGION AS A PART OF EDUCATION

We have before us an article from the New York *School Journal*, on the subject of religious teaching in schools. The topic is discussed from a purely educational standpoint, and is therefore unbiased. One portion of it affords an example of the failure of an attempt, in England, to give religious lessons through the instrumentality of clergymen, to children after school hours. The principal reasons given as the cause for the system proving ineffective is that "the children are tired, instruction is unsatisfactory, a new man comes in to take the place of the regular teacher, etc." An effort of a similar character was made here, but collapsed, through causes that were explained in a report made at the late Conference of this State.

The *Journal* states that it is a vexed question, whether a child can be trained up ethically, and become upright, honest and successful without religious instruction. It exclaims: "Is the admitted increase of crime among young men due to the increase of church indifference? If so, then church instruction must be insisted upon in all our schools." As if in partial answer to this interrogatory the article also says:

"The old theologians believed that there is no possible way of making

children good but by making them religious. Now here is a very important question. We must have in all our schools moral grit and tone, if we have nothing else. The late Mr. Thring, head master of the famous Uppingham School, was a pronounced religious man, and gave his pupils unmisgivingly church diet. There is no question but that his work was eminently successful. Especially was he able to turn out a large number of upright, God-fearing young men, who became distinguished in various walks of life. Another such a man as Mr. Thring was Thomas Arnold; no man in England had more pronounced views on religious questions than he."

We could furnish numbers of examples of the benefits of religious instruction as a part of education through the instrumentality of denominational or church schools in this Territory, but we differ from the *Journal* in its view as to the possibility of the introduction of training of this character into the public schools anywhere in this Republic. It is not practicable, nor would it be just under our form of government. The impracticability of it is almost self-evident. All classes of citizens are entitled to the use of the public schools, and if it should be decided that religion should be taught therein, the question of "which religion" would at once smash the proposition, to say nothing of those who are in no way religious and whose rights in the premises are entitled to as much respect as those of any other class. In the face of these obstacles the *Journal* holds that the introduction of religious instruction into the public schools is possible, providing that it be clear that it is necessary. It illustrates its position in this way:

"Nothing is impossible that is necessary. This is a fundamental principle. If it were necessary to tunnel the Rocky Mountains, it would be done. A canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific is a necessity; somebody will build it even though the Panama scheme is a failure. If church teaching is necessary for the salvation of the world, then church teaching must be enforced in all our schools."

The comparison is not appropriate. The difference in overcoming physical obstacles so as to tunnel the Rocky Mountains, and excavating a passageway through the institutions of a free government is very great. The one is a mere feat of engineering skill, by which the mountains are not materially changed, the other would require the whole governmental structure to be altered by a revolutionary process that would resemble a seismic disturbance.

While we believe religious instruction to be an essential part of the training of a child to enable him to develop symmetrically, that part of his education must be imparted outside of the public schools. Any strong attempt to have it otherwise in this country would cause an agitation here, compared with which the disturbance in Germany over the Kaiser's pet educational measure would be as a fly speck to a mountain. The necessity for religious instruction has passed into a conviction with us. No man can be vicious and a Christian at the same time, and a sense of religious responsibility has a direct influence upon the conduct of the individual, preserving him from the commission of acts for which he believes he will be held account-

able before a Divine tribunal. This, of course, is the mere moral aspect of the religious question. There are others connected with it that are of equal importance.

THE QUEBEC ELECTIONS.

MORE than passing interest attaches to the general elections held in Quebec on the 9th inst. In Canadian politics these elections assumed the form of a climacteric. For months the question asked was, what action will the Catholic church take in the Provincial elections? It was universally conceded that the party which the church espoused would come out victorious. And so it transpires. The Conservatives have obtained an overwhelming triumph, and Mercier and his Liberal faction have been absolutely crushed, by reason of the pronounced opposition of the Romish church.

In early life Mr. Mercier had been a staunch Tory. In 1886 he came into prominence by reason of his emphatic denunciation of the execution of Riel in the Northwest. He assumed the leadership of the Nationalist faction, and on every occasion charged the Conservatives with plotting to destroy the French race and the Roman Church. He became Premier of the Quebec provisional government, and was supported by a strong majority. He was also the especial pet of the Jesuits, and posed as the champion of his creed, his country and his race. He was the idol of the French speaking people of Quebec.

Years ago Sir John McDonald granted a subsidy of \$620,000 to build a railroad along the Bay of Chaleurs in the southern part of Quebec. The road was not finished, and the Quebec government was petitioned to complete it. Premier Mercier, who was a pronounced advocate of subsidies for public works, took the matter in hand. A subsidy of 800,000 acres of land commutable into cash at 35 cents an acre was authorized to be paid to any contractor who would complete the road. A combine was formed, and it was fully shown later on that \$100,000 of this deal went into the private purses of Mercier and a confederate named Pacaud.

A Royal commission was appointed to investigate the railroad scheme. On December 16, 1891 a report signed by two members of the commission was forwarded to Lieutenant-Governor Auger, stating that Mercier and his ministry were undoubtedly guilty of crooked transactions. The Lieutenant-Governor immediately dismissed Mercier and his colleagues from office. Mercier contended that the dismissal was unconstitutional and the report not official, because the third member was not heard from. It was thought that a minority report would follow. It did not, the silence was occasioned by the illness of Judge Jette, the non-signing member, who concurred subsequently in the interior report. It was found also that there was precedent for the dismissal. In 1874, Lord Dufferin acted similarly towards Sir John McDonald and his cabinet, and in 1878 Governor Letellier dismissed the Boucherville ministry.

Mercier then raised the cry of church