How Roberts Turned - Limelight - Utah's Ex-Senator.



HON. B. H. ROBERTS, Who Turned the Calcium on the Political Career of Ex-Senator Thomas

OLLOWING is the full text of the address deliver in the tabernacle at Provo by Hon. B H. Roberts on the evening Tuesday, March 14, under the auspices of the Utah Stake Mutual Improvement association, before an audience of more than 2,500 persons, the report being by Arthur Winter:

IA report of this speech in a local paper contained many verbal inaccuracies and crudities which in many cases were the reporter's, not mine. It is too much to expect that extemporaneous speech will be free from verbal and rhetorical errors, and I do not claim that the speech as delivered in Prove was free from such defects. In the was free from such defects. In the speech as here reported by Mr. Arthur Winter, some of these crudities have been eliminated so far as they could be and still retain the structure and spirit of what was said. One item has been added: a passage relating to the alleged threats against Gentile industries in the State of Usah.

tries in the State of Utah.

Concerning the criticisms that have been made of this speech—one of which extended through seven columns of as vapid and flacid an aggregation of words, words, words, as it has ever been my lot to wade through-I only care to notice one, that is the alleged harshness of some of my utterances. The conclusion is reached that some of my words were unbecoming both calling and the place in which they delivered. In answer I only wish to a say that the propriety of one's expressions is governed very largely by the task one has before him. Even the Son of God, when He had occasion to de-nounce falsehood and reprove deceivers, longer used the gentle tones by ich He comforted the sorrowful or encouraged those bowed down in weak ness; but used language suited to the task before Him. To the scribes and Pharisees, who were bounding Himself and His friends to their death, and as a preliminary to that purpose seeking to embitter the minds of the populace, He said:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly ap-pear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. we are full of hypocrisy and miquity. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the service and say, If pulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the Prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto your-Wherefore ye be witnesses unto your selves, that ye are the children of them which killed the Prophets. Fill ye up, which killed the Prophets. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, ho can ye escape the damnation of hell?

I think I have not gone beyond this worthy example in anything I have said in this speech, and as for the sac redness of the building in which my remarks were made, I in no way fee that there was a desecration, since when the task before one is to defend the innocent against misrepresentation and denounce calumniators, places a temple, and all seasons sum-

KEARNS' ATTACK.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentle-men: On the 28th day of February, last, the then senior senator from the State of Utah delivered an address in the senate chamber of the United States, in which an attack was made against the best interests of the State of Utah. The speech was cunningly planned and adroitly phrased; and with the prestige of a senator of the United States behind it, among the masses of the people of the United States, uninmed of the true conditions existing Utah, its effect will be misleading and mischlevous. It is because these opinions that I have formed the speech that I think it a proper subject for this occasion, that our own peo-ple, at least, should be put upon their guard against the mischlevous effects of this deliverance

ABOUT ANSWERING. I regret extremely that the speech was not answered upon the floor of the senate of the United States. The gentleman upon whom that duty properly rested may have had good and sufficient reasons for remaining silent. It is not for me to say. But when I think of the serious charges the best of the serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges are serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are serious charges are serious charges are serious charges and serious charges are seri of the serious charges that are made charges, false though they he, are sus-tained, I can conceive of no combination of circumstances that would justify the senior senator from Utah for ing silent on that occasion. The sug-gestion of friends may be a good thing gestion of friends may be a good thing to listen to sometimes; but occasions can arise—and this, in my judgment, was one of them—when the call of duty should lead one to reject the counse of well-meaning but perhaps ill-in-

formed friends, and the cold calculations of over caution. It might be possible, of course, that a reply such as one might desire to make, could not be made on the spur of the moment; but ten minutes devoted to denouncing the falsehoods of that speech, and the unmasking of the man who uttered it, would have had a beneficial effect upon the public mind, and would have been more effective than any reply that can the public mind, and would have been more effective than any reply that can now be made. Anything that may be said from this platform, or any other in Utah, or anything that may be said in the future upon the floor of the senate chamber, will not have the effect that an emphatic denial of the charges would have had while the gentleman who made them was still a senator of the United States. That opportunity, however, is lost. All that may be done, here in Utah, at least, is to point out to here in Utah, at least, is to point out to our youth the untruthfulness of these charges, and disclose the sophistry by which an attempt is made to sustain them. I account myself fortunate in having an opportunity to undertake such a task before this magnificent as-

sembly. ABOUT ITS AUTHORSHIP.

Before proceeding to the speech itself I want to say a word or two in rela-tion to its authorship. It will go with-out saying that the ex-senator who stands responsible for it is not its au-Those of us who chance to be acquainted with the duliness of his mind and the density of his ignorance mind and the density of his ignorance know very well that his mind never conceived the speech; nor did he fashion the polished, eloquent sentences devoted to so bad a cause. Those of us who served with him in the Constitutional convention of this state painfully remembering the very few occasions on which he sought to express himself upon the floor of that convention hall can on the floor of that convention hall, conever believe for a moment that he the author of the speech. Those wi Those who were present in the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City on the occasion when the president of the United States honored that city and the state with his pres-ence, and who saw this now ex-senator when he addressed that assembly, with hands thrust deep into his pockets, with stomach thrown forward, and head thrown back, and in nasel tones becoming a retired puglist—and heard him say in the opening sentence of his pech, "We Americans ain't born inuthin', but we git there just the same flaughter); and who had no better taste than to make the visit to our state of the chief executive of this nation the occasion of a partisan harangue, know very well that he is not the author of this senate speech. He is only the authors of this senate speech. thor of this speech in the sense that he has adopted it. He is the author of that adopted it. He is the author of this speech in the sense that he has bought it. I shall not undertake to de-scribe all the contempt I feel for a man who occupies the high station of a senwho occupies the high station of a sen-ator of the United States, and who con-sents to repeat, parrot-like, the bought phrases fashioned by another mind. Jewelry in a swine's snout is as noth-

IN BORROWED FURS.

I glory in that pride, which would prefer to stand in tatters, though the biting winds of winter might nip one, rather than to be dressed in the cust-off clothing or the borrowed furs of a prince; so also I would glory in silence prince; so also I would glory in slience rather than to arise in my place in so august a body as the United States senate and repeat as mine the speech conceived and written by another, though its eloquence rivalled that of a Pitt, a Chatham or a Webster. Indeed the more eloquent the speech the deeper must be the embarrassment—the shame. But here I pause, though I had the language of a Solomon or a Shakespeare I should never be able to express my contempt for the senator who would my contempt for the senator who w consent to appear clothed in the borrowed or bought fabric of another's rhetoric. We may dismiss the ex-senator right here, so far as thinking that he had anything to do with this speech

more than the reading of it.

I wish now to say a word in regard to
the spirit in which I propose to discuss this speech. I believe in the amenities of debate. There is nothing quite so oyous as to witness a debate when differences discussed are honest differences, when opponents are honorable and talented men. I think I may be pardoned, altogether excused, in fact, from any exhibition of egotism, if I say that I take some pride in the reputation I think I have in this state for fairness I think I have in this state for fairness in debate, and respectful treatment of my opponents. But the amenities of debate do not require me to say that my opponent's statements are true when I know them to be false; or that his argument is good and sound when I know it to be the merest sophistry; or that his motives are patriotic when I know them to be selfish and revengeful. Therefore, when I meet and vengeful. Therefore, when I meet and have to deal with such a speech as this before me, it is not to be expected that I shall handle it with gloves, and I promise you I will not.

THE SPEECH ITSELF.

Caustic and Scathing Reply to the Man Who Personally and Otherwise Sought From President Joseph F. Smith, the Influence of the Church to Encompass His Re-election to the United States Senate, and Failing in Which he Affects to Scorn the Very Power That he Pleaded for. Some Truths That the People of Utah Should Know.

set forth in the speech, with very slight exceptions; and by reason of following the order of topics laid down in the speech. I come first of all to the consideration of the pledges under which Utah obtained statehood—the compact between the Statehood—the compact between the State of Utah and the

United States.

Of that long conflict that raged in Utah from early days down to the year 1890 I need not speak. You are familiar with its history. You know that the foundation facts of that controversy are these: that the Latter-day Saints believed a revelation had been given in which was made known, first of all, the eternity of the marriage covenant, with the permission and I may say injunction, under certain circumstances, for good men to have a plurality of wives. You know of the successive enactments of Congress, circumstances, for good men to have a plurality of wives. You knew of the successive enactments of Congress, made at the demand of sectarian clamor throughout the United States against this practise. You know how these successive acts brought to bear hardships upon the Church, until at last we were relieved from the responsibility and obligation of maintaining in practise that plural marriage system, by the issuance of the Manifesto by President Wilford Weodruff in 1890. You know upon that step being taken, that the bitterness of feeling that had hitherto existed subsided; and there began to be manifested a desire that the old Church and anti-Church political parties should be disbanded, and that here in Utah, as in the other states of the Union, the people should divide according to their political convictions to one or the other of the great national political parties. These movements finally resulted in the passage of an Enabling act, authorizing the election of a Constitutional convention for the purpose of framing a state government. This convention met in the spring of 1895, and was the instrument through which so far as the people of Utah are concerned, the compact between the State of Utah and the United States was made. was made.

THE COMPACT.

When it is necessary to establish what a given compact is, instead of calling to mind this man's opinion, and that man's opinion of it, why not go to the compact itself, and after considering it give it a fair interpretation? That is the method of treatment that I have proposed to myself, and consequently I am going to that compact. The Enabling act contained this clause, which was the crystalized demand of the people of the United States upon the people of Utah:

"And said convention shall provide by ordinance, irrevocable, without the consent of the United States and the people of said state:

"First, that perfect toleration of re-When it is necessary to establish

people of said state:

"First, that perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secure, and that no inhabitant of said state shall be molested in person on account of his or her mode of religious worship; provided that polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibted."

That is what the people of the United States demanded of the people of Utah through the voice of the national Congress—nothing more than that, nothing mores—

gress-nothing more than that, nothing less than that. Polygamous or plural marriages are to be forever prohibited That is the demand of the people of the United States,

That being the demand, what was he response to it on the part of the the response to it on the part of the people of Utah, speaking through the Constitutional convention? This was

ORDINANCE.

"The following ordinance shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of the

First, perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabit-int of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited."

You will observe that the convention

ncorporated in this provision the very anguage of the Enabling act.

PUNISHMENT PROVIDED.

That was the demand, and that the response to the demand. But it was not all of the response. There was something more. After this declaration had been mad, towards the conclusion of the work of the convention, when of the work of the convention, when that part of the Constitution called the "schedule" was introduced (and by the way, in order that you may understand that I have clear knowledge of these matters from personal participation in them. I may say that I was a member of the committee on "schedule"), Mr. Varian, a member from Sait Lake county, called the attention of the convention to the fact that while we had made this declaration against "polyga-mous or plural marriages," he held, and very rightly, too, that it was not selfoperating, and provided no penalties for its violation; but was merely a declaration, and he doubted if it would be sufficient to meet the expectations of the people of the United States. He therefore recommended a certain course, You perhaps will remember that our territorial Legislature of 1892 reenacted what was virtually the Edmunds-Tucker law. They followed very closely the congressional enactment. Now, said Mr. Varian, in substance, your Legislature enacted practically the law of Congress against these offences; that being the case, it expresses the willing ness of your legislators to meet the demands of the country on this subect. Therefore, let us take so much of this territorial enactment as defines "polygamy, or plural marriage," and rovides for the punishment thereof nd make it a provision in this Consti tution, operating without any further legislation. Then the people of the egislation. Then the people of the nited States will know that you mean really to prohibit "polygamous or prural marriages" against which you make your declaration in the ordinance. In pursuance of this proposition he introfuced this resolution:

"The act of the governor and Legislative Assembly of the territory Utah, entitled, 'An act to punish poly-gamy and other kindred offenses,' approved Feb. 4, A. D. 1892, in so far the same defines and imposes penalties for polygamy, is hereby declared to be in force in the State of Utah."

INTERESTING DEBATE.

Mr. Varian was of the opinion that this territorial enactment invaded the field already occupied by congressional enactment it was void, and that when Utah became a state the territorial law would not be in force in the state, and of course the congressional enactments applicable to the territory would cease to be operative upon the attainment of statehood; hence he thought it necessary to make this con-stitutional provision against "polyga-

of the territorial law relating to polygamous living or "unlawful cohabitation"—to use the phrase of the law itself—was not made part of the Constitution of this state. And why? Because the demand made by the people of the United States did not reach that condition. The demand was only: "provided polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited." There were other lawyers in the constitutional convention who contented Mr. Varian's opinion, and insisted that this law of the territory would be operative in the state, and therefore there was no need of adopting his amendment; whereupon a protracted and earnest debate took place, in the course of which it was pointed out to Mr. Varian that he had cut this old territorial law in two; he had taken the part that defined and prohibited "polygamy or plural marriages" and made it part of the Constitution, but he had left out the part of the law relating to unjawful cohabitation, and the effect of such action by implication would be to repeal that part of the territorial law defining and punishing unlawful cohabitation. In the course of the argument made on that point in the convention the following took place:

Mr. Evans (Weber)—I would fike to

point in the convention the following took place:

Mr. Evans (Weber)—I would like to ask you [Mr. Varian] a question. The gentleman will agree with me that your [his] amendment will repeal the other kindred of enses in that statute?"

Mr. Varian [Answering Mr. Evans]—
No; there is nothing to repeal. If you want the other kindred offenses [dealt with], my answer is, prohibit them by law under penalties.

Mr. Evans (Weber)—I would like to

law under penalties.

Mr. Evans (Weber)—I would like to ask one question. Suppose the act of 1892 were valid? (). e., the territorial law dealing with polygamous and unlawful cohabitation is referred to)—

Mr. Varian—If the law were valid I should not then introduce should not then introduce— Mr. Evans (Weber)—Wouldn't it then

eneal everything except the poylgamy? Mr. Varian—If the law were valid it might repeal by implication, although repeals by implication are not favored.—Constitutional Convention Proceed-ings, vol. II, p. 1748.

INTO THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Varian's resolution was adopted Mr. Varian's resolution was adopted and became part of the Constitution, so that in the matter of compact between Utah and the United States on the subject of polygamy our response went even beyond the demand of the people of the United States as voiced in the Enabling and subpositions are people of the United States as voiced in the Enabling act authorizing us to establish a state government, in that we not only adopted the very langauge of the enabling act, but accepted the definition of polygamy and provided the punishment, prescribed for that offense by Congress; but no demand was made and no action was taken respecting unlawful cohabitation; nor did it in any manner enter into Utah's compact with the United States.

Now, understand me, I am not taking the ground that unlawful cohabitation—"polygamous living"—as it has

tion—"polygamous living"—as it has come to be called—is not now contrary to the law in Utah. That it is under the ban of the law is known to every one. But it became so because our Legislature, after the ional convention had settled this vexd question upon the terms here pointed out—our state Legislature (and why I have never yet understood) proceeded to unsettle what had been settled in that convention, picked up the part of the old territorial law that had been discarded by the convention and enacted it with the rest of the code.

IS UNDER THE BAN.

Hence unlawful cohabitation is under the ban by our state enactment; and am not arguing that unlawful cohabitation is not against the law, and am not attempting to justify any one in the violation of that law. I am now merely pointing out the fact that in our I am now compact with the government of the United States disruption of marital relations coming down to us out of the past constituted no part of that com-pact. The terms of the compact are here in the Enabling act and in the onstitution, and may be read and known of all men.

That compact was not made between the "Mormon" Church leaders, as claimed by Mr. Kearns' adopted speech, and the United States government, but between the people of the United States acting through Congress and the chief executive of the nation, and the people of Utah acting through their representatives in the Constitutional conven-Utah's Constitutional convention sought earnestly to meet the demands made upon our people by the nation. The chief executive of the nation by accepting the Constitution we had formed and proclaiming Utah's admission into the Union, said we succeeded in meeting those demands. To undertake now to read into that compact something that was not demanded by the enabling act, and not conceded by the convention, that is not expressly found in its terms, and not fairly to be implied from them, is infamous. That is what is constantly sought be done, and we have all sorts of extravagant claims made as to what the "Mormon" Church leaders pledged in order to obtain statehood—the compact they made with the nation, and how the "Mormon" Church has broken it, but never a word do we hear a compact itself. The "Mormon" hear as to the leaders made no pledges to obtain state hood, except as in common with all the people of the state they accepted and ratified the compact of the Constitution. They pleaded for amnesty for their people, it is true, but amelioration of the hard conditions which a cruel enforcement of the law imposed, not statehood, was the object of their de-I shall have occasion to refer to un

lawful cohabitation later in my re-

Passing from the matter of the compact which the speech to which I am replying falsely charges over and over again that we have violated, I come to the accusation and false charges made against the "Mormon" Church. Whoever constructed this speech made the central idea of it, the existence of a "monarchy" and a "monarch" in the State of Utah. The "monarchy" is the "Mormon" Church; the "monarch" is the President of that Church. In order that you may know I am not mistaken I shall read to you a quotation from the

Under these several men (the Church Presidents) the social autocracy has had its varying fortunes, but at the present time it is probably at as high a point as it ever reached under the original inal Joseph or under Brigham Young . . . I want you to know that this re-ligion, claiming to recognize and se-cure the equality of men immediately established and has maintained for the I now come to the speech itself, my stitutional provision against "polyga-mass of its adherents that social equal-reply will follow the order of the topics mous or plural marriages," But the part ity, but has elevated a class of its

. . . the chief among them has the dignity of a monarch. . . . In all dignity of a monarch. . . . In all this social system each Apostle has his great part. He is inseparable from it. He wields now, as does the minister at court, such part of power as the monarch may permit him to enjoy, and it is his hope and expectation that he will outlive those who are his seniors in rank in order that he may become the ruler."

"MONARCH" AND "MONARCHY."

There is much more to the same effect, but this is enough to show you that the existence of both a "monarchy" and a "monarch" are charged as existing in the Church organization and in its president.

I wish to call your attention to the

In its president.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that this is mere assumption. There is no "monarch" in the "Mormon" Church. It is a fundamental, constitutional, and I, might say institutional principle in the Church shall be done by common consent of the Church; (Doc. & Cov. sec. 26) and so long as that remains the great underlying principle of the Church of Jesus Christ I ask you where the principle of monarchy can come in? Furthermore it is expressly provided that no officer of the Church can occupy a place in any branch, or ward, or stake, or in any of the general or local quorums of the Church, only as he is sustained and accepted by the members of the several divisions of the Church named. Moreover, elections, which give the opportunity to get rid of undesirable officers, are more frequent in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, than in any other system of ecclesiastical government known to the children of men. Will you tell me how a monarchy can exist in the face of these fundamental you tell me how a monarchy can exist in the face of these fundamental truths? I would like to see some explanation of that.

PRESIDENT NOT A MONARCH. Again, the President of the Church is monarch." Yet let me read to you he is decribed in Mr. Kearns'

no "monarch." Yet let me read to you how he is decribed in Mr. Kearns' adopted speech:

"Under these several men [successive Presidents of the Church] the social autocracy has had its varying fortunes, but at the present time it is probably at as high a point as it every reached under the original Joseph or under Brigham Young. The President of the Church, Joseph F. Smith, affects a regal state. His home consists of a series of vilias, rather handsome in design, and surrounded by such ample grounds as to afford sufficient exclusiveness. In addition to this he has an official residence of historic character near to the office which he occupies as President. When he travels he is usually accompanied by a train of friends, who are really servitors. When he attends social functions he appears like a ruler among his subjects."

Can any of you recognize President Joseph F. Smith in that descirption? I cannot boast of an extremely intimate acquaintance with President Smith's domestic life, or his financial status; but it has been my good fortune to

domestic life, or his financial status; but it has been my good fortune to know him personally some 30 years. know something of the severe econo and frugality which he practises. know his homes are but cottages, with out the grandeur here given them.
know that his family lives in econom; and frugality, and that every tree evergreen, shrub, or flowering plant, o plot of grass about any one of his cot-tage homes was planted by his own hands or the labor of his cons are wives. I do know that. And though he does occupy an historic building, owned, not by Joseph F. Smith, but by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, it is more for the convenience of the people and those who have business with him that he dwells there because of any "regal" or extravagant tastes that he himself possesses, and in that "official residence" he lives the simpliest of lives. I know at least sevsimplies of lives. I know at least seven of his sons who have arrived at manhood's estate, and I know that they live by daily toll, as my sons and your sons do, as the sons of all the common people do, and occupying no very exalted positions in the industrial world. although they are capable, honest and hard working young men. One of them has assisted me in my office work as stenographer for three years. Don't you think if President Smith really affected this "regal state," "lorded" it over the people as he is here represent-ed as doing, and lived in this "series of villas of sufficient exclusiveness" that he would undertake to elevate these sons of his and all his family above this toil in which they are engaged?

A FALSE PICTURE.

The description presents a false pic-ture. I brand it as such. It represents rather the style and state in which the writer of Mr. Kearns' speech would live if he possessed the opportunities he believes President Smith possesses, rather than the manner of President Smith's living. [Especially as to the villas of sufficient exclusiveness."]
Again, while President Smith, as we

believe, has received a divine appoint-ment to the station he holds, he is de-pendent for his continuance in that office, as he was dependent for his ele-vation to it, upon the votes of the peo-ple. He is subject to the laws of the Church, as much so as you or I; and a special provision is made in the laws of God for a tribunal before which, for nets of irregularity and unrighteous ness, he can be called to account, tes timony taken against him, and if his offenses are of sufficiently serious a na-ture he may be dismissed from his high office, and excommunicated from the Church; and the revelation which provides these arrangements concerning him says that the decision of the court in question is the one of the court him says that the decision of controversy in question is the end of controversy in his case. I know that some men, in their over-zeal to exalt the office or their over-zeal to exalt the office of President of the Church have advanced extravagant ideas upon the subject such saying that no complaint must be de of those occupying that position; that the people must go on performing their daily duties without question, and that the people must go on performing their daily duties without question, and then if the President should do wrong. God would look after him. Such teach-ings have now and then been heard; but I call your attention to the fact that the Church of God is greater than my one man within that Church, how ever exalted his station may be; that the Lord has provided means by which the Church can correct every man within it, and can dismiss the unworthy from power. That right is resident in the Church of Christ; and the Church don't have to wait till God kills off unworthy servants before a wrong can be righted. The power exists within the Church to correct any evil of whatever name or nature that may arise, within it, and that without disrupting the Church, or creating marchy, but all things are to be done in order, and as God has appointed them. I could



EX-SENATOR KEARNS, The Man Whom the People Retired and Who Sought Church Influence to Secure Re-Election.

give you references to the Doctrine and Covenants covering all these points, but it is a matter of such common knowledge among you that it is

not necessary. TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Again, the decisions of the First Presidency of the Church are not final in relation to matters of administration and government in the Church, if such decisions are made in unrighteousness, but from such decisions of the ness, but from such decisions of the First Presidency appeals lie to the general assembly of all the quorums of the Priesthood, which constitute the of the Priesthood, which constitute the highest spiritual authority in the Church, that is, all the quorums of the Priesthood are greater than any one quorum, even though it should be the First Presidency. (Doc. and Cov. sec. 1976) Neither "monarchy" nor "monarch" can exist where these principles are recognized as they are recognized. are recognized, as they are recognized in the Church.

RESTS ON MORAL AUTHORITY. The Church government rests purely

The Church government rests purely and solely upon moral authority. Let me explain. Authority is represented in government as of two kinds. Our writers on government tell us that one is "effective authority" and the other is "moral authority." You see effective authority operative in the various governments of man, in kingdoms, em pires and republics; rest on force, on compulsion. But mor rest on force, on compuision. But mor-al authority rests on persuasion, not upon compulsion or force. "The ac-tion of God," says one, "upon man is moral and moral only. By constitut-ing man free, He has refused to exercise effective authority over him, and an ecclesiastic or politic society claiming divine authority must exercise mora authority only; for the moment it exer cises compulsion it ceases to represen God and resolves itself into effective authority which is human, all human and not at all divine," (Baring-Gold) The government of the Church of Latter-day Saints is such a moral govern ment as is here described. It rests on moral authority only. I read to you from one of the revelations: "No power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the Priest-

hood, only by persuasion, by long suf-fering, by gentleness, and meckness, and by love unfeigned; kindness and pure knowledge

which shall greatly enlarge the soul without hypocrisy, and without guile." This is the spirit of the authority inderlying this sociesiastical institutio that is described as a "monarchy!"

A WEB OF FALLACY. Having laid the foundation for his

argument in this assumption of the existence of a "monarchy" and a "mon arch," the author of Mr. Kearns' weaves around it all sorts of fallacies, a few of which I shall examine. It is charged that the Church is a "busi-ness corporation rather than a Church, and is establishing a monopoly in business, and threatens, as some glantic trust might threaten, the industires of this intermountain region This is not true. It is true that the Church has invested some of its means in various corporations and enterprises. In so doing it has manifested, as I think, profound wisdom. It has long been regarded as a wise policy in establishing endowments for charitable purposes to invest the original donations given by the generously inclined, and use only the interest upon them for the chartable purpose, and thus place the chartty upon a basis sure to prolong its life of usefulness. I say that is a policy of good sense, and good judgment; and that is what is done and no more than that when the Trustee in Trust of the "Mormon" Church invests 'Mormon' Church tithes in business interprises. But the Church holdings enterprises. But the Church holdings in the various corporations where the investments are made are not sufficient to dominate those institutions or to establish them as trusts in the industrial affairs of the state. Charitable, educational and missionary work are th purposes to which the revenue hurch is directly devoted. of this let me call your attention to the work in which the Church is engaged, and in which our tithes are consumed.

WHERE TITHING GOES. We teach, as you all know, the principle of gathering to our people. Wherever the Gospel is preached the cry goes with it, "Come out of Babylon, oh ye, my people, that ye partake not of her sins and receive not of her plagues." And inasmuch as there is a gathering, must there not also be made some provision to care for the people who come to us? Must we not provide some way for them to gain a foothold in the land if they are to become in-habitants in Zion? Most assuredly; and so part of our tithe funds go into col-onizing enterprises that provide a onizing enterprises that provide a This is done not only in the in ests of those who come to us from afar but in the interests also of those who grew up in our own old centers of population and find the need of enlarged opportunities,

The Church has to sustain publica-tion houses in various parts of the world, and they are maintained in part, by the general funds of the

part, by the general funds of the Church.

We have churches to build in sil the wards and stakes of Zion; and while I know, as you know, that part of the expense is met by the people, part of it is also met by appropriation from the general funds of the Church.

Temples have to be built, and not only built, but maintained. We have four of these magnificent structures now in the State of Utah, and other are in contemplation in other lands where our people are settled.

We have a missionary system to support; and while it is true the missionary meets his own expenses largely, yet the Church from its general funds provides for his return to he home and here and there assistance is rendered where it becomes absolutely necessary.

rendered where it becomes absolutely necessary.

The Church has its employes to pay while there is no organization in the world where so much of free laby is given to it—specially in the matter of its preaching ministry—as in the Church of Jesus Christ of Letter-day Saints, the Church does of course require all the time and talent of some of its servants, and when that is the case it necessarily has to remunerate them for their services. for their services.

CHURCH SCHOOL SYSTEM.

Church school system has been founded and must be maintained; and this is a much larger enterprise than many suppose it to be. We sustain and chiefly from the general funds of the Church, the Brigham Young university, Provo, Utah: the Latter-day Saints' university, Sait Lake City. Utah: the Brigham Young college Logan, Utah: the Weber Stake academy. Ogden, Utah: the Juarez Stake academy, Juarez, Mexico: the Snow academy. Ephratin, Utah: the Ricks academy. Rexburg, Ida.; The Thatcher academy. Thatcher, Ariz.; the Fleiding academy. Paris, Ida.; the Cassis Stake academy, Oakley, Ida.; the E. 1erry Stake academy, Castle Pale, Utah: the St. Johns Stake academy, St. Johns, Ariz.; the founded and must be maintained; and Stake academy, St. Johns, Arlz.; the Snowflake Stake academy, Snowflake Arlz.; the Ulntah Stake academy, Ver-

nal, Utah; the Feaver Branch B. Y.
university Beaver, Utah.
If you suppose that this school system does not make large drafts upon
the general funds of the Church paid in by you and all of us, you are very much

Mistaken.

Again, the Church has erested a mignificen hospital in Salt Lake City, the best in the west, and that chiefly from the general funds of the Church, and it will have to be maintained and doubtless enlarged in the same war.

CARE OF THE POOR.

In addition to all this there is the maintenance of the poor, who are always with us, and who are always we comed into the Church of Christ, though the maintenance and care of them ways has been and is now a hear draft upon the resources of the Char but it is borne cheerfully since the k but it is borne cheerfully since the war and care of the Church for the poor is one of the evidences of her own divisity. When men came to the son of Gel anciently and demanded to knew "At thou the Messiah, or must we look for another?"—Jesus said, "Go and tell those who sent you that the sick are healed, that the blind see, that the lame walk and there. I think most glorious of all. and then, I think most glerious of all He said, "And to the poor the Gospel's preached." And so in this dispensation of the fulness of times, one of the signs of the work's divinity preached the Gospel to gathered them from the earth, has tried to tend sustain themselves, but been out of their power nourished and supported them from fitthes and its freewill rast offerings, a

tithes and its freewill rash discussed that the cry of the poor does not reach the ears of the God of Sabaoth from the midst of the Saints.

After the author of this Kearer adopted speech had recalled the fast that "Mormons" Tooked upon this part of their work with pride, he says that is some of the institutions established by the state for the maintenance of the of their work with the solutions of the poor, notwithstanding "Mormon" prior in care of their poor, there are sent "Mormon" poor in those maintained. Well, what of it? Have not the "Mormon" as well as other citizens a right to such assistance? It is conceded even in the speech under consideration that the "Mormons" pay half the faxes (and they pay much more than half out of which the instrained. But notwithstanding there may be some few "Mormons" in these state institutions it still remains true that the "Mormons" it still remains true that the "Mormons that this charitable work is a heavy draft apon her revenues.

A FALSE CHARGE.

A FALSE CHARGE.

It is falsely represented in this steech that the fithes of the Church are the personal income or the Trustee-in-Trust of the Church

I know there are many here who when I make that announcement will doubtless think, surely Mr. Robers