

became a necessity in these last days, in order to fulfil the promises made, for another restoration to take place, by bringing back the ancient Priesthood with all its powers and blessings. This is only a fulfillment of predictions made by inspired men of Israel. Isaiah speaks of a great and marvelous work that was to be performed in the last days, before which the wisdom of the wise should perish. Jeremiah speaks of a gathering of the house of Israel in these latter days. This is a gathering dispensation, a dispensation of the fullness of times, when all things are to be gathered in one, both those in heaven and those on earth.

We, the Latter-day Saints, are simple enough to believe that these predictions are being fulfilled today and that the Saints who have come from all nations of the earth are the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, being mostly the descendants of Joseph, and flowing together in one people as rivers in one ocean.

Joseph Smith was told by the Almighty that he was a lineal descendant of Joseph who was sold into Egypt, and on him was the duty laid to raise the standard in these last days and gather Israel, preparatory to accomplishing a great and marvelous work. And this work is no less than to prepare the world for the coming of the Redeemer in His glory. The human race is to be prepared for this event, and the Lord has called a few to preach the glad tidings of His second advent, as well as to set an example for the world to emulate, by means of which they can be made worthy to enter the presence of God. This was what Moses endeavored to do. A similar mission was given to Joseph Smith.

Why is it that the world refuses to recognize this mission? Why is it to be considered strange that God should send a Prophet to do for us what Prophets did for our ancestors thousands of years ago? Some have asked, Would God, if He intended to establish His work on earth, have passed all the eminent doctors of divinity and chosen a boy like Joseph Smith? and they suppose this to be a valid argument against his claims to being a servant of God. But let me remind such persons that when Jesus came, the same line of argument was used against Him. Is He not, it was asked, the carpenter's boy, and can He be the Son of God? The idea seemed preposterous, and they rejected Him. They could not believe that God would choose for a Messiah one whom they had seen working in a carpenter's shop. There was no light around his head, as some painters depict Him. There was nothing extraordinary about His appearance. He had not come to save souls by the beauty of His external form, nor by eloquence, but by proclaiming the truth. He proved it by promising that those who would do His will should know for themselves whether the teaching was from God. So He was rejected, because people judged from outward appearance, the most deceptive sign whereby anything can be judged. The world would not take the trouble of investigating His teachings but they set Him down as an impostor. It is no wonder, therefore, that Joseph Smith should be rejected.

A minister once said, Joseph Smith was not rejected because he was a farmer's boy, but because his claims were false and his teachings injurious to the world. The speaker would only say to this that those who will honestly investigate this matter, shall know for themselves that these claims and teachings are from God. Can an impostor make such a promise?

The speaker would testify that this religion—no matter what name you give it—is true. He knows that the Saints are lineal descendants of Abraham and on them rest the blessings once pronounced on the father of the faithful. But are we fulfilling our mission? This is an important question. Are we faithful to our mission as the salt of the world? We have a mission to perform and the saying before quoted is as applicable today as ever: "If the salt loses its savor, it is good for nothing but to be thrown out and trodden under the feet of men."

If we are true to our mission, the greatest honor is in store for us. But if not, it will be with us as with the salt that has lost its savor. We must seek the Kingdom of God first and temporal things must be a secondary consideration. Blessed are we if we are faithful, and may God grant that we may fulfil our mission as the children of Abraham, chosen to assist in the salvation of mankind.

The choir sang the anthem:

Let the mountains shout for joy,

and the congregation joined the choir in singing the doxology.

Benediction was pronounced by Counselor Joseph E. Taylor.

## HOME RULE OR STATEHOOD.

*Editor Deseret News:*

Not long since I received a short note, of which the following is a copy: "Hadley D. Johnson:

"Dear Sir—I notice by the *Times* that you are opposed to the bill providing home rule for Utah. I am at a loss to understand the position you take. If you have time to do so, I should be pleased to learn from you the grounds of your opposition to the proposed measure."

I withhold the name of the writer of the above note, but remark, however, that he is a well known, prominent, popular and influential gentleman, as well as a thoroughly posted Democrat, and one who is entitled to be respected, and who is highly respected by me for the many admirable qualities with which he is endowed.

Inasmuch as this gentleman seems to desire to obtain my views in regard to this important question, though for what purpose I do not know, and as the Salt Lake *Times* saw proper to print without any reason being assigned, the alleged fact of my opposition to the Home Rule bill so denominated, I respectfully ask the use of space in the columns of your widely circulated paper to explain some of the reasons which induce me to occupy the position I do on the question.

In the first place, not having interviewed me, the reporter for that paper did not know personally what my views are, and no doubt wrote from hearsay; but, in any event, the word oppose does not express my views at all.

To oppose is to resist; to combat; to withstand. Now, my position is not one of combat or resistance. I merely entertain and express my own ideas of what would best subserve the interests of the people of Utah. I coincide partially with Pope, who wrote:

For forms of government let fools contest,  
Whate'er is best administered is best.

I will quarrel with no man on this question, but entertaining personal views, am not afraid or ashamed to announce them in my plain simple way.

To the point then. I remark that I do not yield my support to the bill in question, because I think there is another plan which would, if adopted, prove of far greater benefit to Utah. I refer to that of statehood; and I believe that if we urge this home rule plan, whether successful or not, the effort will be in the way of, and hinder and delay the admission of Utah as a State. I merely have a choice in favor of statehood in preference to the plan proposed by the home rule bill. I do not say that the present system of governing Utah is better than the proposed measure, but I do say that statehood would be better than either, and I believe that should Congress see proper to make any change it would be more likely to admit us as a State, than to pass an act such as is asked for, such a change would be, in fact, a revolution so great that my opinion is Congress would hesitate to effect it.

It must be born in mind that for 100 years the United States has been in the habit of governing the Territories somewhat according to the provisions of our organic act. Can it reasonably be expected that after so long a time, so great a change as the proposed one would be abruptly brought about? I think not, and hence withhold my support to it.

I have been informed that the proposed measure was adopted by some of my co-workers in the Democratic party, and I wish to say that my failure to see the matter as they see it, does not arise from a disposition to antagonize any portion of my Democratic friends. On the contrary what I write is merely to let them know that I, who have been a life long advocate of home rule, still adhere to the principle.

If this question had been submitted to the Democratic Territorial convention held in this city last July, and if that convention had adopted and made its advocacy a part of its platform, then in that case I should have been willing to waive my personal objections, but as such was not the case, I feel that I am at perfect liberty to dissent from the views of its friends; and this dissent, as I have said, is based upon the fact that I prefer statehood.

I observe that Senator Teller has introduced a bill providing for the admission of Utah as a State. Should an enabling act such as he contemplates become a law, I think it would be much better for Utah, than would be the bill introduced by Senator Faulkner, and I repeat the opinion that its prospect of success in both houses of Congress would be as good if not better, than the Faulkner bill. As one of the Sovereign States in the Union we could say that we possessed home rule similar to that possessed by other States. Should such enabling act be passed, I