

either one of which is capable of sending out sufficient power to propel all the cars on the line. Each has a capacity of 400 kilowatts or 533 horse-power, and the machines will be used alternately or together as occasion requires. The transformers are fed from the converters, and it requires the starting of a small motor which is a part of them, first, in order to determine when there is a sufficient volume of power to furnish the required speed and energy. This can be told by means of lights attached to a portion of the machinery. To use Mr. Knight's explanation, the transformers are like unto the Limited Express on the New York Central; they have to have a freight engine to start them. The machines weigh about twenty-three tons each and run at 400 revolutions per minute.

The Westinghouse company of Pittsburg are the manufacturers of the electric machinery, and they guarantee the dynamos at the generating station to deliver to the wires 95 per cent of the power developed by the water wheels. The necessary losses in transformation and transmission amount to 18 per cent, so that 79 per cent of the total power developed by the water wheel is delivered in the city.

The starting up of this plant should be of considerable interest to consumers of power, as it will afford an economical and convenient substitute for steam power. The economy consists in the saving of all the fuel and practically, all the labor. All the steam plants require the continuous services of at least one man, while it is claimed that a Mesta motor will not require ten minutes attention a day.

The promoters of the enterprise are to be commended for the work done, which is a living monument to their enterprise and business tact and ability.

CHURCH INFLUENCE.

A great deal is now being said regarding Church influence so-called, and it is charged against some of our fellow citizens that they cannot do anything as civil officers. Yea, further, that they cannot accept a nomination to public office without "asking counsel," etc., a terrible state of affairs, to be sure. One would imagine from the public and private utterances of certain of the orators that the Spanish Inquisition was about to be re-established, and the fires of Smithfield to be rekindled in the peaceful vales of our new State of Utah—all because the Church, whose members perhaps comprise three-fourths or four-fifths of the adult population, has issued instructions regarding the government of its functionaries, as such.

The purpose of the so-called "manifesto" has been so widely and thoroughly and unfortunately, bitterly discussed that it is almost out of place to reiterate it. But the chief proposition is, that no Church officer, having voluntarily accepted that responsibility and whose calling requires his time and labor shall accept any employment or office that would hinder the performance of the duties of his ecclesiastical office without advising his ecclesiastical superiors as such, of his intention. It appears very

patent that this rule would be considered as thoroughly consistent in any ecclesiastical, benevolent or commercial society, association or corporation.

The said address expressly declared that there is no desire on the part of the high authorities of the Utah dominant Church, in any sense, to influence any in the exercise of their civil or political privileges or functions.

As I understand the issue—for instance in a ward—a man may be called to be a Bishop, whose duties are well understood. He is the official representative of the Church as such in his locality—a father to the people ecclesiastically. To him his people or any portion are liable to look for counsel, guidance, comfort in the time of trouble. Hence he is a servant of the people. Being a citizen of our commonwealth, and peradventure in the interests of good government, his fellow citizens, and it may be his co-partisans, politically, desire him to represent the county in the legislature, or his state in Congress. This, of course, would involve his leaving home, and being absent from his spiritual flock for a greater or lesser period. Does it not appear to all that, so far as the ecclesiastical body over which he presides is concerned, it would surely suffer from being thus deprived of its head? Does it not appear that common courtesy alone would require that his ecclesiastical superiors should be consulted before his accepting a nomination or election to any such civil office? I am confident that were the same to occur to an employee of an industrial or mercantile institution that that much certainly would be required and in nearly every case would be willingly assented to. It has the appearance of being naught but a well defined business rule applied to Church discipline. Even were it a new rule what exception could be taken to it? But as a member of said dominant Church for well nigh a third of a century, it astonishes me that any should denominate it a new rule. Is it reasonable, should a political office, the performance of which would interfere with my carrying out my ecclesiastical official duties, be offered me, that if I must choose the former to the detriment of the latter or despite the desires of my presiding officers in the Church, or Stake, or ward of which I am a member, I must abandon the duties of my Church office without notice or consultation, whereby the place could be filled temporarily or permanently by some person, in order that that portion of the body religious may be in working trim? I take it that any who have given the matter consideration would agree with my view that I would not be in good faith in my Church to do so—this being substantiated by my choosing political office and its honors, emoluments, etc., in preference to due respect to my official associates and to my continuity and integrity as an official in the Church unto which I have voluntarily joined myself.

I am speaking now of the extreme phase of the matter, the point at which I would be compelled to choose between filling my contract (which I believe that

all religionists would agree to be most sacred and solemn) with my Church—and the acceptance of any employment, political or otherwise, that would interfere therewith.

I am thankful personally that I do not share the doubts and fears that some of my co-religionists, as I think unfortunately and without sufficient warrant, have suffered themselves to entertain and express.

My political preferences are of the Democratic stripe. My experience has impressed me thus: that were I to be chosen for any of the civil honors that my co-partisans desire to bestow upon me, and that would interfere with my ecclesiastical duties voluntarily assumed, I certainly would go to my presiding officer, great or small, not to ask him if I should "run" for said office, but to arrange as a Church officer, to have such and such a recess from my labors in the Church which I had agreed to perform. I would do the same if a lucrative business offer would be made to me, requiring my removal from the seat of my ecclesiastical duties were my source of information on this point the rankest kind of a Republican; I would still go to him. My experience teaches me that if my Church superior could see the way clear to make the arrangement, that he would as readily assent, and so far as he has the power give his blessing, even though politically his and my views would be diametrically opposed.

I fail to find in the said "manifesto" a hint that I or any Church officer shall not "run" for or hold public office without Church permission. Neither do I find the least intimation that the political views of the applicant shall determine the nature of the counsel sought. It is no more nor less than a simple rule governing Church officers as such in the matter of accepting any office or employment interfering with the full and proper performance of their Church official duties.

A great deal is said about rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and all the emphasis appears to be placed on that part of the quotation. I do not ask that the greater emphasis shall be laid on the latter clause "and unto God, the things that are God's," but do ask for it, at least, equal import.

As a citizen of the United States, I hold up my hand and solemnly covenant to support the Constitution of the United States and to obey the laws thereof. As a member of my Church I have made an equally (at least) solemn covenant to abide its regulations, and I think no good American citizen should take exception to my doing this, unless my Church shall require my performances of acts repugnant to the institutions of our body politic. In such case the burden of proof rests upon the accusers.

The phrase "church influence" is so often and irreverently used, and so many vague charges made regarding it, that one feels to ask pardon for mentioning it. But so much has been said in the Legislature, and so many unkind allusions made to it that I could not refrain from thinking that our worthy representatives (I hope that a majority of them) are not carrying out their pet theory of economy in the public ex-