

cles of justice, freedom and equality, —prevail the wide world over.

"Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leather hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No, true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And with heart and hand to be
Earnest to make others free."

God did not found this nation for a mere handful of his children. He founded it for all mankind. And when he bound together these United States, it was but a type, a symbol and a foreshadowing of a united world. All nations will yet join hands as these States have done, and this, in my opinion will only be the prelude to a work still greater, lifting from earth that curse which has so long rested upon it, and uniting it as glorious link in the grand chain of redeemed worlds that circle about the throne of their Creator.

Bishop Whitney was applauded upon resuming his seat at the close of his address, which occupied about three quarters of an hour in delivery.

The president then announced that the subject introduced by the Bishop was now open to the impartial consideration of the members of the conference.

REV. J. H. CROCKER.

The Rev. J. H. Crocker, of Montana, led off. He referred to the pleasant occasion which had brought the conference together in this city, and said that the church which he himself represented was claimed to be one of the oldest forms of religion. They did not come there, however, either to convert or to condemn, but freely to converse and counsel together respecting those interests of our common humanity which should be dear to us all. They came there that they might understand each other better, and take each other at the best. They came with open arms and open hearts to be instructed and inspired. The man who knew only one religion really knew none at all. The bible was a great book, because into it had been poured the riches of the greatest races of this earth. The speaker assured Bishop Whitney that there was no "executioner" present that afternoon; there was no caustic critic there, but a sympathetic attention. While the Bishop was speaking he wondered a little whether he was a "Mormon" and their friend a Unitarian; and he did not know for certain yet. (Laughter.) If to love the truth with all one's energy was to be a "Mormon," then he was a "Mormon" himself; if to feel kinship with that Spirit which lights the heavens on high and strews with beauty the earth beneath his feet was to be a "Mormon," then he, too, was one; if that native reverence of the human heart and the desire of the human soul for the Eternal was to be a "Mormon," he, too, was one; if to have a hope that embraced all eternity and all the children of men; if to stand in sympathy with every human heart and every human interest that called forth love and sacrifice, he, too, was a "Mormon." But he desired to state briefly some things which led him to doubt just a little whether he was quite ready to become a "Mormon" bishop. (Laughter.) While

listening to the charming and eloquent address of Bishop Whitney, the conviction was poured upon him that, whether higher or lower, the last speaker occupied an entirely different intellectual platform from himself. The Bishop saw what he could not see; he assumed what he himself could not grant, and what he could not accept. There seemed to be evidences within his reach which did not touch him. He was sure, however, that Bishop Whitney and himself stood, in many respects, upon the same sympathetic basis—that so far as many of the nobler instincts of the human breast are concerned nothing divided them. But the Bishop's intellectual range was not his; his intellectual method was not his; his intellectual convictions respecting what this universe was and what man was, were not his. The being and evolution of God were clear and plain matters to the Bishop—he knew how God ruled; how He came to be God. He had no doubt as to Bishop Whitney's absolute sincerity, he had no misgivings respecting the religious importance of this theosophy in his own mind; but he frankly confessed that he himself did not know how God ruled the universe or how He came to be God. Bishop Whitney entered where he dared not tread and asserted what he dared not claim. He himself did not care to enter into the secrets of the Eternal, and say that He dwelt upon some star with a revolution of a thousand years. His reverence sealed his lips. From his own intellectual level such assumptions were destructive of reverence for him; they were not for the Bishop. The speaker went on to touch upon what he termed the "results of modern scholarship," and asked, if these be true, what became of the assertions of his friend respecting good old Adam, noble Enoch, faithful Noah, and apostolic Abraham? Brought to the bar of modern scholarship and criticized, the story of Adam vanished as a legend adopted from a heathen nation. They found its original written in inscriptions on clay tablets exhumed from the dust of centuries. If, then, these things turned out to be legends brought in from outside sources, where was the record that Adam or Enoch had such a Gospel? While presenting his argument, though not against "Mormonism" itself, he wished to indicate the obstacles which stood in his own mind against any system based upon the assumption of special, peculiar or supernatural relations; and this applied with equal force against any body of people who assumed to have a special dispensation from the Almighty, who had a special channel of communication outside the intellectual faculties and functions of human nature. When such things were assumed, then was created an artificial and unnatural distinction between those who had that dispensation and those who had not. He wanted a religion with no artificial distinctions between man and man, leaving every soul with equal access to the Eternal.

A gentleman in the audience asked—"Do you make no distinction between good and evil?" to which Mr. Crocker replied—"Certainly." It

seemed to him very clear, he went on, that any such assumption as had been mentioned, was calculated to stand in the way of that noble fellowship and universal brotherhood so beautifully described by the Bishop himself. Such an assumption put a bar across the pathway of discovery, hedged up the way of truth, and bound men to a conformity with a system when they ought to be in the watch tower of discovery.

REV. DR. UTTER.

The Rev. Dr. Utter also offered a few observations. He said the question at issue seemed to be, had the Almighty ever spoken with a man's voice, or with human words, to anybody on this earth—had he revealed himself to man in that way, and, if so, when, further, how could we be sure of it? The position he had taken of late years in this community had been to say plainly that God had never spoken to man about religion in any way different from that which He had spoken to man about arithmetic, geology, astronomy, or science in general. He had left us to ourselves as absolutely in regard to the moral law, and the modes of worship, the origin of man and man's future destiny, as He had in reference to the discovery of America or any other discovery on earth. What should we say of things? For himself he should admit them all equally and reject them all equally, on the principle that a man himself was the final authority for his conduct and belief. There was a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty gave him understanding; and the only revelation was a man's own reading of God's law for himself. A gentleman in the audience had asked "would you make any distinction between right and wrong?" That was a distinction as old as man, a distinction every man felt for himself; and he could not evade the force of it do what he would.

The President made a few remarks, closed in the usual way.

At last evening's session the Rev. W. M. Lane gave a sermon on "The Divinity of Christ," and then the Rev. T. B. Forbush presented the views of the Unitarian faith regarding the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth.

At the Theatre last night ended the first Unitarian Conference ever held in this city. At the

MORNING'S SESSION,

in the same building, Rev. Samuel A. Elliot, of Denver, son of President Elliot of Harvard College, was the principal speaker. His subject was "Liberty under the Law of Life." The law of liberty, said the speaker, was the striking phrase which attracted his attention. Law and liberty seem to stand against each other. The former becomes as the restraint of the latter and causes the belief to arise that there is a point where these compressive forces unite. The highest law is liberty and the highest liberty is law. Constraint always comes first, liberty afterwards. Laws are restraints only as they are preparatory and as they lead into the laws of liberty, precisely as the Magna Charta led to the Declaration of Independence and the Fugitive Slave law to the final freedom of a people.

To explain the full intent of his remarks the speaker illustrated as fol-