

penalty for disregarding this provision is increased by the addition of a sixty days term in the county jail. A magistrate is authorized to issue search warrants for concealed imitation dairy products, which are to be seized and confiscated wherever found. The analysis of seized products is to be made by the chemist of any State institution, and the expense is assessed against the person having the imitations in his possession.

NO CAUSE FOR ALARM.

There is not the slightest occasion for the alarm that is sought to be worked up over the existence of leprosy among Hawaiians in the Iosepa colony in Tooele county. It may suit a certain newspaper fancy to have morgue reporters dig affairs up in ghastly sensational language, illustrated by disgusting pictures, but the fact remains that there is absolutely no danger of the disease being communicated to other people. On this point we have the the explicit testimony of physicians acquainted with the trouble and its history and effects, and of men whose long experience with the Hawaiians is of vastly greater worth than the theories of some physicians who have no practical knowledge of leprosy and its communication. People who go to the Hawaiian islands, either from Utah or elsewhere, do so without the slightest risk of contamination by the disease; and no one who does not want it is under the necessity of coming in contact with the affected individuals. Nobody in Tooele or elsewhere will be touched by the disease if they leave the Hawaiians alone. Some weeks ago we stated the fact of leprosy being in the colony named, and it is regrettable that such a record had to be made. From the discovery all necessary precautions have been taken, and will continue to be. This being the case, it is all the more despicable to seek to scare timid people almost out of their senses when there is no justification for anyone being alarmed.

SILVER AND THE DEMOCRATS.

Our Democratic brethren in this and adjacent states are fond of felicitating themselves over the assurance that their party in national convention next month will assuredly declare for free silver, and name a candidate on that kind of a platform. They have not been experiencing much encouragement lately in the nation, and even the most sanguine among them have referred to the contest this fall with a sort of hopeless shrug. It would be cruel, therefore, even to attempt to rob them of the joy that accompanies the thought of a good, sound, ringing 16-to-1 silver plank as the result of the great meeting at Chicago on the 7th proximo.

It is not so sure, however, that they are reckoning without their host. In the West it is difficult to estimate the might and influence of the gold wing of the party, with the administration at its head. The power of this element is incalculable, and it has thus far proved irresistible. For that matter, it leaps beyond party lines entirely, and the compact between the

so-called "sound-money" men is of a more adhesive and blinding character than ever the blood and water relationship between partisans has been or is. At this supreme moment it is not to be expected that the gold Democrats will easily or tamely submit to be overthrown by the silver wing, nor that, if necessity arises, the former will fail of help even from gold Republicans.

At the present time it looks as though the silver men will control the convention and that the platform and candidate will be of corresponding complexion. But there is a lurking danger that the whole business may be captured by the "sound-money" forces; and until the first test on official roll call, the possibility of such a result will exist in the minds of those who calmly recall events during the recent past, and dispassionately look over the situation as it is today.

THE POLITICS OF THE "BOLT."

Whatever may be thought of the wisdom of the course pursued by the western silver senators in withdrawing from their party's convention at St. Louis—and we confess that we are not prepared to give it unreserved praise—the fact is indisputable that at one jump they have mounted into a prominence before the public eye in the nation at large scarcely second to that of McKinley himself—and that of itself is something that many a man would give ten years of his life for. Furthermore, their gallantry and earnestness extort admiration from even their most bitter opponents. Everybody likes courage, particularly the moral kind, which is shown in adherence to that which is believed to be right regardless of the jeers and taunts and threats of the opposition. Men who display the sort of heroism which the St. Louis bolters have done—burning their bridges, so to speak, so far as the party in the nation and the next administration are concerned—deserve and ought to receive a sympathetic and enthusiastic welcome from their people at home, in whose behalf the fight was made. We apprehend that while some may question their judgment, all will applaud their devotion to principle; and that a warm welcome awaits them on their return.

Looking at the situation from the standpoint of local politics, we repeat that if anything can retain Utah in the Republican column—assuming that the Democrats at Chicago will name a silver candidate on a silver platform—it is the action of the three silver delegates from this State. By their course they declare that the money question is with them no less important than any other principle of the party, and cannot be ignored without grave menace to party success. There will be no question that in this view they are correct. For their own part they assert further that they will not allow the great issue to be ignored; and while they cannot consistently battle under a banner and a leader that directly antagonize a question which with them is most vital, they can still fight for and maintain the historic principles of the party on which all are

agreed, and at the same time win friends for the issue in controversy which their party friends elsewhere have no liking for. The Republicans of Utah, almost to a man, would rather fight for silver than against it. Comparatively few could be prevailed upon to do the latter. Yet save for the action of these three delegates the latter would be the only alternative, unless they gave up the fight altogether. Now they can work for Republicanism with silver as a part of the doctrine. Except for the bolt they could not have worked for Republicanism only as they also worked for the destruction of silver.

We take it, therefore, that so far as local conditions go, there was good politics in the course that was taken. It may lose the State to McKinley—probably it will, if the Democrats put up a silver man as standard-bearer. But it may prevent what would otherwise have been almost inevitable—the loss of the State itself to the Republican party at home. No one can now truthfully claim that as to local parties the Democrats have a monopoly of the friendship of silver. At the election for legislators and other local officers next November, Messrs. Cannon, Allen, Salisbury, Kearns, and others, have made it possible for their party friends to vote as consistently the Republican ticket as ever before. If they had all stayed in the convention and to that extent acquiesced in the work, the opposing party would have been furnished such a club as would have intimidated almost any silver Republican from voting his party ticket at all.

CONSENT AND RULING.

It is a maxim of the Church that all things are done therein by common consent. If a rule is sought to be promulgated affecting the whole Church, the consent of its membership must be obtained thereto before it is of force on those members; and if the membership should not give consent to such rule, then it would not be binding upon them. The principle holds good in all departments, including officials called to preside over the people in any capacity. If those over whom an officer is proposed to preside decline to consent to that presidency, then the effort to establish it fails.

It is not implied, however, in the doctrine of common consent that a rule once accepted by the Church membership may be revoked thereby. For such revocation there is required the approval of the Giver of the rule, otherwise there is no mutual action. The genius of the Church is not that its membership formulates its rules. If it were, then it would be the church of the members and not of the Lord. In the Church the word of the Lord is given by revelation from Him, not by the suggestions of man, and if the people refuse to consent to the revelation as a rule, theirs is the responsibility. But when the Church consents, the rule is established, and it is not revoked except upon inauguration from the same Source that gave it. For the institution of any rule, a regular channel of procedure is established in the authority or Priesthood which the Lord has given; and all who become members of