

CORRESPONDENCE.

Written for this Paper.

IT WENT SMOOTHLY.

Washington, D. C., Dec. 13, 1893.

The Utah admission bill, an enabling act providing for the incorporation of Utah into the Union as a sovereign state, having passed the House this afternoon, it is important that the people of Utah should have correct notions; first, as to the attitude of parties and persons in relation to the passage of the bill thus far in Congress; second, in relation to the provisions of the bill and the things necessary to be accomplished in order to consummate statehood.

It is only the first proposition that we shall consider at present—the attitude of persons and parties in relation to the passage of the bill through the House; as the second proposition will require several articles, and the bill may be further amended in the Senate and by joint committee from both houses before its final passage. The probabilities are that it will not be materially changed.

As it stands, it is a liberal and generous bill, and highly creditable to the people of Utah, and it does much to obliterate the friction of past years. It is expressive of the nation's confidence in Utah. It bids out the past and extends the hand of fellowship for an everlasting brotherhood and co-operation.

As to the attitude of parties and persons, the only feature to be discussed in this article, it might be summed up by saying that Utah was treated generously and considerably all round. The final vote was responded to on both sides of the House with equal volume and emphasis. There was only one distinct voice that uttered "No" when the negative was called. That was on the right, the Democratic, side. I did not know who it was, and it was immaterial, for there was a full house on both sides. I judge that there were 200 on both sides that responded "Aye." Some one told me that there was one "No" on the Republican side, but I did not hear it, although I reported two negatives in the dispatches. A correspondent that sat on the Republican side at the time tells me that there was no voice on that side when the negative was called. It is utterly immaterial at all events. The Populists to a man, so far as I have learned or could judge, were in favor of Utah statehood. Jerry Simpson and Baker of Kansas spoke for them. There were only two decided opponents to the bill in the speaking that was done. These were Harter of Ohio, a Democrat, and Morse of Massachusetts, a Republican. The former opposed it on the general grounds that there were too many small western states now, and that no more should be admitted for some years to come. This objection will be the most potent one in the Senate when the bill comes before that body. It is really the expressed fear of the gold bugs and money monopolists that they will finally be outvoted in the Senate on money questions.

The objections raised by Morse were of a personal character applicable to

the trustworthiness of the Mormon people. He was extremely bitter and virulent in his criticisms and denunciations, brought up the Mountain Meadow massacre, and imputed the darkest and most sinister motives to the Mormon people in their application for statehood. But he was soon called down by half a dozen Republicans who sat near him. They gayer him and annoyed him until he slumped completely, although he had his speech type-written, and I think had not nearly completed it. The House was in no mood to hear anything about Mormon atrocities; neither would they hear any argument from any member aiming to show that polygamy was not or would not be abandoned. They were willing to incorporate some legislation looking to the framing and execution of law in that direction; but no member had any encouragement to get up and say that the Mormons were not sincere, that they were not trustworthy, that they would not be good citizens. No member was allowed to lay on into a tirade against the Mormon people, or to expatiate in some disrespectful way upon their past history.

In all this it must be perceived that the tone of the House was extremely friendly and considerate. When the matter was first brought up last Friday during the morning hour, the Republicans commenced to filibuster, as they had not been consulted so as to take action as a party. On the following Monday they had determined on a course of action, and consented that the Utah bill should come up in regular order and have two days set apart to it, so as to have full consideration and discussion. It was evident on Tuesday that the party had come to an agreement to put Utah through, for Tom Reed took charge of the Republican procedure and contributed to the passage of the bill at every stage; and when Dolliver of Iowa got up and stated that he "felt authorized to voice the will of the Republican party that Utah should be admitted to statehood," it settled the question of the action of the Republicans in the House, and doubtless in the Senate.

Too much praise can not be given to Mr. Rawlins for his able, manly and discreet management of the bill from the start. He did not make any mistakes or blunders. He was modest yet firm and persistent. His speech was excellent, and his overhauling of Morse of Massachusetts for his bitter tirade was admirable, and it brought down the House in long-continued and oft-repeated applause, and the galleries resounded with cheers and acclamations. The fact is, everybody about the House was in favor of Utah. The members all gathered about Rawlins. At least fifty Republicans went over and clustered around the speaker. They wanted him to do well, and gave their encouragement at every step, and took pains to applaud every point he would make. Tom Reed took his seat a good part of the time among the Democrats, and from that position arose several times and asked for an extension of their time to conclude their speeches; so that everything moved in one cur-

rent to the accomplishment of the general purpose of the passage of the bill. The correspondents all knew from the time that proceedings opened on Tuesday, when the party leaders showed signs of working together, that the bill would pass without other incidents than possibly a few amendments, and all the amendments that were made were by common consent all round. These amendments and the bill itself will be the subjects of some further consideration. C. R.

CHURCH THEOLOGY CLASS.

One thousand and fifty students had assembled at the usual time and place, when Dr. J. E. Talmage called the class to order. Prayer was offered by Elder A. W. Davis.

After answering some written questions, which had been submitted, Instructor Talmage took a review on the subject-matter considered at the last session. Leaflet No. 8, copies of which had been distributed at the door, was then taken up for study. Continuing with the Fourth Article of Faith the manner of administering baptism received first attention. The derivation of the word "baptize" gives a proper understanding of its meaning. To fully establish this fact, however, it should be known how the word was used at or about the time of Christ.

Quotations from Roman authors and historians of that time showed conclusively that by baptism was meant immersion, in whatever way the word was used. And this is as Christ used it and surely he could only have meant that. As birth is the beginning of another life, so baptism is compared to the commencement of a new life. Had Christ used this comparison with sprinkling or pouring it would certainly have been an incomplete metaphor. Such would be at variance to all the other so perfect parables and metaphors, which have established his acknowledged ability as a teacher of teachers. Christ himself was baptized by immersion, for after the ceremony he came "out of the water." The language seems so plain that even a wayfaring man may understand. John baptized in the river Jordan; the Apostles at a place "where there was much water." Alma, among the Nephites, preached the same doctrine, and the most explicit instructions were given by the Savior to the people of this continent. In eastern Christian churches immersion was the only mode known for many centuries after Christ, other methods not becoming general till near the close of the Thirteenth century. Quoting Mosheim and other historians many of the foolish practices connected with the departure of the true method and spirit of this ceremony were referred to. The manner in which baptism must be administered in this our day has been revealed through the Prophet Joseph Smith to be as follows: "The person who is called of God, and has authority from Jesus Christ to baptize, shall go down into the water with the person who has presented him or herself for baptism, and shall say, calling him or her by name—Having been commissioned of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Then shall he immerse him