

statements of this man Small. We regard his letter as a bold and unscrupulous attempt to deceive the American people, and hence we give them warning to beware of this man whose record here is very questionable and unsavory.

"We recommend that the M. E. conference which meets in this city in June make a thorough investigation of his record in these matters.

"A. B. JOHNSON,
"S. S. SCHRAMM,
"C. E. COOLIDGE,
"Committee."

Mr. Small has planted suit against those whom he regards as his enemies in Ogden. It was suggested in the meeting that instead of taking any action on Saturday of the character proposed, the decision of the court be awaited. This idea was, of course, not to be entertained, and it was proper that it should not be. There is, in our view, but little prospect of Mr. Small figuring personally in the courts of Utah, else he has some other than the usual reason for slipping over the Canadian border. While there must be but meagre sympathy for the two principals in the unseemly squabble—the Rev. Hill in Utah, and the visitor to Canada—the late president of the Methodist university has cruelly and unjustly assailed the characters of good and honest men of the board of directors of the institution. And any method that is proper should be adopted to set them in a proper light before the public. Some of the most decent and respectable citizens of Ogden have been subjected, in this controversy, to the vile tirades of one of the basest hypocrites of the present generation, and there should, in these instances be a vigorous defense against his venomous onslaughts.

This question is absorbing so much of the attention of Messrs. Small and Hill that their unchristian anti-Mormon tirades have been suspended for a season. Should there be at any time a resumption of their defamatory and slanderous course in that line, it will be natural that we should hold in reserve a few facts that have been elucidated during the present controversy.

RELIGIOUS DISSENTIONS.

PROFESSOR BRIGGS is causing a commotion in Presbyterian circles, that reminds one of the religious agitations of two centuries ago. His case is now before the General Assembly of that church. He was a professor in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, one of the great educational institutions of the Presbyterian religion. For some time he has been teaching doctrines considered unorthodox by many ministers, while others sustained him. He taught a doctrine of progres-

sive sanctification which is interpreted by prominent Presbyterian theologians to be the same as the purgatory of Romanism. He also taught that the Bible is not verbally inspired, which, as some think, makes it no more than any other written record.

The General Assembly is composed of representatives from 210 presbyteries. It is said that it is split into three factions in regard to the Briggs case. One faction wants the professor removed, considering him unreliable, unorthodox, and dangerous to the church. The second faction says he is all right, and quite safe. The third wants him retained, because he is a good man, and of value to the church. Dr. Barrows, a well-known Chicago Presbyterian, endorses Briggs, and says that if the Presbyterian confession of faith is too narrow, it ought to be broadened so as to embrace Dr. Briggs and his doctrines.

As the matter now stands it makes as pretty a quarrel as St. Lucius O'Trigger himself could desire, and bids fair for the establishment of a new Presbyterian sect combining Romanism, Universalism and Ingersollism.

The fact is the theological horizon is clouded everywhere. In the Episcopal church the Howard McQueary case was followed by the cases of Dr. Newton and Dr. Rainsford, accused of promulgating doctrine not orthodox. These two gentlemen will soon be put on trial also for heresy. A New Jersey Episcopal clergyman named Roche is about to be tried for uncanonical practices amounting to heresy. He elevated the elements at communion, which is virtually the "elevation of the host" in the Roman service, thus causing it to be worshipped. It is said that teaching of this kind has driven several young divinity students out of the Episcopal church to find refuge in the Roman fold.

The Baptists are also in a muddle. Dr. Bridgman resigned his pastorate because he could not preach the literal hell of fire and brimstone, and as he could not give hell to the sinners he left the church. Another Baptist minister in Pennsylvania said two weeks ago: "There is nothing positive as to the authorship of the books of the Bible; he did not believe St. Paul was inspired; he did not believe Christ when on earth was conscious of being God; and the Bible should be put in crucible and the dross expunged."

This theological chaos among Protestant sects gives encouragement to Romanism. It is significant of the value of recognized authority, and suggests the absolute need of present divine revelation. But this being out of the question among the masses

in the religious world and totally rejected by the ministers of the various denominations the lack of harmony and unity favors the spirit of indifference, and the absence of a positive standard of doctrine fosters infidelity, and the numerous revolts against ecclesiastical authority leads in the direction of general religious anarchy.

THE CHURCH PROPERTY.

THE Supreme court of the United States has at length taken action in regard to the suit for the confiscation of the personal property of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. That is to say, it has left the question at issue still unsettled, the property seized still undisposed of.

The conclusion reached, that "there does not exist any person or corporation legally entitled to any of the personality as the successors of said Church" is very remarkable, in face of the living fact that the Latter-day Saints still exist "individually and as a body" and are the rightful owners of the property seized.

The statement, too, that there does not exist any trust or purpose for which any part of the personal property was originally required, to which any part of it can be used, that is not in whole or in part opposed to public policy and good morals, is also very peculiar and contrary to the facts of record in the case.

Can any of the ordinances of the Church, now that polygamous marriages have ceased, be fairly classed as opposed to public policy and good morals? Is the preaching of the Gospel, the baptism of repentant believers, the services in meeting houses, the ceremonies in temples, or the maintenance of Church organizations, opposed to public policy and good morals? If so, the same may be said against the conducting of any and every ecclesiastical organization in the country.

"Public policy" is a very elastic phrase. If the State can declare the promulgation and support of the creed of one church to be against public policy, it can do the same in regard to any other or to all of them. The "Mormon" Church, as it is commonly called, has nothing in its organization or practice which is contrary to law. What has the State, then, to do with it by way of interference? "Public policy" is very indefinite, and we fail to find in the system of American government, any power, of court or Congress, to touch church property or suppress a religious system or decide as to the effect of any faith upon public policy.