

scores of others similarly situated, cannot help themselves until a change shall be wrought in the conditions that environ them. Employment must be created or this waste, which is appalling when expressed in figures, must continue. The wonder is not that times are hard in the rural districts of Utah, but that the people, after sustaining such a drain, are as well off as they are.

Just here is a problem of more serious moment, and of much more direct application to the people of our young State, than is the silver question or the tariff, or any other issue in national politics. We stand and gaze afar off in an effort to find a solution for the distant problems, but who of us is trying to solve the stupendous one of employment for home labor?

VIEWING THE DEAD.

It has been a prevailing custom among the Latter-day Saints, as in the world, to make the exposure to public gaze of the remains of the dead a prominent feature at a funeral. At a given juncture in the services or proceedings, held for the purpose of signaling the last tokens of respect to the departed, the multitude is invited to pass in single file around the bier, and gaze upon the mortal remains of the one who has departed.

Characteristic of the Gospel, and of the etiquette of the house of the Lord, is a spirit of delicacy, refinement and propriety, of the loftiest kind; and the exposure to public gaze of the remains is violative of this spirit. No doubt most persons who take advantage of the opportunity to look upon the face of the departed do so with emotions of affection, or at least of respect. But it is undeniable that motives of idle, not to say morbid, curiosity move the gazer in many instances.

Cases have occurred in some of the wards of the Church in which the exposure of the dead was peculiarly objectionable, and it is stated that not only have the people present at a funeral been permitted to see the remains, clothing, etc., but have even handled the corpse, prompted by a superstitious notion that to touch a dead body would bring good luck.

It is needless to say to any intelligent Latter-day Saint that all this is repugnant to that spirit and decorum which ought to characterize the laying away of the earthly tabernacle of those whom we have loved or respected; and the general authorities of the Church have felt called upon to exert an influence to check this evil, and have advised the Saints not to expose their dead to public view.

In the editorial columns of the News similar sentiments have hitherto been expressed; and a prominent occasion has arisen in connection with which they may properly be repeated and will be exemplified. At the funeral of Apostle Abraham H. Cannon the remains will not lie in state; the casket containing them will not be opened; the rule of propriety which should prevail on such an occasion will be observed. Such is the decision of the quorum of Apostles of which the deceased was a member, and which has charge of the funeral arrangements.

On the day of the funeral, but be-

fore the opening of the services, the members of the family of the deceased, his near relatives and intimate associates will, in private, be given an opportunity to look upon his features; but such a privilege will not be extended to the public. It is not designed by this procedure to wound or disappoint anyone, and it is hoped that no person will view it in such a light. The wish is only to conform to an order and help to establish a custom that ought to prevail among the Saints.

It is believed that this innovation upon prevailing usage will meet with the general and immediate approval of the Saints. Arguments in favor of it, not here expressed, will readily occur on reflection. When we have arrayed ourselves suitably for a night of rest and sweet repose, it would not conform to our ideas of propriety to become, in that state, an object of public view. We may, however, give kindly parting to those near and dear to us. The change which is called death brings no change to our sensibilities in this regard; and those who love us, and who wish, when they lay us away for our long sleep, to show their love for us, cannot do so more effectually or fittingly than by conforming to the sentiments of refinement and propriety imparted to us by the Gospel in our lifetime.

CELEBRATION POSTPONED.

Owing to the death of Apostle A. H. Cannon, it has been decided to abandon the proposed celebration of Pioneer Day at Saltair on July 24th.

HEBER J. GRANT,
Chairman Committee.

AN OBJECTIONABLE LAW.

There have recently appeared in the News a couple of communications upon the subject of birds, their destructiveness and their value being argued pro and con. The writers of these arguments have treated the subject from their respective standpoints with considerable ability. One, taking a practical and utilitarian view, has dwelt upon the pecuniary damage inflicted by birds, while the other, on more esthetic grounds, has defended the feathered tribe.

There can be no doubt that, in some localities in our State, farmers suffer more or less loss through the depredations of some kinds of birds; and where this loss is so large as to be serious, it ought to be prevented by suitable means, which would have to be prescribed by legislation. But on the other hand it is not consistent with the highest forms of morality and civilization to destroy birds through sheer wantonness. Birds are creatures of beauty, as well as of utility. Their songs make this world more cheerful, and their plumage, and the grace of their movements, embellish it wonderfully, to the mind of him in whose soul there sparkles a scintilla of poetry, or abides a sentiment of admiration for the works of the Creator.

The discussion of this question has suggested certain objections to a law

now existing upon the statute book of this State, which, in the estimation of many thoughtful citizens, ought to be repealed, or radically amended. It is the section of law under which school boys are encouraged to kill birds and rob and destroy their nests.

It was enacted with a view to the destruction of the sparrow, a bird which, beyond question, is very objectionable. It has been abundantly shown that the sparrow does great damage in the orchard. Not only does he attack fruit voraciously himself, destroying vastly more than he can possibly eat, without doing any appreciable good in the way of destroying insects, but he drives out insectivorous birds. He is a tyrannical monopolist, and the most enthusiastic friend of birds would find difficulty in balancing his debtor and creditor account with the human family.

There is no question that it would be a good thing to get rid of the sparrow; but there is a grave question if the very slight progress being made in that direction, under the statute referred to, is not costing more than it comes to. The legislative power can aim at no higher object than the preservation of the morality of the youth. Pecuniary considerations must always be secondary to this. Enlightened parents and teachers in Christian communities everywhere have always held the robbing of birds' nests, and the destruction of their eggs or young, to be a vice of boyhood of a highly reprehensible character, and it has always been expected of boys indulging in it that they would come to a bad end unless they reformed.

The robbing of a bird's nest, or the destruction of its young, is an act of cruelty, and to teach a boy that such acts are commendable, and merit a reward in money, to be paid by the State, is likely to impart to him notions of right, morality and humanity the effect of which will be unfavorable to his moral status when he is grown. To give a boy license to go among the trees and ruthlessly kill the birds that inhabit them, is not a sort of training to make of him a man of tender heart or sympathetic soul.

Some other means of destroying the sparrows ought to be devised by the Legislature. Science has abundant resources that may be utilized for the purpose. Poisons, under such restrictions as will insure safety to human beings, or snares, or traps might be used with far more efficacious results than are now being accomplished, and without demoralization to school boys.

"A SAD MISTAKE."

The DESERET NEWS makes a sad mistake in saying that the people are sovereign in this country. The only safe position is to say that God and his law are sovereign; that the only authority that will bind the conscience is that of our Creator, who has the best right to govern us, and whose law is the only law that when enforced will perfectly secure human rights.—The Christian Cynosure.

In the article referred to by the Cynosure, the News had occasion to mention the fact that the prerogatives of sovereigns in monarchical countries, in this country belong to the people,