

State Church consisted of 58,250,000 members. The dissenters numbered 15,000,000. The latter were composed of Native Roman Catholics, United Greeks who acknowledge the supremacy of Rome, Armenians, Lutherans and Rascolniks. These last correspond in one sense to the Protestants of Western Europe, but in another sense they are diametrically opposite. While seceding from the State church and protesting against some of its usages, their protestations are against reforms of any kind whatever. They date back to Peter the Great, and had their origin in protesting against reforms introduced by that monarch. They are now very numerous, and stand first numerically among dissenters.

There are in the State church of Russia about 90,000 secular clergymen, about 7,000 monks and 5,000 nuns. These are under the direction of "The Holy Governing Synod," an institution inaugurated by Peter the Great after the abolition of the patriarchate. All its members are appointed by the Czar, and carry out his will to the letter. The question in Russia is not Church and State, nor is it Church over State, but it is State over Church in every particular. The Russian priests are supposed to co-operate with the police in all matters, and if one should disobey a military or civil officer in helping to disclose political plots, a cell in some prison, or an excursion to Siberia would be his fate.

### THE UTAH SITUATION.

THE New York *Times* has a very lengthy editorial on "Parties in Utah," in which is given a detailed account of the history of the different political organizations in this Territory. This is the closing paragraph:

"There is, therefore, no longer a People's party in Utah, but in its place and declaring the same policy as regards the Mormons, who constituted its majority, is a Democratic party. The Liberal party, however, has not dissolved, and has repudiated the declarations concerning it made by the officers of the People's party when in the act of transferring themselves to the Democratic party. The present great desire of the Utah branch of the Democratic party is the passage of a Home Rule act which will enable the Mormon population to nullify the Edmunds act. And, of course, they desire to have Utah made a sovereign State as quickly as possible. The new party was formally recognized and greatly encouraged last October by the visit of a party of distinguished Democrats from the States, among whom were Chauncey F. Black and Lawrence Gardner, respectively President and Secretary of the national organization of Democratic clubs; Senator Faulkner of West Virginia, and Congressman Bynum of Indiana. These gentlemen visited various places in the Territory where Democratic clubs had been organized, and made speeches and also addressed a State convention. We

may conclude, therefore, that the Democratic party of Utah is an accepted organization, and will be countenanced and aided in its local purposes by the national party. What these purposes are is made sufficiently plain in this historical sketch of its institution."

There is no doubt that the Democratic party of Utah is "an accepted institution," and the indications are that it "will be countenanced and aided by the national party." The same may be said of the Republican party of Utah. It has already been recognized by the national party and is an "accepted institution." It has also been "encouraged by the visit" of eminent Republicans, who made speeches and were impressed with the important changes that had taken place in this Territory. In these changes many of the late People's party have joined the Republican party, and therefore the "transfer to the Democratic party" which the *Times* speaks of is an event that never occurred.

And the *Times* has made a big mistake in its statement that the "great desire" of the Utah Democracy is to pass a bill that will "enable the Mormon population to nullify the Edmunds act." The "Home Rule" bill not only does not nullify the Edmunds act, but makes provision for the continuance of its chief feature, which is the provision for the punishment of polygamous practices. We fear the *Times* has neglected to read carefully the measure which it endeavors to criticize. Therefore the "purposes" in view of the projectors of the bill are somewhat misrepresented, not intentionally of course; the *Times* is a very respectable organ with Republican proclivities and therefore such design is out of the question.

But is the New York oracle aware that there is a bill now before Congress called the Teller bill, a Republican measure, which proposes to do much more than the "Home Rule" bill? It not only would nullify the Edmunds act but give Utah complete liberty as a State in the Union on an equality with the other States. What has the *Times* to say about that?

The truth is that good men of both political parties have become thoroughly convinced of the fact, that the very large majority of the people of the Territory are determined to take a course which shall give no excuse for the enmity, prejudice and hostility, which have heretofore hindered the recognition of Utah as worthy of a place in the sisterhood of States. They are satisfied that there is no tangible reason for refusing to Utah the political rights and liberties to which she is entitled by numbers, wealth and perma-

nent stability. Therefore they are ready to promote any measure that will lead to this end.

The Democrats, perceiving the reluctance of the country to accept the evidences of this fact, favor the "Home Rule" bill because, while giving a large measure of liberty to the citizens of the Territory, it yet provides for national control of the objectionable feature which has been in Utah's way to statehood. This has been done to meet the distrust which many good but uninformed people and papers express towards the "Mormons."

The Republicans of Utah have gone beyond that. They say Utah is ready for statehood, or will be ready by the time an enabling act can be set in operation, and they propose to make a full end of her disabilities and meet the issue without hesitation or compromise.

The intentions of both parties are to set Utah free. The difference is, that while the Democrats propose to lead up to that liberty by stages—and that because they think the country is not ready for the complete measure—the Republicans propose to make a bold stroke and have no half way measures about it.

If the New York *Times* really understood the situation in Utah today, we do not think it would oppose either plan, or attribute improper motives to the respective advocates of these political movements.

### "LIBERAL" MISRULE.

IN Mr. W. H. Shearman's letter, which appeared in the *News* of Tuesday, Feb. 2nd, that gentleman stated that the Rev. Mr. Thrall last summer pledged himself to work and vote for such a ticket as the one he outlined in his communication.

This allusion to the clergyman referred to revives a suggestive piece of history connected with the reign of "Liberal" misrule which has filled every good citizen with apprehension and disgust.

The first year under the incubus of crime and immorality, to say nothing about the ruinous burdens of taxation which followed, had developed so much rottenness, that the clergymen and other morally disposed citizens combined and called a mass meeting for the purpose of putting a check upon the stream of municipal filth, which threatened to overwhelm the community. A call was issued, the result being that on Dec. 29th, 1890, the Methodist church, in which the meeting was held, was packed by an audience composed almost exclusively of "Liberals." Judge Bowman