

honored him. The barriers of ceremony and exclusiveness which even thus early had begun to grow up around the executive mansion were thrown down, as he doubtless hoped and believed never more to be erected, and the plainest and poorest person in the grand commonwealth was made as welcome within the portals of the President's home as were the self-constituted patricians and plutocrats of the day. How vastly different it has become in the last half a century!

Perhaps the one act which more than any other makes secure the immortal character of Jefferson's fame was his authorship of the Declaration of Independence. It is at once the plainest and most powerful document ever penned by man. While being a bill of rights in the broadest sense of the term, it is also an indictment and arraignment of the royal ruling power, and it did as much toward impressing George III and his minions with the intense earnestness and invincible determination of the patriots as did the first actual conflict at Bunker Hill. It brought coherency and cohesion into the political and military operations of the Revolutionists, it nerved their arms, cheered their hearts and steadied their aim. It proclaimed in trumpet tones to all the peoples of this world for all time that truth, and honor, and valor, and justice, the eternal right and the unswerving intent to be free are more potent factors in the affairs of mankind than all other human forces by which our race was ever or can be swayed, and that people thus actuated, thus inspired, thus determined cannot be kept in subjection. It was, all in all, the moving factor in the greatest object lesson in human advancement which the world has had since the One whose precepts and practices in behalf of mankind led Him to the cross of Calvary.

Honor to the name of Thomas Jefferson, and may his great deeds and splendid character rest securely with the coming ages!

DISCIPLINE AND PERSECUTION.

A recent issue of the Washington, D. C., Post discusses the claim often made in behalf of ministers who disagree with their church rules that when the organization to which they belong calls them to order they are being persecuted. The Post's article is based on a recent action of the Boston Transcript in defending a priest of the Episcopal church who has violated openly and defiantly a canon of that church, by inviting ministers not episcopally ordained into his pulpit. The Transcript talks about "ecclesiastical persecution" on the part of the authorities who have called the disobedient priest to account, and urges that "canon law is neither infallible nor inflexible." To this the Post responds:

What has that to do with the case? The only question here is, "Did this clergyman violate canon law?" He admits that he did, and the fact is notorious. He did what he was solemnly bound not to do. There is no "ecclesiastical persecution" in disciplining a recalcitrant minister. It is just what every human organization does to members or agents who violate its rules.

Taking up an argument on the sub-

ject, our Washington contemporary makes the following pointed statements:

It is not only true that "no rogue is ever felt the halter draw with good opinion of the law," but the same rule is equally applicable to men who are not rogues, who are honest, or mean to be, in all the relations of life, but, having violated some rule that they were bound to obey, attempt to vindicate themselves by an outcry against the rule and denunciation of those who, in compliance with official duty, undertake to discipline them for disobedience of it. The Post has, on various occasions, discussed the cases of clergymen who had violated the canons or prescribed rules of their respective churches and who cried "persecution" when brought to book. In this happy land of ours we have complete religious liberty. Every man has a right to believe or disbelieve in any tenet, doctrine, or creed. Any two or more persons, holding the same belief, have a right to formulate a creed and set up a sect. They have a lawful right to believe and declare—if they see fit—that their belief is the only true faith; that their path is the only way that leads to the Heavenly City. This absolute religious freedom has naturally resulted in a multiplication of churches, denominations and sects. The slightest difference in belief sometimes splits a church into two or more parts, so that we have various divisions of Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, etc.

The Post says this religious freedom works well under existing conditions in contributing to the peaceful and orderly conduct of religious bodies, and adds:

But no church or sect compels any person to join its membership, and no man can become a clergyman of any denomination except by his own seeking. And every man who takes the office of pastor, priest or minister, must solemnly declare that he believes the doctrines of a church and pledge himself to obey its laws. He is not bound to believe and obey to the end of his life. He may change his faith at any time. He may come to believe that this or that tenet is erroneous, or this or that rule a mistake. But, as an honest man, he is bound to step down and out when he can no longer keep his ordination pledge; bound to refrain from disobedience of canons or regulations. And if, when he has disobeyed, and is called to account and put on trial, he raises the "persecution" cry, he is entitled to no sympathy. Every organization among men, whether for religious, social, commercial, scientific, or any other purpose—every organized body from a baseball club to the greatest church council—has, and must have, its laws; and if its officers or members violate them they are, and ought to be, subject to disciplinary proceedings.

The Post's article covers the ground pretty well as regards the principle involved. If an organization were to pursue a person who had withdrawn from it because he did not submit to its rules, and who made no assault upon the organization but let it severely alone, there would be persecution. But any lawful organization has a right to act in its own defense, and to enforce the rules of the society upon its members. If the latter do not approve of the rules they can withdraw from membership, where the rules no longer apply to them; and no church or society could maintain its self-respect if it did not enforce its rules upon recalcitrant members. So every self-respecting person who has the

courage of his convictions and expects to stand by them, when these disagree with the rules of any organization, will vindicate them by withdrawing from that society whose rules he dissents from. If members of a church entertain views on doctrine and discipline contrary to the church rule, they have no just complaint at the organization for either disciplining or expelling them. If they wish to maintain those contrary views they should retire from the society with which they disagree; but to retain membership while antagonizing a church doctrine or rule is trespassing upon the religious freedom of that church to the extent of the dissemination or disturbance that is caused in its ranks by such antagonism.

THE WHEAT OUTLOOK.

The prospect for the present year is that the Utah man who has a good supply of wheat in his granary would better hold on to it, for a while at least, as it may prove about the handiest thing of a material nature that he can save to the near future. It is true that in these valleys the prospects for a big grain crop are very good; but the same conditions do not exist elsewhere. And here, by the heavy outward shipments of wheat last fall, the supply is comparatively limited. It looks now as though all the wheat that will be raised in these valleys this season will be needed to supply the local demand. In such a situation, the people of Utah would be in a sorry plight, if their grain fields should cease to give of their fulness this year, as the fields in other parts are doing. The present condition ought to be the final warning needed to cause the people of this State to keep ahead in their supply of staple breadstuffs, as they have been advised so often and so strongly.

The status of this nation upon the wheat question is well stated in the current government reports, which announce that over the greater part of this country the conditions for farming have not been favorable. Winter wheat has been winter killed to a greater or less extent over a considerable portion of the principal winter wheat states. It is further stated that practically no spring wheat has been sown yet. In the extensive grain raising regions of the North and Northwest the ground is yet covered with snow, or the weather is so cold and wet that spring seeding is not possible.

The destruction of winter wheat and the backward spring, with disastrous floods that have occurred, all go to insure a smaller acreage and yield than would have been the case with an earlier spring and milder winter. In connection with this are the famine conditions in Asia, the increased demand caused by the movement of large armies in Europe and the warlike preparations and prospect of actual war there, and the disturbances in South America interfering with wheat in that section. So that altogether the outlook is that the price of wheat will not be reduced by the presence of an over-supply locally for some time to come, if, indeed such an event can occur prior to the harvest season of 1898.