

son of its freedom and the accessibility of its functions to every Tom, Dick and Harry that controls a "pull" here and there, one can still be whatever he thinks best for himself or others, and be under no obligations to render an account to anybody so long as statutory enactments are not infringed upon. We appreciate the blessings and realize the honors pertaining to good citizenship in this favored land, and respect the institutions which not only permit a man to belong to any party he chooses or to none at all and protect him if need be in so doing. As a general thing he does not need protection, but he sometimes has to turn upon his annoyers.

### CHURCH RULE.

Lately a good deal has been said about what is called "Church rule," and the probability is that at this time much more will be said on the same subject by a certain publication in this city. The idea is to pronounce abroad that some kind of a "rule" exists for the government of the Mormon people, whereby they are made unworthy to possess the full privilege of American citizenship. And it is called "Church rule," probably in order, by the very sound of the word, to arouse the antagonism of all who hate the Church in general and the Mormon Church in particular. But never was there so much ado about nothing before; never was a false alarm so loudly and so persistently sounded. There is a good deal less rule by the Church among the Mormons than by the Liberals of Utah, a fact well known to all who know anything about the affairs in this Territory.

The allegation is that the Mormon Church attempts to govern its followers in politics. The Mormon Church consists of its members, including both Priesthood and lay members. The meetings of the Church are the Sabbath meetings and various conferences. In these the business of the Church is transacted and never is anything done but what the whole people through their representatives have a chance to approve of. If, therefore, it were true, that the Church laid down any rules for the political guidance of its members, those rules would be adopted by the people in their ecclesiastical assemblies. But all these meetings are public. There are no secret meetings of the Church anywhere. Politics is not part of the subjects considered in those assemblies, and every one who has attended the meetings of the Church knows this. It is therefore a strange boldness on the part of the assailants to assert the existence of "Church rule" among this people.

But this is not exactly what they mean. They assume that the people at large are "ruled" by a few prominent men in the Church, who dictate their political creed and actions. When they cry out that Church rule must be abandoned, they mean that such men in the Church who are supposed to have influence, must not meddle with politics, must cease to exercise their rights as American citizens, among which are liberty of speech and thought, and be politically dead. Rightly interpreted their

words imply that one who holds an ecclesiastical office in the Mormon Church has no more rights as an American citizen, for if he expresses his views on politics, he is both a "tyrant" and a "serf" and everything else that is bad, though this rule does not extend to and include other denominations and classes, not even their own, the worst in this respect of all. This is according to the Americanism of the Utah "patriots."

The trouble is that the same principle is never applied on the other side. There are prominent clergymen in this Territory who have not scorned to join hands and hearts with the opposing element and preached Liberalism pure and simple. Religious bodies in Utah have gathered in conferences and passed resolutions in favor of Liberalism. But such incidents are not called "church rule" in Utah. Yet what are they?

It is well understood that among the Mormons everybody thinks and acts as he chooses. If he wishes to hear the views of his brother and neighbor on any subject and feels to act upon them to some extent, he can do so; if he does not, he is at liberty to decline. That is the true position briefly stated. If this be "Church rule," who is there in this whole Republic that is not liable to the lashes of political scuffers?

It is to be hoped that the mandate of the German autocrat shall not be thought worthy of imitation in this country. He said recently he wished it understood that no ecclesiast in his country should meddle with politics. In this country no ecclesiastical office deprives a man of his franchise, and there is no autocrat to issue an edict upon the subject, although it no doubt would be considered the very thing by the antagonists of true liberty in this part of the United States.

### THE CASE CONCLUDED.

Not for the sake of continuing or renewing a discussion sufficiently prolonged as it stands, but in order that readers of the NEWS may have authoritative information as to a matter greatly concerning them, and which previously we were not in possession of, the following extracts from the rules of the national House of Representatives are published:

It is usual for the member resigning to notify the speaker (or clerk) that he has notified the governor of his state of such resignation, or for the governor or secretary of state to notify the speaker (or clerk) of such resignation, and the name of the member is borne on the rolls until such notice is received.

The resignation is made to the governor of the state, but the name of the member remains on the roll of the House until the House is formally notified of the resignation, either by the member himself or by the governor of his state.

These make the position taken by the NEWS unassailable. It is usual for the speaker or clerk to be notified that the governor has been notified of the resignation, because it is proper that the executive should know of it in order that the vacancy may be filled as early as may be, and that the clerk should know that the governor knows it. If the member fails to give such notice (i. e., that he has

notified the governor), it is then proper for the latter to give it so that it may be known at both ends of the line that there is a vacancy to be filled. And the name is kept on the rolls until the necessary notice is received, which may come from either the member or governor, and of course it is then kept on no longer. In the Utah case, the notice was served upon the clerk before the Governor was actually notified, but both were notified, so that the resignation was made complete and the failure of the latter to read the notice when received does not alter the status of the case in the least, especially when we consider that he had oral and other evidence of it, from the member himself and others. We said that filing a resignation, or notice thereof, with the clerk vacated the office and we say so yet; the above rules and the precedents of the House sustain us fully.

### THE TEMPLE AND ITS BUILDERS.

The smart writers on newspapers in this and other cities have not yet concluded their observations and comments on the dedication of the Salt Lake Temple. It would be uninteresting, and therefore useless, to quote or reply to many of the views expressed, where imbecility or bitterness carries its own refutation. Other views, however, are of more friendly tone—these being the great majority; and they give utterance to sentiments that are in the highest degree gratifying, since they breathe the true Christian spirit of charity, and at most argue a desire to win those who may be deluded back to the pure form and essence of godliness by moral suasion and peaceful means. The old-time popularity of such talk as this from the *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette*, "The evident fact is that Mormonism, wounded as it is, must eventually die, and some one now living may yet see the great building dedicated April 6 occupied as a Methodist Episcopal or Presbyterian Western university," is now only noticeable for its rarity; and newspapers of every shade of creed and politics take up the cudgels against the insinuation, declare boldly that the Mormons have been a misjudged and an outraged people, and that the broad folds of the American flag should cover and protect even this most unpopular sect in their rights of conscience and of property.

It is true that many who are otherwise just and accurate in their philosophizing, hold that the system called Mormonism is in a declining state, and that the great Temple recently dedicated may outlast the religion. On this point it is interesting to observe that the religious press is somewhat skeptical. As a sample, we quote from the *New York Christian Advocate*, which in its attempted sarcasm expresses a solemn truth:

In an age and country in which the autumalated nonsense of Christian science, the puerilities of spiritualism, the fanaticism of (anti-means) faith healing, and the Munchausen tales of theosophy are not only tolerated, but gulped down, while their dupes, like children listening to fairy tales, cry for more, it is not improbable that Mormonism will last a long time.

This is but equivalent to the asser-