

have no need to go beyond the confines of the United States. Here we have the Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, Shakers and so forth. Very well, all these sects have their own peculiar ideas of church government. The Methodist has his Discipline—a system got up by the ministers of that church that all its members have to be governed by. They must come within the purview and be under the influence thereof. If you ask a Methodist to become a Latter-day Saint, he might say, and truly, "I have not the privilege of being Methodist and Latter-day Saint at the same time." A man cannot be a Baptist and a Methodist at the same time, neither can he be a Methodist and a shaking Quaker. Why? Because he is bound by the articles of the Discipline of his church, and he must submit to that. So it is in regard to the Catholics. Many of you have no doubt read recently of Pere Hyacinthe, who, a short time ago, was very popular among the Roman Catholics. But he dissented from their views; and among other things he took to himself a wife, which was contrary to their ideas and creed, and probably his own views. The result was that they excommunicated him and they treated him as if he had been dead, and had a funeral, following him to his grave while he was yet living. This is according to their ideas, and he, being a Catholic, had no right to expect anything else. A Catholic priest must submit to the laws of the priesthood, and they have excommunicated him for departing therefrom, and he had no cause to complain. We may have our own peculiar ideas about the propriety of this, that and the other religious faith, ceremonies and forms of worship, but I am now speaking

of law, and of governments, and of the arrangements that peoples, nations, churches, and the members of churches bind themselves to be governed by.

The same thing applies to any of the various sects that exist in Christendom. The Baptist commences a church, and he believes in baptism by immersion, but he could not be a Latter-day Saint. Why? Because he can be baptized by anybody not having authority from God, and he does not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins. According to his ideas he must have his sins forgiven first, and then be baptized after a while. He could not be a Latter-day Saint, because his ideas and ours are at variance. If a man is a Baptist, as long as he remains so, he must submit to their law. If he is a Methodist, and remains so, he must submit to their discipline, be it right or wrong, the question of their laws being Scriptural or not has to be decided in and of itself. It is the same way with a nation. If I were in Russia, and did not like the government, I might, if they would allow me, go to England, come to the United States, or go to one of the Southern republics, and become a citizen thereof, but I could not be a republican in Russia. If I went to England, I should have to be subject to the laws of England, and the same if I came to the United States, hence the principle that I mentioned before is applicable all the way through, no matter which way you look at it. I am not saying at present which of these governments, whether religious or political, is right, I am merely trying to elucidate a principle that exists among and is acknowledged by men. If I go to live in any country on the face of the earth, I have to be subject to its laws, and if I am a reasonable, intelligent man, I