

votes wine every time. That is majority rule, the basis of a republican form of government.

### MIRACLES.

Rev. Thomas Lafou Gulick, in the Evangelist, discusses modern miracles and suggests the conclusion that all claims to divine power over diseases in this age must be discarded on account of radical differences between the miracles of Christ and those now performed. He asserts that all who came to Christ asking, received, no matter how ungrateful or disobedient they were, and that the healings were all perfect and practically instantaneous. There were no relapses, and the most hopeless cases were as easily cured as the more simple ones.

The Rev. gentleman labors under a very common misconception concerning the universal character of the signs and wonders performed by our Lord. It is true enough that the miracles He performed were numerous and embraced every stage of disease and death, but the view that every sick or dead person that was brought to His notice received health and life finds no support in the Scriptures. On the contrary, it is expressly stated that He could not perform many miracles in a certain place on account of unbelief. The very existence of skepticism among the people as to the divine power of Jesus, presupposes that there were cures apparently justifying a denial. Had the cases of healing been so universal as some Bible readers imagine, sickness and death would before long have been unknown among the immediate environments of our Lord, and life and immortality established. But these facts would have become as apparent as the light of day, and unbelief and denial made practically impossible, or at least futile.

The Apostles were endowed with similar power as the great Master, and their labors may be studied as an illustration of the work of Jesus in this regard. They, too, healed numerous cases of diseases and even raised the dead. But they did not heal every case of sickness that was called to their attention. Paul expressly teaches that the gift of healing is one of the manifestations of the Spirit of God in the Church, just as much as wisdom, knowledge and faith; yet the very branch of the Church to which these manifestations were abundantly given had many members suffering from sickness and weakness, on account of their spiritual condition—a proof of the existence of causes of bodily ailments to which the miraculous gift of healing was not intended to apply.

In the same way Paul, alone in Rome, awaiting the trial that was to finish his good fight upon earth for the crown of righteousness, urges his young friend Timothy to hasten to him, and one reason for his urgency was that he had had to leave his co-laborer, Trophimus, sick at Miletus. Here was a case that might apparently, have been otherwise, had the Apostles been merely miracle-makers, curing diseases at will. No less remarkable is the advice given by Paul to Timothy—to use a little wine as medicine on account of his frequent

infirmities. Why did he not advise him to seek a miraculous cure, so often effective in the age of our Lord and His Apostles? When such cases are considered, it will be found as rational to deny the power of God in the primitive Church as it is to deny its manifestation in this age. For then, as now, human beings became sick and died in their appointed time; and now, as then, there are hundreds of miraculous healings by the servants of the Lord, as an evidence that the Gospel of Jesus is again being preached to man in its purity.

The churches of the world have for centuries denied the power or the will of the Almighty to fulfill in this age His promises to give His servants power over disease and death. They say it is not needed. They forget, however, that this power is one of the fruits of faith and consequently an essential to the Church as faith. It is an evidence of the divine mission of those who are endowed therewith, a testimony to the power of the Priesthood. It is true, that it is of the greatest importance to discern between that power which is derived from God and that which evidently has another origin. For now, as in the age of our Lord, there are many who perform, or pretend to perform, miracles. This does not, however, affect the general truth that God has in this age given His servants the power, in His name, to bless mankind with victory over evil influences, as in former days. The history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints proves this to be true to an extent the world is slow to admit. But the fact remains that the Church has been established with all the gifts and powers and blessings that adorned the first age of its brief but triumphant existence in the world.

### THE QUESTION OF NOMINATIONS

In the district court at Ogden, Judge Rolapp has decided that in Weber county the Independent Republican ticket cannot go upon the official ballot. The effect of that decision is that in Weber county there is imposed a process of operation opposed to that of every other county in the State, and one that is well known will cause voters of that county much inconvenience. As to some of the technical legal objections to the Independent Republican certificate we have no discussion, since the judge did not attach special importance to them, and except in one or two particulars did not seem to regard them as vital. With respect to these, if the law was not complied with in its letter, then such compliance should be had. But as to some of the points to which the court gave special prominence there will be much dissenting from his opinion, and with good reason.

One of these is that because a petition had been filed with the secretary of state, selecting a party name and emblem for the purpose of nominating a State ticket, a body of citizens in a county were barred from selecting the same name and emblem. Now what is the effect of this ruling? It is to say that a new party could organize for State purposes, but could

have no county ticket; for under the law the petition filed with the secretary of state is limited in its effect to a State ticket? It is absurd to say that the Legislature intended anything of the kind. On the other hand, the court's logic would say that if a new party were formed in a county, then it could not be formed in another county because the name was appropriated; and so a new party would have to have a new name for the State and for each county therein. Did the Legislature intend such a ridiculous requirement? And yet that seems to be the culmination of Judge Rolapp's logic. Fortunately for those voters who, by the general movement throughout the State, show themselves to aggregate a considerable number, and have adopted a new party name, the clerks in most of the counties have taken the reasonable view that it was the convenience and not the inconvenience of voters which the Legislature sought. And by the way, the general filing of petitions for the same name in each county, without objection from the State party of that name, is an official record that all were of the same party and not contradictory thereto, and of such record courts are expected to take judicial notice.

One other chief point is presented, viz., that the petition excluded in Weber county "would simply amount to the fact that certain voters had chosen the name, emblem and part of the nominees of one party and part of the nominees of another party. That was never the intention of the Legislature in framing the election act. And yet that is exactly what the petitioners in this case claim." The consistent view is that the claim of the petitioners is correct, the court's judgment to the contrary notwithstanding. The claim as we understand it is not that certain voters could choose the name and emblem of a party existing in the county, but, as shown by the official records throughout the State, they were engaged in a concerted movement for union in a new party. With this explanation it may be further stated that the intention of the Legislature was to allow the voters to do as they pleased in selecting a ticket, whether it was to choose part from one ticket and part from another, or to put up an entire new set of candidates; and if individuals so chosen did not like the endorsement given they were not compelled to accept it. The clear intention of the Legislature was to allow the voters to do prior to the election just what they commonly do on election day, combine in giving their votes for candidates of their choice; and to facilitate such a procedure the combination was allowed to extend through the nominating process to the official ballot. The purpose of the Legislature was to insure liberty to the voters in choosing officers, not to enslave them in a tangle of technical restrictive complications.

In the election laws as they now stand there are a few incongruities that need eliminating; there are also many very excellent provisions to facilitate the casting of a full and free ballot in the State. In defining all the points that will arise under the statutes, there probably will be many reversals as well as many confirmations of the judgments of lower courts when