

ings? Can a teacher understand anything in the abstract which can't be reduced to the concrete? You may teach every branch of numbers and fail to educate. The question of every teacher should be, can my pupils verify in the concrete what they understand in the abstract?

"I believe with Dr. Baldwin that rules and definition have no place in the beginning of a study, but should be the result of study. It is only when children can see mentally and verify concretely that children know. You must teach a child to see through the symbols always back to the things themselves. If they cannot do this you have formed one bad habit in the pupil to think symbols rather than what they represent. Here are two questions for you to think over. Is there any term in the arithmetic that can be construed as having two meanings, and is that right?"

"Can a student comprehend an operation in the abstract which cannot be verified in the concrete or with objects?"

HE IS FOR SILVER.

The following is a copy of a letter just mailed by the writer, a well-known resident of this city, to a gentleman high in official circles at Washington:

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah,
August 1st, 1893.

Hon.

My Dear Sir—I have seen at different times reports of alleged interviews with you on the subject of silver and its use as money. If these interviews are bona fide (which I am not prepared to believe) it would seem that you are opposed to the use of silver money as a measure of value in the United States.

Should it happen, however, that your views are in accord with monometallists who favor gold only, as such money, I could wish (seeing that you and myself have heretofore for so long a time stood upon the same platform, and having in all these years been on friendly terms) that you would find time and be inclined to read what follows, and give to these views some consideration; not that I have the vanity to think that you will be in any degree influenced by what I may write, unless you perceive good reasons therein.

A man who having lived as many years as I have, who has accomplished no more than I in a financial way, is not supposed by the world to know much about finance; notwithstanding, he may by close observation have formed views somewhat correct, entitling them to some consideration by law makers and others.

It is pretty generally understood that President Cleveland is a monometallist and in favor of gold only as money. I do not deny his right to hold such views, but he is not justified in using his official position to defeat the remonetization of silver. I make this remark advisedly. The President is the servant of the people elected by the people, who demand that he shall carry out their will in his administration of public affairs within the provisions of the Constitution. Such being the case he might not, and must not attempt to become a dictator regarding such laws as may be enacted or as to which

shall be repealed. His power is executive not legislative; it is true that he is authorized "from time to time to give Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." He is also invested with a limited veto power. He is sworn "to execute the office of President, and to the best of his ability to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." Congress has power, with other things, "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin." The Constitution provides that "no state shall coin money, emit bills of credit, or make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." Under this provision I hold that silver is constitutional money as much as gold, and, in order that the states may by law say what shall be legal tender, it is the duty of Congress by law to provide for the coinage of both gold and silver "and regulate the value thereof," otherwise it is folly to say that states shall not coin money, and yet give them authority to say that silver money may be a legal tender. If, as I have heard alleged, this government was established by the people and for the people; to be administered by the representatives of the people, in their interest, is it not clear that it is the duty of said representatives to carry out the will of the people?

The will of the people is expressed through the ballot box, and when expressed in terms, must be obeyed, or their servants become traitors and betrayers of a sacred trust.

It may be asked what is the will of the people on the subject discussed, and when was that will expressed? To this I reply, that will was expressed in favor of bimetallicism at the polls last November when Cleveland and Stevenson were elected; it was expressed in this manner:

The Democratic platform adopted at Chicago contains a bimetallic plank; this plank, with all other planks, was endorsed by the voters who cast their ballots for the democratic nominee. The Republican platform adopted at Minneapolis also contained a bimetallic plank, which was endorsed by those who voted the Republican ticket. The Populist voters also, I believe, endorsed silver.

From this showing it seems clear to me that a large majority of the people for whom the government was formed, and in whose interest it must be administered, have made known their wishes concerning silver. Will Congress and the administration be governed thereby, or will they, disregarding the will of the people thus expressed, legislate in the interest of the creditor class at the instance of a minority? Of course minorities have rights which must be considered, but in this country it has been decreed that the majority must rule, as it ought.

For eighty years, from 1792 to 1873, silver money was coined as well as gold, and was recognized as money as well. Is there even one good reason why the same policy should not continue? Why should the United States consult with, or be governed by,

the foreign governments with whom we have commercial relations regarding the kinds of money we may use as measures of value? They do not ask us what they shall use, but act independently regarding their money. Thirteen weak and sparsely populated colonies braved England more than a hundred years ago, and achieved their independence. Are our forty odd states and territories less independent and more under foreign control than those colonies, which became independent and formed the government under which their descendants now enjoy a degree of freedom? Are the statesmen of today more wise, are they endowed with a larger degree of patriotism than were the men who made provision for the use of silver and gold money? And are they justified in the attempt to undo the work which the patriots of the revolution performed? No, verily my friends!

Do you ask what I would advise, if asked for a plan financial? Briefly, then, I would coin silver and make it, as well as gold, a full legal tender at a ratio of 16 to 1, coinage free to all silver and gold presented. Repeal the Sherman law and cease the purchase of silver and gold. Coin the silver bullion in the treasury. Compel the United States treasurer to pay out both metals without discriminating against either, to all creditors of the government. Issue no more gold bonds, nor other bonds upon which to base a banking currency. Wind up whenever possible all national banks now in existence, and charter no more. When it becomes necessary to furnish currency to transact the business of the country, issue non-interest bearing treasury notes of small denominations, none to exceed \$1000, making them full legal tenders for all debts public and private. Enfold the giving or accepting of notes or other evidences of debt as payable in gold, substituting therefor this coinage, "payable in lawful money of the United States." Repeal the ten per cent tax on state banks.

I will add no more on the subject. As ever very truly your friend,

HADLEY D. JOHNSON.

WASATCH STAKE CONEERENCE.

The Wasatch Stake conference convened at Heber on Saturday and Sunday, July 29th and 30th. On Saturday morning Elder Abram Hatch, president of the Stake, Richard Harvey and Joseph Lambert were the speakers. In the afternoon Elder F. M. Lyman, after bearing the Bishops' reports, commented upon the same and advised the people how to live. Sunday morning Elder John M. Murdock, H. S. Alexander and T. H. Giles and Elder George Reynolds of the Presidency of the Seventies, were the speakers. The general and local Church authorities were then presented and sustained, after which Thomas Hicken and Elder Abram Hatch made a few remarks. Sunday afternoon Elder George Reynolds gave a short lecture on the Book of Mormon. Elder Lyman then spoke on Church discipline and after the closing exercises conference adjourned for three months. A large representation from all the wards were present at each session of the conference.

ALFRED BOND, Clerk.