

"This may be a somewhat too rose-colored view of the regenerate Mormon. According to the prevailing Gentile belief in Utah it certainly is. But in so far as it relates to religious liberty it is sound politics, sound morals and sound religion. As we have said before, New England wrongs itself in worrying about Dr. Eliot. Its honor is quite safe in his hands."

The Chicago *Times* says of the address:

"There is nothing in this remark that does not reflect credit upon the man who made it. Yet it is subjected to severe criticism by the Republican journals of the East. As the professor of a religion the Mormon is entitled to as much protection as the founder of Harvard himself might claim. As a practitioner of polygamy the Mormon is properly subject to punishment. But polygamy is a decaying institution. Little of it remains. But they are fervently Latter-day Saints, as they choose to call themselves. And when the president of Harvard says to them that worshipping God in their own way they are entitled to the same liberty which is accorded persons of every sect wherever civilization prevails in the United States he but utters a commonplace of civil and religious freedom."

"The president of Harvard is entirely right. The Mormon, entitled to worship God in his own way, has been outraged and oppressed."

The following is from the Boston *Transcript* and is all we have space for today; we reserve other extracts for another time:

"Is there no courtesy left in the press of Boston? Is there no sense of the dignity of the position of president of Harvard College and of the high-minded gentleman and public spirited citizen who is made the subject of cheap and sensational articles and insulting outcries and headlines? Because there is now a violent partisan struggle in Salt Lake City and because a partisan editor of a partisan paper chooses to twist President Eliot's words to political purposes, is that a reason why the newspapers of Boston should join the vulgar hue and cry? Several days ago, before this local noise was made about Mr. Eliot's speech, the *Transcript* published a letter from a correspondent in Salt Lake City giving the essence of a speech which is now sensationally trumpeted forth as news; in yesterday's issue there was a letter which explains how hot just now is the local struggle between Mormon and Gentile Democrats and Republicans in Salt Lake. In recognizing any decency among Mormons, or any courage in their battle with the wilderness; in expressing admiration of their wrestling for religious liberty as they saw it, and in declaring liberty wholesome, Mr. Eliot said nothing to make him the subject of contumely at home. Are Boston editors willing to fall into the wake of a local editor in Salt Lake, who has simply seized the opportunity to make bricks for his own political tabernacle? It is the business of his paper to belittle every good influence which approaches Mormonism. Mr. Joseph M. Tanner, of the Harvard Law School, one of the Mormon students at Cambridge, puts the case clearly and well when he says to a *Journal* interviewer:

"I don't suppose Mr. Eliot has endorsed or mentioned everything the Mormons are doing. His speech was prompted probably by the opinion that a great many things have been done to this peculiar people that ought not to have been. He sees the situation aright. Whatever else the actions of the Mormons appeared to the world, whatever appeared their position, their true purpose was religious liberty. The Puritans were not always indorsed, their ideas were not always accepted, and so it is with us, and President Eliot is just when he likens us to the Puritans."

They sought freedom of religion, so do we. The general desire of the Mormons is to be in harmony with the rest of the United States, and to accomplish this they are making every effort in an educational way. President Eliot's visit will be appreciated, and highly, too, at that. We would like to be treated fairly by the newspapers, and it is in this department, that our people are most basely misrepresented. The dispatch service from the Territory is especially unfair, belligerent and unreliable, the latter being quite noticeable. From a fair-minded point of view I can't see what else President Eliot could have done and retain his truthfulness. He only spoke of the condition of things as he found them, which every fair-minded, honest man must do when he visits the Territory."

"It is certainly provincial and pitiful to deny to the mass of the Mormons sincerity and zeal."

NOT UNUSUAL FOR MR. GOULD.

FROM time to time for the past six months reports have been circulated of contemplated gigantic railroad combinations. So far only one, that of the coal-carrying roads, has been consummated. Now another report is started that Jay Gould, Sydney Dillon and Russell Sage are about to retire, or have retired, from the Union Pacific railway, and that these gentlemen contemplate constructing an air line to the Pacific from El Paso, on the Rio Grande river. There may be some truth in this, but if so, it is contrary to Mr. Gould's business procedure through life. He always lets others build the road, and then he comes in subsequently to reap the profits. He may, however, wish to put himself on record as having built one great trunk line.

ENTERTAINING LECTURES.

WE have received from Mr. Charles Ellis, the celebrated lecturer, copies of his public addresses on the Utah situation delivered in the Theatre in this city. They make very entertaining reading and contain much valuable information for friend and foe. They would do much good if scattered broadcast throughout the country. The later lectures are on "Statehood," "Church and State," "Our Country, as it is," "Our Country as it should be," etc. The cost is trifling, their value is great. Mr. Ellis has incurred the animosity of the enemies of Utah for the bold stand he has taken in reference to the "Mormon" question, and our people would do well to show their appreciation of his work by purchasing copies of these lectures for their own entertainment and to send to distant friends. They can be had at the DESERET NEWS counter.

THE ATTITUDE OF PARTIES TO SILVER

AN Eastern paper analyzes the situation of the silver question in Congress from the party point of view. It takes the vote on the motion of Burrows to lay the Bland bill on the table as the basis of its analysis. On this motion 148 votes were cast for and the same number against; that is, 296 members pronounced one way or the other. Thirty-five members are recorded as not voting, but twenty of these were known to be paired, leaving only fifteen absolutely unplaced.

Of the 148 Representatives who voted to lay the bill on the table, 82 were Democrats and 66 Republicans. Of the Democrats, New York was represented by 19, Pennsylvania 10, Mississippi 7, Massachusetts 7, Iowa 5, New Jersey, Ohio and Maryland 4 each, Cincinnati 3, New Hampshire and Rhode Island 2 each, Illinois and Michigan 3 each, the remaining 8 being cast from the entire South. This shows that Eastern Democrats are pretty generally opposed to the Bland bill, while the Southern Democrats are for it.

Of the 148 who voted in favor of the Bland bill 11 were Republicans and 137 Democrats and Farmers' Alliance members. Of the Republicans, Kansas sent 2, South Dakota 2, Colorado, Wyoming, Nevada, California, Idaho and Oregon 1. Of the 137 free silver men, the vast majority represented the South and West. From this analysis it will be seen that the silver question can hardly become a party issue, and that as it stands now it is purely sectional. Eastern Republicans and Eastern Democrats voted to table the bill, while Southern and Southwestern Democrats and Republicans voted in the negative.

THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

THE prospects for the accomplishment of the Nicaragua canal seems flattering at present. A New York dispatch says that John W. Mackay, Henry M. Flagler, Austin Corbin and Andrew Carnegie have become interested in the enterprise. The Pacific coast too is awakening to the advantages which would result from the completion of the work. A few days ago a State convention was held in San Francisco for the purpose of fathering the scheme. Several hundred delegates were present representing all shades of political belief. The chairman stated at full length the prospective benefits to the Pacific coast by means of this canal. It would save 10,000 miles of water transportation, and the tolls on lumber alone would pay the interest on the whole investment. Hopes are entertained that the bill now before Congress will be earnestly considered. This bill contemplates the guaranteeing of \$100,000,000 of the bonds of the company, the government to hold \$70,000,000 of the \$100,000,000 in stock. The necessity of building and controlling this canal with American money was also emphatically dwelt upon.

Work is in active progress. Last year \$700,000 was expended. The first mile of the actual canal has been dredged to a depth of seventeen feet and to a width of 270. The experience so far demonstrates that excavation can be prosecuted very successfully. Banks do not slip in or break down, and this is a feature of the soil that engineers regard with great satisfaction.

The convention forwarded a memorial to Congress exhorting that body to take due cognizance of the magnitude and importance of the canal project. By it Liverpool and San Francisco would be only twenty-one days apart in water transportation. It would form an effective offset to the continental railroads, which now charge what rates traffic will bear.