

There was a great cloud of witnesses to testify to the truth of the Gospel. Elder Roberts analyzed the Bible, the Book of Mormon and Book of Doctrine & Covenants, and took the ground that we had a great deal stronger evidence to support us than any other had, for the Book of Mormon comes from a pure source, but the books of the Bible have descended through the turbid stream of tradition, and much had been lost of the original scriptures. The Book of Mormon contains the fulness of the everlasting Gospel, whole and entire, bearing emphatic testimony that God lives. Hence, he reasoned that as a people we should have greater faith, for faith is based upon evidence; and yet, we hear that infidelity is increasing! There are some sixteen quorums of Elders and twelve or fifteen quorums of Seventies in this Stake of Zion, besides M. I. A. associations, and many other facilities to study the Gospel, and yet infidelity was increasing! He thought it was a shame to the Elders of Israel that such a state of things should exist, and hoped that a reformation would shortly set in among those who at present neglected their duties as Elders in the Church of Christ.

"GREAT CRY AND LITTLE WOOL."

THERE is a new attempt on foot to connect the leading authorities of the Church with the political affairs of the Territory. The Republican victory at Logan is made the immediate excuse for the cry of "Church influence." It is claimed that certain individuals "went about" among the people of Logan before the election, and told them "that the high Church officials were interested in a Republican victory" there. Among those named is Geo. F. Gibbs, who is described as "the well-known clerk and stenographer in the office of the First Presidency."

These complaints have come from Democrats who seem to be smarting over their unexpected defeat. But they are entertained by others, and the matter assumes proportions serious enough to warrant some notice of the charges. If it is true that the First Presidency have authorized these or any other persons, to advise the people in Logan or elsewhere what ticket to vote, then those Church dignitaries have not kept within the limits which they have defined for themselves. If it is not true, then all the noise that is being made is "much ado about nothing." But the question is one that concerns both political parties, and is of as much moment to the Republicans as to the Democrats. And, in our opinion, it ought not to be evaded or ignored.

We have authority from Presidents Willford Woodruff and Joseph F. Smith—President George Q. Cannon has been absent from the Territory for some weeks—to state emphatically that they have not authorized or instructed anybody to advise, for counsel, or intimate to the people at Logan or elsewhere, either directly or indirectly, how they should vote or what party they should support. This statement means just what it says, in letter and spirit. Therefore if any person has been doing what is claimed, it has been without authority from the

Church leaders, and is to be condemned by all sincere people of every party.

Brother George F. Gibbs, in answer to queries from this writer, stated that he went to Cache Valley to visit relatives and attend a funeral. That he was invited by Republican friends in Logan to go over to that city and make a speech or two just preceding the election. That he did so, but was not sent there by the Church leaders or either of them, nor did he receive any instruction or permission to speak for them on political matters. As a matter of fact he says he did not use their names in the manner charged.

As to the other persons named, the Presidency have had no communication with them on this matter, and if they have used the names of any Church leader in the way described, they have done so wrongfully and without justification. It is difficult for those who know them to believe that they have gone to the lengths which are pointed out against them.

In the case of Brother Gibbs there is the shadow of a slender thread apparently connecting him with the Presidency and politics. With the others there is none. He is employed as a clerk in the office of the Presidency. He is a Republican. He made some speeches in Logan. He may have used his personal influence in aid of his party. Is there anything wrong in all this? Are the sentiments of a clerk to be taken for the views of his employers? Or must a clerk in a Church office eschew politics and become a political nullity?

Why try to make a mountain out of a molehill, or to terrify the public with apprehensions of a monster evil which is nothing but the ghost of a small shadow? We admit that if the Presidency of the Church have done all that is claimed, the situation is serious. But with the slim evidences claiming to connect them officially with party politics, we think some folks are greatly exercised over a little and false alarm.

OUR DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

PRESIDENT ELIOT, the distinguished scholar now visiting in our city, is connected with one of the oldest and most celebrated institutions of learning in the western world. He is President of Harvard University. The original foundation of this institution dates back to 1636, only sixteen years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, and six years after the settlement of the Boston Colony. An appropriation of \$4,000, in three sums, was made by the young colony for the support of a "school or college," and in 1636 was founded the Cambridge of the New World. A clergyman named John Harvard died in Massachusetts in 1638. He bequeathed one half his little fortune, \$4000, to the newly established "School," and in his honor it was known subsequently as Harvard College. At first special efforts were made to educate Indians in this school, but only one is known to have ever graduated.

From this humble beginning sprang the Harvard of today, the invested funds of which, exclusive of value of

grounds, buildings, books and apparatus, is over \$4,500,000. According to the annual report for 1890-91 the total receipts were \$1,026,738, and the payments \$949,056, leaving a profit balance of nearly \$78,000.

The popularity of Harvard increases every year. Between October 1st, 1887, and October, 1891, the increase was 965 students, whereas during the preceding ten years it was only 458. The number of students at the commencement of the academic year in the college proper was 1341. All departments of the University show proportionate increase. No change has been made in the requirements for admission, nor has any change been made in the method of procuring the ordinary degrees, hence its popularity must be owing to the superior manner in which the business of the institution is administered. Charles William Eliot being the chief executive of the Harvard University administration, the logic of the situation must ascribe to that gentleman the increasing popularity and success of the establishment. He is a graduate of the class of 1853. He was elected President in 1869. The reforms inaugurated during his incumbency are many and varied. The university government is at present entirely and absolutely neutral in its attitude towards religion. The government is vested in two bodies, the corporation and the board of overseers. The former consists of the President, the treasurer and five fellows, the president and treasurer being chosen by the fellows, who are a self-perpetuating body. The Board of overseers consisted originally of Congregational ministers, later on it was chosen by the State Legislature, but in 1866 it was made to consist of 30 of the alumni, five of whom are elected annually for the term of six years. All the acts of the corporation are subject to ratification by this Board.

IGNORANCE AND FALSEHOOD.

JOSEPH COOK, the noted national egotist, has again been devoting his warped and inventive mind to the one-sided consideration of the "Mormon" people. This community and the situation here formed the subject of an alleged lecture recently delivered by him in the city of Boston. In his attempted treatment of the theme he displayed the usual degree of ignorance he has exhibited in the past, and the recklessness of his statements was quite remarkable. He is probably unequaled on the lecture platform as a "mixologist" in relation to facts. Here for instance is a sample, furnished by his reference to Utah politics. He says:

"There are two party cries now raised for Utah—statehood, by the Democrats; home rule, by the Republicans."

"The Republicans, not to be outdone, but having more respect than the Democrats for public sentiment, ask only for home rule for Utah."

It will be observed that the reverend misrepresenter has reversed the situation relating to the formulation and pushing of the respective measures mentioned.

Another sample of inaccuracy is em-