

idea is worthy of the century in which we live. It is an embodiment of the Evangelical Alliance principle on a larger scale, an attempt at its universal application. When in 1845 various Protestant bodies represented at a meeting in Liverpool formed the Evangelical Alliance, few could foresee the results that were to follow. Slowly but surely, however, it has had the effect of breaking down much of the prejudices existing between Protestants and even to draw Catholics somewhat nearer to their opponents. Christians have learned, partly at least, to respect each other, notwithstanding differences of opinion on doctrinal points. Rites have become of secondary importance to a vast majority of church people and to many they have lost all significance whatever, thus broadening the field. May it not be supposed that this process of erasing doctrinal differences and breaking down ritual obstacles is to go on still further, and that the religious congress is one step in this direction? Who can say what the final result will be?

The Gospel of Jesus teaches us with no uncertainty that a time will come when the whole world will acknowledge Him as the Ruler and will worship Him. There can be no doubt that as a preparation for this time, mankind must be more unified in every respect than at present. Old systems must be torn down to give room for the new structure to be reared under the direction of the Lord. And it seems that this leveling process is the chief work of our time in almost every direction, social, political and religious. All is being prepared for a new era, and that will, according to the Scriptures, be the era of the reign of the Son of God.

A DESPERATE CASE.

There is a certain class of men whose disposition to be mean causes them at times to give vent to their venom through the medium of a newspaper, knowing that thereby what they say will find a much larger audience than if they contented themselves with the word-of-mouth process. The incentive is different in different cases, but the disposition spoken of being in stock, the utterances referred to are generally very much alike. Intolerance, selfishness, a spirit of contention, revenge for real or fancied injuries, cupidity and that exotic which blooms only amid the worst and most peculiar conditions of life and which has been aptly but inelegantly classified as "general cursedness"—one or more of these and sometimes all of them constitute the metaphorical spring-board by which such people vault into the field of letters.

Sometimes a small circumstance being shown or admitted, is made to do such service as the most fruitfully imaginative novelist would never have dreamed of. The circumstance itself being established, it is to the kind spoken of an easy matter to fabricate several others which "fit on" well enough and make the addition appear like so many links just like the first one in a chain of circumstances; so skillfully is this done at times that it might almost deceive the elect; certainly it seldom fails to "take in"

those whose time, opportunity or disposition is not favorable to an examination into the matter, and thus out of an isolated occurrence which was never repeated or imitated, and as likely as not was punished if not reported of and turned from, the individual's status is fixed. This kind of thing by itself is surely bad enough; but how much worse is it when not only the individual and his family but every other family belonging to the same organization in the community is branded and pointed out to those who can be influenced as objects to be shunned! This is execrable, but it is not the superlative degree in the dastardly business by any means; for occasionally one of the mental malformations spoken of gives birth to the circumstance needed as a foundation—imagines it, invents it, fabricates it out of whole cloth, and then proceeds with his well-adjusted train of falsehoods to make out a case against the whole people comprising the organization to which the one first named belongs! This is contemptible, but it is not uncommon, and it is less uncommon now than it has been for some months past.

In the only Liberal organ remaining in the Territory appeared this morning a letter from Eureka which is of a piece with much that has of late appeared in that paper, both as original and contributed matter. If the letter does not answer in all respects to the above analysis, it is vile enough in another way to make it a fit companion for all and anything of the kind that has ever appeared in the medium spoken of. "A young man whose father is a leading Mormon in Salt Lake City" told the correspondent that Mr. Hyde had told his (the young man's) father that he would have to wait but a short time until he (Mr. Hyde) would have no other but Mormons at work in the Beck mine. The letter is a sort of inverted syllogism, with one premise (the foregoing) and two conclusions added therefrom. That is a rather colorless precursor to a lurid and terrifying brace of results is it not, impartial reader? Yet the results are about as here described and that is the basis on which they rest. The correspondent heard that somebody else heard that another person heard! That is good evidence of course, in or out of court; and as if to clinch it, one of the hearers in this series of hearings is the son of a good-sized Mormon in this city! Here's logic for you; the whole tenor and bent of the article is to show that Mormons are utterly unworthy of belief and yet he refers to the nearest relative of a big Mormon as a means of giving credence to what is said! Oh, consistency, where have you strayed off to! If the young Mormon is worthy of belief because he is a Mormon, all other Mormons by the force of association also are; and if he is not worthy of belief, of course the whole statement falls prostrate thereby. Can any sensible, unprejudiced person see any other logic in it?

The conclusions reached by the correspondent are:

- 1.—"The sequence shows [our italics] that the plot and plan was laid months before to oust everybody not Mormons from the mine and then fill it up with good tithe-paying brothers."
- 2.—"Hence many of us believe today

that the fight is not merely between Mr. Hyde and the union but that it is the whole power of the Mormon Church arrayed against the miners and against everything and everybody that is not Mormon."

And there you are. It is not much upon which to predicate an argument, but those who set out upon anti-Mormon fishing exploits do not as a rule pay much attention to the kind of material employed nor what the results are likely to be. The Mormons are here, were here a long time before anybody else came, have made a reasonably fair record if the landscape and attendant circumstances count for anything, and have not seen or heard all the vile things nor yet all the good things that have been said of them; so that, even if so disposed and not otherwise engaged, they could not have given their attention to refuting, explaining or affirming. Hence so much comparative silence and hence again the opportunity for saying groundless, contemptible things and escaping without exposure.

The hand of the Church is not now manipulating and has not at any time manipulated the affairs of the Bullion-Beck or any other mine. We speak advisedly and say furthermore that the difficulties attending and that have of late attended the working of that property have not been singular or peculiar to Utah or the United States—that such troubles in fact are incident to labor circles the world over and that what has occurred at the Bullion-Beck works would have occurred under similar circumstances if there were not a Mormon officer or shareholder in the company. If this is not enough we refer the reader to the answer of President Woodruff to the miners' union of Eureka, in which he positively disclaimed anything in the nature of interference and announced besides that if any one else acting in the name of the Church had interfered he did it without authority.

If the son of a leading Mormon giving second or third-hand hearsay as evidence is entitled to credence, surely the leading Mormon himself speaking for himself should stand even higher in the scale of credibility.

It is estimated that the Mississippi river annually discharges into the Gulf of Mexico 19,500,000,000 cubic feet of water. Of this prodigious quantity 1-2900 part will be sediment. Thus the Mississippi river annually deposits alone into the Gulf of Mexico sufficient mud to cover a square mile of surface to a height of 240 feet.—*Ex.*

And yet the gulf doesn't get any shallower nor the river any deeper perceptibly. The question before the meeting is—Does the soil like the water get back to where it started, or how else is depletion made up in one place and accretion dissipated in another?

THE *Tribune* intimates that if the News wants to get inside particulars about certain charges made by the former paper, we need only to place a reporter under its direction—he will be given all the information he wants. That is so characteristic of the *Tribune*; it always wants to run somebody else's newspaper. Not even the prospect of a "scoop" can induce it to attend to its own business. What's the matter with its own reporters?