

THE DISAFFECTION OF R. C. EVANS

No doubt the announcement through the SAINTS' HERALD of R. C. Evans' disaffection and withdrawal from the Church will be a painful surprise to many in the Church at large, and particularly in Canada. Owing to the fact that Evans and his friends are seeking to justify his course by making bitter attacks upon the Church and the chief ministers thereof, both past and present, it is a duty to the membership at large that we place the situation before them so they may know the facts and be able to render a just verdict in this case.

We first call attention to the recent claims which are now being made, publicly and privately, by the Evans faction, that owing to the recent discovery of evidences which implicate Joseph Smith the martyr, in the alleged revelation authorizing polygamy, and the connivance of his son, the late President Joseph Smith, in covering up this fact and seeking to either destroy or ignore the evidences; which together with his disbelief in many of the revelations contained in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, made it impossible for him to continue in communion with the Church. Since his withdrawal R. C. Evans claims that he was visited by an angel on June 3, 1918, who commanded him to leave the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. However, nothing was heard of this angel story until after he left the Church.

STATED REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL.

As a matter of fact, whatever truth there may be in the claim to angelic visitation and the other reasons now being sedulously advertised, by which R. C. Evans seeks to justify his departure from the Church and the organization of his new Church, we have over his own signature the reasons which were presented and partially discussed before the separation took place. All of these go to show that his personal grievances with President Frederick M. Smith, and objections to the rulings and policy of the Church which he seemed to think were interfering with his personal ambitions and designs, are the real groundwork of his action.

SIGNIFICANT SILENCE.

It is notorious that in his association with the Church in the leading councils for years, as well as being a constant attendant at the General Conference, the man has not raised his voice or sent in a line to advise the Church on any matter involving principles, or doctrines, or history. But for years there has been a ceaseless complaint that he was being victimized by jealous brethren, and with singular perversity he has paraded this obsession on the public platform, in his private correspondence and official letters, as well as in his books and articles before the reading public.

NEED FOR INVESTIGATION.

This strange attitude of mind, and the virulent hostility which this man has nurtured for years, have been a source of anxiety to the Church and have been communicated to the work in some parts of Canada, particularly Toronto, and with rare patience the Church has borne with the brother, trying very hard to encourage him to live above such petty and trivial things and devote himself and the talents which all recognize he possesses to the building up of the Church and the glory of God, but in vain. A long series of complaints, together with some very unfortunate developments in the Toronto Branch, taken at the dictation of R. C. Evans, made it clear that some steps must authoritatively be taken to save the situation. This resulted in the joint council of First Presidency, Quorum of Twelve, and Presiding Bishopric, held at Independence, Missouri, this spring (March-May, 1918), authorizing a committee to investigate these matters and take such action as might be considered advisable.

EVANS AND THE QUORUM OF TWELVE.

It is only just to say that this matter is not of recent origin, even officially, for since 1908 serious complaints against the conduct, official actions, and personal attacks on different people came to the knowledge of the Quorum of Twelve, which resulted in an investigation, at which R. C. Evans was present and had the opportunity of hearing what the ones who complained alleged, and made what defence he could at the time.

During the following year these matters developed still further and it became clearly evident that this man, who, at the time, was one of the First Presidency, could not be sustained in such position under the conditions which were proved to exist. In the beginning of the sessions of the Quorum of Twelve for the year 1909 the question of sustaining the First Presidency was formally introduced, the result being that President Joseph Smith was sustained, also F. M. Smith, but R. C. Evans was not sustained.

This action was reported to the President of the Church, after which President Joseph Smith requested that the reasons for this action be placed in his hands. This was done in writing, and the fact that no attempt was made to offer formal charges which would involve measures being taken by the conference, but was merely an expression of the opinion of the Quorum of Twelve, is strong proof that there was not the bitterness of spirit which R. C. Evans has asserted so frequently characterized the actions of the apostolic quorum against him. Indeed, the whole matter was one of painful humiliation and profound regret.

EVANS DEPOSED FROM PRESIDENCY.

It is not necessary to state the particulars, but merely to state that a copy of the complaints against him was handed by President Smith to R. C. Evans, to which he made a lengthy reply. The reply, however meritorious it might be, did not succeed in changing the attitude of the Quorum of Twelve; and, when the revelation of April 18, 1909, was

given through President Joseph Smith, the first paragraph sustained the action of the Quorum of Twelve; and it reads: "The voice of the Spirit to me is: Under conditions which have occurred it is no longer wise that my servant R. C. Evans be continued as counselor in the Presidency; therefore it is expedient that he be released from this responsibility and another be chosen to the office. He has been earnest and faithful in service and his reward is sure."

It would be ungenerous to deny to the brother whatever comfort he may find in the gracious reference to his past services and the promised reward therefor, but the important thing is that because of the conditions existing R. C. Evans was released from the Presidency. We feel sure that the delicacy in not stating the detailed reasons will be appreciated, but because of those reasons the Quorum of Twelve had lost confidence in the man, and the inspiration at the back of the work through President Smith confirmed the attitude, and release came.

HAS ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY.

The fact that the brother was ordained a Bishop is another evidence of the magnanimity of the Church, and he was given another opportunity to still do a great work and recover, if possible, the old-time poise and influence. However, the experience of the years from 1909 to the present are proof in themselves as to the use he has made of these opportunities; and now, in the ungovernable ambition and desire for self exaltation everything has been jettisoned, the most sacred friendships violated, and even the reputation of the man who loved him most and is called by himself in his own book of recent issue "Joseph the Just," is publicly traduced.

NEGLIGENCE OR DISHONOUR?

If conditions were existing in the Church, such as R. C. Evans describes and publicly charges, then, as a Church official of high standing for years, until June 3, 1918, what was he doing to let such conditions exist and yet never raise his voice in protest until he left the body? And now, joining with those who have vilified and slandered the dead and misrepresented the living, he glories in the shameful work of dishonouring men and the principles they stand for! In a letter written to the Reverend J. A. McKenzie, of Toronto, Ontario, R. C. Evans, with characteristic thoroughness, denounces this gentleman for doing the very thing which he himself for the last few weeks has done so cruelly; and we may use the brother's own aphorism and say, "A man is known by the company he keeps." May we express wonder as to where R. C. Evans has been of late?

EVANS' VERACITY IN DOUBT.

All that needs to be said upon the matter of his virulent denouncement of the Church and the leaders thereof is this: that for forty-two years there has not been a man in the Church ministry who has been more extravagant in his defence of the Church and her leading men, and in spite of the fact that he was acquainted with the literature

behind which he now shelters himself; and the very arguments he himself has used so uproariously against them, will be quite as fitting now in his case. The only question we have to decide is as to the honour and veracity of the man before June 3, 1918, or since that date. When we reflect upon the fact that it was in the Church he now holds up to contempt and shame that as a "poor, weak, ignorant boy" he received grace and help, developing into a minister whose work and influence became a household word in many lands and homes; and under his ministry God gave blessings to many people who now have the witness in themselves that what they learned through him is true; and that he was elevated to the highest positions within the gift of the Church, from the highest of which he was removed as a result of his own conduct, this distressing spectacle of this one-time champion of the cause he loved transmuted into a bitter foe, we are moved to pity, and may say with composure, "God judge between me and thee."

EVANS' SINCERITY.

It is noteworthy that the same spirit in which R. C. Evans has made his attacks upon President Frederick M. Smith is manifested in the distortion of the facts, the misrepresentation of the policies, which has been noted in the foregoing. While he was making his attacks upon President F. M. Smith, insidiously impugning motives and holding up for public contempt and criticism the man and his work, yet on December 24, 1917, the following Christmas greeting was telegraphed by him to the man he was so cruelly slandering in public meetings and private conversations:—

"TORONTO, ONTARIO, December 24, 1917.

"PRESIDENT FRED. SMITH,
"INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI.

"May God's first Christmas light illumine thy soul. May His matchless love radiate thy heart. May He impart to thee spiritual understanding as the chief custodian of His work, regulator of His will. May you stand triumphant as the most prominent representative of His Church on earth.

"THE SAME R. C. EVANS.

"Received 4.14 p.m., December 25, 1917."

It certainly will require more ability than ordinary, straightforward people possess, in order to explain this situation. Recognizing the impossibility, we leave it as it is.

EVANS' INDEFINITENESS.

In the letter R. C. Evans tendered to President Smith, resigning from his positions and withdrawing from the Church, there is nothing of a definite nature stated, but in a general way the reasons for this action are couched in the following:—

Because of many rulings and changes which President Smith had made in the faith and practice of the Church, he was leading the people away from the truth as found in the Word of God, and that President Smith had treated him unjustly; and also, there was much in the con-

duct and teachings of President Smith which he could not indorse. It will be noted that the communication makes general allegations involving the following:—

1. Official administration.
2. Departure from the faith and practice of the Church, and the Word of God; i.e., Apostasy.
3. The conduct and character of President Smith.
4. Unjust treatment of himself by Frederick M. Smith, extending over a number of years, and at different times; also during the recent meetings held in the City of Toronto.

AN ILLEGAL ATTACK.

There is a notable absence of any definite and concrete instance and the want of a single specific fact. Surely this man must know that such an attack is out of harmony with the law and procedure of the Church with which he has been familiar for forty-two years. So far as his complaint against the personal conduct of President Smith is concerned, the law of the Church is clear and explicit, according to which such a matter could be adjusted, and none are exempted from this law. See Matthew 18:15-17; Doctrine and Covenants 42:23.

So far as relates to the official actions of Frederick M. Smith as President of the Church, the law is equally plain and definite. See Doctrine and Covenants 104:37 and 122:10.

At no time has R. C. Evans made legal complaint or charges against President Smith personally, or as President of the Church, and consequently in taking the course which he has been knowingly guilty of violating the law of the Church. If, in the judgment of R. C. Evans, the attitude and conduct of President Smith were wrong, then as a general Church officer he had the right to bring the matter to the attention of the Joint Council, either as an individual or through the Order of Bishops to which he belonged; or he could from the floor of the conference have presented his open complaint, and petition for investigation. As is well known, our brother declined such a course, evidently preferring the public scandal which is now familiar to all.

It will be admitted as a fixed principle of our social life that no one is justified in breaking the law to secure redress for personal injury. A man who is sure of the righteousness of his cause cannot afford to take unlawful measures to gain his ends.

FOUR GENERAL COMPLAINTS.

In the absence of specific instances and facts we are obliged to consider the four general complaints in the light of what has been presented in public meetings, priesthood meetings, and several documents. Perhaps the nearest approach to a deliberate statement of complaints is found in a document dated May 17, 1918, signed by R. C. Evans and two others, and handed to President Smith on the morning of his arrival in Toronto. It is evident that this document was the product of R. C. Evans, both in substance and form, and therefore may be taken as rep-

resenting his especial grievances. We give it careful analysis as follows:—

ELECTION OF BRANCH OFFICERS.

First.—The claim is made that, as a branch, the members have the right to elect their own presiding elder, priest, teacher, and deacon.

When, where, and by whom has this been denied? There is nothing on record to show that this right of the branch was abrogated or curtailed. All that might be offered to justify such a strange perversion of the truth is the action of the recent General Conference reported in the *Saints' Herald* for April 17, pages 373 and 374. This action merely provides for the suspension of the rule found in the book of Rules of Order and Debate, all of which is in the hands of a committee for revision, providing that branches shall elect presiding elders, presiding priests, presiding teachers, and presiding deacons. This rule had been found in practice to impede the work in the stakes and consequently the suspension was desired; but it is left optional with all branches of the Church as to whether they will continue the old method or will adopt the policy of not electing presiding priests, teachers, and deacons. In any case this suspension does not refer to the presiding elder. In reply to a question as to whether this rule should go into effect immediately, President Smith stated that it might be well to correspond with the Presidency's office in regard to the matter. The following quotation will show the elasticity of the action: "Also that section six, chapter one, relating to the selection of officers of branches, be so interpreted as not to compel the election of presiding priest, teacher, or deacon."

WHO SHALL PREACH?

Second.—This document states, "We, as a branch, claim the right to decide who will do the preaching."

This may be the right of a branch to a limited extent, as all ministers are ordained and sustained in their offices by the consent and the vote of the branch. However, this is the only right the branch lawfully has in this matter. God calls the ministry of the Church; the branch does not have that right. Again, the conducting of the services of the Church is left with the elders of the Church. "The elders are to conduct the meetings as they are led by the Holy Ghost, according to the commandments and revelations of God."—*Doctrine and Covenants* 17:9.

For a branch to assume the right of deciding who will do the preaching is an infringement of the constitutional right of the presiding elder and an intrusion into the province of the Spirit of God working through the presiding elder. If the elder is not qualified to act in his calling, he should be released, but the branch is not justified in curtailing the constitutional rights of the branch president.

EVANS' AUTOCRACY.

Therefore, when the Toronto branch, under the advice, or at least with the tacit approval of R. C. Evans, placed upon their minute book a resolution giving to him exclusive right over the pulpit, so that not

one of the Church ministers could occupy except by his courtesy, when he was present, the law of the Church was violated, and the autocracy of which we hear so much, found concrete expression.

A SINGULAR THREAT.

We note in this paragraph a threat made that if R. C. Evans were moved from Toronto sorrow and desolation would be upon the heads of those making the change. This attitude is altogether out of harmony with the policy of the Church. It is always conceded that the whole is greater than any one of its parts; and, the Toronto branch being but a unitary part of the whole, it certainly could not be justified in this advertised defiance to the body politic of which it formed a part. It is well to remind ourselves that in baptism people are attached to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, which is "the body of Jesus Christ," and, not to a branch, but hold their membership in the Church, enjoying rights and privileges so long as they remain in good standing anywhere.

MEANINGLESS PLAY ON WORDS.

To make a play upon membership in the branch is as meaningless as the play upon the quotation in the New Testament that those who are baptized "are baptized into Christ." For it is obvious that baptism into Jesus Christ means the alliance of the individual with the principles and policies and ethical code of Jesus Christ, and such principles, and policies, and code are for the government of, and find expression through, the organized body of believers and devotees known as the Church.

Again, all of the stipendiary ministers, as general ministers of the Church, are under the jurisdiction of the General Conference and not of the branch. R. C. Evans was a general minister of the Church, and his appointment was made by the general Church, the Toronto branch having no more right to say what should or should not be done with R. C. Evans than they had regarding any other general minister. They had the right of petition but not the right of demand. No organization could continue its existence if the unitary parts became so much engrossed in their individual interests as to be indifferent to the interests of the whole.

CHARGE OF ESPIONAGE.

Third.—It is charged that espionage and a spy system have been employed by the President of the Church, in Toronto and other cities. This grave accusation is absolutely without foundation. There are regular reports required from all Church ministers, quarterly and annually. Also the missionaries have been requested to send in to the First Presidency's office a weekly letter, in which their experiences, comments, opinions and criticisms are invited, with a view to improving our methods, developing more efficient means to meet the growing and more clearly definitized demands. To call this businesslike system "espionage" or denominate it a "spy system," manifests an unaccountable perversity of mind.

PRESIDENT SMITH'S RULING.

Fourth.—The matter of the branch voting upon revelations given through individuals is introduced, together with an announcement that President Smith's ruling that such manifestations should not be voted upon, but should be allowed to stand upon their individual merits would not be accepted.

This ruling of President Smith surely cannot be rejected on the grounds of illegality, for it is sustained by the law of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, also by the customs and practices of the Church. See Doctrine and Covenants 27:2; 43:2; 125:14. General Conference Resolutions, numbers 15 and 16.

The only manifestations which are voted upon are those which come to the Church through its Prophet and President; and before these are voted upon each revelation is submitted to the several quorums for careful examination and scrutiny. When the several quorums are satisfied, then they present their report to General Conference and it is voted upon and thus becomes law to the Church.

It is obvious that if branches were to adopt the custom of voting upon local and promiscuous manifestations, confusion would exist and the possibility of embarrassing the work would be greatly increased. Branches and districts should be governed according to the law which God has given and not by such manifestations. The law to govern the Church is static and can only be changed by the conference in proper action; and the revelations coming to individuals are for personal comfort or direction, or merely for local conditions, and should not be made statutory by vote.

It might be said that the vote on such matters is but to secure general assent, like the saying of "Amen," to determine whether the gift is accepted as false or genuine. However, this function of testing the spirits manifesting themselves in public services does not belong to the body, but to the Melchisedec priesthood of the Church. See Doctrine and Covenants 46:7: "Unto the Bishop of the Church, and unto such as God shall appoint and ordain to watch over the Church, and to be elders unto the Church, are to have it given unto them to discern all those gifts, lest there shall be any among you professing and yet be not of God."

When President Smith very mildly requested the Toronto branch to discontinue the custom, because it was not sanctioned in law and was inimical to the best interests of the Church, he was quite within his rights as President of the Church. This action of President Smith must not be interpreted to mean that no person could receive manifestations, either of the laity or of the ministry, women as well as men, but simply to discontinue the voting upon such matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ORDINATION.

Fifth.—This document raises the question of the right of the branch to vote upon recommendations for ordination, as though President Smith had denied this to the branch.

This is a serious and wilful misrepresentation of President Smith's attitude, and there is not a shred of evidence to sustain the claim that the right of the branch to vote on all such recommendations is invaded or curtailed in any way.

The law of the Church is specific in this matter, and President Smith has not, nor could he, interfere with this. See Doctrine and Covenants 17:12 and 16.

REVELATIONS THROUGH WOMEN.

Sixth.—The allegation that F. M. Smith took a position against women having revelations calling men to the priesthood; and that no traveling minister should have a revelation calling men to the priesthood until after having talked with the branch and district Presidents; and, the ordination should not be from the call, but because of the action of the branch, is not a correct application of President Smith's attitude; but the following is the position taken by him:—

While under proper and normal conditions in Church work God would recognize the representative ministers in the general Church, district or branch in calling men to the ministry, "for the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets," yet God may manifest His will through any one whom He may select. Even a woman may be used to express God's call of any man; but when the call should come, through whomsoever may be the instrument, that call should be submitted to the district and branch Presidents for consideration and action. This is provided for in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, as already quoted, also in General Conference Resolutions; see numbers 124, 312 and 646.

The call from God comes first, and may come through any vehicle God may choose, but presumably through the responsible ministry; then such call must be referred to branch and district authorities for consideration and action by the branch and district, after which the ordination may be provided.

DIVIDING THE TORONTO BRANCH.

Seventh.—The allegation that the Toronto branch was to be divided into thirteen branches is absolutely without foundation. Never at any time did the Joint Council remotely hint at such a thing, and the only proof offered by anyone that this was contemplated is a private letter from R. C. Russell. Whatever may attach to the private letter, it certainly cannot be regarded as an official document; and this is repudiated as such by the Joint Council, through its President and its Secretary. Brother Russell also declares that to say his letter reflects the attitude of the Joint Council is a misrepresentation. Even though such a thing were true, the Joint Council could not arbitrarily do such a thing, and certainly such a move would only be a suggestion which would be submitted to the branch for consideration. The branch then would decide by vote whether or not said division should take place.

DISTORTION OF FACTS.

Eighth.—The assertion that President Smith has taken the position that a branch cannot purchase a site for a church building, or erect a

church without the permission of certain officers who shall decide whether such Church is needed, the kind of building, and the place where such building shall be erected, as well as prohibiting the collecting of funds for such an enterprise, is still another tedious instance of the persistency with which this man will distort the facts in order to secure his ends.

The question of building on behalf of the Church is touched upon in the revelations which are accepted by the Church as law, and the instruction was given that we should be cautious and, at the present time, not engage in such building unless necessary. (See Doctrine and Covenants 130:7.) The wisdom of that admonition is seen in the events which have crowded upon us since this calamitous war has broken out. Further, in the recent conference President Smith in his annual statement mentioned the growing need of a Church architect, to whom should be referred all matters pertaining to Church buildings, in which the general Church may be interested. This was for the purpose of securing to all the Church a competent man, who will be able to prepare plans and assist in developing a distinctive type of architecture, so that our people everywhere shall have the best work at the most reasonable price. Every building needs an architect of some sort, and to have one of our own Church men competent for this work will be a great saving to all.

BISHOPRIC VITALLY INTERESTED.

In the referring of the matter of purchasing a site and so forth, to the Presiding Bishopric, they being vitally interested in such buildings, a consultation with the Bishopric is designed to reduce the dangers of mistakes to a minimum and place the services of the Church at the disposal of all in these matters. Most decidedly the action is not a mandatory one, but is merely advisory, and surely intelligent people will appreciate the fact that the advice and counsel of competent men will be an advantage and not a hindrance. A casual reading of the paragraph in President Smith's speech and the action of General Conference on this matter, will commend itself to all and be sufficient to expose the animus which lies at the back of Evans' misrepresentation. (See Saints' Herald for April 10, 1918, page 355, and for April 17, pages 372 and 373.)

The foregoing exhausts the complaints in the document, except, of course, the personal allusions and innuendoes, which we will not notice.

However, inasmuch as R. C. Evans has taken opportunity to publicly advertise his opposition to well established Church policies, it might be well to notice one or two points.

EVANS vs. THE BOOKS.

It is now known to all that for some time R. C. Evans has been preaching and teaching against the gathering to Zion, and that the establishment of Zion beginning at Independence, Missouri, was to be ignored. On this question there can be no doubt but what everyone must decide for himself as to whether he will accept Evans' ideas or

the inspiration which underlies the latter-day work. If the work represented in the Latter Day Saints' message is true, then R. C. Evans is woefully wrong.

MISREPRESENTS THE BISHOPRIC.

Evans has thought it proper to make his attacks upon the financial policies of the Church. He has shamefully misrepresented the matter of stewardships and consecration, and held up for public ridicule and execration the efforts of the Bishopric to bring about a practical interpretation of this difficult and important task. In this he not only is in opposition to the Church text-books and the official interpretation of them by the Church, but is also guilty of again unlawfully seeking to undermine the very institution with which he was identified, from which he received his support, and whose confidence he was enjoying. Why, if this man seriously questioned either principles or policies, did he not discuss these with the brethren and in the conferences?

ONLY CONCLUSION.

As we review the career of this man in the light of experiences with him, officially and otherwise, it has become more and more evident that in him is fulfilled the scripture written of others, who, like this unfortunate brother, passed the Rubicon of spiritual opportunity: "They went out from us because they were not of us."

AN IGNOBLE ATTITUDE.

If the man was impelled by high moral purpose and devoted to worthy principle, he surely would not have done what he has done, nor would it have been done in the spirit and temper which has characterized his work in this matter.

While the Church officers tried to accomplish the unpleasant task assigned them by the Joint Council, of investigating conditions in the Toronto branch, so that difficulties could be removed and wrongs, if they should exist, be righted, this man, instead of lending his influence to the attainment of this end in which he himself would have been vindicated if innocent, was abusive in public services, was busy in surreptitious ways in undermining the influence of his brethren in the ministry and misrepresenting conditions so that it became impossible to gain a fair and just bearing before the branch. He complains that he was not treated fairly, and yet he made more speeches than any other man engaged in the controversy and was allowed greater latitude than any other even asked for; and finally, when the matters were being focused in such a way that it appeared compulsory that the brother should be subjected to ecclesiastical discipline because of his unministerial and even unchristianlike attitude and unwarranted attacks upon the Church and men, he would not face the issue, but withdrew from the Church. Not contented with this, he now seeks to camouflage that undignified withdrawal by making foul charges against the Church and her leaders, and he even drags out from the sacred silence of the tomb the person and memory of the man of whom R. C. Evans himself

has written and stated the most fulsome adulations, now publicly charging him with sheltering his father and denying his alleged guilt and viciousness.

DISAPPOINTED AMBITION.

Of all the spectacles of shame which can humiliate the human conscience, none is so tragic as this in which a man, once loved and honored as the friend, comrade and trusted servant of confiding and affectionate people, now cruelly and wantonly becomes the traitor and the would-be executioner of the cause and even personal honour of his erstwhile friend. And what for?

Not because of new light, of greater truth, of holy purpose, or vision still more splendid. No; but simply to secure personal ends and win a cheap victory in the personal difficulties which he may have, real or imaginary, with a fellow minister. Truly the soliloquy of Cardinal Woolsey contains what might easily be paraphrased and applied to this man who was once the loved friend of the late Joseph Smith, the honoured and even pampered minister of the Church. The complaints and action of this man demonstrate that the only fault the Church and his friend, the late President Joseph Smith, were guilty of, was loving not wisely, but too well, one who evidently has been unworthy of such esteem and affection:—

“Richard, I charge thee, fling away ambition.
By that sin fell the angels; how can man then,
The image of his Maker, hope to win by it?”

FREDERICK M. SMITH,
BENJAMIN R. MCGUIRE,
JOHN W. RUSHTON,
Committee.