

if he furnished 160 acres of land and got sixty dollars for it, I think nobody was injured very seriously in giving him ten acres in lieu of it. Some of you would have thought your toes were trodden on pretty heavily had you been required to trade on any such terms. I heard a man say not long ago, when something perplexing occurred, he did not know what excuse to make about it. I said to him, a right needs no excuse, and an excuse will not make a wrong right. We want facts, and when we get them let us appreciate them, and lay aside our nonsense which so frequently arises from our misconception of things.

There is another thing I wish to refer to pertaining to your local officers. I have heard it said that the City Council was in trouble about the land on which the Tabernacle stands, because it was thought the Church would get the benefit of it. Why? Because they have occupied it so long. Who for? For the Church generally? No; but for the local church in this place. The Church, as a Church, has bought a part of that square above referred to, and has paid the estate for it. Brother Joseph F. Smith and Brother F. Richards here are cognizant of the fact, as auditors. I refer to the land where our Tithing Office stands; but this other matter is something that pertains to yourselves and not to the Church. You have had this for upwards of twenty years. (Brother Joseph F., addressing himself to President Taylor, said: "This place was designated by President Young, when the city was first laid out, as a place to build a meetinghouse.") I am informed that this place was designated by President Young, when the city was laid out, as a place for Church purposes. (A voice from the stand—"That's cor-

rect, and Brother D. H. Wells carried the flag when it was surveyed.") Brother Herrick testifies to its correctness. (Brother Wells said, "I am also conversant with the fact; I carried the flagpole when this square was laid out.") Brother Wells also bears testimony to the same thing, he carried the flagpole when the Square was surveyed. I want these matters understood, open and above board; we have nothing to conceal from anybody. But there was some inattention manifested by your local authorities—for the general authorities of the Church have nothing to do with it; this place through neglect, was not entered at the time the city entries were made, and because of this technicality some of the City Councilors seemed to object to the Church having two-and-half acres of the ten acres, which was all they asked for, and that, too, on behalf of the citizens of Ogden, by paying for it what it had cost the city, the same as they have done with private individuals, I believe as provided by law. But somebody seems to think that somebody is injured. Who is injured? If the Church had ten acres and only desired two-and-half acres, or if they desired the whole of it, I don't think it any great stretch of liberality of anybody, and I do not see why anyone should be at all exercised about it. They will say, What will the Gentiles say? No honorable Gentile would say it is wrong, or take any exception to it, and as for those who are not so, we do not care anything at all about them. That is my idea. Somebody said the City Council had given two-and-half acres to some outside religious sect. Well, if they had it to spare, who cares? We do not want to be pinched up in a nutshell. But then, I think the Latter-day Saints have