

memory of the followers of the red flag.

In this connection Emma Goldman's recent oration in New York should be remembered. That lady, who openly professes anarchism, complains of being "persecuted" by the courts, by officials whom she considers infinitely inferior to the assassin of President Carnot. "Imagine," she exclaims, "the prosecution of a woman for talking!" But would she claim that her sex is endowed with the privilege of preaching murder without being held responsible for it? If so, she needs to learn that she is mistaken; and her employers, who possibly meet the expenses of her missionary work, must be made to understand it also. American freedom of speech is sacred; but it never was and never can be understood to be liberty to preach doctrines overturning the society or violating its laws. It is the liberty for each citizen to contribute his or her wisdom, the result of his or her experience and knowledge, to the general fund of information, for the advancement of the state and the betterment of the conditions of its people, morally, intellectually or politically. But if it be diverted from this purpose and used as an instrument of destruction, it is no more sacred than the sword of a traitor, which was given him for the defense of his country. The American people understand this difference and are competent to point out, whenever the occasion shall arise, that the distinction is essential.

#### THE ARID LAND QUESTION.

It is to be regretted that the approaching Irrigation Congress has not aroused and is not arousing as much interest in Utah as the importance of the subject and this Territory's prominence in it ought to require. Perhaps there are good reasons for this indifference—the NEWS has heard numerous expressions of disappointment, dissatisfaction and disgust at some recent operations on the part of the convention's promoters and managers from men who have heretofore been influential and active in the movement. But the occasion seems to us to be one where men should not be too technical or sensitive, and where there should be at least a partial sinking of personal feelings in a wholesome and resolute endeavor for the public good. As a matter both of justice and of propriety, Utah is entitled to the leading place and the principal part in the deliberations of any body that discusses the question of irrigation. In order that this prestige may be claimed and maintained, it is clearly evident that there must be earnestness and unanimity on the part of Utah men—no matter whether in the past they think they have been properly treated in all respects or not.

One of the biggest problems with which past congresses have sought to deal, and one which will no doubt be prominent in future meetings also, is as to the cession of the arid lands by the general government to the respective states and territories in which they may be found. Like every other question, this one has two sides. Probably in most of our neighboring states, the drift of public sentiment is in favor

of the proposition. Yet its opponents are by no means few or unimportant. The feeling in Utah is also divided—more equally perhaps than in other places. In this city there appears to be a strong inclination in certain quarters to array Utah on the affirmative side of the question. In the outer counties the leading men, with commendable conservatism, are not ready to be pledged to that line of action, while some argue decidedly for the negative side. The NEWS thinks the matter is altogether too important to be disposed of off-hand and without due study of all its aspects. For ourselves, we see many reasons why the government itself is quite as able to look after and dispose of its now arid lands to bona fide settlers on the cheapest and easiest terms as any state can be. We see much force in the argument that in this matter, geographical divisions and the contour of the country, rather than formal state boundary lines, must be considered in works for reclamation and improvement. We incline favorably to the logic that while tens of millions out of the nation's treasury are expended for the improvement of rivers and harbors, a share might well be spared for the improvement and construction of national reservoirs, waterways, etc. And we are pretty sure that while the beneficent purpose of the national land laws has at times been evaded or defeated in the interest of speculators and capitalists, there is still more danger to fear such results, with increased expenses and probable corruption, in the case of state governments.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the NEWS is not altogether converted to the plan; and very many of our readers are in this same frame of mind. Doesn't somebody want to argue the question, tersely and plainly, for the general public's information? Our columns are open for communications from either side. We only ask that they be short, pithy and to the point.

#### WHICH IS THE CHRISTIAN?

There is no class among religionists which presents more strongly an "I am holier than thou" demeanor than do the government-paid clergy of the church of England. In that country it is a subject of frequent comment, and even of adverse criticism among outspoken journals which are supporters of the Anglican church, that the education of the clergy is of a character, as one paper puts it, that trains them "to walk along the street as if contact with the masses must be avoided lest defilement follow." An instance showing their attitude to persons outside of their particular denomination is related in the last issue of the *Milennial Star*, in a correspondence from one of the missionaries at Sunderland, Durhamshire, as follows: "Brother Diston had asked a church of England vicar for the privilege of burying a little daughter, who had passed away July 14, by the side of his brother's child, and was asked to what denomination he belonged. When he stated that he belonged to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, permission was refused on the ground that the Mormons were not Christians."

It was not long after this that two Mormon missionaries—Elders J. W. Chambers and John W. Ford—traveling that way, called upon that same minister, in their capacity of bearing the Gospel message and testifying to all who will listen to them of the Gospel restoration in this age. They entered into conversation with the reverend gentleman, and made the inquiry as to what, in his opinion, constituted a Christian. To this he replied, "A believer in Christ," and he went on to say that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." This called out a suggestion from the Elders that professed believers in Christ could not consistently reject the divine Master's teachings regarding the necessity of being "born of the water and of the Spirit," and other principles. The vicar, however, did not believe in obeying the command to be born of the water, though he thought children should be baptized, as the jailer and his house had been all baptized. The Elders pointed out that the jailer "rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house," and as infants could not comprehend and believe, the jailer's family must have been sufficiently mature to perform that intellectual feat. Then the vicar said that anyway immersion was wrong, as the jailer's family were baptized in his dwelling, and it was not probable that there was sufficient accommodation for the ceremony by immersion. It was pointed out that the record declared they were baptized, and then the jailer "brought them into his house" and set meat before them; and to a suggestion that the baptism took place in the cell of the jail, as Paul and Silas were there, the Elders replied by the evidence of the record that the jailer "brought them out," and then asked what he should do to be saved, and later received baptism. Upon the showing made the vicar had to admit that his views were at variance with the Scriptures; and this was made more pronounced when the scriptural proof of the organization of the Church by the ordination of Apostles, etc., was brought forward.

Reverting to the ground of refusing permission to Brother Diston's request regarding a grave for his child, the vicar was also pressed to the admission that he had acted unfairly. He said he had "not slept good because of those words"—referring to his statement that the Mormons were not Christians—and offered an apology therefor. He, however, urged the Elders to "be converted and join the church" of which he was a representative, and to "not belong to such a sect" as the Latter-day Saints.

Here was a man, representative of his class, claiming to be a Christian and a teacher of Christianity—a man trained and educated in the religious profession, and paid for devoting his time and talents thereto. He refuses to grant a permit for burial of a child on the ground that its parents are non-Christians. Then when presented with the evidence that the doctrine those parents believe in is the same as taught by Christ and His Apostles, he avows himself an unbeliever therein; and urges believers in