

irrigation of their respective tracts of land, and that the validity of the legislation has been several times sustained by the supreme court of the state, while demanding on the part of this court great care and caution in the consideration of the case, and casting upon it a very grave responsibility, cannot justify it in failing to declare invalid legislation which, in its judgment, violates those principles of the Constitution of the United States which protect the private property of every person against forcible taking without due process of law and for any other than a lawful purpose. Such questions are not to be determined by questions of expediency or hardship. Unfortunate as it will be if losses result to investors, and desirable as it undoubtedly is in this section of the country that irrigation facilities be improved and extended, it is far more important that the provisions of that great charter, which is the sheet anchor of safety, be in all things observed and enforced.

There is no doubt that the decision is a severe blow to the irrigation system in California, and if it is sustained to the higher court will seriously affect other states which have followed the Wright law. In that respect it is of vast importance. Constitutional lawyers are at variance in their opinions as to whether the decision will stand, some urging that it cannot be maintained, as such a rule would do away with the making and taxing of school districts etc.; while others insist that it is good law and does not effect the school district system, where the funds are used wholly for public use.

Utah's interest in the question is direct, in that there have been strenuous efforts to have the Wright system adopted here. This has been resisted on the very grounds set up by Judge Ross for his objection to the system. The decision comes at an opportune time to cause changes and developments necessary in the exciting affairs of this Territory to be well considered before being made. The idea of confiscation was strongly antagonized when there was a supposed suggestion that way at the late Constitutional Convention; and now that Judge Ross has arraigned the system under the Wright law in such strong terms, for its leanings in that direction, it is not likely to meet with increased favor here, at least until the subject is more fully ventilated.

DISCUSSING UTAH.

Leaders in national thought and action are still keeping a close note of proceedings in Utah, and evince a deep interest in what might be generally considered matters of purely local moment. This is manifested by the way in which leading journals of all shades of political opinion discuss affairs and events in this Territory. A subject that is now receiving considerable attention from the political press particularly is the question as to whether or not women can vote at the forthcoming State election. The completeness of information at hand largely determines the conclusions arrived at; and it is not our purpose to express an opinion one way or the other upon the correctness of these. Reference is made to them merely to

indicate the particular attention that is directed thereto.

This week leading journals at the eastern and western lines of the nation, and of opposing political faiths, have been taking a turn in the controversy. One, the Democratic New York Sun, argues that women cannot vote until after Utah is actually admitted to the Union, giving as a reason that until then it remains to all intents and purposes a Territory so far as the right of suffrage is concerned. On this hypothesis the Sun advises the women who want to avoid interference with the admission of the Territory to keep away from the polls in November. The Republican San Francisco Chronicle takes a similar stand, insisting that the adoption of a constitution is only one step in the process of state-making, and until Utah is fully and completely a State it must be and remain under the control of Congress, and be governed by its laws, which do not recognize female suffrage in the Territory. As to the fact that certain officials are to be elected to become State officers, it is argued that they are to be chosen by the legal voters of the Territory, and that the women must wait until the first State election before they can exercise the right of suffrage.

All this discussion is gratifying from the fact that it incites people abroad to inquire more and more as to actual conditions here, and thereby leads to a more thorough dissemination of knowledge concerning Utah and her people. As to the particular question the newspapers are arguing and giving advice upon, the course of the people relating thereto probably will be governed by the law as construed by those whose immediate duty it is to pass upon such matters, and will not be greatly influenced from a distance. At the same time there is no inclination to regard the general discussion outside of the Territory in other than a kindly spirit, since it is of a friendly character. It is sufficient to note that "all are talking of Utah," and that in a spirit of fairness and candor.

CURIOUS INTERPRETATION.

A writer in a religious Chicago paper advances the idea that the slaying of the two witnesses, a vision familiar to readers of the book of Revelation, was performed in Chicago during the World's Fair. He argues that the whole world was there, through its representatives, and that there never before was such an opportunity for witnessing for Christ, Christendom, however, instead of fulfilling its mission at that time, violated the Sabbath, sold liquor and displayed the vilest impurity under the name of art, while every form of wickedness flourished inside and outside the Fair grounds. The result was, he says, that the representatives of every form of heathenism returned from that city with a firm conviction that their gods are as good as He whom Christians worship. Thus the testimony of God was silenced and rendered ineffective. The witnesses were slain, and are now, figuratively speaking, lying dead in the streets of the great city.

In all of this there is, of course, nothing but an evidence of the wild

fanaticism to which people have recourse when they endeavor to build up a reputation by interpreting prophecies without having the Spirit of prophecy. In order to be consistent the writer ought to assert that the World's Fair is "the beast that cometh out of the bottomless pit," for that beast was the slayer of the witnesses in the Apocalypse.

KEEPING A FAST.

A correspondent writing from Almy, Uinta county, Wyoming, under date of July 27, says:

I would like to ask you some questions regarding the mode of fasting; also some other items connected therewith. First, what is your opinion about Paul? When he was taken prisoner and was sailing toward Rome, it is mentioned by him that they fasted fourteen days without meats. Does this fasting include meats only, or does it include water also?

Now the reason this question is asked is that a schoolmaster in our neighborhood says a man cannot live longer than three days without water. He claims physiology teaches this. Now there will be remembered the case of David P. Kimball, that may help out the schoolmaster, as David was exhausted for the want of water when the searching party reached him, and it will be remembered that he was not more than three days and three nights lost.

Now I would like to know when the Latter-day Saints fast should it be without water as well as without food?

With regard to the first inquiry, we have no opinion to offer further than the statement of the record itself. As the sacred volume does not say whether or not the party refrained from water, and as abstinence from drink is not required in every fast, it is quite possible that Paul and his companions partook of water while at the same time they refrained from meats. The question of fact in respect to the use of water by them is not disclosed by the record, and cannot be discovered by an argument that applies any absolute rule of fasting which does not exist. We would suggest, however, that the statement in the Acts is not that they were fourteen days without meats, but they had "taken nothing."

As to the alleged physiological teaching that a person cannot live longer than three days without water, or the taking of liquid into the system by the process of drinking, that is a fallacy. There are numerous instances on record where persons have gone five to seven days without taking water internally, or having the opportunity to apply it externally; while the number is much greater who have covered that and longer periods, when they have had the privilege of frequent bathing. The three days limit would be sufficient to kill many individuals if they were compelled to undergo it on the hot, sandy deserts of Arizona; while in a moist climate and cold weather they would readily survive deprivation for double that time. Physiologically considered, the failure to take a drink of water does not immediately remove from the body all the water that is in it, or even prevent absorption of the liquid.

Regarding the inquiry as to whether, when the Latter-day Saints are called to fast, they