

belief in Christ, whose name is more often blasphemed than honored in them by its frequent and unnecessary repetition which amounts to "taking the name of the Lord in vain." The polemic "crusade against sin" may create a small boom in a modern style of religion in San Francisco, but it will not enhance the cause of Christianity there. The man that needs that sort of business to make him feel an interest in his soul's welfare has not attained the standard essential to Christian life. The persons who present it as a way to salvation afford a marked contrast to the example of the Lord and His disciples, who taught people to repent and be baptized for the remission of their sins, that they might have the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them and be guided in the way of all truth.

THE COLORADO INFAMY.

The little scheme of a number of Colorado "leather-breeches" and land speculators to remove the Southern Ute Indians from their pleasant and fertile reservation in the Centennial state and drop them into San Juan county, Utah, is just now encountering many an unexpected snag. Even the Congressional committee which has had the bill in charge, is reported as being unfavorable to it; and of course if the lobbyists have not been able to win that small number of usually susceptible champions to their side, their case would seem to look indeed hopeless.

Every honest man, in Congress or out of it, ought to know that in such a trade as this, something more than the mere dictum and the specious arguments of the lobby must be considered. The proposed bargain is too important to be carried through upon the representations of one side only—and that side the beneficiaries? That Colorado people should want to get rid of their red neighbors and get possession of their good lands is easy enough to understand; but the plan proposed is not so easy to justify. It happens that Utah doesn't want any more Indians than she has already and that she is especially averse to being treated as a mere dumping-ground for Colorado's surplus. It further happens that the section which it is proposed to give the Indians in the event of their removal, has been colonized at great expense of time and means and amid great hardships; and that the settlers have made extensive and valuable improvements which money could hardly pay for, in view of the fact that should they lose their possessions they would scarcely know where to go to get other lands for homes and farms. Lastly, it happens that the Indians themselves are averse to the exchange; and this objection, we submit, is tremendously important, notwithstanding the popular Colorado notion that the Indian has no rights which the white man is bound to respect, or that the only good Indian is a dead Indian.

It may be true that a few of these Utes are willing to have the removal take place; there are always white men shrewd enough to bribe with presents and cajole with promises the untutored savage. But the great majority of the latter have remained unshaken by either threats or gifts or

pledges; and far so as the people of Utah are concerned, not only the San Juan settlers but their fellow-citizens in every county in the Territory, there is probably not one who does not regard the proposition as a rank injustice and an outrage. What all of us desire is that the present uncertainty shall be terminated; that the cloud which for months and years has been hovering over San Juan be dispelled; that the thrifty people there be given full title to their lands, and full assurance that they will be left undisturbed; so that they may go on with their reclamation of the wastes, and with their improvements upon and around their farms and hearthstones. The mission of the Colorado lobby in Washington is disgraceful, and if Congress has a spark of conscience left, that mission will fail. Kate Field, in the latest issue of *Washington*, riddles their scheme, which she calls an outrage on the Indians; and her conclusion we fully and heartily endorse: "It is about time that reason entered into the solution of a problem which has only been a problem because sentimentality on one side and godless greed on the other have strangled common sense in the treatment of the Indian."

ROBBING BENJAMIN.

Ex-President Harrison, who is in California delivering a series of lectures before the classes in law, political science and history, in the Stanford university, says that he has been robbed, and accuses a San Francisco morning paper of the larceny. When the ex-President began the course of lectures, he announced that they would not be published, and the precautions deemed necessary to conform to this statement were taken. But the newspaper got a stenographer who took the first lecture and it was printed, its author not being given an opportunity to revise it, for the palpable reason that if he had been he no doubt would have endeavored to prevent the publication. If this is robbery, the boldness of the deed will be still more noticeable in the *New York World*, which has published at a distance of 4,000 miles each lecture thus far delivered the morning following its delivery.

At the opening of the second lecture the ex-President came out with a prelude which showed that he was far from being pleased with seeing his remarks in print. Speaking of what had appeared in the San Francisco paper he said: "Such publications, not revised by the author, are sure to be full of mistakes that are mortifying to the lecturer and misleading to those who read them." He also remarked: "Some of our newspaper friends have greatly exercised themselves over the question, 'What shall we do with our ex-President?' It is a question that has never troubled me much, and I have never felt called upon before to offer a solution, but in view of my experience yesterday, I venture to offer this solution, which will be perfect so far as I am concerned: Do not steal what belongs to them. That will answer all the requirements in my case." He added: "I have not such an estimation of these lectures myself as to think that

grand larceny could be predicated on the stealing of them, but such property as there is in them is mine."

For the sake of argument, it may be admitted that the act of the papers in publishing the lecture was a piece of marked discourtesy to the lecturer, and that it might be unjustifiable except under extraordinary circumstances, which do not appear to exist in this case. But when the ex-President, experienced lawyer and politician though he be, alleges his title to individual ownership of utterances made to the students of a public institution, he sets up a rather remarkable claim, and one that will not be treated as of any virtue in this country. "Such property as is in them" may have been the lecturer's before he spoke; but when he gave his views out to the students and invited guests, among whom was the stenographer, they became the property of the listeners for any lawful use.

The rule laid down by Mr. Harrison as to exclusive ownership of expressions made by an instructor in school would be a very dangerous one in this country. He says that an unrevised report of them is "misleading" to the readers; yet the art of stenography has reached such perfection in practice that the chances are ten to one the report was verbatim. If it is misleading to the readers, were not the same words equally so when spoken to the student-listeners? If they still are Mr. Harrison's private property, might not one who chose to disseminate in the school anarchistic or treasonable doctrines lay the same claim and demand the same protection in the ownership? When expressions, whether proper, misleading, or worse, are made in the hearing of others, they are no longer the property of the speaker exclusively, but having been given to the winds as it were, may be lawfully dealt with by others. The San Francisco paper's and the *New York World's* publication of the lecture may look like discourtesy to the ex-President, but certainly there was no stealing of anything from him. He had given it away before the newspaper got it.

HENRY W. BIGLER.

In another part of the News is a short letter from the veteran Henry W. Bigler, of St. George, Utah. The writer presents a brief sketch of his early life to which we cheerfully give space, wishing that he had continued his account down to a recent period. The biographies of such men contain much that is of interest and value to those of the present generation, and we would that more of them felt inclined to give to the people today a recital of striking events in their long experience. This could not fail to impress lessons of usefulness upon the minds of those who are young and active, and would give to them a more thorough knowledge of the mighty labors that have been performed in the Great West by an army of noble workers whose rearguard is now passing over the silent river.

As Elder Bigler has modestly refrained from narrating the notable events with which he was connected in the prime and later years of his life, we will briefly mention two which are closely associated with each other and