

as on this occasion, injects a few boastful references to British greatness and the insignificance and impudence of any power that dares to question British supremacy over the nations in a conflict-at-arms.

The bluffing of the English press may, however, serve as a temporary covering until the nation's statesmen get their wits together on the proposition presented. On sober second thought these will not be so hasty as the newspapers have been in expressions of defiance or ridicule toward American claims presented in the forceful yet conservative manner of the Venezuelan controversy. Lord Salisbury and his compeers will not be found declaring, as the London Times does, that no nation has endorsed the Monroe doctrine, for the memory will come that it is recognized and upheld by all the American nations at least, and chiefly by the one which has the power to enforce it; neither will the British ministers be very emphatic in reiterating the declaration of "the Thunderer" concerning Britain's "command of the sea." If they were to do so, even the good sense of English public sentiment, which is seldom voiced impulsively through the newspapers but finds more deliberate expression, would revolt, if it were only because of a faint recollection that powerful France had to recognize the Monroe doctrine when the United States was physically weaker than now, and that even the "power which has command of the sea" found such command futile to check the triumph of American arms in defense of the right of self-government on the American continent.

But aside from any bluster that may be indulged in, what are the relative situations of Great Britain and the United States on the issue, which may be carried, though it is doubtful, to the extent of a passage-at-arms? The United States has made no suggestion that it would like to invade British soil, or would endorse any encroachment of British territorial rights. It has stated, in unequivocal language, that as one of the family of American nations it will resist any invasion of the rights of a weaker member of that family—a declaration that even British subjects on this continent will approve, whether Europeans like it or not. Upon this statement, if Britain does not want trouble, all she has to do is to refrain from such invasion; if she does not insist on enjoying as a right the privilege of robbing, there will be no bother—if she is not taking Venezuelan territory there is no occasion for fluttering. A conflict precipitated upon this state of affairs would mean unanimity of action in the United States and a division of sentiment and consequent weakness in the United Kingdom.

It is doubtful whether, if Lord Salisbury had suspected such action as that of President Cleveland, he would have rejected the offer of arbitration. There was an idea in London that the United States would let the matter drop upon the assurance of Great Britain that without interference she would act squarely with Venezuela. Now that the assurance of straight dealing is not received as sufficient, the British premier will not press matters to a war point. He did not dare do that

with Turkey, as was shown recently; much less will he do it with the United States backed by the combined American nations. Nobody recognizes any better than do the members of the British privy council that a war with the United States means to the United Kingdom the alienation of Canada, the loss of India, the separation of the Australasian colonies, and lastly, the most threatening danger of all, the independence of Ireland—to say nothing of its commercially disastrous effect. No; there is no special immediate danger of a war between the two great English-speaking nations. The time was opportune for President Cleveland to assume the position he has taken.

### IRRIGATION IN AUSTRALIA.

We have received from Elder F. W. Ellis a late copy of the Daily Telegraph, published at Launceston, Tasmania, in which there is an editorial discussion of the benefits of irrigation as applied to Australian lands. The Telegraph points out that much of the depression in that country is due to the "land hunger" which was given full scope a few years ago. Men whose fathers had accumulated money and left their sons magnificent properties well stocked and fairly well clear of liabilities—these men were not satisfied with the estates left them. The desire for more land led to the mortgaging of the old place, and additional properties were taken up, largely on credit, and which were too great to be properly stocked. The property thus held could not be properly or profitably managed. The owners could not possibly work the whole of their land, and the payments on the portion that remains unremunerative are proving a veritable millstone round their necks. The Telegraph points out that in America the same mistake was made; but that the farmers in the United States and Canada are now discovering that the actual ownership of a small farm, properly cultivated, is a much more valuable property than the nominal possession of a large holding which cannot be worked as land must be worked to return a profit in these days of fierce competition. Application of this principle is made to Australia, with the statement that to institute successful intensive farming recourse must be had to irrigation. Arguing in favor of its adoption and the idea of small farms, the Telegraph makes the following reference to the people of this intermountain region:

The scientific agriculturists and professors of the science of soil production in the United States now readily admit that the example of Mormon farming in Utah has revolutionized the system of production in the whole of the states. Small holdings, individualism, properly regulated, and irrigation were the principles laid down for Mormon cultivation, and the result has been, perhaps, the most successful agriculture that the world has yet seen. Irrigation proved the keystone of the whole fabric, and, allied to the system of actually enforced labor and small holdings, has converted an arid desert into a magnificently productive area, the fruitfulness of which is the wonder of all visitors. "Irrigation," says an agri-

cultural scientist, "is not a substitute for rain. Rain is a substitute for irrigation, and a mighty poor one." The storing of water during the rainy season, when it is a source of danger, for utilization in summer when it means life, fertility, and a blessing, is really the secret of the success of Utah cultivation. A competent authority points out that there is sufficient water and land in arid America—the great salt-bush desert, which is now practically uninhabited and uninhabitable—to sustain an additional population of 100,000,000 people upon the same basis as that upon which the Utah farms have been brought under cultivation. He also points out that while only five per cent of the people of the United States have any proprietary interest in the land, ninety per cent of the Mormon people are owners or heirs of the soil. The fact of polygamy having been abolished in Utah now enables the world at large to study, without the prejudice formerly existing, the effects and cause of the marvelous prosperity of that people.

The Telegraph further says that irrigation is being followed to a limited extent in Australia, but that the artificial use of water is still neglected to a degree that is inexplicable. As for Tasmania, the lakes are placed at a high elevation, providing almost unequalled facilities for irrigation. Heretofore there have been no attempts to utilize the water supply in artificial application to crops, but now the introduction of a thorough irrigation system is urged as a movement that cannot fail to benefit the colony.

It is highly gratifying to note the progress that irrigation methods are making in various parts of the earth, and to observe that the founders of Utah are receiving due credit for instituting the system in its successful application. When people get a little further along in the discussion of this great factor in agricultural development, they can turn again to the Mormons for further demonstrations of principle in material progress; for after all irrigation is a comparatively small means used in aiding the work, and not the primal cause of "the marvelous prosperity" of the Mormons.

JUDGE RISLEY, of California, has decided that a man need not run from a vicious bull in order to secure damages from the owner of the animal for injuries received. J. R. Clowdis got a verdict Saturday for \$5,500 for being tossed by a bull. The owners of the animal urged that Clowdis contributed to his own injury by failing to run till the bull was close upon him. The judge held that that made no difference in the responsibility for the animal being loose. There will be few men, however, who will desire to take advantage of this point—they will run from a wild bull as early as they discover that he has business with them.

ACCORDING to the Journal of Hygiene, consumptives have been recently treated by feeding them with peanuts, with very favorable results. The physician who used the treatment reports: "The peanut was long known as an excellent fat-producer, and much more agreeable than rancid shark-oil that oftentimes is sold for cod-liver oil. While not all can digest peanuts, a great many even with feeble digestion eat them without discomfort. It beats the Koch lymph and is the most satisfactory treatment I have ever tried for these diseases."