

us not forget our sister city on the other side of the mountains, and if the worst comes to the worst we can spare something toward helping along.

CONSUMPTION CONTAGIOUS.

Consumption is one of the most dreaded of all diseases because it is in so many cases fatal sooner or later. Once the lungs are firmly in the grasp of the destroyer the downward road is traveled and the bottom reached with reasonable certainty and but slightly varying celerity. It had not hitherto been regarded as contagious, but several gentlemen prominent in the practice and study of medicine have lately so declared it and they are obtaining new recruits every day. A recent number of the *Medical Record* contains a paper by Dr. J. G. Hopkins of Thomasville, Ga., in which he said he had joined the growing army spoken of, placing tuberculosis in the category of contagious and his experience with this disease during nineteen years of investigation in Thomasville — which place is a resort for consumptives — bore him out in his opinion and made a willing subject of the great and erudite Koch. He does not doubt that all men, women and children, at some time or times, receive into their air passages the tubercle bacilli, but fortunately the great majority possessed the power of repelling them and throwing them off — they did not find that soil, so to speak, which is adapted to their growth. Indians in a state of nativity seemed impervious to the germs of consumption, but were now dying by thousands on the reservations. The whites and the blacks in prisons all over the world labored under similar conditions. A report from the Illinois state prison, at Joliet, says that there are 1400 convicts within the walls, and fully one-third of them have consumption in a light or bad form. Nearly all deaths of persons in the penitentiary have been caused by consumption.

The doctor lays particular stress upon the danger that lurks in sleeping cars, carpets, bedding, clothing, and even in the walls of apartments which have been occupied by consumptives and have not been properly renovated and made harmless by antiseptic measures. Consumptives should be forced to provide for the destruction of sputa. Whenever situated so as not to expectorate directly into a germicide or the fire, they should use some means of conveying the sputa to the germicide or the flames. If handkerchiefs or clothes are used, they should not be sent to the laundry, as human happiness and life are jeopardized through the probability of inoculation through abrasions upon the hands. These bacilli should never be allowed to dry up and impregnate the air, as is now done through ignorance of possible result. Numerous experiments by leading medical authorities have proved beyond doubt that consumption is an inoculable disease, and so rapidly is the throng of converts growing that the speaker would not be surprised if even in his day resorts now soliciting the patronage of the

consumptive will be quarantined against him.

Utah is, we believe, as nearly free from this scourge as any other part of the country; still, we do have a case now and then and the suggestions contained in the foregoing may be useful.

THE "NEWS" AND HOME PRODUCTS.

A writer in this morning's *Tribune* asks the NEWS to "stand in" on the proposition to retain cash in our midst by encouraging home manufactures. It is very evident that he does not read this paper very carefully, or he would know that such suggestions are altogether superfluous. The upbuilding and forwarding by every available and legitimate means of our domestic industries has been well nigh a hobby with the NEWS from its inception down to the present time; indeed, we take some credit to ourselves for having been in the lead on most of such propositions, and it is a part of the policy adopted to keep up the contention until by it and otherwise those who do not now see where their true interests lie will be unable in time to see any other way.

Not only in the manufacturing but in the productive, mechanical, stock-growing and fine arts departments has this paper been second to none in its advocacy and moral and material support. We favor the restoration of silver to its proper place as an integer of the commercial fabric because it is right and because it is one of our greatest industries, if not, when things are properly adjusted, the greatest; railroads to new fields have had no warmer advocate than the NEWS because they furnish additional work for a great many more people, both directly and indirectly; legitimate enterprises of whatever nature do not have to apprise us a second time of their coming nor urge at all for encouragement; the woolen mills would not only never be idle but would be running to their full capacity with a demand ahead of any possible supply if we could have our way, and it is not all assured that we can't; the constant employment and equitable treatment of wage-workers and those who work for themselves has never been lost sight of — and in all this it mattered and matters not to the NEWS management whether those concerned in any business or enterprise looking to the public good are of our faith or against it, whether they are Democrats, Republicans, Populists, Prohibitionists or, like this paper, keep themselves utterly aloof from all political affiliations with their concomitant entanglements. Anything that is beneficial to the whole people is good for us and there is no hesitation or halting or giving out uncertain meanings in the matter either.

In conclusion we disclaim any intention of "blowing our own trumpet" or making any "noise" about what has been done and is being done by this paper for the country's good. What is herein said is called out by the almost astounding proposition that we assist in a cause in which it has been as much a pleasure as a duty to assist since near the

beginning of this generation. And as it has been so shall it continue. Let "homemade goods for home-loving people" be the watchword, and by its strict observance we will enter upon and maintain a better condition of things, a more general, substantial prosperity than we have yet known by any experience through which we have passed. Of course the NEWS will "stand in"!

ABSURDITIES OF HIGHER CRITICISM.

Certain Bible critics of a rationalistic school assert with great confidence that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch. They ignore all the historical evidence for the common view on the subject and claim that internal evidence is conclusive against it.

Their internal evidence is briefly this, that the Pentateuch has many passages which Moses could never have written, and that it shows by its fragmentary character that it has several authors; the various names used for God — Elohim and Jehovah — indicate a Jehovahist and an Elohist author, and the ritual law bears the mark of a much later time. Ezra is hinted at as the author of the last one, if not actually the "editor" of the whole book, and he, or somebody else, engrafted upon it the myths and legends of Babylon, previous to issuing the work as the books of Moses.

What are the facts? In the first place, it is admitted by all that there are some parts of the Pentateuch which Moses never wrote. The narrative of his death and subsequent events were added probably by Joshua, and some verses were evidently explanatory interpolations by later transcribers. "And the Canaanite was then in the land," and "Moses was the meekest of men," may be expressions of this class. When added, or by whom, is impossible to ascertain by any ordinary means of historical research, but such passages may have been inserted by inspired men and therefore be of equal authority to the original text. At all events, they do not prove that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch any more than the foot notes in the Doctrine and Covenants prove that book to be spurious. Such additions and explanatory interpolations do not amount to fity in all.

As to the fragmentary character of the books, it is not denied that the author consulted various documents for the historical part. Vitrings, we believe, was the first who made this suggestion, but he was far from contending that Moses was not the author. This questionable honor belongs to later and less profound scholars. Moses was a very learned man and it is but reasonable to suppose that he should have availed himself of all that was written before him and which was within his reach. It is also reasonable to suppose that the circumstances under which he wrote would be reflected in his compositions and render them to some extent fragmentary. But to conclude from these premises that Moses was not the author is about as logical as to say that Prescott is not the author of his famous histories of the