

The paragraph quoted in an editorial of the NEWS on the proceedings of the conference and also in a correspondence subsequently published refers to Thomas W. Smith. The exact words are:

"For the same reasons in me that it is not expedient to fill the quorums of the first presidency and the twelve, who are apostles and high priests, it is not expedient that a patriarch for the church should be indicated and appointed. My servant Thomas W. Smith is in my hand; and his bishopric shall be continued for a season; if he fully recover he will enter again into the work; if I take him to myself another will be appointed in his stead when the quorum is filled."

The subject is again referred to in these columns because of a desire to present it with greater accuracy than it was possible to do from the necessarily brief account received over the wire. The fact remains, as previously stated, that the members of the Reorganized church, as far as can be judged by the proceedings of the conference as reported, are divided on the question whether this purported revelation is authentic or not. That this is a serious dissension in the ranks cannot be denied. We again express the hope that even this division may ultimately result in benefit to the honest in heart. The "revelation" itself states with reference to the long vacancy in the presidency that it "shall be well for my work in the end." It would be well indeed if it should prove to be a means whereby many of those who love the Gospel and yet pursue a course separate from that of the Church for which Joseph the Prophet laid down his life, were led back into union with their brethren. In the end it will be apparent that what leads to division and dissension among the followers of the Divine Master is not from Him and must result in error, weakness and defeat.

SWEDEN AND NORWAY.

On account of rumors in Berlin to the effect that Emperor William has given his imperial word to King Oscar of Sweden and Norway that Germany would be up in arms in behalf of Sweden should Russia interfere in any manner in the threatened conflict between the two Scandinavian kingdoms, the attention of Europe is at present focused on the events on the northern peninsula. In official circles the report is generally discredited, although it is well known that for years the king of Sweden has sought the main support for his policy in friendly relations with Germany. But the alarmist rumors are nevertheless spreading, owing to the facts that the relations between St. Petersburg and Berlin apparently at present are less cordial than usually.

The trouble in Scandinavia is entirely between the king and the dominant liberal party of Norway. It dates back to the beginning of this century. At that time Norway was merely a province of Denmark and had been so for over four hundred years. When the Napoleonic crisis came, Denmark, after the disastrous war of 1813, was compelled by the allied powers to sign the treaty of Kiel, in 1814, by which it was stipulated that Norway should be ceded to Sweden, the latter country giving

Swedish Pomerania and Rugen to Denmark and Finland to Russia. The Norwegians, however, very properly objected to seeing their country disposed of in that way. They refused to accept the treaty of Kiel and convoked a national diet. A constitution was adopted, a Danish prince elected king of Norway and the country's independence proclaimed. The allied powers, however, refused to recognize the new government and a Swedish army under Bernadotte invaded the country. Frederickstad and Fredrickshald fell into his hands and Christiania, the capital, was threatened. Norway at the time being utterly destitute of the necessary means for prosecuting a war, gave up all resistance and accepted the proposition made by the Swedish government to join Sweden as an independent kingdom, retaining the newly adopted constitution and enjoying perfect liberty within its own boundaries. This seemed agreeable to all parties, and the union was effected by the proclamation of Charles XIII joint king of the two monarchies.

The progress of Norway since that time has been marvelous in every respect. Yet much dissatisfaction has of late been manifest with the arrangement. The liberal party are aiming at a republican form of government and evince no desire of conciliation in their attitude toward the chief executive of the state. The latest advices from Christiania describe the situation as serious, the liberals declaring their intention to impeach any cabinet the king may select if not in sympathy with the party, thus apparently threatening the constitutionally guaranteed prerogatives of the monarch to select his own counselors. Yet, it is hardly likely that this purely constitutional conflict will involve the two countries in a war. The fact is that the conservative party in Norway has been gaining ground lately under the liberal rule, and there is statesmanship enough in both countries to find a solution of the vexed problem satisfactory to both. History gives evidence enough that in periods when Sweden and Norway have been united, prosperity has been the result while disaster has attended their separation. That lesson can not be lost in the leaders of the destinies of the two nations.

WATER AND ITS USE.

When the national board of irrigation experts lately appointed by the government gets down to work and to making reports thereof, there ought to be a considerable advance in the understanding and application of the science of irrigation in this country; for a science it is and must be in having, "in point of form, the character of logical perfection, and, in point of matter, the character of real truth," as Sir W. Hamilton describes such knowledge to be.

Wonderful progress has been made through the irrigation methods of the West, yet it is a fact that their misapplication in many respects has resulted in the loss or much of the benefit that otherwise might have accrued. In proof of this it is but necessary to recall that in the experience of irrigators in this Territory there has been

much damage to crops and property by the use of too much water.

In respect to this suggestion, it is well known that there are many people who possess an idea that too much water cannot be given to garden and farm crops. There are in many localities, and perhaps in every district where any considerable number of people have congregated, some persons who would irrigate the same piece of land every day in the week if they had opportunity. If a record were made it would be found that such individuals are not the most successful gardener or farmer; in fact, about the only thing that keeps them from being complete failures in this line is that they are prevented through their neighbors' needs and the lack of water from getting sufficient of the liquid to drown their crops altogether.

Yet it is not only these exceptional individuals who overdo irrigation. The evidence points to the fact that the fault is general among cultivators of the soil. So eager has been the scramble for water when it was scarce, that when it is obtainable in abundance, the tendency of the over-thirsty but unwise man is made to prevail—too much water is taken, and an unhealthy condition is the result. Note, for instance, the present and past condition of Utah potatoes. Once their fame was that they were the best raised west of the Missouri river—that being the section of country to which they had access. This was in the days when there was much less water used in irrigation than now. That time has passed away, and our most experienced and successful farmers say the quality of the Utah potato falls short of what it was for the sole reason that the fields where it is grown are over-irrigated. Then again, lucerne fields are injured and destroyed from the same cause; shade and fruit trees fail for similar reason; and in a hundred other ways the misapplication of irrigation has been an injury.

In the same line, it is not difficult to go into the earliest settled sections of this Territory to find the evidence of an excessive use of water in the impoverished and over-moist soil. It is in Weber county where, it was stated recently by a high authority on such subjects, much land had been rendered positively useless by this means; from Utah county come similar reports; while in Salt Lake county instances of this kind are numerous, and many farms which were formerly productive now are failing because excessive irrigation on them or on the higher land contiguous is forcing the water and alkali to the surface of the lower fields. These are extreme cases, and do not represent the greater loss which comes to many sections by crops being short because they have been too freely irrigated. Vegetables and fruits, like man, are injured and enfeebled by getting too much water as well as by having too little. In its investigations the national board of irrigation experts can tell every farmer, gardener and horticulturist how much water the grain, the vegetables, and the fruits need in a given locality, and when it should be furnished, they will have placed irrigation on a scientific basis among the masses of people, where its application can be made one of the most beneficial of the arts.