

Mr. Huxley, as you are aware, is the author of the term "agnostic" in its modern theological or anti-theological sense and I believe he is about the only agnostic who knows what he means by the word. Mr. Spencer, I think, can hardly be classed as an agnostic, although there is a difference of opinion on that point. Mr. Underwood thinks he is a materialist, but John Flake thinks he is a theist.

There is a vast difference between free thinkers and "freethinkers." I admit that Mormons, as well as other sectarians, may be free thinkers, as you say, but while there are honorable men called "freethinkers" and intelligent men, there are many called by that name who are not free thinkers or thinkers at all. So, too, while there are many honorable men called Mormons, Methodists, etc., there are men bearing those names who are not honorable. So it comes to this, that there are good and bad in and out of all sects and organizations. I do not think I am better or worse for not being a church member, but, thinking as I do if I were to become a church member I should certainly be worse than I am, for my action would be the result of hypocrisy practiced for some selfish end. But when I am convinced that my right place is in the church in I shall go—if not debarred by mortality's statute of limitation.

When I engaged to lecture for atheists and infidels here it was with a clear understanding that I was not an atheist and had no fellowship with what was then known here as "the American Secular Union," a body composed of the same reckless, thoughtless class that makes up Utah Liberalism. I had a brief hope, of four weeks' duration, that I might make something of these people here, but made my experiment at a loss of both time and money. However, as they have since joined a so-called church I am not sure that I did not accomplish something, though it is doubtful if it can be called good.

I will now subside, but in closing let me say that if in the far future you and I should be clothed upon again so that we shall know each other, and I have a place higher on the North Bench in the Kingdom than you, you shall share it until you choose your location. I say "if" because I shall "go" long before you do. But if you "get there before I do, just tell them that I am coming too." And when we meet we can laugh again over the way we made the "old boy" dance on the *Tribune* stove in Salt Lake.

God bless us both—and everybody.

CHARLES ELLIS.

## RUM VS. IGNORANCE.

August 25 the long-expected debate between the Y. M. C. A. and Lyceum debating clubs came off at Hammond Hall. The question debated was: "Has Intemperance Produced more Crime and Misery than Ignorance?"

Mr. Scott Anderson was chosen to act as chairman in the absence of the regular chairman.

The judges appointed were Mr. H. O. Whitney, Mr. William Bateman and Mr. Balderston. The latter gentleman not being present, Mr. D. J.

Browne was chosen by the other two judges to act as their colleague.

The affirmative side of the question was opened by Mr. J. D. Axton, who painted a vivid picture of the misery and crime resulting from alcoholic intemperance.

In 1887, said he, 100,000 drunkards died during that year. From 1863 to 1887 the consumption of alcoholic liquors increased 300 per cent. Mr. Blaine emphatically stated some time ago that two-thirds of the crimes in the United States could be traced to intoxicating drink. Mr. Axton next glanced at the condition of the European countries, and showed that intemperance was also on the increase there.

Mr. J. F. Smith, Jr., followed Mr. Axton, and opened the negative side. He stated that in contrasting intemperance and ignorance, the crimes resulting from the former were but an atom to the universe as compared with those resulting from ignorance. The speaker then dwelt on the crimes and misery arising from the crusades, the inquisition, religious intolerance, witch-burning and plagues as the direct result of ignorance.

Mr. Plaisted was the next speaker. He took the second place on the affirmative. He opened very earnestly and rather excitedly. The last speaker had made a very fine speech, and if all the category of crime he recounted could be traced to ignorance, Mr. Plaisted felt that the negative would come out triumphant.

Mr. Plaisted contended that the inquisition and other religious persecutions were the results of intemperate religious fanaticism. He said these fearful crimes were the result of a devouring greed for power and wealth. The speaker next quoted from the census statistics of 1890, showing that though schools and colleges and churches had increased in America from 1880 to 1890, yet the inmates of jails had increased some 57 per cent. more than formerly. This speaker dwelt largely on statistics. He also pictured the bliss and beatitude of rural innocence as compared with the vice and misery of city civilization. He described the bands of educated revelers who make night hideous and day gloomy with their deeds in eastern cities.

Mr. Pierce followed on the negative side. He made a splendid speech, but it was mainly of a religious character.

Mr. Taylor followed on the affirmative. He quoted from Herbert Spencer, who stated that if education could avert crime Bacon and Napoleon might be honest men.

Mr. Lyon followed next on the negative, and made a very powerful speech, showing that ignorance was the parent of all crime and misery.

This closed the list of speakers, and Mr. Smith, the leader of the negative, spoke in rebuttal for ten minutes. Mr. Axton, leader of the affirmative, then closed the debate by a ten minute effort, also in rebuttal.

One of the judges asked whether the word intemperance embraced other topics than alcohol. The answer was that it did. The judges then retired and after a few minutes the decision was rendered in favor of the affirmative, but only by two to one, and because intemperance was considered in its widest application.

## SENATOR CHANDLER ON IMMIGRATION.

SENATOR CHANDLER of New Hampshire is chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration. He is alive to the fact that public opinion is being actively directed towards the immigration question. On this account, he is himself giving the matter close observation and serious thought. He admits that the sentiment in favor of greater restriction grows stronger. But if new laws are to be instituted for regulating immigration he thinks that Congress should seek the aid of thoughtful men competent to speak on this issue.

In order to facilitate the obtaining of wise counsel on this question, Senator Chandler has formulated a series of twelve queries, to be submitted to men eminent in various walks of life, for answers. The pith of the questions is as follows: Shall the list of excluded persons be enlarged? Shall anarchists and socialists be excluded? Shall persons be excluded who cannot read and write their own tongue? Shall each immigrant or each family be required to bring a certain amount of money or property? Shall immigrants from particular countries be excluded? Shall the head tax be increased from 50 cents to \$10? Shall a consular certificate from the country of departure be required? Shall the latter requirement be extended to Mexico and Canada? Shall certain restrictions be placed on naturalization and shall it be confined to the United States courts, and taken from the State courts? Is any amendment to the Contract Labor law desired, and if so, what?

From the tenor of these questions it will be seen that the immigration issue is assuming a comprehensive scope, and that when it comes before Congress, it will be discussed in all its phases. It is more than probable that the whole matter of alienism will finally come under the Federal government. The abandonment of Castle Garden in New York, and the transfer of the immigrant service there from the State Board to the Secretary of the Treasury shows that the Federal government is not opposed to such a scheme. It also shows that the States are not opposed to it, because the New York State Board at the time of the transfer last winter entered neither objection nor protest.

The legislation already enacted with a view to restricting undesirable immigration is said to be very imperfect. It was based on the principle that only the bad should be excluded, while the good should have free entrance. Senator Chandler, personally, believes this principle should prevail in the future, though he thinks that the demand for absolute exclusion of all aliens will soon come. He is also desirous that the Republican party should at once make a political issue of this immigration question.

In reply to a reporter, who asked what the attitude of the Republican party was on the question, from the workingman point of view, the Senator said: