

ing after the doctors with a loaded shotgun to exterminate professional healers? Would it not be both a sin against common sense and against God to kill a physician because his patient died in spite of his medicine?

The ordinance of the Church for the benefit of the sick does not preclude the administration of healing remedies to those who have not faith. On the contrary, it is commanded in the Church that they are to be nourished with herbs and mild food, and that these are to be administered with judgment and skill, with prudence and thanksgiving. But, at the same time, the ordinance for the sick is not to be neglected. All have not faith to obtain the desired benefits. For this they are not to be blamed. Neither is it always a mark of merit that a person has the gift to heal, or faith to be healed.

There are some persons who have what is called animal magnetism, and they go about on professional tours, stimulating shattered nerves, and working upon weak people's strong imagination. We do not wish to be understood as saying anything against any good they may be able to accomplish. But we do say that when a child, sick near unto death, is healed by the laying on of hands, when broken bones are knit with marvelous rapidity, when the blind are made to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the dumb to speak, fevers are dispersed in a moment, deformities made to disappear, organic derangements take their flight, and diseases, pronounced incurable, to be permanently dispersed, these are not merely the workings of a magnetic personality upon shattered nerves, but the manifestations of a divine power that works through faith. It is faith in the administrator or in the recipient, or both. It is as much an operation of force as the lifting of a weight, the scattering of dust by the wind, the attraction of moisture by the rays of the sun, or any of the common exhibitions of physical power that are called natural phenomena.

Healing by faith is an essential part of the Christian creed. It was neglected and ignored when the errors and follies of perverted Christianity overspread the world. It is restored with the pure Gospel of the Savior. It has come back in a day of unbelief. It is but imperfectly exercised and enjoyed. It is ridiculed even by those who profess belief in the Great Teacher who made it so prominent in His doctrine and practice. But it is a comfort and blessing to the Latter-day Saints, and many who do not wish to boast of their experience or make proclamation of that which is sacred, rejoice and give thanks to God for the ordinance of the Church for the healing of the sick.

There has been a very severe winter on Iceland, with much snow and ice in the northern parts. Wild reindeers and anipes have in masses repaired to the habitations of man and been killed by the thousands. On the southern coast the winter-fisheries have been exceedingly lucrative. From the Faro islands great storms are reported.

SUNDAY SCENES IN SALOONS.

IN another part of this issue is an account of a quarrel which occurred yesterday. It came near culminating in a tragedy. The scene of the disturbance was in a Main Street saloon. George Barr, proprietor of a gambling house, leveled a pistol on Charles Steel, and doubtless would have killed the latter had it not been for the intervention of the barkeeper, who performed the disarming act. Barr's manager also drew a weapon for the purpose of shooting Steel, but he also was disarmed by the active and intrepid bartender.

Perhaps Councilman Wantland will arise and explain at the next session of the city fathers how this incident could have occurred in a saloon on the Sabbath day. When speaking to Councilman Folland's resolution to instruct the police force to enforce the ordinances in relation to Sunday liquor traffic, he questioned the veracity of the mover. He did not believe that the saloons were conducted on Sundays in open and flagrant violation of law.

Another Sunday saloon incident was related by the proprietor of the drinking shop opposite the Warm Springs. He asserts that while he was sitting in his premises last night, a couple of masked men walked into the place and relieved him of his loose cash, amounting to about \$100. Perhaps the "Liberal" councilmen who wanted Mr. Folland's resolution expunged from the minutes will take the ground that the establishment was not open on Sunday for the sale of intoxicants, but merely to maskers for purposes of plunder.

LABOR FOR CONVICTS.

IN a conversation had recently with Governor Thomas, the exercise of the pardoning power was incidentally alluded to. He stated that there were no cases in which he was asked to extend executive clemency that appealed more strongly to both his sympathy and judgment than those in which the dependent families of convicts were punished much more severely than the offender against the law himself. While the latter was simply deprived of liberty, wives and children were frequently left in destitution, and suffered from hunger and exposure. These conditions tempted them too often to lead lawless lives. Mr. Thomas thought that the laws in relation to the punishment of criminals were, in this respect, deplorably defective.

When asked if he could suggest a remedy, Mr. Thomas replied that the situation could be at least greatly ameliorated by providing work for convicts, and that the surplus proceeds of their labor should go to the maintenance of their families, in cases where they had people dependent upon them. The governor has twice made a recommendation to this effect to the government, as can be seen by reference to his reports of 1889 and 1890, to the secretary of the interior.

This idea is sound on its face. To keep a large body of men in idleness is a violation of the law of economy. Every

person capable of performing work ought to be productive. It is a natural and legal duty of every capable man who has a wife and children to provide for them, and convicts ought to be no exception to this wholesome rule. We believe there are but few criminals who are the heads of families so hardened that they would not cheerfully labor during their confinement under the consciousness that they were to some extent keeping the wolf from the doors of their own domiciles. Such a provision as that recommended by the Governor would at least mitigate the sufferings of numbers of women and children who are innocent of any crime, but are virtually punished under the operations of the law, by being deprived of needed support.

THE EDUCATION CONTROVERSY.

THE question of education is provoking a great deal of controversy all through the United States, and is becoming an issue in politics. At the recent elections in Cleveland, Ohio, and in several of the New England cities, the public school versus the parochial school figured as a direct issue. The political upheaval caused by it in Wisconsin and in Illinois two years ago is yet fresh in the minds of the reading public.

The New York *Educational Review* for March contains an article entitled "Education, to Whom Does it Belong?" It was written by one who might be termed an ultra-Catholic. In fact, it is a criticism on a pamphlet written by the professor of moral theology in the Catholic University of Washington.

In that pamphlet the professor, the Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, claimed that he wrote at the request of his ecclesiastical superiors, and it is but reasonable to assume that the work was perused by them before its publication. He held to the theory that education did not belong wholly to the family, to the State, to the church or to the individual, "but to all four combined in harmonious working." The matter of combining harmoniously these four factors the learned doctor left to "the men whom God has placed at the head of the Church and the State."

Before the pamphlet was written several parochial schools were leased to school boards in Minnesota at a nominal sum, and, ceasing to be Catholic schools, were at once turned into public schools. This immediate change was effected with the consent of Archbishop Ireland, who was so warmly received by the Pope a few weeks ago. The same authority indorsed Bouquillon's pamphlet at the time of its publication.

The *Educational Review* writer, whose name is John A. Mooney, takes direct issue on the question. He contends that the ideal Catholic school is the parochial, and that all the church councils and synods have imposed upon the clergy the duty of providing a school in every parish. He dwells on the inconsistency of this proceeding if Bouquillon's scheme is the real church plan. The Catholic theory is, he says:

"To the parent belongs the education of the child. The State has no right to