

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

NOT A COMPETENT CRITIC.

A recent issue of the *Lamoni Saints' Herald* has a fifteen-column response to a NEWS editorial, the latter having pointed out as untrue the assertions of the *Herald* that "those who have been desirous of passing through the endowment ceremonies for themselves, and of attending to baptisms for their dead, have been charged a certain sum for the privilege" in the Temples of Utah. Upon this point the *Herald* replies that it had taken the statements of those whom it had reason to believe were in a position to know, and if it has been misinformed is pleased to understand that fact, therefore accepts the NEWS statement without dispute; all of which is commendable in our friend, but reveals at the same time its incapacity to judge of Temple matters, because it does not understand them.

Upon another point in our editorial, the *Saints' Herald* says it had not the slightest intention of sneering in referring to Elder Merrill as one of the latest Apostles chosen. Although a re-perusal of the first article does not change our impression upon the statement which appears in that article alone, with this later explanation we are satisfied, and accept it in good faith. Responding to an inquiry in the *Herald's* reference to this subject we will say that neither Elder Merrill nor Elder Lund is the youngest of the Apostles in the order of choice, although they are among the later additions to the quorum.

The *Herald* then goes to another branch of the subject, and endeavors to maintain that there has been "something lacking in the observance of the rites of baptizing for the dead and sealing, or adopting for eternity," and makes several quotations from sermons and the Doctrine and Covenants. Later, a glimpse of light seems to penetrate the *Herald* article, for it says, "It was perhaps unfortunate that we considered baptism for the dead, sealing and adoption all in one reference;" but farther on it lapses into the old error, and consequently argues from a wrong premise.

As to baptism for the dead, there is not and has not been any misunderstanding or variance in relation thereto in the Church from the days of the Prophet Joseph, and no repetition where individuals have followed the instructions of the authorities; so that every reference of the *Herald* to "an unstable, undefined, indecisive policy" relating thereto is wholly without warrant. There has been no such thing. Even from the standpoint the *Herald* seems to assume relating to adoptions, there is not a shadow of excuse for including baptisms for the dead in its references. And as to the adoption there has been no uncertain policy; neither was there a misunderstanding on the part of the living oracles. There were some things that were not fully revealed respecting certain relationships; and people, at their own urgent request, were permitted to perform certain work which at most

could be but superfluous and did not contravene any principle; but they did so with express instructions as to the real status, so that there was no change of policy whatever. The Prophet Joseph did not have all the knowledge given him revealed at once, but from time to time, and on one occasion proceeded as related with respect to baptisms for the dead. The Lord afterwards gave him more light, and ever since the matter has been perfectly understood. Nor did the Prophet Joseph reveal to the Church all things which the Lord had to say to it; change of circumstances required new revelation, as the Prophet frequently and emphatically declared. And in respect to certain sealings in adoptions that revelation came to President Woodruff, evoking this discussion; and the alleged "change" which the *Herald* seeks to make so much of but which the Latter-day Saints know furnishes no occasion therefore, was no greater, if as great as that by the Prophet in relation to baptism for the dead. There has been no change whatever in relation to the principle of adoption, but the Lord has given more light upon it than formerly was in possession of many who desired to know of these things.

The *Saints' Herald* also devotes space to arguing that the word "oracles" used in a revelation given March, 1838, refers to commandments. The fancied controversy on this point is none of ours. We understand that commonly the word is applied to the communicated will of the Lord, and also to those through whom that will is communicated; the latter are referred to when we use the term "living oracles." Upon its assumed basis, our Lamoni friend seems to think that because "the keys" of the kingdom were not to be taken from the Prophet either in this world or the world to come, no one else could be given the power to use those keys. On this point we will remind it that when Elder David Patten was killed the Lord informed the Prophet that his Priesthood could not be taken from him, but that another could be appointed in his stead. So it was with the Prophet Joseph; when he was called away another was appointed in his stead, and the Church has not been without a Prophet, Seer and Revelator, nor has the Prophet Joseph, who stands at the head of this dispensation, been deprived of any keys or powers that were conferred upon him—he will continue to hold them throughout eternity.

Our controversial friend quotes from the revelation given to the Prophet Joseph, January 19, 1841, and endeavors to make a point in relation thereto. We will call its attention to that same revelation, which says, "I give to you my servant Brigham Young to be a President over the Twelve traveling Council, which Twelve hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth, and after that to send my word to every creature. They are—Heber C. Kimball, Parley P. Pratt, Orson Pratt, Orson Hyde, William Smith,

John Taylor, John E. Page, Willford Woodruff, Willard Richards, George A. Smith." That is a rather broad authority, and is pointedly exclusive to the matter of key-holding, so far as concerns any organization that did not receive the keys from President Young and his associates, or legitimately succeed thereto. It is for that Council and the legitimate successors thereto an exclusive franchise to send the word of the Lord to every creature.

The *Saints' Herald* says: "Joseph Smith did not become a martyr in the cause of the Utah Church." The assertion is not true. He was the first President and Prophet of that Church, which is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He held that position at the time of his death. The Church has never been disbanded, reorganized, or changed. Its quorums of Priesthood have been reorganized as necessarily required, just as they were before the Prophet's death; but the entire institution is the same. The Reorganization is a perfect stranger to the Prophet Joseph and the spirit which actuated him. The Lord made no mistake in selecting the Prophet Joseph for the work of organization of His Church. He cuts no such sorry figures as to awaken a necessity for such men as William Marks, Jason Briggs and Zenas Gurley to do that which He was unable to accomplish. The Lord organized His Church April 6, 1830. It has continued in organized form to the present, and will remain to the full accomplishment of its divine purpose. It is the Church which has built Temples in "the top of the mountains" in Utah, will continue Temple building as the Lord directs, and is engaged in all the work of salvation for the living and the dead that the Lord requires in this dispensation. The *Saints' Herald* is not a competent critic of the doctrines, teachings and practices of that Church. This is shown in various ways, one of which is its confessed failure to comprehend actual conditions which exist within the Church, and the intent and effect of the instructions of its leading authorities.

IRRIGATION IN THE LEGISLATURE.

The importance of the right kind of legislation, and the diversity of views as to what is the right kind, was no doubt firmly impressed upon the minds of several members of the Legislature at a conjoint meeting of the House and Senate committees on irrigation and agriculture, held last evening. Besides the members spoken of, the session was attended by President George Q. Cannon, Judge L. W. Shurtliff, Col. Stevenson and other gentlemen identified with the State Irrigation association; by Prof. A. A. Mills, of the Agricultural association, and Prof. J. H. Paul, of the Agricultural college; by Bishop Rawlins and Mr. Israel Evans, who were considered representatives of the "old settlers," and by Judge Dusenberry, Prof. Cluff and others. Nearly every visitor present was heard in remarks upon the subject, all agreeing as to the tremendous importance of the questions involved and also agreeing upon the main proposition as to its complexity with