

of the Lord. All who have a standing among the Saints, and especially parents, will do well to bear this in mind, for it conveys a lesson of importance. In this dispensation the Almighty has by direct revelation called the attention of the Saints to the special obligation resting upon them to teach their children to understand the doctrine of faith in Christ, repentance, and of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands when eight years old. Little children are to be instructed to trust in the Lord Jesus for their salvation; to forsake and avoid evil, and to understand that at the age of eight years they are entitled to and should receive the ordinances which give them membership in the Church.

This feature of a child's education is a responsibility that cannot be evaded by parents without bringing condemnation. The Lord sends His servants to all nations to preach the everlasting Gospel—the only means of salvation in the kingdom of heaven—and they are admonished to "search diligently and spare not," that their garment may be clean of the blood of this generation; the Saints are commanded to "every one warn his neighbor," that no sin of omission may be laid at their door. The law being thus particular with respect to the world, how can parents in Israel justify themselves for failure to train their own flesh and blood in the fear and admonition of the Lord; for neglecting to instruct their own offspring, over whom they have entire control, in the principles that are essential to salvation? The Lord has declared that when the parental duty in this regard is not performed, the sin is "upon the head of the parents." It is through omission to bring the first principles of the Gospel to the attention of their children, parents are the cause of their offspring taking the downward road, what judgment must be passed upon them by a just Judge?

The word of the Lord to the Saints is that "their children shall be baptized for the remission of their sins when eight years old, and receive the laying on of the hands." It is as necessary for a child who has reached the age of eight years to be "born of the water and of the Spirit" as it is for a person who has attained maturity. And if parents do not see that their children are properly instructed and that the ordinances are administered when the way is open therefor, they become the means of keeping their offspring outside the Church; they are barriers to the progress of the children in the path of life eternal, and are standing in the way of their admission to the kingdom of heaven instead of doing their duty by leading them in at the door.

Some people urge that they would rather leave their children till they grow old enough to judge for themselves of the truth and power of the Gospel. Doubtless there are some people who prefer to disobey rather than obey the commands of the Lord; but the fact of their preference in that particular line does not make the wrong anything but wrong. These same people would probably think it a very foolish thing to refrain from giving their children the benefit of parental

care and experience in temporal matters; and so it would be—less unwise only than to neglect to give them proper care and guidance in things that relate to their spiritual and eternal welfare.

Children of members of the Church have the right to receive these Gospel ordinances. But what right has a person who professes to be a Saint to deprive, intentionally or by carelessness, a child of the precious boon of divine cleansing from sin or of the priceless gift that is conferred by the laying on of the hands at the time of confirmation in the Church? None whatever; and those who do so commit a grievous error. Children at eight years become accountable before the Lord for their actions; they are objects of assault by the adversary, and unless protected are liable to be led into temptation. What would we think of persons who deliberately left poisonous food within the reach of those who knew nothing of its injurious nature? They would be regarded as deserving of severe punishment for thus endangering life. Then what must be said of those who imperil both body and soul of the comparatively helpless ones entrusted to their care, by leaving them in the bondage of sin and exposing them to the influence of evil, without even an opportunity to obtain that spiritual nourishment that is essential to their protection and development?

It may be that there are few, if indeed there are any, among the Saints who are responsible, by neglect to have the proper ordinances attended to at the proper time, for their children not being numbered in the fold of Christ. But it is a situation against which every parent should be warned by being instructed thoroughly in the Gospel requirements. The principle of the proper and necessary training of children cannot be too deeply and forcibly impressed upon the minds of the Saints. It is the duty of the Teacher to "see that there is no iniquity in the Church," and there is a measure of iniquity if a child is sinned against so that by wilful neglect it is excluded from the sacred rights associated with membership in the Church. It is the duty also of other instructors to warn against this evil. And there probably are no parents entitled to fellowship with the Saints, who, when they realize their obligation to their children in this respect, would desire to do otherwise than follow the example of Father Abraham in directing his household in "the way of the Lord."

SHEEP OR STOCK AT LARGE.

A correspondent propounds these three questions, and asks that they be answered through the columns of the News:

1—If there were no benefits to be derived from sheep or stock, should they not be declared a nuisance running at large?

2—Is it right and just for the owners of animals to turn them loose in or around our fields?

3—Should they not be required to fence their own land if they wish to turn their animals out?

1—Not necessarily; many animals, human as well as other breeds, that

are running at large are of no benefit to anybody, and yet they may scarcely be declared a nuisance, as that term is usually understood; there are natural and inherent rights of life and liberty which even a worm may not be deprived of without good cause. If our correspondent considers it flippant to answer him in this way, we shall have to rejoin that his question is not a fair one. There are benefits, many and great, incalculable and indispensable, to be derived from sheep and stock.

2—It is certainly not right for the owners of animals to turn them loose in another man's field without his consent and to his injury. To turn them loose "around" another man's field may not in the abstract be called wrongful. We cannot see, for instance, that there is anything very wrong in such proceeding if he and others like him who may object to it are not injured. Sheep and stock must live and move somewhere; and under the best of circumstances they are at times bound to be loose nearly or remotely "around" somebody's field.

3—As to whether sheep and stock-owners should be required to fence their land to keep their animals in, or farmers should be required to fence their fields to keep the animals out, we prefer to express no absolute opinion, because circumstances and conditions differ greatly and a rule that might be right and wholesome in one locality would perhaps be absurd and injurious in another. We know very well which would be the easier of the two plans, if that were the only question to be considered. But ease is not always justice, nor is difficulty always a sign of evil. In thickly-settled sections, the many who own and cultivate land should be protected against sheep and stock running at large. In sparsely-settled regions, where there are only two or three farm-owners in perhaps a whole county of grazing land, it would be ridiculous to compel the owners of flocks and herds to fence in the lands on which their animals browsed.

Each community seems to have the power to regulate this matter to the satisfaction of the majority and in accordance with its own notion of right and propriety. If it hasn't, we are in favor of such power being conferred. Further than that we are hardly willing to go. We cannot through a newspaper article decide off-hand the question at which our correspondent seems to be aiming, and we shall not try.

NO BACKWARD STEPS.

There is such a thing as liberality in expenditure being real economy, and excessive economy amounting to actual extravagance. A happy medium exists and can be found by those who bring thought and judgment to the solution of the question. Retrenchment, where the reduction of expenses will not impair the efficiency of the service and retard necessary improvements, should be the watchword, now that times are hard and money scarce, with those who disburse public funds as well as with those who have only personal concerns to control. But parsimony to the extent of hurtful retrogression should be as carefully