

## THE "LIBERAL" CITY GOVERNMENT AND SPECULATORS.

THE status of the waterworks exhibits one of the peculiarities of "Liberal" municipal government. Attention was directed to it by a resolution introduced in the Council last evening in relation to the extension of watermains to localities where their existence is of no present benefit to water-takers. This means that the expenditure was worse than useless. It was money thrown away for the time being, so far as actual residents and the city are concerned. Some of the localities to which mains have been laid have no population, except in the mind's eye of land speculators. The real estate owners at whose request the pipe-laying was done are snug enough. They paid their proportion of the expense. They then sold the scrip issued to them by the city at a discount to anybody that would purchase it to pay water-rates with, thus getting back the bulk of their money. The city is the loser by the transaction, as instead of getting cash payments for rates, it receives back the scrip issued to speculators, while the latter re-pocket the cash they originally paid out, less the discount on the scrip.

Statements were made by Mr. Rich to the effect that the mains had been laid to inhabited districts—lucern and sagebrush patches. A little person by the name of Wantland—unfortunately a member of the Council—questioned the correctness of the statement. This is not surprising, as this infinitesimal resolver is in the habit of exhibiting his ignorance—real or assumed—on a variety of subjects. This peppery gentleman is not even aware of the fact, we presume, that the public are beginning to regard him as being so intoxicated with the exuberance of self-importance that he does not know how to show, in his deportment, a suggestion of modesty. Such effervescent individuals as he soon make themselves general nuisances in a deliberative assembly. So far as they are concerned dignified deliberation is a non-existent quantity. Mr. Wantland is always slopping over with resolutions and surface observations.

If Mr. Wantland or any other member of the City Council is not informed as to the extent to which the "Liberal" government has played into the hands of land speculators to the detriment of the commonwealth, the way to obtain information is open. Let them go down Third East street and they will see, between Eighth and Tenth south, that the watermains have been laid along five-acre blocks where not one building has yet been erected. They have been placed in that locality around several sides of one particular block where there is but one house—that of Mr. Busby. All this has been done in the interest of real estate boomers, and to the detriment of the city and its people. It might also possibly enlighten Mr. Wantland on the same subject if he were to wander westward beyond the river Jordan, where the same evidences of jobbery exist, the watermains having been taken out in that direction, not for the benefit of water-takers, but to enhance the value of uninhabited real estate.

## THE HEALING THE SICK.

ASSOCIATED press reports have caused some comment from various public journals over an incident said to have occurred at the late Conference of the "Josephites" at Independence, Missouri. The press dispatch stated that a day had been appointed for healing the sick by the laying on of hands, that many afflicted persons were in attendance, but no cures were effected. The papers that take this telegram for truth, of course find a good deal of amusement in it, and the remarks they make are not altogether complimentary or indicative of faith in "miraculous healing."

Among the editorial disquisitions evoked by the subject was one from the "Liberal" organ in this city. It went further than the ordinary derisive newspaper article, and attempted to enter into the principle of the healing power, to define its limits and to give advice to the Church as to what it should and should not do in relation to its exercise.

It suggested that "this laying on of hands is not a promiscuous gift." That "there is occasionally a human being of wonderful magnetic power." That "when such a person finds another whose nerves are shattered, the stronger person can exercise a healing influence on the weaker." That "when a Church finds such a man they should work him for all the healing and all the reputation there is in him." That "in that way the Church would get credit." That when a man who has not this gift "lays his clumsy fingers on a delicate child," it is "a sin against common sense if not against God." And if the child dies, it is enough to make "the ordinary man" feel like "calling on his shotgun, filling each barrel with twelve good buckshot, and going on a hunt to exterminate healers." The writer, too, seems to be under the impression that the Church assumes that "when a man goes through certain forms and makes certain confessions, and is properly blessed and sprinkled and hoodooed, in some incomprehensible way that gift is bestowed upon him."

Now to come down to facts: In the first place the press dispatch which has provoked these various comments was incorrect. There was no such day appointed or display attempted as telegraphed to the country. Some persons present at the "Josephite" gathering testified to having been healed by prayer and the laying on of hands. With all the mistakes of that body, it has not, so far as we are aware, made any attempt at claiming power to heal at will, or to make an exhibition of sacred gifts or to take to itself the glory which belongs to God alone.

In the next place, when professedly Christian papers ridicule the laying on of hands for the healing of the sick they ridicule Christ and a tenet of New Testament Christianity. Further, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called "Mormon," which holds to that as well as all other parts of the primitive Christian creed, does not think that the fact that a man has gone through certain forms and ceremonies, whatever they may be, endows him with the gift of healing, or that this gift is a matter of priestly authority.

As to "the laying on of hands" being "a promiscuous gift" we have this to say: That is not a "gift" at all. Healing is another matter. Anyone who believes may lay hands upon the sick. That is part of Christ's doctrine, or Christianity. See Mark xvi, 17, 18. If the sick recover, the result is the effect of faith. Christ taught that faith was a force. According to His doctrine things that are ordinarily impossible may be wrought by faith. Among them is the healing of the sick. The manifestations of power under His administrations were not "magnetic power over shattered nerves." They were the effects of faith, so He said. "Go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole," was His word to the restored leper, blind, lame or otherwise diseased or afflicted person. "All things are possible to them that believe," is a principle of genuine Christian philosophy.

But in the early Christian Church there was an ordinance for the benefit of the sick. They were to be anointed with oil and prayed over, the Elders laying hands upon them. But it was "the prayer of faith" that was to "save the sick," and it was the Lord that was to "raise them up," not a magnetic action upon shattered nerves. See James v, 14, 15.

The Church in those days did not claim any "credit" for the healings that were wrought in this way, nor does the Church claim or want any "credit" now, because the power exercised is from God and the glory belongs to Him alone. That He is ready to manifest it now through faith as much as at any former time, is well known to thousands of Latter-day Saints who have seen and felt its operations in all kinds of marvels, which some people call miracles, as instantaneous and wonderful as anything recorded in the Old or the New Testament. But they are not given to bring "credit to the Church," nor to be boasted of, nor to be displayed, nor to make skeptics believe. They are the effects, not the cause of faith, and they are for the benefit of believers and the glory of God.

It is true that there are persons who have "the gift of healing." Their very touch is soothing to the sick. Healing virtue seems to flow out of them when they lay their hands on the afflicted. There are others who have faith to be healed. It is easy for them to obtain relief, even if no special gift of healing is possessed by those who administer to them the ordinance appointed for the sick. There are various gifts which are manifestations of the Spirit of God through different individuals, adapted to their organisms and according to their faith. But as a general form for the good of the sick, anointing with oil and the laying on of hands of the Elders is established in the Church, and there are thousands of witnesses as to its general efficacy.

But suppose in spite of the administration of this ordinance a child should die. Would there be any "common sense" in "loading a shotgun and going on a hunt to exterminate healers?" Is it not often the case that in spite of all the powders, plasters, potions, learning, experience and skill of the best physicians, children die, sometimes very unexpectedly? Does any sane person talk then of go-