

I have known the Gospel, as I remarked, for 25 years, and in that time I have materially altered my views upon some points. I then thought that they came into the Church for the purpose of repenting and forsaking their evils, and receiving the Gospel with all their hearts and with a resolution to do right. Well, it is true that there is a oneness, as far as repentance and faith is concerned, in the outward acknowledgment, but do all who in word acknowledge the Gospel forsake their sins? We would all like to see such a state of things in the world, we would like to see our neighbors forsaking their sins, even if we could not forsake and overcome our own dear sins. Suppose we happen to repent and leave off our sins, would not that be about right? Would not that answer for us without waiting for others? Or can we have some ceremony performed that will do as well, something besides leaving off our sins and leading a new life?

Perhaps we may not come to the repentance of fear, or feel afraid of doing wrong, but the other part we will come to, says one, "For instance the baptism for the remission of sins given by the Savior, in whose name we can receive every good gift, and without whose name we cannot receive any spiritual gift." Then seeing that he, with all this power in his hands, and he, knowing all things that would be good for man, not only ordered that repentance should be preached in his name, but that the Apostles should baptize the people in his name, and to fulfil this mission they did baptize the penitent believer for the remission of sins; and they exhorted the people, every one of them, to repent and obey this ordinance for the remission of sins; and they also assured them that if they would do so they should have the gift of the Holy Ghost; and the Apostles further assured them that this promise was to them that were

afar off, to all nations and countries—it extended to every creature.

And now, what objection can a man have to obeying one part more than another part of the Gospel? Why should men have such various opinions about the Gospel when it is so plainly set forth? One man says, "I suppose that baptizing or sprinkling me when I was an infant was sufficient, for that was the custom in those days, and I suppose they called that baptism." Well, have we not shown you that repentance was of God, and therefore that all men must repent? Jesus Christ did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance, and he also commanded his servants to go forth testifying to those that were seeking the kingdom of God, and gave them power to heal the sick and cast out devils.

Can little children commit sins? Can they hear the Gospel and receive it in their hearts? Can little children reason, think, repent, and bring forth fruits meet for the kingdom of God? Can little children be instructed to obey the Gospel in their infancy? To all these questions every rational man would answer—No! Well, then, what have we to do with the Gospel as it pertains to little children? We are willing to carry out the instructions of the Savior where we are told to bless them, and this we are willing to do wherever we see them, and to pray for them, but to sinners that are sufficiently grown to be free to act for themselves—persons who are sufficiently grown to be accountable before the Almighty, and to be capable of conceiving sin in their hearts, and of bringing forth the fruits of it, to such was repentance and baptism, and therefore the Gospel could never be applied to little infants; it was a Gospel of voluntary obedience, and therefore it could not apply to the infant in its mother's arms.