

## "TRIBUNE" PETTIFOGGING.

The News of March 5th published a portion of a lecture by a Mormon Elder on "Joseph Smith as a true Prophet." The Elder re-told the account of Joseph Smith's conversation with Steven A. Douglas in which it was predicted that Mr. Douglas would attempt to secure the Presidency of the nation. Referring to this lecture as though it were an editorial of the News, the *Tribune* said:

"Stephen A. Douglas was an American statesman. Formerly he was a Judge on the Bench in Illinois. When the Mormons were driven out of Missouri into Illinois, with the vigor which was part of his nature he investigated thoroughly their system and reached the irresistible conclusion that it was something more than a creed, that it was a government diametrically opposed to the Government of the United States; and when the Saints in turn were driven out of Illinois, and, when from this region they petitioned for Statehood, Judge Douglas in his incisive way declared that the United States Government should interpose and send a Commission here to govern this Territory, backed with sufficient force to enforce its edicts."

I want to call attention to a misrepresentation in the above. It was when the Mormons were driven from Missouri that Mr. Douglas became their friend, and there is nothing to indicate that he was not their friend all through their persecution in Illinois. Up to 1843, at least, he was intimate with Joseph Smith, and on the 18th of May of that year Mr. Douglas dined with Mr. Smith at Carthage, Illinois, and it was on that occasion that the prediction was made that it is claimed was a "true" prophecy. That was but a year before Mr. Smith's death and Mr. Douglas said nothing against the Mormons until 1857, fourteen years after that conversation took place.

Furthermore, the Mormons petitioned for Statehood in 1849, eight years before Mr. Douglas opened his lips against them. It is clear, therefore, that the *Tribune* misrepresents Mr. Douglas, and yet this is a matter of history. It shows how little reliance can be placed upon the *Tribune's* statements in anything concerning the Mormons.

Again the *Tribune*, in its pettifogging effort to weaken the force of the statements made to Mr. Douglas by Mr. Smith, says:

"It was safe to tell him, too, that he would die, for the disease even then was upon him which killed him, a disease which was beyond the science of medicine to relieve."

That is to say, the *Tribune* asserts that when Mr. Douglas dined with Mr. Smith on the 18th of May, 1843, he was suffering from a disease "which was beyond the science of medicine to relieve." Yet he lived eighteen years after that dinner, that conversation and that prediction! It will doubtless be news to Mr. Douglas to be informed thus that in 1843 he was already so far gone that medical skill could not relieve him. This is only another evidence of the *Tribune's* skill as a pettifogger.

It was well known that Mr. Douglas' disappointment hastened his death, as similar disappointment had hurried Webster into the unknown, as similar

disappointment hastened Greeley's death. It is quite likely that Mr. Douglas had for years forgotten that conversation with Joseph Smith and died without recalling it. But, while the prediction may have had nothing whatever to do with Mr. Douglas' defeat, while his hostility to the Mormons may have in no wise contributed to his defeat, there is no need to misrepresent the historical facts in order to manufacture prejudice against the Mormons today.

Mr. Douglas knew Mr. Smith and doubtless many more of the Mormons well. Mr. Douglas, knowing more about the Mormons than the editor of the *Tribune* seems to know, was their friend for many years, and not until the malice of Brochus, Drummond, Magraw, and others of their kind had succeeded in creating a belief in the East that the Mormons were in rebellion against the government of the United States, did Mr. Douglas say a word against them. He had not known them personally for fourteen years. He knew how they had been driven. He may have believed that they were in rebellion, as charged, and so believing he may have made up his mind that they should be destroyed. Then, again, the outcry against the Mormons in the East was very bitter and general. No man could have hoped to be elected to the Presidency of the nation who should defend them. Mr. Douglas, it was remembered, had been the friend of the Mormons. When he thought the time had come for him to ask for the highest office in the gift of the people, he may have reflected that his friendship for the hated Mormons would be raised against him and hence he would kill the possibility of such a thing by denouncing them. Such a thing is not only possible, but it is human, and Mr. Douglas was human. All the facts in the case and all the presumptions are solid against the rancor of the *Tribune* as shown in its efforts to twist, distort and misrepresent the actual relationship that existed between Steven A. Douglas, Joseph Smith and the Mormon people prior to 1857.

There is no reason to doubt that such a conversation did occur, as is reported. If the Mormon people call it a true prophecy, what is there wrong in that? If there were prophets in ancient times, why should there not be prophets now? The *Tribune* dotes on the prophets of the past, why should it stultify itself by assuming a position, the logical outcome of which is that God is dead and therefore the gift of prophecy is lost forever? Let us tell the truth and leave the event to time.

CHARLES ELLIS.

## SAMUEL MULLINER.

On Tuesday, March 10th an account of the death of Brother Samuel Mulliner, of Lehi, which occurred on the 25th of February, appeared in the *EVENING NEWS*, together with a recital of some of the prominent incidents in his life, as furnished us by a correspondent. Owing to a number of the dates given being erroneous, and the interesting nature of the career of the deceased, we copy the following from the *Historical Record* of 1887, which, as the data was furnished by

Brother Mulliner himself, can be relied upon as being correct:

"Samuel Mulliner was born in Haddington, East Lothian, Scotland, Jan. 15, 1809. He spent his boyhood days at Dunbar, where he also learned the shoemaker's trade. He married Catherine Nisbet Dec. 4, 1830, and shortly afterward decided to emigrate to Australia, but finding himself short of means he changed his plans, and emigrated to America in 1832 settling near the city of Toronto, in Canada, where he first heard the fullness of the Gospel proclaimed, and was baptized by Theodore Turley Sept. 10, 1837, together with his wife. In the following spring he started with his family for Missouri and arrived in Springfield, Ill., on his way thither, July 30, 1838. There his family remained while he performed his mission to Scotland. Owing to the temporary location of a number of families from Kirtland, Ohio, in 1838 a branch of the Church was organized at Springfield, Nov. 4, 1838, in which Elder Mulliner officiated as a Teacher. Later, a Stake of Zion was organized there. Brother Mulliner was ordained to the office of an Elder March 10, 1839, and to that of a Seventy May 6, 1839. On the latter date he was advised to prepare for a foreign mission, which he did and left his family at Springfield, July 16, 1839, and started in company with an Elder Snider for New York, where they arrived Aug. 10th. After preaching in the neighborhood of that city and having made a visit to Kirtland, Ohio, he sailed from New York, in company with Elders Hiram Clark and Alexander Wright, Nov. 6, 1839. They arrived in Liverpool, England, Dec. 3rd. On the 7th they started for Preston, where they arrived on the 8th. There they spent about ten days very pleasantly with Willard Richards and the Saints. On the evening of Dec. 19th, Elders Mulliner and Wright started for Scotland and arrived at Glasgow on the 20th. After a successful mission Elder Mulliner took an affectionate leave of the Saints in Scotland and sailed from Glasgow Oct. 2, 1840, on his way back to America. After visiting among the Saints of Liverpool, he attended a General Conference at Manchester and then engaged passage for a small company of Saints from Scotland on board the ship *Isaac Newton*, which sailed from Liverpool on the 15th. This was the first company of emigrants who went by way of New Orleans, where the company arrived December 2nd, after a pleasant voyage of 48½ days. For years afterwards the favorite route of emigration from Great Britain to Nauvoo, Ill., was via New Orleans. Elder Mulliner's little company of Scotch Saints continued their travel from New Orleans by steamboat up the Mississippi River to St. Louis, Mo., where Elder Mulliner left the company and traveled by stage to Springfield, Ill., where he was again united with his family on December 19th, 1840. Some time after his return home Elder Mulliner removed with his family to Nauvoo, Ill., from which place he was sent on a mission in November, 1842. In crossing the lake from Chicago to Buffalo, a terrible storm came up which wrecked nearly every vessel on the lake except the one Elder Mulliner and a fellow-missionary, James Houston, were on. In parting with the captain of the vessel (Mr. Walker) at Buffalo, Elder Mulliner made him a present of some Church books and thanked him for bringing him safe across. The captain replied with emphasis: "Elder Mulliner, don't thank me; it is I who am under obligation to you for a safe voyage, for I am fully convinced that had it not been for you Mormon Elders being on board, the ship would have gone to the bottom. And I wish you, when you get back home, to tell your brethren that if any of your Elders wish to cross these lakes, let them inquire for Captain Walk-