

mission of weak vitality to posterity. The person accustomed to either one of them has just one less chance of perfect health than he who abstains from all, while he who is addicted to all those deleterious practices has his chances for health and long life diminished seven-fold.

There may be nothing surprisingly new to the readers of this magazine in these principles of diet, as taught by the Latter-day Saints, but there is surely something worthy of consideration in that peculiar people accepting those principles as a part of their religion, and claiming they are but a few among the multitude of grand truths embraced in their remarkably biblical, although unpopular, doctrines.

D. M. McALLISTER.
Salt Lake City, Utah, Oct., 1885.

AN IMPORTANT TESTIMONY.

A FORMER PLURAL WIFE OF THE PATRIARCH HYRUM SMITH TESTIFIES CONCERNING HER MARRIAGE AND THE READING OF THE REVELATION TO THE HIGH COUNCIL IN NAUVOO.

The following communications, confirmatory of the statements so many times made by others that the doctrine of plural or celestial marriage had not only been revealed by the Almighty during the lifetime of the Prophet Jos. Smith, but that it was also practiced by the leaders of the Church, and that the revelation was read before and the doctrine taught to the High Council of Nauvoo, are so interesting that we publish them entire. Sister Thompson is now nearly seventy-nine years of age, and an invalid, but with mental faculties clear and strong:

TESTIMONY AS TO THE REVELATION:

SALT LAKE CITY,
January 31st, 1886.

A. M. Musser:

DEAR BROTHER—Having noticed in the DESERET NEWS an enquiry for testimony concerning the revelation on plural marriage, and having read the testimony of Brother Grover, it came to my mind that perhaps it would be right for me to add my testimony to his on the subject of Brother Hyrum reading it to the High Council. I well remember the circumstance. I remember he told me he had read it to the brethren in his office. He put it into my hands and left it with me for several days. I had been sealed to him by Brother Joseph a few weeks previously, and was well acquainted with almost every member of the High Council, and know Brother Grover's testimony to be correct. Now if this testimony would be of any use to such as are weak in the faith or tempted to doubt, I should be very thankful. Please make use of this in any way you think best, as well as the copy of the letter addressed to Joseph Smith, at Lamoni. Your Sister in the Gospel.

MERCY R. THOMPSON.

TESTIMONY AS TO HER MARRIAGE TO HYRUM SMITH.

SALT LAKE CITY, Sept. 5, 1883.

Mr. Joseph Smith, Lamoni, Ill.:

DEAR SIR—After having asked my Father in heaven to aid me, I sit down to write a few lines as dictated by the Holy Spirit.

After reading the correspondence between you and L. O. Littlefield I concluded it was the duty of some one to bear a testimony which could not be disputed. Finding from your letters to Littlefield that no one of your father's friends had performed this duty while you were here, now I will begin at once and tell you my experience.

My beloved husband, R. B. Thompson, your father's private secretary to the end of his mortal life, died August 27th, 1841, (I presume you will remember him.) Nearly two years after his death your father told me that my husband had appeared to him several times, telling him that he did not wish me to live such a lonely life, and wished him to request your uncle Hyrum to have me sealed to him for time. Hyrum communicated this to his wife (my sister) who, by request, opened the subject to me, when everything within me rose in opposition to such a step, but when your father called and explained the subject to me, I dared not refuse to obey the counsel, lest peradventure I should be found fighting against God; and especially when he told me the last time my husband appeared to him he came with such power that it made him tremble. He then enquired of the Lord what he should do; the answer was, "Go and do as my servant hath required. He then took an opportunity of communicating this to your uncle Hyrum who told me that the Holy Spirit rested upon him from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet. The time was appointed, with the consent of all parties, and your father sealed me to your uncle Hyrum for time, in my sister's room, with a covenant to deliver me up in the morning of the resurrection to Robert Blaskel Thompson, with whatever offspring should be the result of that union, at the same time counselling your uncle to build a room for me and move me over as soon as convenient, which he did, and I remained there as a wife the same as my sister to the day of his death. All this I am ready to testify to in the presence of God, angels and men.

Now I assure you I have not been prompted or dictated by any mortal being in writing to you; neither does a living soul know it but my invalid daughter.

God bless you, is the sincere prayer of your true friend,

MERCY R. THOMPSON.

P. S.—If you feel disposed to ask me any questions, I will be pleased to answer concerning blessings which I received under the hands of your late mother by the dictation of your father.

M. R. T.

SOME LEGISLATIVE INCONSISTENCY.

[From the Boston Investigator.]

MR. EDITOR:—In the President's message, which recently appeared, there were two points which have been much discussed separately, but I have seen no reference made to them as they relate to each other. One is the "Kelley matter," and the other the "Mormon question."

The President and Secretary Bayard rap Austria over the knuckles, and declare in no uncertain terms that our Government can in no way recognize or take cognizance of a difference in religious views. They even go so far as to indicate that if Austria does take official notice of what she deems not only an objectionable religious, but a wholly unrecognizable social position on the part of our Minister and his wife, that Austria may suffer the penalty of having no Minister from this country at all, to object to. "But," says Austria, "this is not a religious question. It is a social matter. The Minister is in a large part a social position. Mr. Kelley's wife is a Jewess. In our country a Jewess can have no social standing. It is no longer a question of religion, but one of blood—of race. We would not object to a negro because he might chance to be a Jew in faith, but because of his blood or race. It is the same in this case."

Now I need hardly say that, to me, the position of Austria is wholly wrong, and that the declaration of President Cleveland and Secretary Bayard, that if a man and his wife are morally and mentally fitted for the position, that our government can take no cognizance of these other matters, appears the only tenable ground. But, when I turn to another part of the same message and read a recommendation that Congress take measures to prevent the "importation" of Mormons to our shores—that they be not allowed to land—then it strikes me that the high secular tone in the Kelley matter becomes a little overstrained. Surely, if we are not willing to take our own medicine, it is a trifle unjust to insist upon Austria taking a double dose of it. If mere unofficial immigrants are to be examined and excluded from our shores upon the religious test, then is it not a trifle high-handed to attempt to read a foreign power a lesson on religious equality and toleration? The more so, since it is to strike them in a high official matter and place.

"But," says one, "the Mormon question is not a religious one; it is social." "So, by your leave, is the matter of recognition of a Jewess," replies Austria. "You draw the social line at negroes and Mormons—we at Jews." And who is to set the limit? There are those who believe that both are wrong. But while this government is attempting to teach a moral secular lesson to a foreign power by thrusting an unwelcome minister down their throats, it impresses an outside observer as peculiarly absurd to read in the same State paper a recommendation to establish a religious test for immigrants, and to "import" none but such as may reach the test—prescribed by Mr. Cleveland—in religious belief and numerical matrimony.

True, only a very few of the Mormons ever practice polygamy. What will the President propose to do with the rest of them who are "imported" in the future—those who believe in and practice monogamy, or even celibacy? But above all, what does he propose in defense of a position so absurdly contradictory as this State paper offers to a wondering world? I have read a few State papers before which appeared to be on neither side of the fence; but in this one Mr. Cleveland's feet are so far from the ground on either side, that his position approaches the ridiculous. The fence of religious liberty, of secular government, of toleration, has thrown many a rider before who attempted to take it recklessly; but it usually leaves the victim on one side or the other. Up to date we find Mr. Cleveland with one foot on each side, and both fully six inches from the ground.

Austria's position, however mistaken, is dignified. Utah's position, however wrong, is consistent. But neither the one quality nor the other can be claimed for a President or a Senate who are on both and all sides of a question at the same time. I say "or a Senate," for while the Senate is in no way responsible for the position in which the President has placed himself, it is engaged (and was last winter) in an equally absurd and inconsistent undertaking.

I stepped into the Senate chamber last winter in time to hear the chaplain, whom they are pleased to employ, quote the wisdom of Solomon and offer a prayer to Jehovah. Then the Senate took up the Edmunds bill against the Mormons! Nobody seemed to see the absurdity of the situation of quoting the wisdom of the most numerously married man on record, and praying to

the God of polygamy, as a prelude to a bill to destroy that wisdom and undermine that Deity! There is no room to question the fact that Solomon was a "Mormon"—a polygamist. There is no question that most, if not all, of the "prophets" were the same. The men who "talked to Jehovah face to face," who were "after God's own heart," had more than one wife at a time; believed polygamy was right, practiced it, and taught it. Jehovah never once told anybody it was wrong. He gave those very men (we are required to believe) all the moral law necessary for man, but he left them all polygamists.

We are taught by every Orthodox Church that "Solomon was the wisest man" who ever lived, and he had the largest number of wives on record up to that time; and if anybody has outdone him since, he has not come forward for his medal yet. Jehovah never rebuked anybody for this belief or practice, although he descended to all the minutiae and details of snufflers, tongs, candlesticks, etc., and therefore must have either approved of polygamy, or else thought it of vastly less importance how many wives a man had than how many sheep he owned, or whether he killed them in the light or dark of the moon.

"Oh! but," they say, "Jesus brought a new dispensation." Well, his record appears to approve of only celibacy, and our Senate does not appear to take kindly to that—not as a body. And then, as I say, it is to Jehovah, and not to Jesus, that the chaplain of our Senate prays; and an unchangeable God can hardly have changed his mind—and his friends—since the olden days. Men may grow in wisdom; but can a infinite God learn morals from the United States Senate—or from Mr. Cleveland?

The latter gentleman, as well as the Senate, professes to believe in and worship Jehovah, and so long as they do so, the Mormon members have all the argument and logic on their side. So long as they do so, the Edmunds bill and the President's message will be absurdities, and will be looked upon by all fair-minded people as unfair persecution of the most consistent followers on earth, to-day, of Jehovah, the God of the Bible.

One other thing in the Edmunds bill that impresses me as a singular piece of inconsistency, is this: The bill is supposed to be an effort in behalf of the dignity and honor of womanhood. It is not the men Mr. Edmunds hopes or expects to "save" from the degradation of irregular marital relations. Mr. Edmunds is neither a blind man nor a lunatic, and he knows that so far as that sort of morality goes the Mormon men can give several points to a good percent. or so-called monogamists. Therefore, it is the women he hopes to save, and posterity he wishes to aid, and yet he proceeds to disfranchise the women to do it! The bill provides:

"That it shall not be lawful for any female to vote at any election hereafter held in the Territory of Utah for any public purpose whatever, and no such vote shall either be received or counted or given effect in any manner whatever; and any and every act of the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah providing for or allowing the registration or voting by females is annulled."

Whoever taught a people self-respect, dignity, and an understanding of equal rights, morality, and honor by depriving them of the only means of power and expression they have? In this one point, this strange people gave their women the impression that they were human and had a right to express their opinions at the polls and have them counted as any other human opinion. Mr. Edmunds proposes to elevate (?) and teach these women self-respect by first letting them understand that they have no rights which men are bound to respect—not even the right to express an opinion.

He proposes to "raise their lot" by giving their men absolute power over them, and making them understand once for all that they are to be monogamists, polygamists, polyandrists, or celibates, just as and when and under such conditions as men see fit to offer them, and to give them absolutely no appeal. Surely, it is not necessary for Mr. Edmunds to take one step backward in order to take another forward—to take what little dignity and standing the Mormon women have from them in order to teach them self-respect. What party or class of men will Mr. Edmunds or the United States Senate dare attempt to teach dignity and self-respect that way? It is surely not necessary in performing a surgical operation upon a broken leg, to cut off the sound one too. But space forbids more than this mere mention of the case, and leaves but a line to ask, would it not be less cruel and more humane to mete out punishment to the guilty instead of the innocent? The bill says:

"That the laws of Utah, recognizing the capacity of illegitimate children to inherit a father's property are disapproved and annulled, and no illegitimate child born subsequent to the passage of this act shall be entitled to any share in the inheritance."

Take this provision, which amounts to a law of attainder. Does not the fact of illegitimacy carry with it pains and penalties enough without this cruel provision? Would it not be better to make the man who is responsible for the child suffer instead of the hapless child? If all his property were given to such child it would still be at a disadvantage. Why deprive it by law of the one thing it its father can do for it—the one slight atonement he can make! In the name of mercy, why

add to that child's burdens poverty as well as disgrace? But we are assured that this "Mormon question" is not a religious question, and yet the bill "limits the amount of real estate which a religious corporation in Utah may acquire and hold, to \$50,000, and forfeits any excess of this amount to the United States." And all this in the face of the fact that one church alone, in the city of New York, has obtained donations of public city lots, \$3,500,000; public money in eleven years \$6,043,625.45, and is now drawing from the public treasury annually \$700,000! It is hardly likely, while this is the case, that such financial limitations placed upon the Church of Latter-day Saints will be looked upon as "not a religious distinction" of a decidedly pronounced character.

Surely, our statesmen should be able to deal with the question, and at the same time preserve their integrity of character and some show of logic and justice. Of the many other glaring inconsistencies of the bill I may speak at another time.

Yours, HELEN H. GARDNER.

BY TELEGRAPH

PER WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE

FOREIGN.

LONDON, 10.—Burns, Champion, Hyndman and Williams, four Socialists who inspired Monday's riots, called yesterday upon Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, President of the Local Government Board, at his office. Mr. Chamberlain declined to receive the Socialists personally, but conveyed to them his willingness to give attention to anything they might have to say, provided they placed it before him in writing. Burns and his colleagues thereupon drafted a statement of their wishes. They said they had called to obtain from Chamberlain a declaration of the government's intention with regard to providing work for several hundred thousand unemployed people, who were at present starving in the City of London and elsewhere in England. The statement contained the assertion that all pressure which the workmen's societies have brought to bear upon the local authorities has entirely failed, and that letters sent to the local government by persons authorized to speak for the distressed were left unanswered. Mr. Burns and his colleagues averred that they had hopefully come for a statement of the government's intentions in order to report to a meeting of unemployed workmen of London, which is soon to be held.

Mr. Chamberlain replies in writing that he does not think any of the remedies proposed by the Social Democratic federation would prove effectual to relieve the prevalent want and misery existing among the unemployed in England. He was on this account unable to support these proposed measures. At the same time he felt the urgent necessity of having something done, and he was now having an inquiry made for the purpose of ascertaining the exact extent and character of the distress. Wherever it should be found necessary to do so, boards of guardians, unless they were already empowered, would be authorized to grant outdoor relief, when labor tests had been arranged sufficient to prevent imposture. The erection of public works, continued Mr. Chamberlain, was not within the province of the local government board.

The Socialists departed dissatisfied with the outcome of their visit.

Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Champion were quite angry over what they called Mr. Chamberlain's evasion of the real points at issue. They denounced his scheme of inquiry as a device to secure delay, while the very men in whose behalf the alleged inquiry was claimed to have been started were actually starving to death. "The unemployed of London," the gentlemen continued, "do not want outdoor relief. They do not want charity. They want nothing but honest and useful work, which will enable them to earn bread. The proposition to give them doles accompanied by servile and degrading labor tests, galls them, and is calculated to exasperate them into revolt."

A meeting of West End tradesmen was held last evening for the purpose of giving expression to their indignation and want of confidence in the authorities for permitting the riot. Mr. W. H. Smith, Member of Parliament, presided. Mr. Picketts stated that the on Monday distributed 20,000 circulars among the workmen urging peaceful proceedings. He threatens that unless the police proceed against the Socialists, the workmen themselves will endeavor to punish them. Kelly and his eyes blackened and was otherwise badly bruised in a fight yesterday.

THE DAMAGE DONE.

4:30 p.m.—The estimate heretofore made of the losses inflicted by the mob on Monday appears to have been greatly too small. The official estimate places the amount of damage at £20,000. Various Socialistic and labor reform societies threaten to have a monster demonstration at Hyde Park next Saturday to be attended by contingents of laborers from the country. The shops are being closed and barricaded everywhere throughout the city.

A Socialist's meeting is to be held this evening at Colburn and Market. At 6:30 o'clock, two and a-half hours before the time announced for the

assemblage, over 1,000 men were on the ground waiting to attend the meeting. The crowd is being constantly augmented by accessions from Trafalgar Square. The cavalry from Albany barracks and large bodies of police have been ordered to remain in readiness to maintain order.

AN ADJOURNED MEETING.

By 8 o'clock a crowd that numbered many thousands gathered in Cumberland Market, composed of the lowest criminal classes of London, represented by a strong contingent, intent upon upon harassing and insulting the police. At 9 o'clock, Hyndman, Williams and other Socialist leaders appeared and were greeted with uproarious shouts of welcome. They held a short consultation and resolved to abandon the attempt to hold a meeting to-night, because as they said, the dense fog that prevailed prevented their distinguishing true unemployed workmen from loafers. The announcement was then made that the meeting was adjourned until Thursday. As the crowd slowly dispersed the cheering for the Socialist leaders by the disorderly element again manifested itself. The police were jeered at and stoned, but easily drove their assailants from the ground. Three regiments of foot guards two of cavalry and a battery of artillery were confined in the barracks all day in readiness to sally out at a moment's notice. The vigorous action of the police of South London compares favorably with the inaction of the police at the Trafalgar Square meeting on Monday. Mounted constables, armed with cutlasses and revolvers, assisted the police on foot in dispersing a mob of 5,000 men near the Elephant Castle tavern. A gratifying feature was the fact that many small tradesmen and bona fide workmen joined in assisting the police to repulse the rioters. The police had been informed early in the day of a conspiracy of thieves inhabiting common lodging houses, to make South London the starting point of a pillaging expedition. Precautions were accordingly taken to prevent disorders.

Midnight—The city is quiet. The crowds disappeared by 10 o'clock and the streets are deserted. The panic is subsiding. The scare is without parallel in the history of London. Tens of thousands of desperate men were gathered in the streets and it only needed some one more reckless than themselves to lead them to commit the wildest excesses.

LONDON, 10.—William E. Forster, Liberal member of Parliament for Bradford and ex-Chief Secretary for Ireland, who for some time has been confined to his room by a serious illness, to-day suffered a relapse.

DYSPEPSIA

is a dangerous as well as distressing complaint. If neglected, it tends, by impairing nutrition, and depressing the tone of the system, to prepare the way for Rapid Decline.

BROWN'S IRON BITTERS

PHYSICIANS AND DRUGGISTS RECOMMEND IT.

On Every Bottle.

TRADE MARK

QUALITY NOT QUANTITY

THE BEST TONIC.

Quickly and completely cures Dyspepsia in all its forms, Heartburn, Belching, Tasting the Food, &c. It enriches and purifies the blood, stimulates the appetite, and aids the assimilation of food. Rev. J. T. ROBERTSON, the honored pastor of the First Reformed Church, Baltimore, Md., says: "Having used Brown's Iron Bitters for Dyspepsia and Indigestion, I take great pleasure in recommending it highly. Also consider it a splendid tonic and invigorator, and very strengthening." Genuine has above trade mark and crossed red lines on wrapper. Take no other. Made only by BROWN CHEMICAL CO., BALTIMORE, MD. LADIES' HAND BOOK—useful and attractive, containing list of prices for recipes, information about coins, etc., given away by all dealers in medicine, or mailed to any address on receipt of 2c. stamp.

FORFEITURE NOTICE.

TO J. K. PARDEE.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT you are indebted in the sum of One Hundred and Fifty Dollars, for money expended and labor performed upon the Vulcan Mine, situate in Rush Valley District, Tooele County, Utah, said indebtedness being your just and proper proportion of an assessment duly incurred by reason of expenditures and outlay necessary to the proper working and development of said Vulcan Mine, in which you are part owner. This is therefore to notify you, that unless your said assessment of One Hundred and Fifty Dollars be paid on or before the Tenth day of March, 1886, to the undersigned, your interest in said Mine will be forfeited and become my property as provided by law.

CHAS. AUER.
Salt Lake City, Utah, Dec. 2, 1885.
w48 96d

SEEDS!

E. J. BOWEN'S ILLUSTRATED DESCRIPTIVE and priced catalogue of Vegetable, Flower, Fodder, Grass and Alfalfa Seeds, containing valuable information for the Gardener, the Farmer, or the Family. Mailed free to all applicants.

Address,
E. J. BOWEN, SEED MERCHANT,
815 & 817 Sansome St., San Francisco, Cal.,
w 2u