

ferred to. In our college the pupils are from 14 to 30 years of age. I am 27 years old. In regard to the Kingdom of God, I do not understand that it is set up at all. I understand it is the mission of this Church to prepare for the Kingdom of God, but to do so that it is not necessary for them to exercise temporal authority. I have read the sermons of the leaders of the Church, but have not seen any declarations that the Kingdom of God is set up, without modifications of those declarations. I understand that when the principles of righteousness taught by the Church shall prevail, then the Kingdom will be established. But in the sense of a kingdom, it is the teaching that it is not set up.

To the court—When Christ comes and reigns, then the kingdom will be established; it cannot be a kingdom yet, because there is no king.

To Dickson—The President of the Church is not the representative of the King in temporal matters. He is in spiritual matters. I believe that when Christ comes He will hold control in temporal matters, and that all men who work righteousness will aid in control—that the Priesthood holds no control in temporal matters, but in spiritual matters. I do not believe that the Priesthood have the right to control men in all temporal matters. I don't think the President has a right to direct absolutely in all temporal matters. A doctrine to that effect is foreign to my understanding. I never have understood that they have a right to dictate in all matters. I have studied the teachings of the authorities of the Church.

To Baskin—We teach the pupils that there is a distinction between plural and celestial marriage. We designate no revelation as the one on polygamy. We have one on the eternity of the marriage covenant. We teach that the revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants are divine, and this includes the revelation on celestial marriage. Plural marriage is not given as a command to the Church, but celestial marriage is. Plural marriages in the Church are celestial marriages, but celestial marriages are not all plural marriages. I believe that a deception or fraud is a necessary characteristic of bigamy. I understand there was no law in 1843 against a man marrying two wives, unless he practiced fraud. I understand now that there are laws against polygamy now in existence. I do not consider that our system includes bigamy. In the school we have not given any instructions as to whether plural marriage should or should not be practiced.

To the Court—In the highest grade in the school these questions may come up. We say that celestial marriage is binding for eternity, being consummated by divine authority. We do not explain what plural marriage is, but I understand it to mean plurality of wives. We teach that marriage can be performed as a religious ceremony, or as a civil contract. We don't men-

tion plural marriage, either one way or another. I am neither authorized nor qualified to teach plural marriage. We do not understand that teaching that plural marriage is corrupting the morals of the pupils, because we do not teach it. There has never been any comparison between the laws of the government and the doctrines of the Church. I believe plural marriage to be a proper condition, but have given no instruction upon it. I think a young man educated in the college would believe that a law which binds his conscience is unconstitutional, but he would not believe that such a law was not binding. I would not advise the breaking of any law, for I consider a law binding until it is annulled.

To Dickson—I believe the anti-polygamy law is unconstitutional, but that it is binding. I have never taught the children that plural marriage is right, because I have not taught it at all. The Priesthood do not now control in temporal matters. I have never heard it taught that plural marriage, of itself, will exalt anyone; I believe celestial marriage is essential to exaltation.

To Le Grand Young—A celestial marriage is one consummated between a man and a woman that will be of avail in eternity as well as in this life. This is the revelation on celestial marriage. I understand that polygamy is not obligatory, but is permissive. I think celestial marriage is obligatory for exaltation—that is an eternal union in marriage of husband and wife. The revelation has been read in school. We teach that marriage for eternity is necessary. We have never taught that polygamy is necessary. We have never taught that the Priesthood control in temporal matters. We teach that advice in temporal matters from those who understand them is proper, and the same as to spiritual matters. I think there must be a king to a kingdom. I think Christ will be King of the Kingdom of God, and that there will be no other ruler. As to the proportion of polygamists in Utah, I would say there is not to exceed one in thirty among the adult male members of the Church.

To Dickson—I think there are less than 200,000 people in the Territory; do not know how many Gentiles there are.

To Baskin—I said if I needed medical advice I would ask one qualified to give it.

Baskin—Is laying on of hands for the healing of the sick a doctrine of the Church?

The court ruled that this was improper.

To Mr. Young—When a man is a polygamist, it is usually but a short time before his neighbors know of it. I don't think it possible to keep it secret long. I know the monogamists have the elective franchise, and polygamists do not take the oath. Some people do not take it from conscientious scruples. A man who does not take it is usually spotted.

To Dickson—I have never taken any steps to prosecute polygamists.

I consider it my duty to mind my own business.

To the court—I know prominent men in the Church who are not polygamists. I do not understand that all the Apostles are polygamists. Brigham Young, John Taylor, Geo. Q. Cannon, J. H. Smith, C. W. Penrose were polygamists. I understand that Apostles H. J. Grant, John W. Taylor and A. H. Lund are not polygamists.

Did you never hear that Heber J. Grant had a second wife, now in England?

Dr. Falmage—I never did.

Court took recess till 7:30, when

JOSEPH SOWDEN

was called by Mr. Dickson, and testified—That paper (identifying a document) was made out by the Bishop's court of the Fourth Ward. It is a judgment in a suit with Charles Williams.

WM. WARD

was called by the defense. He testified—I was in Salt Lake from September, 1850 to 1856; then went to St. Louis; was back here 13 years ago for a short time. I was once a member of the Church; joined it in 1844 and left it in about 1854. It was generally known that I did not consider myself under any obligations to the Church; I sent a letter to President Young, notifying him of my position; I went east with a number of witnesses; while I was here, after I left the Church, I found no difference in treatment by members of the Church; they treated me just as well after as before. I received my endowments; took no oath or obligation to avenge the blood of the Prophets on this nation; did not hear of any such obligation. I am not now a member of the Church.

To Mr. Dickson—I apostatized from the Church because I changed my views with regard to religion. I believed the leaders had no authority. I disapproved of their assumptions of authority from God. I heard nothing said about avenging the blood of the Prophets that I can remember. I know there was no obligation on that point. I am clear on that point. When my right arm was amputated it was not that it should be strong to avenge the blood of the Prophets when required. When I left here, in 1856, it was known that I was going to stay away.

Le Grand Young said he had but one more witness, who was not here, but they would close early on Monday.

Dickson objected to permitting any more witnesses by the defense, and wanted them to close their case at this session.

The Court said that unless counsel closed, the Court would close the case.

An adjournment was ordered till 9 a. m., November 25th.

After this announcement was made there was a discussion as to who should open and close the case, both sides wanting that privilege. The court ruled with Baskin and Dickson.

This closed the proceedings of Saturday evening.

[To be continued.]