

have given birth to children within the last year is beyond question."

Such is the "evidence" put forth in support of the assertion that the practice of plural marriage has been revived in Utah. How did Dr. Bliss discover that such was the case? Why did he go before a congregation of Congregationalists in Massachusetts, instead of a grand jury in Utah, to make the disclosure? How did the Chicago Tribune obtain its statistics? Has somebody been making a house to house canvass throughout Utah, for the purpose of registering plural wives, and counting their offspring, born within a twelvemonth? What means would be at the command of such a canvasser for getting at the facts?

There are two reasons why Dr. Bliss made his statement in Massachusetts instead of Utah: First, it is false; and had it been made among the people he accuses, there would have been a thousand witnesses ready to refute it. Second, money is needed for the support of mission work in Utah, and statements have to be made in the East that will call forth the dollars. The pockets of the pious people of New England can be far more easily and effectively reached by misrepresenting the Mormons, than by telling the truth about them. Not a single case of polygamy has occurred in Utah, for which the Mormon Church is responsible, since the adoption by the Church, in the year 1890, of the rule abolishing plural marriage.

The statement made by the Chicago Tribune is, upon its face, a wild and reckless assertion, impossible of being supported by any evidence tangible enough to examine or refute. The rest of Elder Etzenhouser's communication to the Gazette is incoherent, jumps from one subject to another, and mingles assertions and quotations in a manner which makes the intended meaning obscure. It is not worth the attention here paid to it. But a point ought to be made in his address calls for examination. The report of it, as clipped by him from the Independent for re-publication in the Gazette, is as follows:

"Elder R. Etzenhouser, of Independence, Mo., who spoke at the opera house Sunday, exposing Utah Mormonism, is a representative of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The latter society was organized at Beloit, Wis., in 1851; more perfectly at Amboy, Ill., in 1860; had its headquarters and publishing plant at Plano, Ill., till 1881, when it was removed to Lamoni, Iowa, from where the Saints' Herald, the official organ, and other publications are issued."

"This church was incorporated in Illinois in 1872, which of course could not have been had it been in league with Brighamism. Court decisions, extracts from which appear below, also show conclusively the distinction: February 13, 1880—Judge L. S. Sherman in the court of common pleas, Lake Co., Ohio, deciding property interests, declared: 'And the court does further find the plaintiff, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, is the true and lawful continuation of, and successor to the said original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, organized in 1830, and is entitled in law to all its rights and property.'"

"The Utah Mormon Church was the defendant and lost in the case above cited. Judge Phillips's decision in another case, tried in the United States court, date of decision being March 3, 1894, is to the same effect, as the following extract shows: 'Beyond all cavil if human testimony is to place any matter forever at rest, this church was one in doctrine, government and purpose from 1830 to June, 1844, when Joseph Smith, its founder, was killed. *"

There can be no question of the fact that Brigham Young's assumed presidency was a bold and bald usurpation."

"That Utah Mormons departed from the former text books is seen in Judge Phillips's words: 'Conformably to the Book of Mormon, the Book of Doctrine and Covenants expressly declares that we believe that one man should have but one wife, and one woman but one husband.' Title was again awarded the Reorganized church, the unrelenting antagonist of Utah Mormonism."

"Briefly summed up, the Reorganized church believes in the unchangeability of God, and therefore claims the identical Gospel as taught by the Savior, in doctrine, ordinance, organization, the gifts and blessings."

"These items we have gathered from documents placed in our hands."

The case heard before Judge Sherman, in the court of common pleas, Lake county, Ohio, was one wherein the "Reorganized church" sought to quiet the title in itself to the Temple in Kirtland. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, whose headquarters are in Utah, paid no attention whatever to the case, neither by filing any pleading nor offering any evidence. No issue was joined in the case involving any question of authoritative succession to the religious organization of which Joseph Smith was president at the time of his assassination, and Judge Sherman's decision was based exclusively on an ex parte showing.

Judge Phillips presided over a district court in Missouri, and the case tried before him was one involving the title to what is known as the Temple lot, situated in Independence, Mo. The contestants in that case were the "Reorganized church" as plaintiff and a small religious society commonly called Hedrickites, as defendant. The latter held the property in possession, and claimed its ownership on various grounds, one of which was a tax title. Judge Phillips ruled in favor of the plaintiff, but the case was appealed, he was reversed, and the title to the property was quieted in the defendant, which still holds it. The Church in Utah took no part whatever in the controversy.

The Josephites are welcome to all the capital in support of their claims to divine authority, they can make out of an ex parte decision by one judge, and a reversed decision by another. But such an attempt at bolstering up their pretensions involves features that would be ineffably grotesque did they not border so closely on the sacrilegious. For instance, would a "Josephite" base a claim that his sins had been remitted by baptism, on the ground that Judge Sherman, of Lake county, Ohio, had decided his church to be the owner of the Kirtland Temple? Would he claim "power over unclean spirits," in other words, the Holy Priesthood, on the ground that Judge Phillips—afterwards reversed—had decided his church to be the lawful successor to the one organized by Joseph Smith?

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints never has submitted, and never will submit, to the adjudication of any human tribunal, its claims to divine authority. It would regard such a thing not only as absurd but as sacrilegious. Its works, its teachings and the declarations of Holy Writ are the proofs upon which it relies to show to all the world that it is the only true Church upon the earth.

If the re-organization of the Church, which was led by Joseph Smith, was ever a necessity, then a new dispensation, authorizing such re-organization, was necessary. If a new dispensation has been necessary since his death, then the dispensation which he ushered in was not the dispensation of the fullness of times; and if it was not, he was an impostor from the beginning or

his work; for he taught that it was, and he made this claim a vital feature of his calling and authority. The whole fabric of his work, from beginning to end, is destroyed when the claim is conceded that the Church he was the instrument, under God, of founding, has ever required to be reorganized.

But the organization effected by Joseph Smith, under the direction of the Almighty, has remained intact. It has been self-succeeding, and no link is either lacking or fractured in the chain of its authority.

DIVISION OF IRRIGATION.

A Cheyenne dispatch today announces that a special from Washington has been received there to the effect that the committee on agriculture of each house of Congress has agreed to report favorably Senator Warren's bill establishing, in the agricultural department, a division of irrigation. If both committees favor the measure it is very likely to become law.

The effect will be to give the subject of irrigation much greater prominence among governmental interests than it has heretofore enjoyed. Separate and more complete statistics in relation to it will be compiled, and no doubt Congress will be impelled from time to time to legislate upon it, in a manner to aid in the process of redeeming lands now worthless because of their aridity. It is understood that Secretary Wilson, of the agricultural department, has interested himself earnestly in securing support for the bill. He is a practical man, has made personal investigations in the arid regions, and realizes the magnitude of the proposition.

A CONDITION OF SALVATION.

From what we know concerning John the Baptist we may well suppose that he was a preacher of righteousness possessing great courage and power. He converted many, and on one occasion rebuked a multitude who came to him for baptism without having repented of their sins first, denounced them as a generation of vipers, and commanded them to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.

"And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then?"

"He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise." Luke 3: 10, 11.

From this record it would appear that those who sought to obtain a remission of their sins at the hands of John the Baptist were by him required to demonstrate the genuineness of their conversion and repentance by dividing their substance with the poor. The language he used, in the light of the circumstances under which it was uttered, justifies the inference that charity to the poor was made a condition of salvation under his ministry; and that any person possessing wealth who would not divide with the destitute, was not entitled to receive the ordinances of the Gospel.

In this respect, as in all others, the Gospel taught by John the Baptist to prepare for the first coming of the Savior, is identical with that taught by Joseph Smith, the modern Seer, as a preparation for His second coming. In a revelation given April, 23, 1834, "concerning the order of the Church for the benefit of the poor," the following passage occurs:

"Therefore, if any man shall take of the abundance which I have made, and impart not his portion, according to the