

ly effort to sustain the tenets of his faith.

After the debate was over his flock gathered around him, and they held a long consultation in an undertone. Not being able to hear what was said, we could only surmise that, having failed by fair means to show that we were wrong he was seeking by foul means to create a prejudice against us. It seems, however, that we did him an injustice in our conjectures, for just before leaving last evening, one of his flock, who is quite interested in the principles which we teach, told us that the minister acknowledged to them that he had not the authority to baptize, and officiate in the ordinances of the Gospel. He further told them that if they were satisfied with our authority, it was their duty to go forward and be baptized by us, as that ordinance was clearly essential to salvation. He spoke in such a way as to include himself in his remarks, and just how far our labors in that town will be blessed we cannot tell.

This illustrates how opposition to the truth serves only to fan it into a flame that sheds its light into recesses that otherwise might not be penetrated for years. Had it not been for that scurrilous article in the Baptist paper, our attention might not have been directed to Tuihualco for an indefinite time.

THE MISSION

Is in a very prosperous condition, and we have good prospects ahead. It is very difficult, however, for the Utah missionaries to make new openings, as the conditions, mode of life, and religious ideas of the people are so different from ours that it is almost impossible for us to work our way into their good will sufficient to present our message, without the assistance of our native brethren, who almost invariably pioneer the way and make the openings, which we follow up.

When the people, who are mostly pure-blooded Indians, learn of the Book of Mormon, and that we claim it to be the sacred history of their forefathers, they generally manifest quite an interest in it, and express a desire to see it. In fact, on my second visit to the village of which I have been writing, I spent the whole time of our meeting, at their request, in giving an account of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, a synopsis of its contents, and an explanation of the Bible prophecies concerning it, all of which seemed to interest them deeply. In fact, most of those who are in the Church here, as well as a number who have not yet been baptized, are waiting anxiously to see that book printed in their own language; and we cannot but feel that as missionaries our labors would be much more effective if we had the assistance of that record, which was written, preserved, and brought forth for the purpose of bringing this race to a knowledge of the truth and of their forefathers.

We were all quite disappointed a few weeks ago on learning by a private letter that work on the Spanish edition of the Book of Mormon had ceased for an indefinite period. If our informant be correct, we certainly hope that the period will not be a protracted one, as we are greatly in need of its assistance.

Your fellow laborer in the cause of truth,
HORACE CUMMINGS.

THE NEW EDMUNDS BILL.

REMARKS BY SENATOR VAN WYCK.
COMPLETE REFUTATION OF AN EDMUNDS SOPHISM.

In the U. S. Senate on January 7th, Mr. Van Wyck of Nebraska, replied as follows to a statement made by Mr. Edmunds, that the provision of his bill compelling legal wives to testify against their husbands, was substantially the same as in several States of the Union:

Mr. Van Wyck. Mr. President, without desiring to say a word upon the merits of this bill or any of its provisions, I still think it proper to make a correction of a portion of the statement made by the Senator from Vermont yesterday, as I understand it, that the provisions of this bill as it affects the power to compel the testimony of husband or wife against each other is substantially the same as the statutes of New Hampshire and Nebraska, and twenty-five States of this Union. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. Edmunds. I do not know whether the Senator did or not. I have not looked at my remarks.

Mr. Van Wyck. Then, to refresh the Senator's recollection, I will read what he said:

There is nothing, therefore, in the penal part of this bill relating to the punishment of the crime of polygamy that does not exist in substance and almost in form, going to the extent of giving evidence by husbands and wives against each other, in every single State in this Union. I have looked at the statutes of Nebraska since my friend from Nebraska alluded to that point, and found that the laws of Nebraska, their standing statutes, are in substance just the same thing.

Mr. Teller. On what point?
Mr. Edmunds. On the point of husband and wife giving evidence against each other in criminal prosecutions that affect either one or the other. I looked at the statutes of New Hampshire after my friend from New Hampshire alluded to that point yesterday, and I found they had the same.

Is the Senator's recollection refreshed by the reading of his speech?

Mr. Edmunds. Not much. [Laughter.]

Mr. Van Wyck. Then I take it for granted that the Senator believes today as he stated yesterday.

Mr. Edmunds. Yes.

Mr. Van Wyck. I take that for granted. His memory is not refreshed sufficiently at least to contradict the statement he made yesterday. Now, Mr. President, I fail to see in the statutes of Nebraska, as my friend from New Hampshire does in the statute of New Hampshire, that the features are the same as this bill contains. I think the Senator from Vermont will not find in the statutes of any State of this Union provisions such as that which is incorporated in this bill. I do not now say whether this provision is right or wrong, or whether the enormity of the crime to be stricken at in Utah is not so great that that people should be visited by legislation such as is not found in any statute in this Union or probably in any civilized country on the globe.

The statutes of some States provide so carefully that they deal in minute particulars wherein they allow a departure from the great principle of the common law as to the sacred bond that holds the virtuous marriage relation upon the foundation on which it was built. It has been guarded so tenderly that a statute has never dared to touch it unless it pointed out particularly the respects wherein the testimony should be receivable. This is the legislation of his own State of Vermont. Now let me show this just for a moment, because this is apart from the consideration of polygamy and its crime. It is higher, and above, and beyond that. This bill provides:

In any prosecution for bigamy, polygamy, or unlawful cohabitation, under any statute of the United States, the lawful husband or wife of the person accused, shall be a competent witness.

Does it do as the statute of every State says on what points husband or wife may testify? No. "A competent witness" in the case as any other witness, and therefore a witness to prove any transaction or crime or offense which the prosecutor chooses to ask of that witness. This bill makes the husband and wife competent witnesses against each other in the case to prove anything. That is my point. Now, I should like my attention to be called to the statute of any State which justifies or allows or compels a husband or a wife to be a competent witness for anything that may be sought to be proved in the suit pending. This bill says:

And may be called and may be compelled to testify in such proceeding, examination, or prosecution, without the consent of the husband or wife; but—

Mr. Edmunds. Yes.

Mr. Van Wyck. The Senator says "yes," precisely. It is not so in any other State to which he can call our attention. There is one negative, my friend says triumphantly:

But such witness shall not be permitted to testify as to any confidential statement or communication made by either husband or wife to each other, during the existence of the marriage relation.

He or she may testify to everything else, is a competent witness, as to everything else, which she or he is not made I think by the statute of any State in this Union, so carefully are their laws guarded. Let me call the attention of the Senator to his own State in her revised statutes. In a case of civil damage, where the sale of intoxicating drinks has produced a cause of action, the Vermont law says:

No person shall be disqualified as a witness by reason of the marriage relation in a proceeding under this section.

Again, by the Vermont statutes, in actions against a savings-bank by a husband to recover moneys deposited by his wife in her name or as her money the wife may be a witness as if she were an unmarried woman.

Is there any statute in the State of Vermont which compels a husband or wife to be a witness against the other, even in an immaterial matter, where he or she is indicted for an offense? If so, I have not found it. If that exists, the Senator from Vermont can call our attention to it.

Then look at Massachusetts; and we look upon Massachusetts as the height. In one provision the Massachusetts law is—

Neither husband nor wife—

Part of the provision in this bill is in the law of Massachusetts, but the other part is not—

Neither husband nor wife shall be allowed to testify as to private conversations with each other.

Oh, yes, the Senator from Vermont says that provision of the Massachusetts law is here, but that is all of it there is here. It is only the negative part of this law which is proposed by the judiciary committee:

Neither husband nor wife shall be allowed to testify as to private conversations with each other.

There is more in the Massachusetts law, that there may be no doubt about permitting the virtuous marriage relation being disturbed:

Neither husband nor wife shall be compelled to be a witness in any trial upon an indictment, complaint, or other criminal proceedings against the other.

That is the Massachusetts law. She is entitled to all the glory which the world gives her. She preserves good

laws in her statute-book yet. No such law as this could the Senator from Massachusetts from the judiciary committee inflict upon any other portion of the country.

Now we come to New York, not so virtuous probably as New Hampshire or as Vermont, because the region is not so cold, not so good as Massachusetts, because Massachusetts is nearer to Vermont than New York is but New York has a very large city and it is probably necessary to go a little further there, but even she regards the marriage relation. New York says:

Nothing herein contained shall render any husband or wife competent or compellable to give evidence for or against the other in any criminal action or proceeding (except to prove the fact of marriage in case of bigamy)—

That is all she can prove. You may put the wife or husband on the stand, but you can prove by him or her only one thing, and must stop there. That is what New York says, nearly as wicked probably as Utah, by comparison. New York says you can only compel the husband or wife to prove the fact of bigamy. Will the Senator from Vermont put that language in this bill to restrict the effect of it as the statute of New York says, providing that in case of bigamy one or the other may be a witness, but only to prove one fact, and there they must stop—prove the fact of marriage, nothing more—

Or in any action or proceeding instituted in consequence of adultery, or in any action or proceeding for divorce on account of adultery (except to prove the fact of marriage), or in any action or proceeding for or on account of criminal conversion.

Where are the twenty-five States that have the provision of this bill? I have gone from Vermont away down to New York, and probably it is not necessary to go either up or down any further. The others probably are the same. In his own State the witness is not allowed, and in the good old State of Massachusetts it expressly says it can not be done, and in New York, where probably there may be greater necessity, it says it can only be done to prove one fact, and that is the fact of marriage. If it be that we are making a great divergence let it be understood, not that this is in conformity with the legislation of the States of this Union, but that it is an innovation, going further beyond the settled law than ever has been gone before. Let it be so understood, and then let the justice, or rather the emergency, of this occasion be the only excuse upon which we seek to make this innovation, which never has been proposed by any State statute to which my attention has been called. It may be that the Senator from Vermont with his vast experience and greater knowledge will be able to call our attention to such a statute, but I have not found it.

MILLARD STAKE ACADEMY.

JANUARY 15, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

Following are the minutes of the examination of the Millard Stake Academy, held in the meeting house of Fillmore, January 15th, 1886:

Prior to the opening exercises, the roll was called by the conducting monitor, George Hansen.

Singing by the Academy choir: "Wake the Anthem, Mild and Free," was followed by the opening prayer by Jesse Bennett, and singing by the Academy choir: "The Music of Heaven."

The principal, Alma Greenwood, then gave some explanatory remarks, concerning the manner in which the examination was managed. After which the following programme was carried out.

Fifth Readers, teacher, Lexia Curtis; single reading by Lois Reed, George Robinson and Courtneah Black. Song, "This is the song we long to sing," by singing class B., teacher, Lillian King.

Physical Geography, teacher, Alma Greenwood. To lecture on "volcanoes" Susie Dearden and Joseph Moody; on "earthquakes," Media Giles; on "changes going on, on the surface of the earth," George Hansen. Geography B., teacher, Lexia Curtis, was represented by Jesse Bennett.

Recitation, teacher, A. Greenwood. Single reading Louisa Black, Frank Merrill, and William Partridge.

U. S. History, teacher, Lexia Curtis; represented by Jesse Giles. General History, teacher Alma Greenwood; represented by Albert and George Hansen.

Fourth readers, teacher, Lexia Curtis; single reading by Eva Croft, Carrie Reed, Alfred Moyle, John Brunson, Elmer Hinkley and James Kelley.

Singing, "O what a world this might be," by class A., teacher Lillian King. The Theological Department was represented by Wm. Partridge.

Physiology, teacher, Alma Greenwood; short sketches given by Louisa Black and Frank Merrill.

Representation of Domestic Department by John Beckstrand.

Reading of the Principal's report by Alma Greenwood.

Reading of the financial report by treasurer of the Academy, Lyman Robison.

Encouraging and instructive remarks were made by Messrs. Hinkley, Robinson, Black, Stevens and Callister—all members of the Board.

Singing by Academy choir: "Musical Elements," and benediction by George Robinson. LEXIA CURTIS, Secretary.

A TERRIBLE CONFESSION.

A PHYSICIAN PRESENTS SOME STARTLING FACTS.

The following story—which is attracting wide attention from the press—is so remarkable that we cannot excuse ourselves if we do not lay it before our readers entire:

To the Editor of the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat:

Sir:—On the first day of June, 1881, I lay at my residence in this city, surrounded by my friends and waiting for death. Heaven only knows the agony I then endured, for words can never describe it. And yet, if a few years previous any one had told me that I was to be brought so low, and by so terrible a disease, I should have scoffed at the idea. I had always been uncommonly strong and healthy, and weighed over 200 pounds, and hardly knew, in my own experience, what pain or sickness were. Very many people who will read this statement realize at times they are unusually tired and cannot account for it. They feel dull pains in various parts of the body and do not understand why. Or they are exceedingly hungry one day and entirely without appetite the next. This was just the way I felt when the relentless malady which had fastened itself upon me first began. Still I thought nothing of it; that probably I had taken a cold which would soon pass away. Shortly after this I noticed a heavy, and at times neuralgic, pain in one side of my head, but as it would come one day and be gone the next, I paid little attention to it. Then my stomach would get out of order and my food often failed to digest, causing at times great inconvenience. Yet, even as a physician, I did not think that these things meant anything serious. I fancied I was suffering from malaria and doctored myself accordingly. But I got no better. I next noticed a peculiar color and odor about the fluids I was passing—also that there were large quantities one day and very little the next, and that a persistent froth and scum appeared upon the surface, and a sediment settled. And yet I did not realize my danger, for, indeed, seeing these symptoms continually, I finally became accustomed to them, and my suspicion was wholly disarmed by the fact that I had no pain in the affected organs or in their vicinity. Why I should have been so blind I cannot understand!

I consulted the best medical skill in the land. I visited all the famed mineral springs in America and traveled from Maine to California. Still I grew worse. No two physicians agreed as to my malady. One said I was troubled with spinal irritation, another, dyspepsia; another heart disease; another, general debility; another, congestion of the base of the brain; and so on through a long list of common diseases, the symptoms of many of which I really had. In this way several years passed, during which time I was steadily growing worse. My condition had really become pitiable. The slight symptoms I at first experienced were developed into terrible and constant disorders. My weight had been reduced from 207 to 130 pounds. My life was a burden to myself and friends. I could retain no food on my stomach, and lived wholly by injections. I was a living mass of pain. My pulse was uncontrollable. In my agony I frequently fell to the floor and clutched the carpet, and prayed for death! Morphine had little or no effect in deadening the pain. For six days and nights I had the death-premonitory hiccoughs constantly! My water was filled with tube-casts and albumen. I was struggling with Bright's Disease of the kidneys in its last stages!

While suffering thus I received a call from my pastor, the Rev. Dr. Foote, at that time rector of St. Paul's Episcopal church, of this city. I felt that it was our last interview, but in the course of conversation Dr. Foote detailed to me the many remarkable cures of cases like my own which had come under his observation. As a practicing physician and a graduate of the schools, I derided the idea of any medicine outside the regular channels being in the least beneficial. So solicitous, however, was Dr. Foote, that I finally promised I would waive my prejudice. I began its use on the first day of June, 1881, and took it according to directions. At first it sickened me; but this I thought was a good sign for one in my debilitated condition. I continued to take it; the sickening sensation departed and I was finally able to retain food upon my stomach. In a few days I noticed a decided change for the better, as also did my wife and friends. My hiccoughs ceased and I experienced less pain than formerly. I was so rejoiced at this improved condition that, upon what I had believed but a few days before was my dying bed, I vowed in the presence of my family and friends, should I recover I would both publicly and privately make known this remedy for the good of humanity, wherever and whenever I had an opportunity, and this letter is in fulfillment of that vow. My improvement was constant from that time, and in less than three months I had gained 26 pounds in flesh, became entirely free from pain, and I believe I owe my life and present condition wholly to Warner's safe cure, the remedy which I used.

Since my recovery I have thoroughly re-investigated the subject of kidney difficulties and Bright's disease, and the truths developed are astounding. I therefore state, deliberately, and as a physician, that I believe more than one-half the deaths which occur, in America

are caused by Bright's disease of the kidneys. This may sound like a rash statement, but I am prepared to verify it fully. Bright's disease has no distinctive features of its own, (indeed, it often develops without any pain whatever in the kidneys or their vicinity), but has the symptoms of nearly every other common complaint. Hundreds of people die daily, whose burials are authorized by a physician's certificate as occurring from Heart Disease, "Apoplexy," "Paralysis," "Spinal Complaint," "Rheumatism," "Pneumonia," and the other common complaints, when in reality it is from Bright's disease of the kidneys. Few physicians, and fewer people, realize the extent of this disease or its dangerous and insidious nature. It steals into the system like a thief, manifests its presence if at all by the commonest symptoms it often shows none whatever, but brings death suddenly, from convulsions, apoplexy or heart disease.

As one who has suffered, and knows by bitter experience what he says, I implore every one who reads these words not to neglect the slightest symptoms of kidney difficulty. No one can afford to hazard such chances.

I make the foregoing statements based upon facts which I can substantiate to the letter. The welfare of those who may possibly be sufferers such as I was is an ample incitement for me to take the step I have, and if I can successfully warn others from the dangerous path in which I once walked I am willing to endure all the professional and personal consequences.

J. B. HENSON, M. D.
ROCHESTER, N. Y., Dec. 30.

FILES! FILES! FILES!!!
Sure cure for Bilind, Bleeding and Itching Piles. One box has cured the worst cases of 20 years' standing. No one need suffer five minutes after using William's Indian Pile Ointment. Its absorbs tumors, allays itching, acts as a poultice, gives instant relief. Prepared only for Piles, itching of the private parts, nothing else. Sold by druggists and mailed on receipt of price, 50c. and \$1.00.
For sale by Z. C. M. I. Drug Dept.
FRAZIER MEDICINE CO., Prop's,
Cleveland, Ohio.

WILLIAM'S INDIAN PILE OINTMENT
ILLUSTRATED AND DESCRIBED IN PRICE
SEED
FOR 1886.
Will be mailed FREE to all applicants, and to customers of last year without ordering it. It contains about 120 pages, 60 illustrations, prices, accurate descriptions and valuable directions for planting all varieties of VEGETABLES and FLOWER SEEDS, BULBS, etc. Invaluable to all, especially to Market Gardeners. Send for it.
D. M. FERRY & CO., Detroit, Michigan.

THE CHICAGO AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.
THE BEST ROUTE AND SHORTLINE BETWEEN
Omaha, Council Bluffs and Chicago.

The only line to take for Des Moines, Marshalltown, Cedar Rapids, Clinton, Dixon, Chicago, Milwaukee, and all points East. To the people of Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington and California it offers superior advantages not possible by any other line.

Among a few of the numerous points of superiority enjoyed by the patrons of this road between Omaha and Chicago, are: two trains a day of **DAY COACHES**, which are the finest that human art can invent; its **PALACE SLEEPING CARS**, which are made of comfort and elegance; its **PARLOR DRAWING ROOM CARS**, unsurpassed by any; and its widely celebrated **PALACE DINING CARS**, the equal of which can not be found elsewhere.

At Council Bluffs the trains of the Union Pacific Ry. connect in Union Depot with those of the Chicago & Northwestern Ry. In Chicago the trains of this line make close connection with those of all Eastern lines. For Detroit, Columbus, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Niagara Falls, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Toronto, Montreal, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and all points in the East, ask the ticket agent for tickets via the

"NORTH-WESTERN"
If you wish the best accommodations. All ticket agents sell tickets via this line.
M. HUGHITT, Gen'l Manager.
R. S. HAIR, Gen'l Passenger Ag't.
GEO. D. WILLIAMSON, Gen'l Agent, Room 8, Windsor Block, Denver.
W. N. BARCOCK, General Western Agent, Omaha, Neb.