

phet Joseph Smith. The nation's rejection of those great, grand and sacred principles, revealed and brought to light through him; the persecution and abuse heaped on the Saints of the Most High God; and that, too, by the inhabitants of this once land of liberty and freedom, overshadowed with a glorious Constitution that granted the right and privilege to all to worship God as seemed good in their own sight, with none to molest; and, notwithstanding all this, we see the Prophet submit to law and order, and place himself with his brethren under the pledged faith of the sovereign State of Illinois—Thomas Ford, Governor, incarcerated and imprisoned, deprived of his liberty, and then, with his brother Hyrum, martyred in cold blood; and the rulers of the nation winked at the deed, and afterwards allowed the Church and kingdom of God to be persecuted, and finally driven from the United States, to seek an asylum in the wilderness, with a hope that all who did not sicken and die would starve to death or fall victims to the savage Indians.

The spirit of hatred and persecution towards the servants of God still prevails with the hireling priests and the religious bigots and fanatics, who are always ready to raise the hue and cry, "false prophets," "delusion," &c., and, at the same time, take special pains to keep their "reverend" persons at a good distance, so as not to come in contact with us on the doctrine and principles of the gospel contained in the Bible. I have directly, or indirectly, challenged them all in this section of the county to talk, converse or debate with me on religious subjects; but they will not face us. On the 2nd of this month, as I was returning from Columbus, Miss., I called at a relatives of mine and stopped all night. The next morning some of the members of the family invited me to accompany them to the camp meeting that was being held in the neighborhood. I concluded to do so, as I was expecting Bro. A. R. Beard to return from Monroe Co., Miss., and join me near that place, and I had no appointment to fill for a few days. I attended the meeting two days, taking some few notes each day. On the 3rd day Bro. Beard arrived. We both visited the camp ground. Shortly after taking my seat one of the "reverend" gentlemen, waited on me, and told me not to sit in the congregation and take notes again. In the meantime the high sheriff of the county had been sent for. He is an intelligent, interesting young man, and a friend of ours. The trick was to have him present, so when the warrant was issued he would be compelled to arrest me for disturbing the meeting by taking notes, as one of the preachers alleged. They finally concluded not to issue the warrant, but to present me to the grand jury at the next term of the court, which will be the 5th Monday in Nov. It has been said that I will be indicted at that court for preaching and defending the principle of a plurality of wives, as being in accordance with the mind, will and law of God to His people and church. It is quite probable that I will try my hand at pleading law, as well as preaching plurality, as my money is scarce, and I cannot fee a lawyer; but feel competent to plead my own case. I preached at the county site once, but the court house was closed. The next time I think the doors will be opened to me.

Brother Joseph Mathews has returned from Mississippi. He will labor with me in this section a short time, then return to Mississippi again. His health has been very poor; he is gaining as the cool weather advances. Bro. A. R. Beard has been traveling and laboring with me since the first of August. He will leave in a few days for Perry county, Alabama. He has exerted himself in the defence of truth and for the building up of the kingdom of God in this land. The Saints in this country feel well and are rejoicing in the truth. All who can possibly raise the means are calculating to emigrate to Zion as early next season as practicable. Some who would be glad to go to Utah cannot possibly raise the means to pay their way.

I did not enjoy good health during the incessant hot weather; but my health is improving at this time. I remain your brother in the New and Everlasting Covenant,

JOHN D. HOLLADAY.

#### THE ADMISSION OF UTAH.

Editor Deseret News:—Dear Sir,—As the question of Utah's admission into the Union will again be brought before

Congress at an early date, allow me, as a citizen of the Territory, to advocate through your popular columns, her claims to State sovereignty.

The repudiation of Utah, on account of the practice of polygamy, by her citizens, is most unjust and unwarranted, and without precedent in the history of the Republic. When dispassionately viewed, this action of the National Council must receive the censure of the American people. Every citizen knows, or ought to know, that the admission of a State is strictly a Constitutional question. Hence, we may inquire at once, is the proposed State government of Utah republican? Has she sufficient strength and population to maintain the machinery of a State organization? Let the facts in the case answer. The proposed constitution of the State of Deseret, provides that every male citizen over the age of twenty-one, shall be allowed to vote, regardless of race or color. This is certainly republican enough; the Constitution of the General Government is not more so. As to her ability to maintain a separate government, it need only be stated that there are several States in the Union, that have a less population than Utah.

Polygamy in Utah, to which reference has been made, is not merely a social question, it is something more: it is a fundamental principle in the "Mormon" religion. The "Mormons" were led to the practice of polygamy through a revelation given to the Prophet Joseph Smith, and it is made, by this revelation and commandment, the duty of every elder whose circumstances will allow of it, to become a polygamist. Hence, it is a part and portion of their religion, and as such, beyond the reach of the legislation of Congress; for the Constitution expressly forbids that body to make any law, "respecting the establishment of religion." "But," say American statesmen, "polygamy is a crime." It cannot be so proven; the Bible justifies it, and certainly, it is higher authority than modern politicians. The most eminent servants of God that ever lived,—prophets and high priests, who talked with the Almighty, and received commandments from Him, were in the constant practice of it. Isaiah, the most celebrated of ancient prophets, foretold the birth, crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah, and the subversion and captivity of the Jewish nation, declares that in the latter times, when men shall have been reduced in numbers by war, seven women will cleave to one man.

It has been argued that if polygamy is exempt from legislation in Congress, on religious grounds, that the Hindoo might upon the same plea, claim the prerogative of performing the rites of the worship of Juggernaut, and immolate the widow upon the "funeral pile," or his own body beneath the wheels of the idol. This, Congress would legitimately restrain, as being criminal. The law of God says: "Thou shalt not kill." No sane person will argue, that what is criminal should be protected under the cloak of religion.

No one will deny that, when the framers of the Constitution guaranteed protection to religion, that they meant to protect such doctrines and tenets as are not sanctioned by the Bible. They understood the Bible to be the standard, and whatever is in harmony with it, they evidently intended should enjoy exemption from the domination of Congress. They had seen the bad results of political authority attempting to control religious questions, and very wisely forestalled any action of that kind by Congress. The "Mormons" do not ask protection for what is criminal, nor toleration for what is idolatrous, but they do demand, that what is sanctioned by the Bible, shall be let alone.

Let us suppose that in obedience to the requirements of Congress, the "Mormons" strike out the doctrine of polygamy from their faith; what then will be the character of their church? It would then be the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, established by Joseph Smith, and modified by the Congress of the United States. Would this be Constitutional? Statesmen seem to think so; the "Mormons" think differently, and consequently, object to the proposed amendment to their faith. This is certainly carrying matters a little too far; it is too barefaced. Every one can see that Congress is astray on the question of polygamy, and is influenced solely by religious prejudice. As far as the National legislature is concerned in this matter, it may be stated thus: if Senators and Representatives do not like the "Mormon" church, they need not join it; if they consider polygamy immoral and unsanctioned by Christian usage, they need not prac-

tice it; but they have no right to interfere with it, as a legislative body.

Hence, it is clearly evident, that it is no part of the duty of Congress, to make creeds for religious bodies, nor change those already established. If Congressmen do not understand their duty, in the matter of admitting a State into the Union, some school-boy should inform them. His instruction would probably be as follows: "Simply institute an inquiry in regard to the character of the proposed State government; if the constitution is republican, it becomes your duty to admit the applicant—provided there is sufficient population to maintain a State organization; if the government is not republican, it is your duty to reject it."

Mr. Editor, if it would not be monopolizing too much of your space, the writer would be much pleased to notice one or two arguments used by the Hon. Scuyler Colfax, in his late speech at the Townsend House, while visiting your city. Referring to the admission of Utah, he held this extraordinary view of the subject: "The Mormons, and the balance of the nation, are two people, having different views and ideas; one must come to the others terms. Which shall yield, the Mormons or the Nation?" Here is plainly manifest, a disposition to float with the popular current. With such a man as this, might is right. Farewell to the minority, when he sits as judge. Such men have their price. Which shall yield? It is not a question of yielding; it is one of coming into the Constitution, and the parties at variance are the "Mormons" and Congress. Which will have to come to the Constitution? We answer, the party which has forsaken it. Why attempt to throw dust in the wind? Every body can see the subterfuge. If Mr. Colfax wished to discuss the subject, why did he not do it like a candid minded man, and prove that it would be unconstitutional for Congress to admit Utah with her institution of marriage? or, if such position can not be maintained, why not freely tell the citizens of this Territory, that, under the broad, liberal provisions of the Constitution, they are entitled to a State government?

Referring to the action of Congress in passing its late bill against polygamy in the Territories, he argues: "Congress has the same right to legislate against polygamy in the Territories, that the City of Salt Lake has to pass an ordinance against the sale of liquor on Main Street." Mr. Colfax certainly had a poor opinion of the intelligence of his hearers. In order to maintain this position, he will have to prove that polygamy is as much an evil in a community as the cup of intoxication. This neither himself nor Congress can ever do, for thousands of upright, God-fearing men and women in Utah have proven it to be a blessing. Thousands of healthy, happy children, which now swell our day and Sabbath schools, and which in a few years will add strength and greatness to the State and nation, are at once the blessed result,—the result of what Congress would legislate down as an evil, and which Mr. Colfax thinks it has a right to do, as much so as any community has a right to pass laws against the use of and traffic in intoxicating liquors. O consistency! thou art a jewel!

The increase of population in Utah, under the auspices of polygamy, has not been attended by a single bad result; society has remained pure. The polygamic men and women of Utah, are as virtuous, moral and upright, as can be found in Europe or America. The children, intelligent, beautiful and highly moral, the pride of every teacher, and the joy of every parent, challenge comparison. Who, acquainted with such a community, would not say, keep away the demoralizer—liquor? Is the law of righteousness violated by withholding from their lips the poisonous cup? The Bible forbids drunkenness, and all good men use their influence against it, and the community that legislates it down, is clearly acting in self-defense. But Congress was not acting in self-defense when it attempted to legislate down polygamy; but was yielding to a popular prejudice. Such legislation can not prevent evil, nor oppose a successful barrier to the course of crime; but its legitimate results are to foster evil, and produce crime. Debauchery, robbery and bloodshed, are not the results of polygamy; but they are of drunkenness.

Let us for one moment suppose that the act of Congress against polygamy should become a law of the country, what would be its effect? It would cause good, peaceable citizens of the republic, to be imprisoned for doing what they conscientiously believe to be right, and a part of their duty, and what the Bible sanctions; it would cause them to be punished for doing what prophets

and holy men have done, and left as an example, for the faithful to follow. Would not such a law bring the Government into lasting disrepute, and destroy for ever its reputation for tolerating religious liberty? Congressmen seem to think polygamy a disgrace to the Nation; would not this be a thousand times more so than the worst evils that plural marriage has ever produced? A government which has made religious toleration its boast, imprisoning its citizens for adherence to their faith, and that faith in accordance with the Bible!

Why need Congressmen, give themselves any concern in their official capacity, about a question of this character? If it is not in consonance with the Christian religion, it is the business of its ministers to expose its immoral character. They can certainly make a clear case, if such be the fact, when all respectable men and women will renounce it. If it be a social evil, it will soon become apparent, and when it loses its respectability, it will lose its votaries; for the polygamists of Utah are staid, moral folks, and are what they are, for conscience sake.

So, in either case, it is bound to become obsolete, if not founded upon truth; if on the other hand, it is founded upon correct principles, it will endure despite the legislation of Congress and every other law-making department in existence. This is pre-eminently an age of progression, and whatever is progressive in its character, will ride the billow's crest, and survive every storm.

There can be no doubt as to the successful issue of the question of Utah's admission. There is but one objection, and that is not a respectable one. The legislation of Congress against polygamy is unconstitutional, and can be proven so, by any school boy, miller, or farmer. A few men of narrow minds and strong prejudices, who have been so fortunate as to get into office, may delay the issue, but there can be no doubt as to the final result. A hundred thousand republicans, whose indomitable perseverance and industry, have reclaimed the barren wastes of the American Desert, and transformed it into a fruitful land, are worthy of a State government, and the American Nation is magnanimous enough to give them their political rights, polygamy or no polygamy. Hurrah for Utah! the Constitution is on her side, and her ship of State will soon be afloat, with pure white sails, and streamers spread to the breeze.

G. W. CROUCH.

Beaver, Nov. 1st 1869.

**BARBAROUS LAWS.**—A vast deal of cruelty has been wiped out of the English criminal code of late years. Formerly, when almost every felony was punishable with death or forfeiture, persons who felt they had no chance, if tried at the assizes, used to refuse to plead, or "stand mute" to the indictment, in order to escape forfeiture in the interest of their families. But there was a rule of law that no one could be tried unless he pleaded, and in order to make a prisoner put himself on trial, *peine forte et dure* was invented in the time of Henry the Fourth. It was applied thus:

"The accused shall be remanded to the prison, and laid there in some low and dark house, where they shall lie naked on the bare earth, without any litter, rushes, or other clothing, and without any garments about them; and they shall lie upon their backs, their heads uncovered; and their feet and one arm shall be drawn to one quarter of the house with a cord, and the other arm to another quarter; and in the same manner shall be done with their legs; and there shall be laid upon their bodies iron and stone, so much as they may bear, and no more. And the next day following they shall have three morsels of barley bread, without any drink; and the second day they shall drink thrice of the water that is next to the house of the prison (except running water), without any bread; and this shall be their diet until they be dead."

It will scarcely be believed that this precious power was retained in English criminal law down to the time of George the Third.

Wm. Miller, a well known humorist in the District of Kyle, visited the United States, and was taken to see Niagara Falls. "Well, Mr. Miller," said a full-blown Yankee, after allowing time for the contemplation of the scene, "is that not wonderful? In Scotland you never saw anything like that." "Like that?" quoth Will; "there's a far mair wonderfu' concern no' two miles frae whar I was born. Man, at Kilmashill there's a peacock wi' a timmer leg!"