

was first introduced among this people, it was one of the greatest crosses that ever was taken up by any set of men since the world stood. Joseph Smith told others, he told me, and I can bear witness of it, "that if this principle was not introduced this church and kingdom could not proceed." When this commandment was given, it was so far religious, and so far binding upon the Elders of this church, that it was told them if they were not prepared to enter into it, and to stem the torrent of opposition that would come in consequence of it, the keys of the kingdom would be taken from them. When I see any of our people, men or women, opposing a principle of this kind, I have years ago set them down as on the high road to apostasy, and I do to-day, I consider them apostates, and not interested in this church and kingdom. It is so far then a religious institution that it affects my conscience, and the consciences all good men; it is so far religious that it connects itself with time and with eternity. What are the covenants we enter into, and why is it that Joseph Smith said that unless this principle was entered into this kingdom could not proceed? We ought to know the why's and the wherefore's in relation to these matters and understand something about the principle enunciated. These are simply words, we wish to know their signification.

Where is there in the world a people that make any pretensions to have any claim upon their wives in eternity? Where is there a priest in all Christendom that teaches anything of this kind? You cannot find them. Marriage is solemnized until death do them part, and when death comes to either party then there is an end to the whole matter, and what comes after death is in the dark to them. It was so with us up to the time of the giving of that revelation; we had no claim upon one wife in eternity. They had obeyed the gospel as we had, they had been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins as we had; we had been married to them according to the laws of the land, and were living as other gentiles were, but we had no claim upon them in eternity. It was necessary that one grand truth should be unlocked, which is, that man and woman are destined to live together and have a claim upon each other in eternity. The priesthood being restored the key was turned in relation to this matter, and the privilege was placed not only within the reach of the Elders of this Church, but within the reach of all who should be considered worthy of it, to make covenants with their partners that should be binding in the eternal worlds, "that in this respect as well as in other respects we might stand as a distinguished people, separate and apart from the rest of the earth depending upon God for our religion."

Previous to this revelation who in all the world had any claim upon their wives in the eternal world, or what wife had a claim upon her husband? Who ever taught them any such principle? Nobody: some of the novel writers have noticed it, but they did not claim authority from heaven, they merely wrote their own opinions, and followed the promptings of their own instincts, which led them to hope that such a thing might be the case, but there was no certainty about it. Our position was just as Joseph said, if we could not receive the gospel which is an everlasting gospel, if we could not receive the dictum of a priesthood that administers in time and in eternity, if we could not receive a principle that would save us in the eternal world and our wives and children with us, we were not fit to hold this kingdom, and could not hold it, for it would be taken from us and given to others. This is reasonable, proper, consistent, and recommends itself to the minds of all intelligence when it is reflected upon in the light of truth. Then what did this principle open up to our view? That our wives who have been associated with us in time—who had borne with us the heat and burden of the day, who had shared in our afflictions, trials, troubles and difficulties, that they could reign with us in the eternal kingdoms of God, and that they should be sealed to us not only for time but for all eternity. This unfolded to us the eternal fitness and relationship of things as they exist on the earth, of man to man, and of husband to wife, it unfolds the relationship they should occupy in time to each other, and the relationship that will continue to exist in eternity. Hence it is emphatically a religious subject so deep, sacred and profound, so extensive and far-reaching, that it is one of the greatest principles that was ever revealed to man. Did we know anything about it before? No. How did we get a knowledge of it? By revelation. And shall we treat lightly these

things? No. The Lord says that His servants may take to themselves more wives than one. Who gives to them one wife? The Lord; and has he not a right to give to them another and another and another? I think he has that right. Who has a right to dispute it, and prohibit a union of that kind if God shall ordain it. Has not God as much right to-day to give me or you or any other person two, three, four, five, ten, or twenty wives, as he had anciently to give them to Abraham, Isaac, David, Solomon, etc? Has not the Lord a right to do what He pleases in this matter and in all other matters without the dictation of man? I think He has. Every principle associated with the gospel which we have received is eternal, hence our marriage covenant is an eternal covenant given unto us of God. Then when poor, miserable, corrupt men would endeavor to trample us under their feet because of the principles of truth which we have received from God, shall we falter in the least? No, never. Its opposers may croak against it until they go down to the dust of death; God will defend His work which He has introduced in the latter-days, and the Lord being our helper we will help Him to sustain it.

Associated with this is another important principle:—the baptism for the dead. One of the prophets has said that, "I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord; and he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." This Elias signifies a restorer. Jesus said of John the Baptist, in his day, "and if ye will receive it, this is the Elias (or restorer) which was for to come." "He that hath ears, to hear, let him hear." But they would not hear; they did not receive it. They beheaded John, crucified Jesus, killed his apostles and persecuted his followers; and their temple nation and polity was destroyed. But the times of restitution spoken of by the prophets, must take place; the restorer must come, "before that great and terrible day of the Lord." The hearts of the fathers must be turned to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, or the earth will be cursed. This great eternal marriage covenant lays at the foundation of the whole; when this was revealed, then followed the other. Then, and not till then, could the hearts of the fathers be turned to their children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers:—Then, and not till then, could the restoration be effectually commenced, time and eternity be connected, the past, present and future harmonized, and the eternal justice of God be vindicated. "Saviors come upon mount Zion to save the living, redeem the dead, unite man to woman and woman to man, in eternal, indissoluble ties; impart blessings to the dead, redeem the living, and pour eternal blessings upon posterity."

Let us now go back to the action of Congress in relation to plural marriage, of which these eternal covenants are the foundation. The Lord says,—"I will introduce the times of the restitution of all things; I will show you my eternal covenants, and call upon you to abide in them; I will show you how to save yourselves, your wives and children, your progenitors and posterity and to save the earth from a curse; Congress says if you fulfill that law we will inflict upon you pains and penalties, fines and imprisonments, in effect, we will not allow you to follow God's commands. Now if Congress possessed the Constitutional right to do so, it would still be a high-handed outrage upon the rights of man; but when we consider that they cannot make such a law, without violating the Constitution, and thus nullifying the act. What are we to think of it? Where are we drifting to? After having with uplifted hands to heaven sworn that they will "make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," to thus sacrilegiously stand between a whole community and their God and deliberately debar them, so far as they have the power, from observing his law. Do they realize what they are doing? Whence came this law on our statute books? Who constituted them our conscience keepers? Who appointed them the judge of our religious faith, or authorized them to coerce us to transgress a law that is binding and imperative on our consciences? We do not expect that Congress is acquainted with our religious faith; but as members of the body politic we do claim the guarantees of the Constitution and immunity from persecution on merely religious grounds.

What are we to think of a United States Judge who would marry a man

to another man's wife. He certainly ought to know better. We are told that she was a second wife, and therefore not acknowledged. Indeed, this is singular logic, if she was not a wife, then polygamy is no crime in the eyes of the law; for Congress have passed no law against whoredom; a man may have as many mistresses as he pleases without transgressing any law of Congress. The act in relation to polygamy contemplates punishing a man for having more wives, not mistresses, if she was simply his mistress, then the law is of no effect, and the very fact of Congress passing such a law is the strongest possible proof, in law, of the existence of a marriage covenant, which, until that law was passed, was by them considered valid. If, then, she was not his wife, no person could be punished under that law for polygamy; if she was his wife, then the judge transgressed the law which he professionally came to maintain.

In relation to all these matters the safe path for the Saints to take is to do right; and by the help of God seek diligently and honorably to maintain the position which they hold. Are we ashamed of anything we have done in marrying wives? No. We shall not be ashamed before God and the holy Angels, much less before a number of corrupt miserable scoundrels who are the very dregs of hell. We care nothing for their opinions, their ideas or notions, for they do not know God nor the principles which He has revealed. They wallow in the sink of corruption, as they would have us do, but the Lord being our helper we will not do it; but we will try to do right, and keep the commandments of God, live our religion, and pursue a course that will secure to us the smiles and approbation of God our Father. Inasmuch as we do this He will take care of us, maintain His own cause, and sustain His people. We have a right to keep His commandments. But what would you do if the United States were to bring up an army against you on account of polygamy, or on account of any other religious subject? We would trust in God as we always have done. Would you have no fears? None. All the fears that I am troubled with is that this people will not do right—that they will not keep the commandments of God. If we will only faithfully live our religion we fear no earthly power. Our safety is in God. Our religion is an eternal religion. Our covenants are eternal covenants, and we expect to maintain the principles of our religion on the earth and to possess them in the heavens. And if our wives and children do right, and we as fathers and husbands do right in this world we expect to have our wives and children in eternity. Let us live in that way which will secure the approbation of God, that we his representatives on the earth may magnify our calling, honor Him and maintain our integrity to the end, that we may be saved in His celestial kingdom, with our wives and children and brethren from generation to generation worlds without end: Amen.

RELIGIOUS SECTS IN SCOTLAND.—The *Edinburgh Courant* has an elaborate article analyzing the ecclesiastical statistics of Scotland. The results are summed up as follows:—"Adherents of the Church of Scotland, 1,426,280; Free Church, 739,035; U. P. Church 391,449. In round numbers, the Church has 300,000 adherents more than the two rivals put together, and embraces one-half of the population of Scotland, according to the marriage returns, stand as follows—Roman Catholics, 265,000; Episcopalians, 59,000; no church, and those not specified, 236,040."

PLATTE BRIDGE.—Nearly three thousand feet has been run and flagged, crossing twenty small islands, most or all of which seem available for bridge heads. The deepest quicksand found was less than seven feet, and many of the channels can be crossed without piles, or by the use of one section in the center. So far the prospects are fairer than has been the general impression, and if the north channels are susceptible of anything like a similar sub-division the bridge can be built. Scouts are now on the Little Blue, Spring Creek, and elsewhere, reporting as to timber, with orders to examine for stone, peat, coal, etc.—[*Kearney Herald*.]

CONSTITUTIONS.—When twitted with neglect of certain patients, Garth, the poet-physician, replied that half of them had constitutions so bad that no physician could cure them, and the rest had constitutions so good that no physician could kill them.

Varieties.

—A minister in Scotland recently, when his deacons hinted that he might preach three sermons on the Sabbath, said:—"Preach three sermons! Never! That is an invention of Beelzebub for destroying the effect of two good ones, and killing the minister."

—Josh Billings in treating of humorous lectures says:

Humor is hybrid, and is a nice cross between sense and nonsense.

I don't think it has ever been well defined; it is like the smell of a flower, hard to describe.

I have known men tell 4 good stories, and then spile them all by telling one poor one.

Much of a humorist's success depends upon the physick of his audience; a man who has the dyspepsia fast rate laughs under protest, but if his dinner rides easy you can tickle him with a skoop-shovel.

Humor sometimes lurks in the way a thing is said, and I have seen men who carried their fun in the wrinkles of their face.

Nonsense ain't humor, it is only a jest.

Humor must have some truth in it and a good deal don't hurt it.

I can steal a good philosophical lecture out of a library, but these cussed humorous lectures have so much original in them (or ought to have) that you can't calculate on them for certain—they are like twins—they can't be had nor they can't be stopped.

Upon the whole, as near as I can guess, my opinion is that humor is a natural disease that a man can't catch nor can't give to anybody else.

—People who are resolved always to please, at all events, frequently overshoot the mark. A lady of this sort, going to a friend's house, one morning, ran to the cradle, as soon as she came in, to see the fine "boy." Unfortunately the cat was occupying the baby's place; but before she could discover her mistake, she exclaimed, with uplifted eyes and hands, "Oh, what a sweet child—the very picture of its father!"

—A pretty girl says: "If our Maker thought it wrong for Adam to live single, when there was not a woman upon the earth, how criminally guilty are the old bachelors, with the world full of pretty girls."

—"I don't miss my church so much as you suppose," said a lady to her minister, who had called upon her during her illness, "for I make Betsey sit at the window as soon as the bell begins to chime, and tell me who are going to church, and whether they have got anything new."

—The following definition of the rights of women is given in a Vermont paper, "To love her lord with all her heart and her baby as herself—and to make good bread."

—An Irish waiter once complimented a salmon in the following manner:—"Faith, it's not two hours since that salmon was walking round his real estate with his hands in his pockets, never dreaming what a pretty invitashun he'd have to jine you gentlemen at dinner."

—Charles Lamb was sitting next a chattering woman at dinner who, observing he didn't attend to her, said—"You don't seem to be at all the better for what I am saying to you!"—"No ma'am," replied Lamb, "but the gentleman on the other side of me must, for it all came in at one ear and went out at the other!"

—A gentleman saw a notice of valuable information sent to any address on the receipt of ten cents, and thought that he must have ten cents' worth more of knowledge. He sent the sum, and received in answer the following: "Friend, for your ten cents, postage, &c., please find inclosed advice which may be of great value to you. As many persons are injured for weeks, months, and years by the careless use of a knife, therefore my advice is, when you use a knife, always whittle from you."

A SCION OF THE CHURCH.—"The first time I took my eldest boy to church," a minister's wife says, "when he was two years and a half old, I managed, with caresses and frowns, and candy, to keep him very still till the sermon was half done. By this time his patience was exhausted, and he climbed on the seat, looking at the preacher (his father) quite intently. Then, as if he had hit upon a certain relief for his troubles, he pulled me by the chin to attract my attention, and exclaimed, in a distinct voice, "Ma, make pa say Amen."