

## THE TWIN RELIC AGAIN.

Messrs Editors.—In your first note attached to my communication you say, "the writer leaves wholly out of view the consideration that a practice may be legal in Salt Lake City and illegal in Boston." Not at all; the question is not what *may* be, but *is*, polygamy legal there? Will the Banner please inform us when and how polygamy was legalized in the Territory of Utah?

[If a practice is not made illegal by the laws of Utah, we assume that it is legal under those laws. Now polygamy has not been made illegal.]

Again you say, I "ignore the fact that the essence of the crime of bigamy is its fraudulent intent." I cannot ignore it because it is *not* a fact. My critic should know that in point of law it would not serve the bigamist one grain, should he prove to the court that his wife and every one concerned not only were thoroughly informed in relation to the matter, but advised and counseled to his marriage with a second woman.

[We were not speaking of the legal construction put upon bigamy by any particular State, but of the simple fact that its essence as a crime or offence against human rights consists in its fraudulent intent. If our correspondent chooses to contend that polygamy is a technical crime whether committed in Utah, Turkey, or Massachusetts, then to argue the point with him would be an absurd waste of time. More than three-fourths of the people of the globe are at this day polygamists, and polygamy was sanctioned explicitly in the Old Testament, and tacitly by the New. We think polygamy is opposed to the highest civilization; we distinctly oppose it; but we have respect enough for Abraham and Isaac, and even Mahomet, not to pronounce it a crime in the sense of an infraction of divine laws. It may be technically a crime in Massachusetts, but it is not one in Utah.]

Again: "There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States to show that a polygamist State has not a perfect right to legalize polygamy." What has that to do with Utah, which has not legalized polygamy? And that being the case, Utah being a territory of the United States, why is not the marriage of one man to several women, just as much *bigamy* here as anywhere else?

[The marriage of one man to "several women" is not "bigamy," but polygamy. Our correspondent would seem to be unaware of the fact that a bigamist is a person who has *two* wives or husbands at once.]

And why should it not be proceeded against, according to the common law of the country?

[Simply because the territorial laws of Utah do not provide for the punishment of bigamists or polygamists, where the essence of a criminal intent, namely, fraud, in the case, is wanting. The "common law of the country" is a very vague and unmeaning expression.]

You say: "Polygamy is not defended on the ground that the Mormon religion approves it, but on the simple ground that a territorial community who choose to practice it, whether for religious, or physiological, or any other reasons, have a perfect right to do so." Again: "Polygamy is legal in Utah simply because the people have established it." Does the mere practice of a system or art by any number of people legalize that system? What establishes a thing? Webster says: "Established: set, fixed firmly, founded, ordained, enacted, ratified, confirmed;" but nowhere says "practiced." I have always understood that our territories are special children of the general government, and though necessarily framing some local laws for the time being, are specially held amenable to the common laws of the country, in cases not provided for by their own statutes. Now will the Banner still contend that because a portion of the citizens of a city in one of our territories commence practicing a crime, called bigamy in every State in the Union, that that fact legalizes that crime there, and consequently our government has no just right to interfere in the matter? I confess the Banner here "has got beyond our depth." You say: "We are considering polygamy in its legal aspects," and open and undisguised polygamy, in a polygamist community, has not the elements of a crime under the statutes." Let us see how this reasoning will work: A polygamist community, ac-

ording to your theory, is a city or town where a majority of its people openly practice this plurality-wife system.

[Do not frame theories for us, for which we give you no authority. A polygamist community, according to our theory, is not a city or town, or a ward or street of a city or town; but a State, either actual or potential, in the form of a territory. Therefore, your illustration of a town in Massachusetts defying the laws of the State is wholly inapt and pointless. What we assert is, that if a large majority of the people of a State chose to sweep away all marriage laws whatever, they could do so for all that the Constitution of the United States says to the contrary. And so if a State chooses to abolish all penalties against polygamy, it can undoubtedly do so.]

The people of a certain town in Massachusetts, gathered there, it may be, for the purpose, go into the business; they do so openly and undisguised, claim it a part of their religion, and christen the child polygamy. There is not a word in the Constitution about polygamy, nothing in the statutes of Massachusetts about polygamy; true, we have statutes against adultery, but you say adultery is an offence wholly outside of marriage and in violation of it; true, we have laws against bigamy, but you say, "That the essence of the crime of bigamy is in its fraudulent intent," the italics being yours.

Consequently you are very consistent when you say, "However we may deplore the existence of polygamy, we have no right to say that it shall not exist in a State where a majority desire it." Indeed you have made out quite a case. What is to hinder Massachusetts from becoming another Utah, and Boston a Salt Lake?

[Plainly nothing whatever is to prevent Massachusetts being like Utah if a majority of the people choose to have it so. We told you so twice or thrice before.]

Why not invite our Mormon brethren to return and occupy some of our sparsely settled counties, outvote the natives, and establish polygamy? Would I be simple enough to stigmatize a Turkish gentleman, who may have more than one wife, as a criminal like these bigamists? Should said Turk, after becoming an American citizen, as are the Mormons, take to himself several wives, we are "simple enough" to stigmatize him as a bigamist, and so would the laws of every State of the Union. Pray why not?

[But we were speaking of a Turk, and not of an American citizen. You seem to contend that polygamy has in it the essence of a crime independent of statute laws—and we contend just the contrary—and all history, sacred and profane, is against you, and the practice of all un-Christianized nations is against you.]

Would the Banner be simple enough to stigmatize the cannibal gentlemen, or human sacrificers, as criminals, who may come to this country, become citizens, obtain a majority of votes in some town or State, and establish their social and religious system, and commence feeding on the missionaries sent them? It is their religion, the custom of their country, and not a word in the Constitution or statute law against cannibalism.

## A SPIRITUALIST.

[To class polygamy with cannibalism, theft, or any crime against humanity, is simply childish and absurd. What a libel is it on human nature to suppose that when the great religions, which at this day have most influence upon the most advanced portions of the race—the Jewish and Christian—sanction polygamy, that it has the same essence of criminality, abstractly considered, with cannibalism and other gross crimes!]—Banner of Light.

## LUCERN.

Editor Deseret News:

We take the liberty to call the attention of our farmers to this valuable plant.

Some years ago it was introduced here from Switzerland. It belongs to the clover family; grows best on warm grounds; has hard roots, piercing the ground three to ten feet deep; can in this climate be cut from three to five times every season; and no other fodder-plant will easily compete with it in productiveness, to feed cows, sheep, and working animals.

It is commonly sowed in the spring,

and in well cultivated and manured land; 15 to 25 pounds of seeds to the acre. It will yield two crops the first year, or more. Oats or other grain may be sowed with the lucern seed, and cut green with the first crop. The seed should be covered from one to two inches deep, and kept moist enough to start the incipient growth.

The first crop, the second year, generally can be cut about the last of May; in our "Dixie," likely long before that time. It should not be cut before in blossom.

When wanted for hay, lucern is treated like clover, so that the valuable leaves be not lost.

Efficiency in this line of farming, as in others, is of course only arrived at by perseverance and experience.

The enormous quantity of fodder that this plant will yield, when properly treated, draws a corresponding amount of strength from the ground, which must be compensated by manuring. Top manuring should be applied every fall just before winter sets in.

Animals should not be staked, or let loose on lucern, it is very detrimental to the yield afterward, it should only be cut and brought to the animals.

Recommendation, we think, is only needed for those who are unacquainted with it; when known, lucern will recommend itself; it is undoubtedly for this climate the best fodder-plant known.

Thirty rods of good lucerne will stable-feed a common sized cow. For a family with only an acre of land, up to the farmer of ten sections, lucerne will prove very profitable as a fodder plant. If the owner of only one cow, and one acre garden lot, would sow one-fourth of his lot with lucerne, give the cow and land a little extra attention, and not send the cow off four to six miles every day, to feed mostly on weeds and brush, he would have milk and butter for his family. And if the farmer sowed one-fourth of his area with lucerne, it would revolutionize his present farming system, give useful occupation to his boys, and teach him more completely the value of his land. Each acre of land with lucerne would abundantly sustain two cows, summer and winter; and after he got started well, and gained experience, he could most likely double the amount.

One acre of lucerne, in well cultivated, irrigated and manured land will yield from ten to fifteen tons of the very best kind of hay, in three or four cuttings. It is particularly well adapted for irrigation, in our dry and warm climate; it grows best in the warmest part of the summer, when properly irrigated. On sandy ground, three irrigations to each crop is not too much.

If scarcity of water occurs, lucerne may be without water for months, without damage to the life of the plant; it will again reinvigorate to its full strength, when watered. This is on account of its deep and heavy roots.

For stable use it should be cut in the morning, while cool, and brought under shade; and when during our hot summer days, you appear in the stable, to feed your animals, they will appreciate their keeper, and relish the cool nourishing green fodder.

It is within the reach of farmers and gardeners to grow enough lucerne to stable-feed their cows and work-animals. By thus increasing manure will enrich the land, and add greatly to the productiveness of our valleys.

It would be no great expense for the farmer to sow half of one acre of lucerne for each cow and work animal he has on the farm, as well as for what he has running at large on the range. Does it take any great amount of insight in farming, to see what change it would cause, if the farmer stable-fed his cattle, horses and mules? Double the area of land would at least be manured every year, which would more than double his grain production; and where he now makes one pound of butter, he would probably make three. A good deal of time would be saved from hunting on the range, as well as the 25 per cent. losses in strayed, stolen and drowned stock.

Another thing: the wild grass, on the benches, hills and mountains near the settlements, has not much of a future; it propagates not by the root; and where the seeds are eaten off, in a few years, the grazing land belongs to the past. Hence, farmers will be under the necessity of growing fodder on their farms. This, we think, will eventually prove a blessing, by obliging farmers to be rational, and really take care of their flocks.

If we were only rid of those uninvited official gentlemen suckers, sharks and peace disturbers, so that we could have peace, we would go on and improve,

enrich and beautify, and make the wilderness blossom in abundance and luxury. C. A. M.

## THE COAL SUPPLY OF ENGLAND.

A London correspondent of an eastern exchange writes:

The commissioners appointed to enquire into the several matters relating to coal in the United Kingdom have published the first volume of their reports, comprising a general report and two sub-reports. In the face of the cry so generally raised in such alarming prophecy that the coal supply, the basis of English wealth and industry, is drawing to an end, these reports possess grave interests for the English public, and I am probably not wrong in attributing to American readers a share in this feeling. The report dispels some of the fears entertained by coal alarmists, in estimating the available amount of coal in the British Isles at one hundred and forty-six thousand, four hundred and eighty millions of tons, sufficient to last the country two hundred and twenty-six years. As chemists are promising us discoveries which shall enable us to produce heat with the hydrogen of decomposed water, this disclosure may, to persons of a sanguine disposition, or to such as "take no thought for the morrow," appear a most hopeful prospect; but the commissioners take a different view. They have taken five years to investigate the matter before them, and though one volume seems a poor result of so prolonged researches, its pages bespeak an amount of labor and careful investigation which amply accounts for the tardy progress. They assume four thousand feet to be the extreme depth down to which coal may be at present profitably worked, and leaving out of account beds of less than a foot in this chain, they find the unexhausted treasures, down to that depth in mines already known, to amount to ninety thousand two hundred and seven millions of tons. The strata lying below this depth furnishes, as far as they are known, another seven thousand three hundred and twenty millions. The remaining fifty-six thousand two hundred and seventy-three millions are added from presumable beds at workable depths under the Permian, new red sandstone, and other superincumbent strata. The hope of an escape from the dreaded exhaustion of our stock of coal is based upon the assumption that, besides the beds already referred to, there is coal in the south-east of England—a very convenient situation for practical use. A suggestion that this might be so was thrown out many years ago by Mr. Godwin Austen, who showed that the coal treasures thinning out under the chalk near Therouanne, in France, probably set in again near Calais, and are prolonged in the line of the Thames valley, through which they may extend to the Bath and Bristol coal area. Though opposed by the late Sir R. Murchison, this theory has still many adherents, and by the rule that we believe what we wish, it is not likely to lose in popularity. Mr. Prestwick, the member of the commission intrusted with the investigation of the south of the kingdom, adopts, on the whole, Mr. Godwin Austen's view, presuming coal to exist at a depth of 1,000 or 1,200 feet under the cretaceous rocks of South-eastern England. The commission dwell with particular stress on the terrible waste common to most coal mines, by which, in the best case, ten per cent., in a very large number of instances, however, as much as forty per cent., of the gross produce is sacrificed and uselessly lost.

The sweetest, the most clinging affection is often shaken by the slightest breath of unkindness, as the delicate rings and tendrils of the vine are agitated by the faintest air that blows in summer. An unkind word from one beloved often draws blood from many a heart which would defy the battle-axe of hatred, or the keenest edge of vindictive satire. Nay, the shade, the gloom of the face, familiar and dear, awakens pain. These are the little thorns which, though men of a rougher form may make their way through them without feeling much, extremely incommode persons of a more refined turn in their journey through life, and make their traveling irksome and unpleasant.

Much of the unhappiness in this world arises from giving utterance to hasty, unkind words.