

salem in the days of Herod, when all the children were ordered to be slain under such an age, with the hopes of slaying the infant Savior. They might have suffered by the hand of the assassin, as the sons of many kings have done who were heirs apparent to the thrones of their fathers.

History is replete with circumstances of neck-or-nothing politicians dyeing their hands in the blood of those who stood in their way to the throne or to power.

That seed has had its influence upon the chosen of God in the last days. The same spirit inspires them that inspires their father, who bled and died upon the cross after the manner of the flesh.

"Well, but," says one, "there was certainly an injunction laid upon the Bishops in New Testament times, that they should have but one wife." This is brought up as a great argument against the position the Latter-day Saints have taken. In olden times they might have passed through the same circumstances as some of the Latter-day Saints had to in Illinois. What would it have done for us, if they had known that many of us had more than one wife when we lived in Illinois? They would have broken us up, doubtless, worse than they did. They may break us up, and rout us from place to another, but by and by we shall come to a point where we shall have all the women, and they will have none. You may think I am joking about this, but I can bring you the truth of God to demonstrate it to you. I have not advanced anything I have not got an abundance of backing for. There is more truth than poetry in this as sure as you live.

The Bishops anciently, in their office and callings, had a great deal to do with temporal matters—serving tables, attending to the poor, &c. And inasmuch as so much trust was reposed in them of a temporal character, they

were required to have a fair reputation, and must not stand in any relation that would in the least prejudice their reputation with the world of mankind.

In certain countries, plurality of wives is legal. Christendom think they are about everybody, and the "rest of mankind" are few and far between. I have traveled among nations and countries where this doctrine was tolerated by law, and I will venture to say, if we were to take a walk through the world tonight and find out those who are in favor of, or against, this doctrine, the majority would be in its favor. Could the whole world be assembled here before me, and a vote taken upon this subject, they would give us the right of conscience in this matter.

Has not the Muhammadan a right to be in favor of it? Did not God make him? And is not his right as dear to him as ours? Why should we set ourselves up as a little family of nations in Christendom, and say to the rest of the great family of the world, "You shall not do so and so, and you shall do this or that?" Why should we be restricted in this matter, while the great majority of the world decide in its favor?

Take this question up upon political principles, and what do the majority of the world say about it? They establish our right. Then take it upon the principles of natural philosophy, and the truth of our position is made still more apparent. Had I language to portray to the most delicate ear the principles of our existence, and the laws of our nature, the most stubborn skeptic would be obliged to yield to the power of truth. I might take up the subject in this point of light, but I will forbear, I will spare you. If I had a congregation of men, I would not spare them one whit.

The Bishop is to be the husband of