

The Doctrine and Covenants shows that control in temporal matters is a doctrine, for the revelations go into detail. Mr. Baskin was mistaken when he said it was not in the late edition of the Doctrine and Covenants. Never was there greater blasphemy than when Joseph Smith gave that as a revelation. The people who would believe that God said such things are just the people to be priestridden slaves. H. C. Kimball told the people to do as the Priesthood said, whether it was right or wrong. Think of a man favored of God, to receive revelations, teaching such things as are in the Doctrine and Covenants, in the revelation on celestial marriage, regarding the forgiveness of sins and cursing. Think of Wilford Woodruff being able to curse, and God approving it, and saying that a people under that bond are free? That is heresy; it cannot be true. The Doctrine and Covenants has directions as to what the members of the Church should do in temporal affairs. Can any one doubt that they believe the head of the Church is the representative of God? and, if he has this power, that men whose consciences are bound by this superstition have surrendered their free agency.

Polygamy is believed in by all the Mormons. For 30 years the government has been trying to destroy it, and are no nearer now than when they started. Is it persecution to say that such persons should be excluded from citizenship? The government says that it will give them protection, but will not admit them to citizenship. I cannot see how a member of that Church can conscientiously ask to become a citizen. Neither can I see that a man who believes polygamy is right can take an oath of allegiance to the government that is trying to overthrow it. If I believed that polygamy was right, I would have my right hand cut off before I would swear to obey the laws of a government that is trying to overthrow what I believe to be right. I think no sincere Mormon takes such an oath without a mental reservation. I think that no man who believes in polygamy has a right to the franchise, for such a social order is opposed to the monogamic order on which the government is based. We don't desire to persecute. We desire to uphold the arms of the government in crushing polygamy, and to weaken the power of the Church. It is not persecution to say that these people will have the protection of the laws, but so long as they aid the Church by membership they shall not be admitted to citizenship.

In regard to blood atonement we say that the testimony conceals the real facts of the case. It is claimed that murder and adultery can be atoned for only by death, but that is to be inflicted by the law of the land. They do not call attention to the law that adulterers shall be destroyed. I say that the idea that the Church has no authority to punish the crime of adultery, according to the law of God, is not correct—that it is not sincere. In the lecture on blood atonement,

C. W. Penrose says that the time will come when the law of God shall be enforced against adulterers. In the same lecture, speaking of the laws against polygamy, he says those laws are unconstitutional and not binding on the people. That shows they believe the Constitution gives them the right to do anything in obedience to any revelation which they claim to be from God. They say the nation is persecuting the Saints in opposing the practice of polygamy, and that is why Wilford Woodruff prayed for the destruction of the government.

As to the penalty for apostasy, the witnesses say there is nothing but excommunication; but Brigham Young said that rather than apostates should flourish here he would unsheath his knife and conquer or die.

Surely there is no court that will admit to citizenship members of an organization such as the history of this Church shows it to be.

#### LE GRAND YOUNG

said that the facts were all that the court should listen to. Inference of any character should not be taken as evidence, especially when the man interested, the applicant in this case, has taken no part in any of the transactions testified to. Mr. Young read the law on naturalization, and then proceeded with his argument. The discretion of the court in these matters is merely a legal discretion; it is not captious. When a man makes the requisite showing, and shows the proper conduct, it is the duty of the court to admit him. An objection to him must be on legal grounds. Mr. Moore has applied for citizenship. He has shown proper residence, good moral character and attachment to the Constitution. He is a qualified applicant, and we demand that he be allowed to take the oath and that the court give judgment for him.

The objectors said they objected to him because he had taken an oath against the government. They proposed to show this, and we came here to answer them. We have answered them. We have shown that no such oath has been taken. Mr. Young reviewed the testimony of the witnesses for the objectors. It had been claimed that men had been murdered by the Danites. They referred to the killing, by the officers of the law, of the notorious desperado, Ike Potter. This case did not suit them, so they dropped it, and got Wardell's story about the killing of a man named Green. This is the only time in this Territory that a man has been named as having been blood atoned. We challenged them to the issue, and after 40 years of talk we have this one case. They stand or fall by this record. They came to prove the infamy of the Church by this their champion case. But where has it gone to? Never have I heard such a statement as this Wardell made; he went on to say that Hickman confessed it. Such a story is too absurd. Bill Hickman was a murderer, and lived too long, but he never was fool enough to confess as Wardell says. No man who ever knew him would believe such

a statement. If there was no other evidence this would be sufficient to stamp Wardell's story as false. For forty years there has been a cry of blood atonement, and now the best legal talent of the Territory comes forward with this case at last, to say that the Mormons are a bloody people. Wardell is the kind of witness they have brought here to prove their case—and the witnesses have swept away even a possibility of the truth of his story.

The witness Cahoon says that there was no oath against the government, but he inferred, etc. It is the truth that we want considered in this case, not inferences. Cahoon says there was nothing of an unlawful nature in the Endowment.

McGuffie said he had taught that Brigham Young was God. He was just such an idiot as to do so. But if he had taught it in public, he would not have remained in the Church as long as he did. I do not believe he ever taught it at all, any more than he heard that the Endowment oath never existed.

As for Gilmor, he is an apostate with all that the term implies—a man who quarrels with his neighbors, a man who cannot be believed under oath, as the witnesses here say.

But they say H. W. Lawrence is respectable. His early life was in the Church. He spent 21 or 22 years in the Church, and was in the Endowment House. He does not say he apostatized because there was anything wrong there, or because he was opposed to "Mormonism." He says he left because his friends took issue with Brigham Young in regard to the control of temporal affairs. He says the only reason was because he did not believe that Brigham Young should control private affairs. He says that his custom fell off after he left the Church, and he was socially ostracised. That is the secret of his venom to the people. It was because he was denied the privileges he had had before. No man oppressed him; but those who had patronized him ceased to do so. He says he stood by his friends; but he forgot that the people who had patronized him would do the same thing, and when they did he became venomous. But with all this he does not intimate that there is anything unlawful in the Endowment. On the witness stand he contradicted their witnesses. They did not dare to ask him if there was any oath against the government, and it was only brought out on cross-examination. Then he said there was a covenant for the avenging of the blood of the Prophets, but that the government was not referred to. His is an emphatic denial that there is any oath of avenging the blood of the Prophets on this nation.

The other side say that the government was meant. That is the first time that the government has been charged with being responsible for the murder of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and I say the charge is false. The government is not and was not responsible. The deed was done by