State in this Union, but that is no reason why whole communities should be disfranchised. He has cited an incident which he sought to make very dramatic. He had seen "an alleged second wife on the witness-stand and heard her swear that she was not married to the defendant." Well, now, if she was "an alleged second wife," could she in law be married to the defendant? May not her lawyer have advised her to make such an answer, holding that in law she was not a wife?

But technicalities aside. If any such case existed, and I can not say it did not, the woman was doubtless a plural wife, and to save her husband, the father of her children, from merciless prosecution, to save him upon whom she and her unborn babe were dependent for support, she denied that she was married to him. While I do not justify any person in testifying falsely, I will say that it is not the first time in the world's history that women have sworn falsely to save their husbands from punishment. On the mimic stage such women are heroines, and their acts are applauded to the echo.

The gentleman had no word of condemnation for the cruel law, the brutal prosecutor, and the inexorable judge who compelled the woman to testify under such circumstances. If he had told you how helpless, delicate women and innocent children were hunted down like wild beasts, dragged into court, badgered by lawyers, and who, failing to testify to suit the prosecution, were thrust into filthy prisons, among thieves and murderers, and kept there till forced to answer questions which would convict their husbands and fathers, he could have drawn a picture much more realistic than any afforded by the horrors of polygamy.

He failed to tell you how in Idaho and Utah juries were packed to convict Mormons of polygamous practices; how the Territories were ransacked to find material for juries that would bring in the right kind of verdicts. He forgot to recite how a high court official in his Territory, after an herculean effort to secure a jury "warranted to convict," sacrilegiously declared that he had secured a jury "who would convict Jesus Christ Himself." The gentleman has not told you a fractional part of the appalling misery and degradation to which polygamist women and children have been subjected in the Territory of Idaho. Had I his learning and eloquence I could draw a picture that would make the angels weep; but I rather hang my head in shame and blush for humanity than speak of the outrages committed in the name of law in Utah and Idaho for the alleged suppression of polygamy.

The gentleman from Idaho and others on the republican side of the House have, either by direct allegation or artful innuendo, charged the Mormon people with disloyalty to the government. I deny the charge, and I assert that few people of any age or country have been more patient, peaceable, and submissive than the Mormons—often under such circumstances of palpable wrong and oppression as have incited resistance and insurrection in other communities.

Reference has been made to certain expressions of individuals among the Mormons, under circumstances of excitement and exasperation, as evidence of disloyalty of the whole Mormon people. We are also arraigned for disloyalty because we have sometimes protested against laws and decisions which we deemed to be oppressive and unjustly discriminative against our people. Our belief in God as the supreme ruler of the universe and His overruling providence and authority has been distorted by our enemies into treason against the government. How would gentlemen who are citizens of the States like to have their loyalty tried by such standards as these? The constituents of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Baker) may freely denounce the governor and the legislature, criticise the decisions of the judiciary, or denounce their sheriffs, and even send them to the penitentiary.

The constituents of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Struble) may meet in State convention and denounce the prohibition laws and demand their repeal. The farmers of Kansas, the constituents of the gentleman from that State (Mr. Perkins), may meet in convention, arraign United States Senators, and protest against laws which they deem wrongful and oppressive. Again, good and loyal Christians all over this country may demand such a change as would recognize "God in the Constitution as the supreme ruler of the universe." All these things may be done by non-Mormons with impunity; but if Mormons criticise and protest against cruel laws and wicked officials their acts are brought forward here and elsewhere as evidence of disloyalty and treason.

In this free country there can be no criterion of loyalty except obedience to the constitution and laws. The Medes and Persians were the only people within my knowledge of history with whom the laws were thought to be so sacred, perfect, and infallible that they were held to be perpetual and irrepealable. The protest against these laws was treason punishable in the fiery furnace and the lion's den.

The right of the people of a republican government to protest against a law, or demand its repeal, or agitate for reform is not to be limited to cases where the people are clearly in the right—that is begging the question. But it is hard and cruel, as was the case with the Mormons in Utah, to be charged with disloyalty for denouncing and criticising acts and decisions of Federal officers that were clearly wrongful and oppressive. Recent instances of this kind were related by an ex-Utah commissioner, Hon. A. B. Carlton, before the committee on Territories of this House. Though personally cognizant of the facts related by him, I prefer to give his statement, as he, being a non-Mormon, is not an interested party. I therefore condense from his testimony as follows:

The Federal judges in Utah, a few years ago, made an extraordinary decision in the application of what was called "segregation." The third section of the so-called Edmunds act of 1882 makes it an indictable offense for any male person to cohabit with more than one woman, and fixes the maximum punishment at a fine of $300 and imprisonment for six months. But the judges invented a new doctrine and called it "segregation," the gist of which was that if a man had been living with two or more wives for three years, the period of the statute of limitations, the grand jury might "segregate;" that is, divide up the three years into periods of a year, a month, a week, or a day each, and bring in a separate indictment for each one of the "segregated" periods, so that the three years being "segregated" into periods of one day each, the offenders of three years' continuous cohabitation might be indicted one thousand and ninety-five times with commulative fines and imprisonments, amounting to $328,500 fines and five hundred and forty-seven years and six months' imprisonment.

This doctrine was applied in many cases. The Mormons criticised it as contrary to law and against the whole course of judicial decisions in similar cases both in England and America, and that by a sort of judicial legislation the judges sought to punish a man an indefinite number of times for one offense, in violation of the Constitution. But the judges gave no heed to these "disloyal" complaints, and went on "segregating" until the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the cases and decided that the Mormons were right and the Utah judges were wrong. (*In re* Snow, 120 United States Supreme Court Reports, 274.)

Another case of Mormon "disloyalty" occurred in the autumn of 1882. A majority of the Utah Commission decided that a man was not entitled to be registered as a voter who had married a plural wife subsequent to July 1, 1862 (the date of the passage of the first act concerning polygamy), although all his wives, or all but one, had died from ten to twenty years before.

The Mormons were so disloyal that they criticised the ruling as absurd, unreasonable, and contrary to law. "How," they asked, "can a man be a polygamist who has no wife at all?" This decision, however, continued to be enforced by the Commission for over two years, and many of the leading citizens were denied the right to vote or hold office (among them William Jennings, the mayor of Salt Lake City), although they had had no more than one wife for many years. Finally, after the customary "law's delay," the Supreme Court of the United States decided that this ruling of the Commission was erroneous. (Murphy vs. Ramsey et al., 115 Supreme Court Reports, page 15.)

The facts stated by Judge Carlton are undeniable, for they are matters of record in the Supreme Court of the United States.

That the position of the Mormon Church relative to laws and governments may be fully understood, I quote from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, a standard book of the Church in matters of faith and doctrine. My time will not permit me to read the whole article, but I will print it with my remarks. I will content myself by reading two or three extracts.

The speaker here read from the section of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants relating to "Governments and Laws in General."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the accepted doctrine of the church, and the utterances of no man in the church, be he Elder, Apostle, or Prophet, if in conflict with these precepts, can be set up as superior to this standard.

The advocates of this bill divert attention from the real issue by crying out "Polygamy!" "Polygamy!!" thus seeking to make it appear that those who are opposing the disfranchising clause in this constitution are opposed to the suppression of polygamy. I contend that it is not a question of polygamy at all. No one asks that polygamists shall vote, hold office, or serve on juries. The