

Continued from page 293.
freak of a fanatic. When the leader of the Latter-day Saints announced to his persecuted and despised followers that God had revealed to him that plural marriages were the Divine will, it was scarcely deemed "worthy" of a sneer. Immediately after the announcement of this supposed revelation, as if frightened at the thought of so violent an innovation upon the civilization of the age, they wandered away from their fellow-men and hid themselves among the mountains of what was almost an unexplored portion of our national domain.

There for a time almost forgotten, they suffered and waited and labored as others of a better faith had frequently done before. Industrious, frugal, and zealous in the propagation of their religion, they rapidly increased in numbers and in wealth, while the outside world took no thought of them. The pioneer spirit of the people could not rest, and in about a quarter of a century they were no longer beyond the border, or upon the border, but were in the midst of us. In 1862, Congress, being controlled by that party which has never hesitated to grapple with evil wherever found or however strongly entrenched, passed laws declaring polygamy a crime and prescribing punishment for it. So strong had the institution become that those practicing it laughed at the idea of its being restrained by law. Public sentiment and the authority of the Church were so strong in its favor that officers and juries could not be found to execute the law against it. The Church was the supreme power. The Church claimed polygamy as a part of its creed, and claiming the law to be unconstitutional, they have openly defied it for twenty years. Now they add another defiance to those of the past by sending to these Halls as their representative one who openly avows himself a polygamist and declares that the Constitution of the United States protects him in it. It is not unnatural that he should make this claim, reared as he has been amid the influences of his Church. The most remarkable part of this is that he has found members on this floor who were not reared in the Mormon Church to assert that claim for him. Four of the distinguished gentlemen upon that committee advocate his claim and solemnly say to this House and to the country that the Constitution of the fathers protects the institution of polygamy in Utah. The distinguished gentlemen taking this position are without exception from the other side of this House.

It is but repeating familiar history to say that the greatest evils which have cursed us as a people have always found statesmen on the other side of the House to throw up constitutional breastworks for their defense, and plead the letter of the law in their extenuation. Nearly a quarter of a century ago I sat in the Senate gallery, at the other end of the Capitol, and heard a brilliant Democratic Senator, in the interest of slavery, claim that the Constitution gave Congress no power to prevent slavery in the Territories; that the provision in the Constitution, "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," now quoted and relied upon to some extent by all the members of the committee, gave no other authority than to sell or otherwise dispose of the public lands. Then I heard another distinguished Democratic Senator, in the interest of slavery also, insist that the clause quoted above made it obligatory upon Congress to legislate for the establishment and protection of slavery in the Territories. Thus it was that at every attempt to restrain or eradicate that evil the letter of the law was laid down and constitutional barriers raised up by gentlemen from the other side of the House to prevent it. There was no power under the Constitution, they told us, to destroy that which was threatening to destroy us.

A little later, when rebellion had its grip on the national throat, a Democratic President—and I cheerfully remember that he was the last of his line, and unless his party has changed views on that subject since, I will doubtless be pardoned for hoping that he may continue the last for all time—sat like an incubator while the enemy robbed us of our munitions of war and supplied himself, declaring that in the absence of positive legislation the Constitution gave no power to protect the government against rebellion.

And now comes another evil that threatens to inoculate our social system with the leprosy of the Orient. In comes in defiance of positive law, and asks to be publicly recognized by the admission of its representative to a seat in this House. Again we hear from the other side of the House that the Constitution, purged as it has been from every sentence, word, and letter which could possibly be construed as shielding evil, protects this man in his practice of polygamy, and that we must admit him.

In reading the reports in this contest we find that it has fallen to the lot of a gentleman from this side of the House to read the letter of the law in behalf of this representative of polygamy. The member of the committee on elections from Massachusetts, a State where republicanism has generally assumed its most radical form, tells us that the letter of the law compels us to bestow membership upon one whom he thinks should immediately thereafter be expelled. While the argument is ingenious and the authorities skillfully marshaled, yet one is disappointed on arriving at the end to find that the entire web is woven to cover a bit of sentiment. The proposition made by the gentleman from Massachusetts would read well in a story book. A master hand has tried it, and in my judgment he has succeeded in forming one of the finest climaxes in literature. Hugo describes a scene at sea. A gunner carelessly allowed a monster gun to escape from its fastenings. As the vessel rocked from side to side with the waves, the gun went thundering and pounding about the deck, threatening to send vessel and crew to the bottom of the sea. After an exhibition of extraordinary courage and strength, the gunner succeeded in again securing it. Calling the crew together, the commander spoke of his brave act, and in recognition thereof pinned upon his blouse the cross of Saint Louis, and then ordered him instantly shot for allowing the gun to escape. As I said before, this reads well in romance. As narrated by the great novelist it is sublime, startling; but this is no place for such things. The legislation of the country is supposed to be, and I believe is, the sober second thought of the people, and romantic climaxes and elaborately clad bits of sentiment partake largely of the ridiculous. What has this man done that entitles him to this distinction? Has he shown any obedience to law and an attachment to republican principles which entitle him to such a reward? On the contrary, he is an avowed law-breaker.

Another thing in connection with the dealings of this House with polygamy deserves a passing remark. While I have, I think, as cordial a hatred of the crime of polygamy as any other, I am not disposed to go as far in denunciation of the Mormon people as many who have addressed the House recently on measures affecting them. As a people I do not believe they deserve the harsh words that in the heat of debate have been spoken of them.

The history of the past shows us that religious fanaticism has in all ages caused both the barbarous and the civilized to do many strange and unreasonable things. I call it fanaticism without meaning to speak lightly or contemptuously of it, for in its most unreasonable phases there is a kind of heroism about it one cannot help but admire. In the Pagan world it manifests itself in long and toilsome pilgrimages and in self-inflicted torture. This is not confined to Pagan people. In Christendom the humiliation and sufferings of the Mau of Sorrows have been imitated by devotees in all ages. At one stage of our civilization men of great mental power and liberal culture, in obedience to what they thought their duty to God, fled from human society, and in caves and barren places spent their lives in solitude, privation and suffering. At another, statesmen, philosophers, and divines, for conscience's sake, denounced the virtue of cleanliness as the vice of pride, and passed their lives besmeared with filth and swarming with vermin. In every age of the world since the death of the Savior, devoted, conscientious, and pure-minded men and women, in the firm belief they were pleasing God, have denied themselves the common comforts of life; have starved, scourged, and tortured themselves, literally "living in the agonies of which other men die."

I do not recall an instance among Christians where the demands of the conscience of the devotee have led him to do any thing but "crucify

the flesh," except the instance of polygamy now under consideration. If we may believe our critics across the oceans, we are always doing something usual in a very unusual manner. It seems to have been left to us to first attempt to make the Christian religion contribute to the gratification of the desires of the flesh. That which all other Christian people crucify, the Latter Day Saint would gratify. That polygamy at its inception was the babe of lust I do not doubt, but it has grown into youth of conscience. That the few master minds who arbitrarily control the Mormon Church may be insincere I will not dispute, but I would do violence to my sense of right and propriety if I joined in an outcry against the sincerity of the mass of the Mormon people. The fact that they are sincere in what they term their religious belief does not change the attitude of this question here. They may as well claim immunity from punishment for any other crime as for that of polygamy. Are the honorable gentlemen who are now claiming that polygamy is a religious tenet, and therefore protected by the Constitution, willing to bear the odium of the other conclusions to which their doctrines legitimately lead? Whether willing or not, the people will hold them and the party they represent responsible.

I am one of those who honor the patriotism of the fathers. They were the wisest and best men of their day. They had no Jupiter's brain from which they could strike forth a full grown Minerva, but they wrought as wisely as they knew, and left the completion of their work to those who came after them. I have felt when I saw the leaders of the democratic party holding up the Constitution as a warrant for the extension of slavery, as a barrier in the way of protecting the life of the nation, and as an edict robbing men of citizenship, that they insulted the memory of those grand men. I feel it more forcibly now, when I see them erecting it as a shield for the loathsome crime of polygamy. I believed in the earlier contests of this generation as I believe in this contest, that the fathers put no word in the Constitution and left none of it with intent to protect crime or tolerate oppression. As we have conquered the other evils, and saved the life of the nation by striking directly at them, I see no reason why we should hesitate now. I shall therefore deal as hard a blow as I can at polygamy by voting that its representative shall not have a seat in this House.

Mr. Calkins. Mr. Speaker, before demanding the previous question it is due that I should say to the House that Mr. Cannon has personally asked me for an hour in his own behalf. I make this statement for the reason that only a few minutes ago Mr. Cannon notified me that he would like to have an hour. I cannot see why it should be granted, as four hours have already been given to that side of the question for discussion by unanimous consent. Still as a matter of justice to him, I feel bound to submit the fact to the House.

Mr. Sparks. I can see very well why it should be granted. Here is the very gentleman himself who is to be affected by the action here, and it would only seem to be a matter of right to allow him an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. Calkins. Gentlemen will bear me witness that I have not objected to the extension of any time of any gentleman who has taken the floor upon this question, but I supposed that the hour asked by the gentleman from Utah would have been taken out of the time allowed for debate upon the other side of this question.

Mr. Randall. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there has ever been a case where an application of this sort has been refused?

Mr. Calkins. I understand, if the gentleman will allow me, the practice has been that when an understanding has been reached, or an agreement arrived at between the parties for an equal division of the time, that only that time could be occupied, and no extension of it under that agreement was allowed, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. Randall. Then I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah be allowed the honor.

Mr. Calkins. I am not going to object; but I do not consent, because I think it is fairly within the agreement that all the time on that side has been already occupied.

Mr. Cassidy. I submit that the

time should be granted, and if necessary that an equal time be taken on the other side of the question.

Mr. Atkins. I would ask the gentleman from Indiana, if that argument is made, if it would not be well to adjourn and let the matter go over until to-morrow?

Mr. Calkins. No. I want to close the question to-night.

Mr. Randall. Then I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed an hour.

The Speaker. The Chair will submit the question to the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah, the contestant, be allowed an hour. Is there objection?

Mr. Reed. There will be no objection if we can close up the matter to-night.

Mr. Randall. I will assist the gentleman to do so, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Reed. I think we can close it up to-night by extending the session an hour or two later than usual.

Mr. Atkins. Is the gentleman from Indiana going to occupy his hour of the previous question?

Mr. Calkins. I have an hour after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. Randall. That is usual there is no objection to that.

Mr. Speaker. The Chair will again submit the question. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. Reed. It is understood that we are to close this question to-night.

Mr. Randall. I have only spoken for myself.

Mr. Reed. I think in all fairness it should be closed to-night.

Mr. Humphrey. I shall object, unless an understanding is reached that it is to be closed up to-night.

Mr. Randall. There has not been any effort at delay in this case and I have no knowledge that there will be any.

Mr. Humphrey. If we are to close it this afternoon I have no objection.

The Speaker. The objection must be absolute, or the Chair will regard it as no objection.

Mr. Humphrey. I shall not insist upon a vote to-night, but insist that the previous question be ordered and take a vote in the morning.

Mr. Calkins. I will not agree to that. I want to dispose of it to-night.

The Speaker. The Chair will again submit the question.

Mr. Calkins. Before that, if the Chair will permit me, I will ask the gentleman whether or not thirty minutes will be sufficient?

Mr. Randall. He has asked an hour; let him have it.

Mr. Calkins. Well, give him an hour.

Mr. Sparks. Let him have an hour, and if he does not consume it himself he can yield to other gentlemen.

The Speaker. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman will be allowed to give the hour away if he does not choose to occupy it himself. The chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Calkins. I now demand the previous question, with the understanding that the contestant is to occupy his hour after the previous question is seconded and that I am to have my hour.

The Speaker. Is there unanimous consent to that understanding?

There was no objection.

Mr. Calkins. But before calling the previous question I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Moulton] to offer formally his resolution, that it may be read from the Clerk's desk and considered pending.

The Speaker. The Chair will state there are three resolutions reported by the majority of the committee, the first declaring that Mr. Campbell is not entitled to a seat; the second declaring that Mr. Cannon is not entitled to a seat, and the third declaring vacant the seat of the Delegate from the Territory of Utah. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Moulton] is recognized to offer an amendment, which the clerk will read.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That George Q. Cannon was duly elected and returned as Delegate from the Territory of Utah and is entitled to a seat as Delegate in the Forty-seventh Congress.

Mr. Calkins. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Thompson] to offer an amendment by way of a substitute for the resolution of the committee.

The clerk read the resolution of-

ferred by Mr. Thompson, of Iowa, as follows:

Resolved, That Geo. Q. Cannon is not entitled to a seat in the Forty-seventh Congress of the United States as a Delegate from the Territory of Utah.

Resolved, That Allen G. Campbell is entitled to a seat in the Forty-seventh Congress of the United States, as Delegate from the Territory of Utah.

Mr. Calkins. I now demand the previous question on the resolutions of the committee, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Calkins moved to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The Speaker. The contestant, Mr. Cannon, is recognized for one hour.

[Mr. Cannon, of Utah, then addressed the House, whose speech has already appeared in the News.]

[To be continued.]

BY TELEGRAPH.

PER WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

A MERICAN.

WASHINGTON, 22.—Senator Miller introduced in the Senate to-day a joint resolution declaring martial law to exist in Alaska and authorizing the President to detail an officer of the army to act as military governor whenever necessary, and to have command of the land and naval forces. Senator Miller has received a number of telegrams from San Francisco calling his attention to the lawless condition of affairs. Among those who have telegraphed are Wm. T. Cabman, Thos. Brown and Col. J. D. Frye. The Senator consulted with the President on the subject and he suggested it would be advisable that Congress should authorize him to declare martial law before issuing a proclamation to that effect. The impression among those in Washington who are familiar with Alaska affairs, is that the joint resolution should be immediately passed. It is believed the recently reported troubles are probably at an end by this time, but similar occurrences are likely to be reported at any moment.

The counsel for Guiteau says he has a plan which he would put in execution if the new trial is adverse to his client to save the country from everlasting disgrace by hanging an insane man. It is thought Reed would apply for the *commission de lunatics inquirendo*.

The Postmaster-General has sent a letter to the House recommending that the postage on second-class matter (papers and magazines) be abolished. He states that fourth-class matter (merchandise) is carried at a loss to the Government, and if the Government is to be taxed for the transportation of either class, it should be for second class.

MUSCATINE, Ia., 22.—There are new and startling developments in the McMenormon patricide, 12 miles west of here. The girl Mary, on Saturday, declared she shot her father in self defense. Her brother and older sister are here in jail. The *Journal* has a full confession from the two girls, showing that the murder was committed by the brother in order that the children might have things their own way at home, and that it was arranged that the youngest sister should acknowledge the shooting, with the idea that the plea of self defense and her extreme youth would save her from punishment. There is much excitement over the case here.

SAN FRANCISCO, 22.—A Tombstone dispatch says: The Mexican Custom House officer who arrived here to-day, reports the Juhs band of Indians are being driven across the line into Arizona. It is believed the Indians are aiming to reach the San Carlos reservation, where they will quietly mingle with the friendly tribes already there. Gen. Reynolds is in command of the pursuing Mexican forces.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., 21.—Four attempts have been made since dawn to destroy the office of the *daily World* newspaper. Two of the fires were extinguished without an alarm, for the others the fire department was called out. Loss so far trifling.

GRAND RAPIDS, Mich., 22.—A fire at Wymon, burned O. W. Avery's saw mill yesterday. Loss \$20,000 to \$30,000; insurance \$15,000. It also destroyed 4,500,000 feet of lumber, and 2,000,000 shingles, be-