

question is, shall Mormons who have never entered into any polygamous relations—who have never violated any law, either of Idaho or the United States, many of whom probably do not believe in the doctrine of plurality of wives; shall these men, possessing every other qualification to entitle them to the franchise, be deprived of it because they belong to a church or organization which holds that under certain circumstances it is not sinful for a man to marry more than one wife? The clause reads:

No person is permitted to vote, serve as juror, or hold any civil office * * * who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society which teaches, advises, counsels, encourages, or aids any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage.

Under this provision every member of the Mormon Church who in any manner, however remote, contributes to the support of that Church will be disfranchised. If he donates to any charitable institution, any Sabbath school, college, academy, or hospital connected with that Church he is to be disfranchised. Nay, more, any person though not a member of the Mormon Church who contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement, etc., is to be disfranchised.

The language is unmistakable, "who is a member of or contributes to the support," etc. This provision is doubtless intended to be made applicable to that class of independent Gentiles in Idaho who, refusing to wear the anti-Mormon collar, are stigmatized by my gentlemanly friend from Idaho as "Jack Mormons." The gentlemen who are supporting this infamous measure surely do not see to what lengths they are going to accomplish a political advantage.

Under a Territorial statute of Idaho an anti-Mormon test oath was prescribed for voters. This measure, though not nearly so far-reaching in its disfranchising elements as the clause in the constitution, was generally so construed as to prohibit every Mormon from voting even though he was willing to take the prescribed oath. In some instances men tired of political ostracism, weary of being deprived of every right as American citizens, sweltering under the iron heel of political despotism, withdrew from the church and while attempting to vote were arrested for conspiracy; quite a number of whom are now awaiting trial on that charge. Just think of it, American citizens every way qualified to vote, having even taken the obnoxious test oath, while attempting to exercise the highest privilege of that citizenship are arrested for conspiracy, placed under exorbitant bonds are thrown into jail, to be indicted, tried, and convicted not by juries or their peers, but by juries of their enemies. "Oh, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name."

Now, while under the Territorial statute there was some opportunity for the accused voter to purge himself by taking the test oath, under this constitution the proscribed classes are forever barred from vot-

ing, holding office, or sitting on juries. There are no means provided by which the status of voters is to be determined. There is no expurgatory oath as in the Idaho statute, nor is any provision made by which the disfranchised class can ever be re-enfranchised, because this provision is unchangeable. Some gentlemen who support this constitution insist upon calling this provision a test oath, and when told that there is no oath provided persist that there is an oath in the constitution, thus demonstrating that they do not understand the provisions of the measure they are advocating. If those gentlemen who so vehemently assert that there is an oath provided in the constitution will examine the document they will fail to find it. No, gentlemen, you cannot find it; it is not there.

Nor is that all; if a citizen is once disfranchised there is no remedy for him, he must ever remain so, for the Constitution, Article 6, Section 4, declares that:

The Legislature may prescribe qualifications, limitations and conditions for the right of suffrage additional to those prescribed in this article, but shall never annul any of the provisions in this article contained.

Again, if a member of the Mormon Church, a citizen of any other State, enjoying there all the privileges of an American citizen, without let or hindrance, should change his residence and move into Idaho, he would immediately be disfranchised and not permitted to vote, serve as a juror, or hold any civil office. By crossing an imaginary line he would cease to be a free man and become a political slave.

Nay, more; if the distinguished Delegate from Idaho, who so obstinately champions this clause, should ever be converted to the faith of the Saints, as was Saul in ancient times; if he should be baptized and confirmed a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, under this constitution he would be immediately disfranchised, notwithstanding his eminent services in bringing the State into the Union. Nor would he have any recourse except to apostatize from the faith and "return to the beggarly elements of the world." Could anything be more absurd and un-American?

While the advocates of this measure are clamoring for the political equality of the blacks in the South, they, by this constitution, doom white American citizens to perpetual political bondage. Just think of it; political white slaves in a free and independent State, one of the States of the American Union, "The home of the free, the asylum of the oppressed."

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to another feature of this disfranchising clause of the constitution now under consideration. It is this:

No person is permitted to vote, serve as a juror or hold any civil office * * * who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society * * * which teaches or advises that the

laws of this State prescribing rules of civil conduct, are not the supreme laws of the State.

While this provision, by any fair construction, would not disfranchise any member of the Mormon Church, for, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, that church teaches, as I have already shown, implicit obedience to the laws of the State, it would disfranchise every man who believes that "Jehovah is the Supreme Ruler of the universe;" "that Jesus is King of Kings and Lord of Lords."

I have before me a copy of the *Christian Statesman*, a paper published in Philadelphia, which contains a call for a conference of the National Reform Association, which is now in session at Lincoln Music Hall in this city. I will read two brief extracts from said call. Referring to "Christian principles of civil government," it says:

Among the principles which this association holds to be fundamental in civil government are these: Nations and governments are accountable to Almighty God and are bound by the moral law; the Lord Jesus Christ is the actual governor of nations, and His will, revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is the supreme rule to decide moral questions in political life. These principles we hold to have been woven historically into the very fiber of American institutions. Our stability and our progress have been due to the power they have exerted in our national life. All the evils which have afflicted us have been traceable to our departure from them. All our hopes for the future depend upon them. Our gravest peril lies in the fact that these principles are ignored by large numbers of our citizens and denied by many others. The duty of the hour is to emphasize and uphold them, and to inculcate them upon the fast-increasing millions of our population.

Underlying all these practical issues is a deeper and more radical controversy provoked by those who deny that civil government sustains any relation to God, or to Christ, or to the moral law; who deny that our laws and institutions should bear at any point the impress of the Christian religion, and who are striving constantly and of deliberate purpose to obliterate every Christian feature of American institutions and to divorce our government from all connection with religion.

The document states that this call is concurred in by Hon. William Windom, Secretary of the Treasury; his honor William Strong, formerly justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; by the Protestant Episcopal bishops of the dioceses of Missouri, Central New York, Connecticut and Delaware; by three bishops of the Methodist Episcopal church, and several other eminent Christian men and women.

Among the speakers at one of the meetings of the conference on Tuesday last was Rev. R. M. Somerville, of New York, who in an address upon "the Christian doctrine of civil sovereignty," as reported in the daily *Washington Post*, held that God was supreme in all affairs and must be recognized above the imperialism of any earthly monarch or chief executive in American governments. He was surprised that any one should attempt to deny the authority of Christ everywhere except in the Church, and the disposition to rule him out of consideration in civil affairs, and insisted that any theory of civil government that denied his Supreme authority was radically and wholly wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that if Hon. William Windom, his honor ex-Judge Strong, and the