

## LARGE AND SMALL.

STATESMANSHIP is one of the highest spheres in which the powers of man can be exercised. Mere politicians exist in great abundance. Statesmen are few and far between. Whenever one of the latter appears he naturally draws upon him the fire of smaller souls. They cannot understand him, because he is as far out of the reach of the self-seeker as the ripe scholar is beyond the comprehension of the novice. The smaller fry are as easily distinguishable, though numerous, from the statesman, as near-sighted men are distinguishable from those whose vision is of wider scope. Commoner minds are always engaged in scrutinizing objects in close proximity to themselves, while the more comprehensive mentality sweeps the horizon.

So, men called to legislate exhibit their calibre by their processes, making it patent that they consider themselves bound to employ most of their energies in turning every beneficent stream toward the particular spot of earth from which they happen to hail, losing sight of the fact that their highest duty is to operate for the benefit of the whole and subordinately to protect the proper interests of their own section.

Hence the upward gradations of statesmanship. The germ of selfishness is in the individual. His operations—barring the limitations prescribed by the sphere in which he moves—will exhibit the extent of his sympathies and manifest the size of the man. From the individual it may extend merely to the family, if he have one; thence to his special circle of friends, town, county, territory or state, nation and finally the human race.

The great mass of men are camped all along the line, the number reaching the terminus being but a corporal's guard. Indeed, there are hosts who practically never leave the threshold of their own doors.

Small men have lots of elbow-room, because they do not occupy much space. Large men are jostled because of these conditions being reversed. A statesman in the true sense of the term will stand by what is right and just. He meets with abuse. He does not recede from his position, no matter as to the character of the obstacle. His way may be impeded. He accepts of the inevitable, braces himself for a stay and waits. Another inevitable arises, if he is on the

right track—the obstruction in time will vanish and he will resume his march until another impediment, for a while insurmountable, appears, and again he bides his opportunity, which appears, and onward he goes toward the goal of his purpose, while self-seekers and satellites linger on the road, fluttering around a limited area commensurate with their contracted dimensions. There are men and there are mice.

## REGARDING THE TEST OATH DECISION.

THE following account of an interview with President George Q. Cannon and the annexed biographical sketch appeared in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of the 10th inst.:

Mr. George Q. Cannon, First Counselor to the President, and one of the highest dignitaries of the Mormon Church, talked freely and interestingly today about the decision.

"It is very sweeping in its conclusions," he said, "and gives the framers of the Idaho test oath all they ask for in their proposition to disfranchise our people. There is one point, however, which the Court ignored. Evidence was presented when the case was tried to show that this man who took the oath and voted was not a polygamist. It was further set forth by testimony that the Mormon Church is not at the present time teaching or encouraging polygamy. Bishop Budge, of Idaho, testified clearly on that. But his evidence was not given any consideration in the lower court. The fact that the Church had in the past taught and abetted polygamy was taken as sufficient. In the Supreme Court's decision the present attitude of the Church upon the subject is ignored, although counsel were careful to emphasize it in the arguments. The Supreme Court, in its decision, assumes it as established that Mormonism today means polygamy, and on that wrong premise declares that Mormons can be disfranchised."

"What will your people do about it?"

"I don't know what we can do."

"Why doesn't the head of your Church—the First Presidency and the Twelve Apostles—issue an official declaration upon the subject. Why don't you say, as a Church, that polygamy is no longer taught and is not encouraged by the Church? Wouldn't that meet the decision of the Supreme Court and enable your people to take the test oath?"

"Some think it would and advise such a step be taken. But a declaration of that kind is open to objections. We have already declared and shown our intention to obey the laws. We are trying to live in conformity with the legislation enacted on the subject of polygamy. Suppose the principal officers of the Church put forth the official assertion. It has been repeatedly charged that our people blindly follow a few leaders. Will not such a declaration be an admission on our part that the charge is true; that the few men control the lives and consciences of the mass of believers? It seems to me we are in danger of stultifying ourselves if we go further than we have. We bow to the law. We obey it outwardly. Surely we ought not to be obliged to declare what we believe

or do not believe as the price of suffrage. Our consciences are at least our own. You must remember that the doctrine of polygamy was accepted many years ago as a revelation from God. That revelation stands. We cannot wipe it out by a declaration of man. We can submit to the laws of our country and that we are doing. It seems to me that is as much as can be asked."

"Do you think, Mr. Cannon, that Mormons can take the test oath honestly without committing perjury?"

"Most of them can do it without violation of conscience. Only the small minority of our people have lived in polygamy. Those who have plural wives living are disfranchised. The others, in the present attitude of the Church, can truthfully subscribe to the oath."

"And say that they do not belong to an organization which teaches or advises polygamy?"

"Yes. There is no question in my mind that we can take this test oath honestly. I say 'we,' I mean our people. I do not include myself, for I am one of the ultras. There are two views of this question of polygamy taken by our people. Some of us believe that the revelation is a command from God to take plural wives. I so consider it. I went into the Church when I was very young. It has always been my belief that the revelation commanded polygamy. Others, and they are in the majority, do not regard the revelation as making polygamy obligatory. They consider it as permissive. I obey the law, but I do not acknowledge that I did any wrong in entering into polygamy before the law was passed. I provide for all of my children, and treat them precisely alike. Since I came out of prison I have provided for my wives, but I have not lived with any of them. I am living the life of a bachelor, and sometimes it is pretty hard on an old man like me, for I have had a good deal of sickness, and there are times when I need home care and attention."

"What will the Idaho Mormons do? Will they take the oath and try to vote? Can they get this question of the present position of the Church before the Supreme Court?"

"I don't know what they will do. They can take the oath conscientiously, but they will probably be prosecuted for perjury if they do. Whether the Idaho courts will continue to stand on the position taken in the Davis case I can't tell. If it is assumed by the courts that to be a Mormon is to belong to an organization that encourages polygamy, then all of our people who take the oath will render themselves liable to punishment by the Territorial courts on the charge of perjury. I don't know what our people in Idaho will do, but I don't think they will give up the fight. They will keep trying for their rights. It is not characteristic of the Mormons to give up. They will fight on—in the courts, of course."

"Will the admission of Idaho follow the decision sustaining the test oath?"

"I can't tell, but it looks probable. There seems to be a general feeling in Congress favorable to the admission of new States."

"Any other Territory or any State can, by the adoption of a similar oath, disfranchise the Mormons?"

"Yes. The decision is sweeping enough for any of them to stand upon."

"Do you think the Idaho precedent will be adopted elsewhere?"

"No. It is not probable. There are some Mormons in Wyoming, Colo-