

the moral influences of civilization, we have a quiet, orderly, and Christian community. Our towns are without gambling halls, drinking saloons, or brothels, while from end to end of our Territory the innocent can walk unharmed at all hours. Nor is this due to an organized police, but to the kind natures and Christian impulses of a good people. In support of my argument of their entire sincerity, I with confidence appeal to their history.

The Mormon church was established at Fayette, New York, in the year 1830. In 1831 the headquarters of the people was removed to Kirtland, Ohio, and considerable numbers of missionaries were sent out to preach the new religion in various parts of the Northern States. Many converts were made and removed to Kirtland, but they were subjected to various petty annoyances and persecutions by the surrounding people. Land not being abundant or easily acquired for the rapidly increasing numbers, the new converts were advised to locate in Jackson county, Missouri, where land was abundant and cheap, where in fact a few settlers had preceded our people. The Mormons soon became a prosperous and wealthy community; the same habits of industry and thrift which they have ever maintained being even then vigorously inculcated by their leaders. Many hundred thousand acres of Government land were purchased, fine farms and thriving settlements were established, and the first printing press in western Missouri put in operation. But the wealth acquired by the people was desired by our neighbors; the lawless border-men, who afterwards made the frontiers of Kansas their battle-field, attacked, plundered, and murdered our settlers, and finally drove them from their delightful homes, which they appropriated to themselves. The title to much of the land in Jackson and other counties is to-day in Mormons, who were then driven from their homes. During the troubles incident to the expulsion of the Mormons, hundreds of men, women, and children were murdered, or died from diseases caused by exposure to the inclemencies of the weather. The wretched refugees afterward located at Clay, Caldwell, and Davis counties, Missouri, where there were almost no settlers, and where, within a few years, their industries had again built up thriving settlements and accumulated large herds of stock. The outrages of Jackson county were then repeated, the Mormons driven from their homes, which were seized by the marauders, and thousands of women and children driven forth homeless, and the prey for the border-ruffians whose cupidity had been excited by the wealth of the industrious exiles. Hundreds perished from cold, exposure, and starvation. But their leaders, sustained by an undying faith, again called together their scattered and impoverished followers, and removing to Illinois, founded the city of Nauvoo.

For several years they were comparatively undisturbed; they built up one of the most thriving and beautiful cities of the State. Far as the eye could reach from the eminence of their temple, the well-tilled farms and gardens, the comfortable farm-houses, the mills and factories, and well-filled schools, attested the industry, the thrift, and the wealth of the once persecuted people. But again their wealth created envy in the lawless border-men of the new State. Without what even their enemies claim was justifiable cause, and in a manner which Gov. Ford characterized as a permanent disgrace to the people of the State, they were attacked, pillaged, and driven across the river, their houses burned; their women and children driven forth unsheltered in the inclement season of the year; their leaders brutally murdered.

The annals of religious persecution, so fruitful of cruel abuse, can give nothing more pitiable and heart-rending than the scenes which followed this last expulsion. Aged men and women, the sick and feeble, children of tender years, and the wounded, were driven into the flats of the river, yet in sight of their once happy homes, to perish from exposure and starvation. While over our broad land the church bells of Christian communities were ringing out peace and good-will to men; while to the churches thronged thousands to hear preached the gospel of charity and forgiveness; these poor, heart-sick followers of the same Redeemer, were driven in violence from their homes to perish like wild beasts in the swamps and wilderness. The gentlemen charge us with hypocrisy and depraved lusts for motives, with such a record as this to mock their charges! The world has many hypocrites, and is well filled with wicked men, but they keep about them the recompense of sin, and have other histories than this I give you, and which history no man can deny.

Ward went out to the world that Mormonism had finally been annihilated. But again the scattered hosts were gathered together, and set out on a pilgrimage, that since that of the children of Israel has been without parallel in the history of the human race. They had no stores; they were beggared in the world's goods, yet with earnest religious enthusiasm they toiled on through unknown deserts, over unexplored mountain ranges, and across plains haunted by savages, only less cruel than the white Christians who had driven them forth in search of that promised land, where at last they could worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences, and find unbroken that covenant of the Constitution which guards this sacred right.

Ragged, foot-sore, starving and wretched, they wandered on. Delicately nurtured women and their little children dug roots, or subsisted on the bark of trees or the hides of animals. From Nauvoo to Salt Lake, the valley of their promised land—1,500 miles—there is to-day scarce a mile along that dreary and terrible road, where does not repose the body of some weary one, whom famine, or sickness, or the merciless savage, caused to perish by the way.

It was while on this pilgrimage that an order came from the Government for five hundred men to serve as soldiers in the Mexican war. The order was promptly obeyed. These devoted men, who had received only cruel persecution from the people they were called upon to protect on the field of battle, dedicated their poor, helpless wives to God, and themselves to their country. Leaving their families to struggle on as best they could, these brave, patriotic men followed our flag into New Mexico and California, and were at last disbanded at San Diego, with high praise from their officers, but with scanty means to return to those they loved, and whom they had left to suffer, and perhaps to perish on the way.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, three times did this persecuted people, before their location in Utah, build up for themselves pleasant and prosperous homes, and by their industry surround themselves with all the comforts and appliances of wealth; and three times were they, by an unprincipled and outrageous mob, driven from their possessions, and reduced to abjectest poverty. And bear it in mind, that in every instance the leaders of these organized mobs, offered to all who would abandon and deny their faith, toleration and the possession of their homes and wealth. But they refused the tempting snare. They rejoiced that they were thought worthy to suffer for the Master, and, rather than to deny their faith, they welcomed privation; they sacrificed all that earth could offer; they died the saintly martyr's death.

Mr. Speaker, is this shining record that of a community of hypocrites? What other Christian denomination of our country can show higher evidences of earnestness, of devoted self-sacrifice for the preservation of their religious faith?

In further presentation of my argument, Mr. Speaker, that the doctrine of polygamy is an essential feature in our religious faith, and that in our adherence thereto we are advocating no new or unsupported theory of marriage, I crave the indulgence of the House while I cite some few from the numerous writers of weight and authority in the Christian church, who have illustrated or supported the doctrine.

Now, sir, far be it from me to undertake to teach this learned House, and above all, the Hon. Chairman of the Committee on Territories, great theological truths. If there be any subject with which this honorable body is especially conversant, it is theology. I have heard more Scripture quoted here, and more morality taught, than in any other place it was ever my fortune to serve. With great diffidence, then, I venture to suggest to the supporters of this bill, that while polygamy had its origin in holy writ, taught as I have said before by the greatest of all lawmakers, and not only tolerated, but explicitly commanded by the Almighty, as I shall presently show, monogamy, or the system of marriage now recognized by so many Christian nations, originated among the Pagans of ancient Greece and Rome.

I know, sir, that the report accompanying the bill fetches vast stores of theological information to bear; informs us that polygamy is contrary to the Divine economy, and refers to the marriage of the first human couple, and cites the further testimony of the Bible, and that of the history of the world. Setting aside the last named as slightly voluminous for critical examination in the present discussion, we will take up, as briefly as possible, the Divine authorities, and the commentaries and discussions thereon by eminent Christian writers, and see how far my people have been misled by clinging to them. As for the illustrious example quoted of our first parents, all that can be said of their marriage is, that it was exhaustive. Adam married all the women in the world, and if we would find teaching by example, we must go among his descendants, where examples can be found among the favored people of God, whose laws were of Divine origin, and whose conduct received sanction or punishment at His hands.

At the period of the Reformation in Germany, during the early part of the 16th century, those great reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle and Bucer held a solemn consultation at Wittenburg on the question, "Whether it is contrary to the Divine law for a man to have two wives at once?" and decided unanimously that it was not; and upon the authority of this decision, Phillip, Landgrave of Hess, actually married a second wife, his first being still alive. This fact is recorded in D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, and by other authors of that period.

Dr. Hugo Grotius, a celebrated Dutch jurist and statesman, and most eminent law writer of the seventeenth century, states that "the Jewish law allows a plurality of wives to one man."

Hon. John Selden, a distinguished English author and statesman, a member of Parliament for Lancaster in 1624, and who represented the University of Oxford in the Long Parliament of 1640, in his work entitled, "Uxor Hebraica," the Hebrew

Wife, says that "polygamy was allowed, not only among the Hebrews, but in most other nations throughout the world; and that monogamy is a modern and a European custom, almost unknown to the ancient world."

Dr. Samuel Puffendorf, professor of law in the University of Heidelberg, in Germany, and afterwards of Lund, in Sweden, who wrote during the latter part of the 17th century, in his great work on the law of nature and of nations, says that "the Mosaic law was so far from forbidding this custom (polygamy) that it seems in several places to suppose it; and in another place he says, in reference to the rightfulness thereof, 'the polygamy of the fathers, under the old covenant, is an argument which ingenious men must confess to be unanswerable.'"

Rev. Gilbert Burnett, Bishop of Salisbury, the particular friend of William III., who was eminent among both historians and theologians, wrote a tract upon this subject, near the beginning of the 18th century. The tract was written on the question, "Is a plurality of wives in any case lawful under the gospel?"

"Neither is it (a plurality of wives) anywhere marked among the blemishes of the patriarchs. David's wives, and store of them he had, are termed by the prophet, God's gift to him; yea, a plurality of wives was made in some cases a duty by Moses' law; when any died without issue, his brother, or nearest kinsman, was to marry his wife, for raising up seed to him; and all were obliged to obey this, under the hazard of infamy, if they refused it; neither is there any exceptions made for such as were married. From whence I may faithfully conclude that what God made necessary in some cases to any degree can in no case be sinful in itself; since God is holy in all His ways."

"But it is now to be examined if it is forbidden by the gospel. A simple and express discharge of a plurality of wives is nowhere to be found."

"It is true our Lord discharges divorcees, except in the case of adultery, adding that whosoever puts away his wife upon any other account, commits adultery; so St. Luke and St. Matthew in one place have it, or commits adultery against her; so St. Mark has it, or causes her to commit adultery; so St. Matthew in another place."

"But, says an objector, if it be adultery then to take another woman after an unjust divorce, it will follow that the wife has that right over the husband's body that he must touch no other."

"This is indeed plausible, and it is all that can be brought from the New Testament which seems convincing; yet it will not be found of weight."

"For it is to be considered that if our Lord had been to antiquate the plurality of wives, it being so deeply rooted in the men of that age, confirmed by such fashions and unquestioned precedents, and riveted by so long a practice, he must have done it plainly and authoritatively, and not in such an involved manner as to be sought out of his words by the search of logic."

"Neither are these dark words made more clear by any of the apostles in their writings; words are to be carried no further than the design upon which they were written will lead them to; so that of our Lord being, in that place, to strike out divorce so explicitly, we must not by a consequence condemn a plurality of wives, since it seems not to have fallen within the scope of what our Lord does there disapprove."

"Therefore, to conclude this short answer, wherein many things are hinted, which might have been enlarged into a volume, I see nothing so strong against a plurality of wives as to balance the great and visible imminent hazards that hang over so many thousands, if it be not allowed."

Rev. Martin Madan, a relative of the poet Cowper, and an accomplished scholar, was chaplain of the Lock Hospital in London during the latter part of the 18th century. By his exertions the first chapel for the use of the unfortunate inmates of that hospital was built, and then, perhaps for the first time in the history of England, the gospel was preached for the special benefit of fallen women. The sympathies of their benevolent chaplain were so deeply enlisted in their behalf that he published a book upon the subject in 1780, entitled "Thelyphthora; or, a Treatise on Female Ruin, in its Causes, Effects, Consequences, Prevention and Remedy," which remedy he discovers to be polygamy, and which he discusses in a very thorough manner in three octavo volumes. I submit copious extracts from this learned work, which, in addition to being directly in point in the discussion before us, illustrate the earnestness and sincerity of the author in his efforts to benefit the condition of fallen women and to prevent the ruin of others.

"The best and fairest, and, indeed, the only way to get at the truth on this, as on every occasion where religion is concerned, is to lay aside prejudice, from whatever quarter it may be derived, and let the Bible speak for itself. Then we shall see that more than one wife, notwithstanding the seventh commandment, was allowed by God himself, who, however others might take it, must infallibly know His own mind, be perfectly acquainted with His own will, and thoroughly understand His own law. If he did not intend to allow a plurality of wives, but to prevent and condemn it, either by the seventh commandment, or by some other law, how is it possible that He should make laws for its regulation, any more than He should

make laws for the regulation of theft or murder? How is it conceivable that He should give the least countenance to it, or so express His approbation as even to work miracles in support of it? For the making a woman fruitful who was naturally barren must have been the effect of supernatural power. He blessed, and in a distinguished manner, owned the issue, and declared it legitimate to all intents and purposes. If this be not allowance what is?

"As to the first, namely, His making laws for the regulation of polygamy, let us consider what is written in Exodus, xxi, 10. If he (i. e., the husband) take him another wife, (not in so doing that he sins against the seventh commandment, recorded in the preceding chapter,) but her food, her raiment, (i. e., of the first wife) and her duty of marriage, he shall not diminish. Here God positively forbids a neglect, much more the divorcing or putting away of the first wife, but charges no sin in taking the second."

"Secondly. When Jacob married Rachel she was barren, and so continued for many years; but God did not leave this as a punishment upon her for marrying a man who had another wife. It is said, (Genesis xxx, 22,) that God remembered Rachel; and God hearkened unto her and opened her womb, and she conceived and bare a son, and said, 'God hath taken away my reproach.' Surely this passage of Scripture ought to afford a complete answer to those who bring the words of the marriage bond as cited by Christ, (Matthew xix, 5,) 'They twain shall be one flesh,' to prove polygamy sinful, and should lead us to construe them as, by this instance and many others, the Lawgiver himself appears to have done; that is to say, where a woman, not betrothed to another man, unites herself in personal knowledge with the man of her choice, let that man's situation be what it may, they twain shall be one flesh. How, otherwise, do we find such a woman as Rachel united to Jacob, who had a wife then living, praying to God for a blessing on her intercourse with Jacob, and God, hearkening to her, opening her womb, removing her barrenness, and thus by miracle taking away her reproach? We also find the offspring legitimate, and inheritors of the land of Canaan—a plain proof that Joseph and Benjamin were no bastards, or born out of lawful marriage."

"See a like palpable instance of God's miraculous blessing on polygamy in the case of Hannah. (Samuel, i and ii.) These instances serve also to prove that, in God's account, the second marriage is just as valid as the first and as obligatory; and that our making it less so is contradictory to the Divine wisdom."

"Thirdly. God blessed and owned the issue. How eminently this was the case with regard to Joseph, see Genesis lxix, 22-26; to Samuel, see 1 Samuel, iii, 15. It was expressly commanded that a bastard, or son of a woman that was with child by whoredom should not enter into the congregation of the Lord, even to his tenth generation. (Deuteronomy xiii, 2.) But we find Samuel, the offspring of polygamy, ministering to the Lord in the Tabernacle at Shiloh, even in his very childhood, clothed with a linen ephod, before Eli the priest. See this whole history, 1 Samuel, i and ii. Who, then, can doubt of Samuel's legitimacy, and consequently of God's allowance of and blessing on polygamy? If such second marriage was, in God's account, null and void as a sin against the original law of marriage, or the seventh commandment, or any other law of God, no mark of legitimacy could have been found on the issue; for a null and void marriage is tantamount to no marriage at all; and if no marriage, no legitimacy of the issue can possibly be. Instead of such a blessing as Hannah obtained, we should have found her and her husband Elkanah, charged with adultery, dragged forth and stoned to death; for so was adultery to be punished. All this furnishes us with a conclusive proof that the having more than one wife with which a man cohabited was not adultery in the sight of God; or in other words, that it never was reckoned by Him any sin against the seventh commandment, or the original marriage institution, or any other law whatever."

"Fourthly. But there is a passage (Deuteronomy xxi, 15) which is express to the point, and amounts to a demonstration of God's allowance of plurality of wives. If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born be hers that was hated, then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is, indeed, the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength, and the right of the first-born is his. On the footing of this law, the marriage of both women is equally lawful. God calls them both wives, and he cannot be mistaken; if He calls them so, they certainly were so. If the second wife bore the first son, that son was to inherit before a son born afterwards of the first wife. Here the issue is expressly deemed legitimate, and inheritable to the double portion of the first-born; which could not be, if the second marriage were not deemed as lawful and valid as the first."

"Fifthly. To say that a plurality of wives is sinful is to make God the author of sin;