

is true that a number of witnesses testified that no such obligation is imposed by the ordinance upon

but it is a very suspicious circumstance

The evidence showing that such a prayer is further supported by proof that during the endowment ceremonies a prayer is offered on God to avenge the blood of Hyrum Smith upon this nation, and converses from the Bible are read as being similar to justify the obligation and the prayer. That this prayer is offered and that such passages from the Bible are read was disputed by any witness who was sworn on the investigation. Nor did it questioned that by the term "vengeance" in the endowment ceremony, reference is made to John and Hyrum Smith. That an obligation of vengeance is part of the endowment ceremony is further attested by the fact that shortly after testimony was given on that subject before the committee, Bishop Daniel Canelle the Mormon Church denounced the witnesses who had given this testimony as traitors who had broken their oaths to the Church.

That such an oath of vengeance is part of an endowment ceremony, the nature and character of such a ceremony was judicially determined in the judicial district court of Utah in year 1889 in the matter of the application of John Moore and others, against the Mormon Church, and after an opinion denying the application the court says:

"In these applications the usual evidence on behalf of the applicants—residence, moral character, etc.,

"Those objecting to the right of applicants to be admitted to citizenship I will witness who had been introduced to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormon Church," Saxton

these witnesses had held the post of bishop in the Church, and all gone through the endowment and participated in its ceremonies. The testimony of these witnesses is to the effect that every member of the Church is expected to go through the endowment house, and that nearly all of the marriages are usually solemnized there, and that those who are married elsewhere go through the endowment ceremonies at as early date thereafter as practicable in order that the marital relations shall continue throughout eternity.

"On behalf of the applicants I have read the endowment oath, and the

ment ceremonies, but all of them declined to state what oaths are taken.

then entered into, or what penalties are attached to their violation; these witnesses, when asked for a reason for declining to answer, said that they were not present, while several stated they had forgotten what was said about avenging blood of the prophets

"The witnesses for the application were the following: The promises and covenants of the covenant ceremonies and the penalties attached thereto, testified generally that there was nothing in the ceremony consistent with loyalty to the government was not mentioned. The objects of this investigation ascertain whether the oaths and obligations of the endowment have been taken, and if not, to determine this question. The referees applicants' witnesses to state that such oaths, obligations, or promises are taken or entered into by the applicant, and that they are of little value, and tends to do so rather than contradict the evidence this point offered by the objectors. Evidence established beyond any doubt that the oaths, endowment ceremonies are inconsistent with the application for citizenship is required to take, and that the oaths, or covenants there made entered into are incompatible with the requirements of the laws of the United States." (Vol. 4, pp. 340-341.)

The obligation hereinbefore set is an oath of disloyalty to the Government which, at the least, would require, or at least encourage every member of that organization to take.

It is in harmony with the view of the conduct of the leaders of the Mormon people in former days, when they

States, and is also in harmony with the conduct of those who give the law.

flant disregard of the laws against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation may be that many of those who are in the habit of committing this reasonable import; but that the first presidency and the apostles retain an obligation of the nature in the ceremonies of the temple that at least some are honest and loyal to this nation and its government.

And the same spirit of disloyalty manifested also in a number of hymns contained in the collection of hymns published by the Mormon Church to be sung by Mormon congregations.

There can be no question in regard to the taking of the oath of vengeance by the first presidency and apostles through the ceremony of taking endowments in the year 1880, and the head of the Mormon Church states his testimony that the ceremony is the same as that it has always been.

An obligation of the nature of the before mentioned would seem to be wholly incompatible with the laws which Mr. Smoot as a member of the United States Senate has sworn to uphold. It is difficult to conceive how one could discharge the obligation which rests upon every senator to perform his official duties as to the welfare of the people of the United States, while at the same time calling down the vengeance of heaven on this nation because of the killing of the founders of the Mormon Church twenty years ago.

Mr. Smoot Not Entitled to a Senate Seat.

The name deliberately and con-

the testimony taken on the invitation is considered, the more irresistible is the conclusion that factually Mr. Smoot is one of a self-appointing body of men, known as the presidency and twelve apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormons, who claim to have been given authority to control the membership of said Church in all things, temporal as well as spiritual; that this authority, as has been for several years, is now exercised by said first presidency and twelve apostles as to establish the cities of the organization, to encourage colonization in the States of Utah and elsewhere, contrary to the constitution and laws of the State of Utah and the law of the land, that said first presidency and twelve apostles do now control, and are exercising the power of the

thus brought about in said State union of church and state, contrary to the constitution of said State of Utah and contrary to the Constitution of the United States, and that said J. W. Smoot comes here, not as the accredited representative of the State

It follows, as a necessary conclusion from these facts, that Mr. Smoot is entitled to a seat in the senate as a senator from the State of Utah.