that they have a right to sprinkle; I would say the same, however much I might differ from the Presbyterian practice, in my own mind; however much I might look upon that act as abominable in the sight of heaven; however much I might consider it to be criminal before God, yet I would say they had a constitutional right to sprinkle; so in regard to all other divisions so far as religious sentiments are concerned. Wherein those divisions of political or religious sentiments do not harm the neighbor, do not harm society, do not harm families, or the nation at large; a law, passed by men, has nothing to do with it, what courts might decide to the contrary notwithstanding.

These are my views as an individual. I do not pretend to set these things forth as your views or the views of the people generally, but my own individual views on this subject.

Now in regard to plurality of wives, why is that a crime? Only because Congress passed a law making it criminal. Does the Bible make it criminal? No. Does the Book of Mormon make it criminal? No. Does the Doctrine and Covenants make it criminal? No. Why is it criminal? Is there a law of our nature that makes it criminal? No. There are some things that are criminal in and of themselves, and we cannot think of them only as such, and as we by our own consciences know them to be criminal. And for instance, stealing property that belongs to our neighbors. That we look upon as being criminal. We would not wish our neighbor to steal our property. Again violence done to another person to rob him of his property, that is something which is criminal in itself. Taking life like the heathen, who offer up their human sacrifices, the heathen widow that is burned upon the pile, is criminal. Why? Because it is something that our nature at once denounces to be criminal, and it is also denounced as such by the laws of heaven, by the laws of God; but not so in regard to many other things. For instance, one day out of seven is set apart as a day of rest; and under the law of God, in ancient times, it was considered criminal to gather a bundle of sticks on that day, for the purpose of making a fire; and the person who was found doing so was condemned to death. Now if there had been no law concerning that matter, all Israel would have made no distinction between the sacredness of days. All would have been alike to them. Why? Because there was nothing in their own minds or consciences that would perceive such an act to be criminal. But when the revealed law of God came, making it criminal, it then became so. So in regard to many of these religious principles, observed among the heathen. They are criminal, and any person acquainted with the law of God is compelled to pronounce them as such. But then, shall we condemn anything that the conscience does not denounce to be criminal, that the law of God does not denounce as criminal; shall we get our Congress to make a law declaring it criminal, so that those that break that law shall become criminals? I cannot see it. I am so obtuse in my understanding and my mind is so blunted, that I really cannot see any sense in a law of that kind, whether passed by Congress or a congressional power of all nations combined; it makes no difference, so far as my mind is concerned.

I have read the speeches of members of Congress, in which they have