

at variance with all precedents in this nation, which as stated by Judge Black, is altogether "odious, unjust and unconstitutional," which "reverses those rules of evidence which lie at the foundation of civil liberty," and is a flagrant, violent and direct attack upon the inherent rights of man. Thus in their intemperate, religious zeal making a direct onslaught upon the bulwarks of republican institutions, jeopardizing the safety of the state, and thoughtlessly, recklessly and inconsiderately ignoring every just principle; assailing the fundamental doctrines of political and religious freedom; and exerting all their energies in attacking a phantom to tear down the pillars of state and to destroy the Temple of Liberty, though they themselves, as a Samson, perish in the ruins.

What is the moral effect? This same test-oath, while it assails a Scriptural usage practiced by the most renowned, revered and honorable men of antiquity, who are denominated men of righteousness and the friends of God, protects and sustains the degraded, corrupt and licentious who are supposed to be good Christians and not polygamists.

A very honorable, upright and virtuous gentleman, whom no one will accuse of immorality or vice—the respected ex-mayor of this city, who has filled that office with dignity and honor for the last six years, has a son who was appointed registrar for the Fifth Precinct in this city; this son had the painful and humiliating duty to perform of refusing to register his father's name, because many years ago he had had more than one wife, but who, through death, was for some time without a wife at all, and has lately married one wife; and yet this young man had to perform the disgusting

task, according to the provisions of said test-oath, of registering a notorious keeper of a bagnio, and many of her harlot associates. Another circumstance occurred of a gentleman who came to be registered, but thought it would be impracticable for him to take the test-oath. More honorable than many of his pious associates, he suggested that he did not know that he could take the prescribed oath, for he not only had a wife, but kept a mistress, but on examination he found the oath exempted all those who might engage in illicit intercourse, provided the association was not, as expressed in the oath, "in the marriage relation." On discovering this, he observed, "I can take that oath, for I am only married to one;" and he was accepted. Another young man in this city, whilst having the test oath read to him, said he could not take it, as he could not swear that he had not cohabited with more than one woman; but when the reading was continued and the words "in the marriage relation" sounded in his ears, he said, "I can go that," and was duly sworn.

Thus these moral and religious reformers and teachers, these professors of high moral ideas, these inveighers against a scriptural practice professedly because it is immoral, have introduced safeguards to protect the libertine, the voluptuary and the harlot, whilst they have made criminals of those who have been observing a law instituted by the Almighty. Perhaps it would be considered too severe to call these "reverend gentlemen" and those "venerable seigneurs" who occupy honorable positions in Congress by the harsh name of hypocrites, yet it is very humiliating to the sensitive and virtuous to contemplate the result of their ill-timed and intem-