

The attempt to show that there is any obligation of polygamy associated with these sacred rites has utterly failed. Of course it has been shown that a certain class of witnesses will testify to anything, so long as they can gratify their spleen against the Church with which they were formerly connected. Wardell is an instance in point. His evidence, shown to be totally false, reached the point of ludicrousness when examined in relation to the obligation of polygamy in connection with the endowments. Being asked—after he had stated that it existed—as to its nature he said substantially that some one exclaimed, "All those in favor of taking more wives than one, say aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it." Of course nobody, including the "Liberal" prosecutors, believed a word the old man said.

The blood atonement or death penalty business has shared a similar fate. Not one instance has been cited of any such penalty having been inflicted, this fact of itself being unanswerable as showing its non-existence. Of course the witness Wardell tried to furnish a case; the man named Green, a resident of Farmington, who was blood-atoned in an immigrant train near Green River. There seemed to have been a great deal of green about this alleged sanguinary circumstance. Some facts were elucidated in rebuttal that threw a shadow on Wardell's blood and thunder. The only Green that ever lived at Farmington was produced in court and was ready to testify that he was not at Green River in 1862, and that to the best of his knowledge and belief he had never been killed. As a circumstance of that kind could not very well have occurred without his being cognizant of the fact, Mr. Green's evidence in rebuttal could not be considered as remarkably weak. If any more proof were needed, it was furnished by Mr. Follett, one of Wardell's eye-witnesses to the taking off of Mr. Green. He said that there was no Green in the train. After that broad statement his subsequent assertion that he never saw the man who wasn't there murdered, had a slight tinge of superfluity about it. Wardell's son and daughter both supported the statements of Messrs. Green and Follett.

Throughout the investigation a particular feature was noticeable. Whenever a witness would testify in a way that damaged the "Liberal" cause, Mr. Dickson would al-

most invariably ask: "Are you a 'Mormon?'" The answer was occasionally in the negative. The point sought to be made by the attorney was that if the witness was a "Mormon," he could not be fully relied upon. At this point it is appropriate to reproduce the testimony of Mr. Robert N. Baskin, (it has already appeared in the NEWS) given before the Congressional House Committee on Territories on January 21st, 1870:

"I have been for five years past a resident of Utah. I must do the Mormons the justice to say that the question of religion does not enter into their courts, in ordinary cases; I have never detected any bias on the part of jurors there in this respect, as I at first expected; I have appeared in cases where Mormons and Gentiles were opposing parties in the case, and saw, much to my surprise, the jury do what is right."

We do not know whether the case—if such it may be designated—now in progress before Judge Anderson, has ever been definitely entitled. Several names have appeared upon the papers connected with it. We do not wish to be obtrusive, but if a mild suggestion is in order, how would this do: "The Bosses of the Liberal Party vs. Constitutional Rights and Religious Liberty."

"MORMONS" AND CITIZENSHIP.

On the morning of November 18, the forces of the anti-"Mormons" were augmented by the addition of Parley L. Williams. The first witness called in the case was

DR. H. J. RICHARDS

who testified—I have resided in Salt Lake City since 1848; have been a physician since 1871; have been a member of the Church since I was eight years old; received my endowments in 1856; I made no covenant or oath to avenge the blood of the Prophets against the government of the United States; nothing of that character was presented. I took no obligation to enter into polygamy.

To P. L. Williams—I never officiated in the Endowment House; I saw Heber C. Kimball and Dr. Sprague; I do not know whether I hold the Priesthood or not; this is because I was notified that if I did not join a quorum I would be dropped from the Priesthood; I did not go to the meeting; I am not a very active member of the Church; I go to no meetings whatever. My arm was anointed to avenge the blood of the Prophets; Joseph and Hyrum were not mentioned; I remember no obligation to obey the Priesthood; I do not remember anything about polygamy being said. When I was married there was nothing in the ceremony about avenging the blood of the Prophets, obedience to the Priesthood, or polygamy. I have no recollection of any statement that plural marriage was not adultery. I promised not to state any of the obligations I entered into there. I could not state them, nor am I willing to do so. I don't wish to reveal any of them. I decline to state what they are.

To the Court—I understood that Joseph and Hyrum Smith were numbered among the Prophets. I took no oath to avenge their blood.

To LeGrand Young—I did not understand the avenging of the blood referred to.

To the Court—I did not understand that the avenging was to be done under orders of the Church, or that I was to do it at all.

To LeGrand Young—When I was married there was nothing said to me about adultery. There was nothing said about the people or the government of the United States. I did not feel enjoined to go out and kill anybody. Never heard any such instruction in public or private.

I did not understand that an apostate was to be killed; never heard of any one being killed for this; I understood that I could offer my life as an atonement for certain sins.

To P. L. Williams—The idea of shedding the blood of apostates was not in the minds of the "Mormon" people at that time. It was a current belief, in 1856, that a man might offer himself as an atonement for his sin; but that his death need not necessarily follow; that was not taught in the Endowment House; I have heard talk about the subject; never heard how the death penalty could be inflicted; never heard the authorities teach such a doctrine; have never heard that idea since the excitement of what was called the reformation, in 1856; it was then the talk of people, not of any authorities.

To Dickson—Brigham Young never preached the doctrine of blood atonement, that I know of.

To Baskin—In this talk about a man offering his life, it was not said that it was for a violation of the Endowment covenants. These may have been included. There was no one authorized to inflict the death penalty. I never heard any one state how it should be done, nor did I ever hear any of the leading men say anything about it.

E. L. T. HARRISON

testified—I have resided in Salt Lake 27 years; am 59; have been a member of the "Mormon" Church; was a member 20 years; left the church in 1869; am an architect; when I was in the Church I went through the Endowment House; this was in 1862 or 1863; I have a clear remembrance of what took place; there was no covenant to avenge the blood of the prophets against the government; the government or the United States was not referred to; there was nothing that could be construed into teaching a man not to be a good citizen; no reference was made to citizenship; the teachings were of another nature; I don't remember polygamy being mentioned; if it came up it had no prominence in the ceremony; I made no promise about it.

To P. L. Williams—I never went through the Endowment House more than once; do not remember polygamy being mentioned there; it was publicly taught at the time; I was severed from the Church for opposing the doctrine of the Church governing in temporal affairs, at least that was my understanding;