#### DESERET EVENING NEWS: TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1900.

## CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS' DEFENSE.

#### (Continued.)

ext proceed to the consideration final right of the member from

his seat. forris, Do I understand, Mr. its, that you have finished that your argument in regard to ight to be sworn in? Yes, sir. And now you proceed to toberts.

torris. And now which covers at of the argument which covers stion of expulsion? toberts. No, sir; to the right to ny seat-to my final right. Morris. After once being sworn

Mr. Eoberts. Yes, sir; or to be ad-sitied. The whole question of my ght to my seat is involved in the prop-

ons I next proceed to consider. Mr. Morris. I asked the question bethe it has been suggested in some, rees that you would have the right swern in, and then the House d turn around afterwards and ex-Do you expect now to proceed at part of the argument?

Mr. Roberts. Not upon the question expulsion. As I understand it, the of expulsi on is to exclude me. The matthat I propose entering into is my at to my seat, whether it shall be d to exclude me or expel me, the whole question. This part ument, of course, deals with the NY BIEUK n of eligibiliy. This part of be question of course, deals with the period of eligibility. The proposition to exclude me from the seat to which cted, because, it is claimed, wible; and that would involve ration of the fact of my pleaded guilty to the misde-of unlawful cohabitation in d which was attended by dis-tion for yoting and holding of-It is also charged that from that ne (1889) until now I have continuel live in violation of the law, I could understand the silence of r. Schroeder)-I suppose he called the counsel for the othde-in regard to the evidence that been submitted to the committee; passed it over in silence I sup-did so because he took it for d that it established the charge hat I had since 1889 lived in violation This, I understood, was his As this, I presume, is the only I shall have to enter into stion before the committee, must inquire into this testi-I shall leave for a moment the deration of the fact of having ed guilty to a misdemeanor in 1889 nd take up the testimony that has en given by the witnesses before this I shall group the testimony of these

esses, or rather group the witnesses mselves with reference to their tes-

first group consists of C. M. Rev. T. C. Illiff, Rev. G. W. Marand Rev. E. H. Parsons. They ed merely to the general repn existing in Utah of polygamous as between myself and the ladies otion, with the exception of Mr. who testified that he had over the telephone, one Dr. argaret C. Roberts at 8 o'clock in the ing and had been answered by ne who said he was B. H. Rob-

Ashte from that, I take it, the first of witnesses testified solely to a eputation existing in the State Utah that B. H. Roberts sustained is relations with the women in the charges. estimony of the second group of erts and one Dr. Margaret C d, Dr. Luellen P. Miles, and Mrs. Wishard, on the 4th day of De-1899, signed an affidavit in Washington stating in substance that behad been introduced to one Dr. Mar-Shipp Roberts. I don't know her the gentleman, feeling a little with the affidavit he had iven, thought it necessary to go to tah to find out whether it was true or but certainly he did go to Utah, while in Utah claimed to have aited upon the Dr. Roberts in ques-ion, and found out that she was the lady he had been introduced to years before upon the train at Dr. Wishard came before the commit tee and was questioned upon that subect, he claimed that the introduction k place on a train leaving the city He was asked the questio ther the introduction on the part Mr. Roberts was "This is my wife" "This is Mrs. Roberts," and the gen in was not quite certain which erm had been used. And I undertake say that it is very, very doubtful if ther term was used. He doubted one or the other of the forms of the intro-duction. I question both of them, and er this reason: The man Wishard had ently opposed to the member from tah for quite a number of years. We were by no means friends. Our rela-lons were strained. I had regarded im as an enemy of my people. The Chairman. If you want to testi-Mr. Roberts. I am not testifying. I arguing from the testimony.

and the pronounced opposition that ex-Isted Mr. Morris (reading from the testimony of Rev. E. S. Wishard.)

babos

bridge when we come to it.

making an argument.

the different witnesses.

that a lawyer would not.

later

Mr.

testimony.

ahead.

Mr.

Q. Have you not been very pronounced against Mormonism?-A. Yes, sir; I have been very pronounced in my views, Q. Did you not join with other ministers of your church in the publication called "Ten reasons why Christians should not fellowship Mormons?"-A.

Q. You took a prominent part in all those things, didn't you?-A. Yes. . That is in the testimony

Mr. Roberts-And it is further along in the testimony that I asked the gentleman at that time if I was drunk on the occasion of the introduction, or if I was insane at that particular time and for the reason that I knew him to be a personal enemy and therefore could not have introduced him to the lady under those circumstances, or would not have done so. The Chairman-I ask Judge De Ar-

mond as a lawyer if that is a proper statement. Not that I care about it particularly, but as a matter of correct procedure. Mr. Roberts says, "I knew Mr. Wishard to be a personal enemy of ergo, I could not have said things that it is alleged I said to him."

Mr. De Armond-My view is this: In view of the wide range the examination has taken-the examination and the cross-examination--that there is noth-ing in the line of argument that this gentleman may make, who is a layman and not a lawyer, that ought to preju-dice the minds of the committee, no matter what line of argument he may choose to pursue. The Chairman-But he has refused to

go upon the witness stand. He declined to submit himself to examination. Nov he proposes, in arguendo, to state facts closing his mouth either to a prosecu-tion for perjury, if he should not be telling the truth, or our right to cross-examine him. Therefore he is not in the position of a person ordinarily arguing here and using those weapons that argument makes proper. But he declares his personal relations with this man were of that character, reciting a fact relating to that not covered anything that Mr. Wishard said-that Mr. Wishard was not on friendly per sonal relations with Mr. Roberts, and therefore it was impossible that Mr. Roberts should have said anything to Mr. De Armond-I don't know what

Mr. Wishard said upon that point, but my understanding is that in arguing a case, an impression of the man who is arguing as to a thing of that kind can be allowed to be used for his purpose, and the committee will not be bound by i impressions, but will be controlled their own judgment, and will discrimfnate between what is testimony

and what is not testimony. The Chairman-Do you mean to say judge, that we are to permit him to proceed here and say, "I deny this fact, I deny that this is a fact, and that the other thing is a fact," and that we are going to undertake later on to differen. tiate between what is proper and what is improper-undertake to make notes of those things which he denies properly and those things which he denies im-

oroperly? Mr. De Armond-I am prepared to say that I can do it very easily. He has not testified at all, and my understanding is that we will have no testi-mony to consider from Mr. Roberts, Therefore I will have no trouble in differentiating between that which is ar-gument and that which is no argument, The Chairman-For my part, I shall object to his stating facts which are essential-items of evidence which he that Dr. does present as evidence upon his own motion. If he desires to be sworn respecting his relations with Mr. Wishard he has a right to be sworn. I shall object, as I have said, not because that is important, but because it 's evident he intends to continue along that line to asseverate certain things that are from the cross-examination, that the contradictory of statements of fact by witnesses. I don't think we have a two men were not upon friendly relations, and a man does not usually throw right to be constantly disturbed men-tally by the alleged facts brought out himself into the arms of one whom he knows to be as violently opposed to him as even the record would indicate in argument by Mr. Roberts, which he declines to testify to under oath. Mr. De Armond-I am not in that this man was opposed to Mr. Roberts. The next witness was Mrs. Dr. Miles. state of mental disturbance that I am disturbed by what he is going to say. I don't know what he is going to say. I do not find myself able to anticipate what he is going to say. I can not see The substance of her testimony was that Mrs. Margaret Shipp Roberts had quested her, in the year 1897, I think was, to change her name upon the hysicion's registry of Salt Lake and into his argument so far as the chairhereafter to forward any communicaman can apparently see. I do not know whether what Mr. Roberts is arions to her under the name of Mrs. Roberts. The question was asked, in cross-examination, if that was done at the instance of B. H. Roberts, and the guing may be authorized by the testi-mony or not, because I don't know how far the examination went. Even if it be not authorized by the testimony emphatic statement was that it was not so done. Therefore that was an act not of B. H. Roberts but of Dr. Shipp Roberts. The only other point it does not seem to me that this com mittee, in examning this case, will be liable to be controlled by the influence of the of belief that Mr. Roberts is testifying way that subsequently to this changing of names she was introduced in the office of Dr. Margaret Roberts to the when he certainly has not testified. Now, if Mr. Roberts had testified, and If he were then making an argument Representative from Utah as "Mr. Roband mixing testimony and argument in rts." Mrs. McDougal in substance testified a way that might be confusing, I can understand how some harm might be that in a journey from Salt Lake City to Pocatello, in Idaho, she had over-heard Mr. Roberts introduce this same done, but nothing that comes from him is testimony, gecause he has not testified at all. dy, Dr. Margaret Shipp Roberts, as The Chairman-Therefore he should his wife once, and several times introcontinue to make statements of fact ad luced her as "Sister Roberts." libitum ourney was a night journey in a day Mr. De Armond-That proposition I do not understand to be before us at oach with all its inconveniences, and did not indicate, I take it, the rela-tionship of husband and wife between The Chairman-That is the proposi the parties further than might be intion I have up, for I attach no particu ferred from this introduction, if it lar importance to the particular thing he is now stating. I understand that took place. It must be remembered in considering the weight of this testi-mony that, first of all, it is not estab-Judge De Armond's statement is that we are a committee of discriminating lished that B. H. Roberts was ever married to Dr. Margaret C. Roberts, and acute lawyers, and when he make statements of fact here we know they so-called, and that the acts testified to before the committee do not, even if admitted as being true, establish the are not testimony, and that we will exclude from our minds, because of our acuteness and discrimination, what efrelationship of cohabitation, which is living in the habit and repute of marfect that may have produced upon them

tween Cella Dibble Roberts and the member from Utah. These witnesses are T. J. Brandon and Ray F. Brandon. lot of attempts made to get Utah into the Union and none of which suc-The Chairman-All of which were

In this case the marriage of B. H. Rob erts and Cella Dibble Roberts may b matters of public record. Mr. De Armond-But there was no ferred, of course, from the cour-cord in regard to the misdemeanor o inferred, of question raised by the other side, and 1889; but the testimony of the Brandons does not rise higher than to establish the gentleman was allowed to pursue his own argument. My idea is, when general reputation since that time. the question is about a contract, that we should go first to the contract. That contract we did not have. Next, the marriage of the partles previous to 1889 he conceded, then I hold that the by the Brandons do not amount to nor do they establish the existence of unif there is any part of the contract which we can not understand, we should go to outside circumstances and facts. We had an hour and a half of lawful cohabitation since 1889. The points of special testimony are

outside circumstances and facts yesterto the effect that B. H. Roberts attend-ed the funeral of a girl somewhere be-tween the age of 12 and 14 years in the day, and nothing of the contract. The Chairman-I should have objected if the gentleman had undertaken to llage of Centerville, and sat among introduce anything except what was public record of Congress, printed by the mourners on that occasion. Since he birth of that child took place preauthority of Congress. Mr. Freer-If there be no objection to vious to the pleading guilty in 1889, an not conceive that there is any vio-ation of the law in being found in atthe particular remarks, let us cross the endance upan the funeral of a chill who had departed this life under those Mr. Littlefield-Have you not a right to argue that we ought not to believe a witness? Why can he not argue specifically that every one of these witircumstances. It is said that the head-

stone over the grave of the child bears the name also of B. H. Roberts. Mr. Littlefield. What is the date of that; have you the date of the funeral, Mr. Roberts? nesses is not entitled to belief, and then, whether we take any slock in his argu-

ment is for us to decide? Mr. De Armond-My contention is A. I don't remember the date of the funeral. It was about eighteen months that there is no danger in the world of onfusing his argument with testimony, ago, as I remember it. Since these parties live, according to the testimony of the Brandons, within a quarter of a mile of the residence of Cella Roberts. because he has given no testimony and Mr. Littlefield-Cerainly he has the right to take the ground that every one and that home lies between their place these witnesses is not entitled to creof residence and their farm, as stated here by them, and that thy passed and Mr. Lanham-It is competent for him repassed that place often, it is rather peculiar that they could only testify they had seen B. H. Roberts some time to comment upon the testimony-as to the weight of the testimony given by during the day at that place, "not very often." The testimony of the elder The Chairman-Entirely so. Mr. De Armond-Mr. Roberts is not a Brandon was to the effect that he had not seen him there frequently. He had, lawyer, and he may comment in a way however, seen him there once of twice The Chairman-Pardon me for Inter-The testimony of the younger Brandon on the particular subject of Mr. Robrupting; but he is enough of a lawyer to know that he has no right to state erts being seen at the home of Cella Dibble Roberts, when sifted down on matters of fact within his own personal knowledge only as bearing upon the weight that the testimony ought to cross-examination, amounted to his having seen him there once, and that in the summer of 1898, in the daytime. The other item of the testimony is that As I said some time ago, it is not especially important upon this matthe member from Utah furnished ter of Dr. Wishard; but this indicates a home for this lady. Relative to the birth of children in the family, all these ethod that he is entering upon. Whether he will do so or not I can not say-Mr. De Armond-I certainly can not. The Chairman-But it is better we men could testify to was the general reputation that existed in the neighborshould have some understanding about 100d, that such births had taken pla In this case, as in the case of Dr. Margaret Shipp Roberts, these partics, B. H. Roberts and Cella Dibble Roberts, It at this stage than to have it raised De Armond-One further remark are not seen associating together as man and wife, they are not seen driving as illustrating the latitude give in dis-cussion. The lady who addressed us yesterday afternoon did it upon the theory that she appeared for the ladies together, they are not seen in society they are not seen at theaters together they are not at church together, ex-cept in this one instance of the funeral. of the United States, and while her discussion was a most interesting one, it was almost absolutely outside of the There is no testimony before this committee that goes to show the habit and repute of marriage between these parrecord. Nobody had any disposition to make any objection to her argument, and I do not suppose anyone is infused The testimony, if you may dignify it by such a name, rises not above with the idea that what she said was he matter of general repute, and I take it that it is no wonder that the courts in Utah refused to prosecute upon testi-Mr. Freer-I think Mr. Roberts understands the suggestion. Let him go ony of this description. Here let me say that it appears in the testimony, Roberts-Mr. Chairman, I must say I thought I was within matters that offered by Mr. Owen, that a complaint had been filed in Davis county, the county where Cella Dibble Roberts rewere clearly indicated, to me at least, in the cross-examination of Dr. Wishard sides and where B. H. Roberts resides-a complaint is filed before the prose-cuting attorney of the county, and a in regard to the relative position of mself and me; and I was through,

and there is no other case of this de-scription, that I know of, to arise, list of names was given, names whole of witnesses in that case. Morris-This is in the record.

It is one of the complaints, nay, I may say it is one of the walls, of the Q. Mr. Roberts has known you as a man bitterly opposed to the "Mormon" parties who are hounding the member from Utah up to this point, and trying to prevent him from taking his seat. people, has he not?--A. No; he has known me as a man conscientiously opposed to the "Mormon" Church, but I that the officers in that county refuse have no bitterness in my opposition. to prosecute for adultery in this case: Mr. Roberts. And in addition to that and, I take it, for the very good reason remember that reference was made that there was not sufficient eviden to a debate that he and I had in the town of Nenhl. The point that I want before them upon the prosecution. And if they could not succeed there, before the courts of the State where all the witnesses could be o urge upon that head was simply this, Wishard was uncertain as to whether he had been introduced to Dr. Marg ref Shipp Roberts as "the wife of B. H. Roberts" or as "Mrs. Roberts." examined, it seems a rather odd thing to me that it should be entertained before this committee in the course of and as he was in doubt as to I was very much in doubt, and I think there may be a fair inference that neither form of introduction may have taken place, for the reason, as appears this investigation. Relative to the fourth group of wit-

have never taken the oath of allegiance to this country. That, however, was merely by the way. He has openly and defiantly continued

to live in unlawful cohabitation. and then in the latter part of the next paragraph, on page 3: At the time of the issuance of the

the paragraph which continues that I

governor's certificate of election to him to was, and now is, a bigamist and polygamist, and living in unlawful co-habitation with more than one woman, and prior to his said nomination and election had, and ever since has, con inued and still continues to do the

same, in open and flagrant violation of such compact. That is, referring to the compact be-tween Utah and the United States. And therefore the said Brigham H. oberts is ineligible to membership in the House of Representatives.

The point, Mr. Chairman, I had in mind, in referring to these statements is that the open and flagrant violation of the law and the defiant violation of it nowhere appears in the testimony that has been produced before this commit-tee; and I hold that it is a little unfortunate for those who have introduced this testimony that they could not sus-tain the more open and flagrant viola-tion of the law than appears in any act to which they testify The Chairman-I want to ask you a

estion there, because I want to understand what is your meaning of this statement. Suppose it should ap-pear to the satisfaction of the commitee that you had three wives, and that you had been cohabiting with them, within the definition of that term by the Supreme court of the United States. ever since your marriage to them-do you construe that that would be in defiance of law

Taylorsville, Union and Wilford. Mr. Roberts-If it was established it The Chairman-If it were established?

Mr. Roberts-Yes, sir. The Chairman-That you had married three wives and that you had been liv-

ng with them? Mr. Roberts-It would be in defiance f the law, true; but here is the question in relation to flaunting that relationship and flagrantly living in violation of the law that these people under took to establish.

The Chairman-Suppose that you inagain inaugurated, under the direction troduced these women as your wives, and reared children, would that be in violation of the law? of Sister Donnetta Smith. Instructio

Mr. Roberts-That is a question I do not admit

The Chairman-Supposing that. Mr. Roberts. I am not supposing. I ould be pleased to continue my argu-

The Chairman. I do not wish to disarange your argument, nor interfere with you, and I beg your pardon for

aving interrupted. Mr. Roberts. If the vindication of law had been the object of those who now for some eighteen months have been pursuing the member from Utah. they have had ample opportunity for doing that without coming all the distance from Utah to Washington to accomplish it. The agitation on this subect against the member from Utah began at least in September, 1898, and coninued during the campaign of 1898. It oppears in evidence here that the Brandons had given affidavits to the gentleman who made the argument for the opposition yesterday, as early as the 13th of February, 1899, in the case of Cella Dibble Roberts; and, as I have remarked, they undertook the prosecuion later-that is, in the month of October-to establish a case of adultery that county. But here were men olding these affidavits from the 13th of February, 1899," and no action was taken against the member from Utah.

nickel per capita. Twelve schools paid nearly 100 per Yet, he was pursuing his daily avoca-tions, was within easy reach of the law. cent; four schools paid almost 80 pe

structors.

structor.



The Kind You Have Always Bought, and which has been in use for over 30 years, has borne the signature of Chart H. Flitchers. and has been made under his per-sonal supervision since its infancy. Allow no one to deceive you in this. All Counterfeits, Imitations and Substitutes are but Experiments that trifle with and endanger the health of. Infants and Children-Experience against Experiment,

### What is CASTORIA

Castoria is a substitute for Castor Oil, Paregoric, Drops and Soothing Syrups. It is Harmless and Pleasant. It contains neither Opium, Morphine nor other Narcotic substance. Its age is its guarantee. It destroys Worms and allays Feverishness. It cures Diarrhea and Wind Colle. It relieves Teething Troubles, cures Constipation and Flatulency. It assimilates the Food, regulates the Stomach and Bowels, giving healthy and natural sleep. The Children's Panacea-The Mother's Friend.



UNION MEETING. Large and Interesting Gathering of Officers and Teachers,

SUNDAY SCHOOL

KINDERGARTEN CLASS WORK

Children Furnished Sweet Music-In

teresting Report of "Nickel

Sunday" Collections.

The officers and teachers of the Sun

day schools of the Salt Lake Stake me

with the Stake officers and aids i

Union meeting Monday evening, Jan.

15, 1960. All the city schools were rep

resented except First ward branch

Second, Eighth and Twenty-second

branch. The following county wards

were also represented: Big Cottonwood

Mr. Littlefield. You are arguing that statement that is not denied by anydy as a witness ought not to be be-

as I understand it. Mr. Roberts. What is that? Mr. Littlefield. I understand that you are arguing that a statement, not de-

aled by anybody as a witness, ought be believed. Mr. Roberts. If the character of the

mstances are such that it renders Mr. Littlefield. That is a legitimate

Mr. Roberts. That was what I was The Chairman. But you are describ-

ng your relations to him from your

Mr. Roberts. Yes. The Chairman. That is as much testimony as anything else Mr. Littlefield. It is if we take it as

The Chairman. Yes. Mr. Littlefield. We do not take it less he makes the statement as a

Mr. De Armond. I think it is legiti-

mate argument. The Chairman. For him to describe his personal relations with the witness

Mr. De Armond. The latitude that has been allowed in this case has been very great, and the committee, I think, will discriminate between evidence and

Chairman. But I do not underhow it is possible that a person g a case can undertake to give motion as to his personal relations feelings toward a witness whose

stimony he is commenting upon and it do that under oath. Mr. Littlefield. As long as Mr. Robshall make between argument and evi-dence I don't see that there is any obto his making the statement he making in argument.

Mr. De. Armond. It is not so import-

A that he should understation of the should understation as that we do. Mr. Littlefield. No; it is not. The Chairman-So far as he comes within the scope of the examinations, Il right; but he can not go outside of

Mr. Roberts-As I remember the cross-examination upon that particu-lar point, questions were asked Mr. Wishard that substantially amounted to pointing out the differences between us

by his statements of facts. Mr. De Armond-No; I would not put it that way. I do not lay any special emphasis upon the "acute" proposition. My idea is that even an obtuse lawye

ought to be able to discriminate be-tween what is said in argument and what is said in testimony when the per-son has not testified at all.

erts, but I sincerely hope that there

theater together; they are not found in places of worship together, and it

er from Utah.

The Chairman-So he is at liberty to state any matters of fact? Mr. De Armond-No: not at all. My

view of it is, as to the particular sub-ject that was up, that while he may be outside of the record, and I do not say that he is not, I do not see how harm can come from it, and I do not see that the interruption by the chairman, if I may be pardoned, was at all called for. I do not wish to criticise, but I do not

be speaks of? Mr. De Armond. Yes. The Chairman. I beg your pardon. The Chairman. I beg your pardon. out that would certainly be ruled as see how the chairman can do it. I can not do it. The argument has been one

of great latitude. It might have been suggested yesterday, for instance, when the argument went on for an hour or an hour and a half as to the compact between Utah and the United States, nt-at least I think I know one try to do se

that the compact might be found in the enabling act and the constitution of Utah instead of speeches and testimony taken years before, when there were a

FOR DYSPEPTICS There is no reason why any one should saf-

fer from dyspensia or any stomach trouble. Hostetter's Stomach Bitters cures constipation, indigestion, dyspepsia, malaria, fever and ague. It has done so for fifty years. Any druggist will sell it to you. Take it faithfully. It will regulate the bowels, improve the appetite and bring back health and strength. See that a Private Revenue Stamp

PURIFIER AND Hostetteer's covers the neck of the bottle. Stomach Utah.

Mr. McPherson. You say the courts of Utah hold that repute is not evidence? Mr. Roberts. No, sir; I did not say

that. Mr. Littlefield-What is your view as

to that-of reputation as tending to establish marriage?

Mr. Roberts-General reputation? Mr. Littlefield-Yes.

Mr. Roberts-I think it not sufficient, Mr. Roberts-What do you think of Greenleaf's suggestion on that point? Roberts-I am not acquainted Mr.

with that. Mr. Littlefield-You don't know the

author? Mr. Roberts-No.

Relative to the testimony of E. A. McDaniel, and also Mr. Arthur Mc-Ewan, their statements amount to nothing more than a reputed conversation with the member from Utah, and I hold is not testimony proper or suftestimony given by that witness icient to establish his guilt in the mater charged.

Mr. Littlefield-That is, the member's sions are not competent?

Mr. Roberts-No, slr; and in this instance they are not specific at all. Mr. Littlefield-You do not have any

authority for that, I suppose? Mr. Roberts-No, sir. This testimony amounts merely to the general reputation, and the specific acts testified to in The both cases fail, in my judgment, to establish habit and repute of marriage; and it must be remembered, and I have alreday called attention to that point, that all along the member from Utah has been heralded as a flagrant, open, and defiant transgressor of the law. Here in this memorial, submitted by the opposition to Congress, on page 2, It is said

Your memorialists specifically allege that the said Brigham H. Roberts, since the expiration of his term of imprisonment for said crime, has openly and defiantly continued to live in unlawful cohabitation with more than one woman, and has ever since that date been and is now, a polygamist, and since his These parties are not described as be said discharge from the penitentiary said Brigham H. Roberts has contracted ing seen together in society anywhere. They are not found together taking a third polygamous and bigamous martheir meals. Mr. Roberts at the hours of morning and night is not seen going to and from the house. It is in testi-

It will be just a little interesting to find out when and where and with mony that he was seen once within half a block of the house of Dr. Robwhom that third polygamous and biga-mous marriage had taken place. I chalenge name, place, and all there is conwas not any very serious harm in that: and once, I think, he was seen at the office of the doctor. They are not seen driving together; they are not at the nected with it, because it is not true in iny particular.

The Chairman-This is the first time that I have ever heard that you had been charged with a fourth marriage. Mr. Roberts-With a third polygamous narriage.

seens to me that if the member from Utah was the defiant, the flagrant, vio-The Chairman-That would be a fourth marriage. I didn't know that you had been so charged. lator of the law that he is held out to be by those who are opposing him in the matter of taking his seat, that cer-

tainly some of the acts that would indi-cate the habit and repute of marriage Mr. Roberts-This is, however, the charge; and I call the attention of the committee to this--that this is one of the methods by which the excitement of this country has been aroused. It has ought to have been brought out in this testimony; and surrounded as he is, and so far as I can recollect always has been, by a flock of enemies, somebeen by making just this kind of false accusations. And it has appeared in accusations. And it has appeared in the press of the country-The Chairman-That is, there is a body ought to have been found who, in describing the relations of these par-ties, could testify to acts that would

have amounted to the habit of associatlegal or moral distinction, in your opining together as man and wife, and not be confined to the kind of evidence that ion, between marrying three times and marrying four times? has been introduced in regard to the relationship of this lady and the mem-Mr. Roberts-I don't understand what

ou mean by that. The Chairman-I understand you to The Chairman. How do you account

say that the spirit has been aroused against you because you have been for your picture being in Mrs. Roberts's charged with marrying four times in-stead of only three times. Mr. Roberts. I don't know. If you would visit Utah you would find his picture in many homes. The Chairman. I mean in connection Mr. Roberts-You will observe this

It is said: The said Brigham H. Roberts, since the expiration of his term of imprisonwith your introduction of her as your

ment for said crimes, has openly and defiantly continued to live in unlawful Mr. Roberts. I reply to the gentleman that I don't know how to account for phabitation with more than one man, and has ever since that date been Those are the witnesses that testified and is now, a polygamist. as to the relations between Dr. Margar-

It is merely a false statement, which tomach Bitters Utah. Bitters Utah. The third group of witnesses relates only to the alleged relationship be-

The affidavit of Dr. Miles bears the date of the 17th of February, 1899, and the affidavit of Mrs. McDougall was made as early as May 27, 1899. The purpose, however, of these parties, I wish The Chairman. If it will not inter-

rupt you to stop here, unless yau can finish your argument within a rea-sonably short time, perhaps we had better tak: a recess. Thereupon, at 12:49, the committee

took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

(To be Continued.)

THAT LAMONI DEBATE. It is Still Going On With Little Profit

to Anybody.

(SPECIAL TO THE "NEWS."] Lamoni, Ia., Jan. 15.-Elders O. K. Hansen, of Fairview, and D. M. Bick-more, of Paradise, Utah, are still here

and have occupied the Saints' church, all told, four nights, Apostle Smith, of the reorganization, alternating in swer the other four evenings, closing the 13th

The question as to who was responsihle for the introduction of the polyga-mous revelation has thus far been the chief topic of controversy. Affidavits and testimonies have been introduced in support of the theory that the mar-tyr was the man. This was met by an

effort to impeach the witnesses, es-pecially the Laws and Cowles. The affirmative rallied with the testimony of President Smith, who in his auto-biography in Tullidge's history, in speaking of Cowles, said that a better and truer friend his father never had up to the time of his death. Mrs. Lucy Kimball was also saved from the grave of mystification by establishing the fact

mony in Jenson's Historical Record and her testimony in the temple lot Other strong points were made which were met with sarcasm wit and such logic as came to hand. The Utah Elders commenced their

labors here without challenge or apparent intent to debate, and after speak-ing twice followed with criticisms on There is another meeting tomorow, Tuesday, evening. The building ontains a seating capacity of 900 to 1,000, and has been crowded every even-Organization and authority are ing. supposed to be the next features on the

Logan.

It isn't fair

proportioned out and distributed.

the way the work of the human race is (

Look at the house-drudgery of women.

ness with the occupations of most men !

Compare it in its hardness and wearing-

The only way out

housework.

Pearline.

of it is to use

Use Pearline,

cumbrance and that the old company is succeeded by George McCarroll and Albert J. Vorse, and has retired from business altogether. between her testi

HISTORICAL SOCIETY. Business of the Annual Meeting Postponed Until April Next.

The annual meeting of the Utah State Historical society at the Deseret Na-Historical society at the Deserat Na-tional bank, at 4 o'clock yesterday af-ternoon, was was lightly attended and as a consequence the business to be transacted was deferred until the April meeting, at which time it is expected meeting, at which time it is expected some interesting papers will be read. Those who were proposed yesterday for membership in the society were: Ex-Senators Arthur Brown and Frank

J. Cannon, Senator Joseph L. Rowlins, Congressman B. H. Roberts, Judge S. A. Merritt, Moses Thatcher, R. B. Shepard, Byron Groo, Fisher Harris, R. W. Sloan, Le Grand Young, Waldemar Van Cott, John Sharp, Rebecca E. Lit-tle, J. B. Toronto, J. H. Paul, Benjamin Clough of Provo, and W. J. Kerr of



cent; twenty paid 75 per cent or less and four schools paid less than 50 pe WE OFFER FOR ONE DAY ONLY, cent of their quota. The meeting at this time separated into the four Sunday school grades and interesting exercises and instructions

were had in each, under the usual in Child's assorted color STRIPED SHORT COATS, Personal reminiscenses of the Life o Angora Fur trimmed collar, value \$1.25, for Joseph Smith, the Prophet, was th special feature of the First Intermedi ate department, given by Elder Samue W. Richards. This closed the subjec only

in this department. They next take up the Life of Brigham Young. Upon reassembling, the meeting was addressed by Elder James A. Ure of the Sunday School Union board. He referred to the great improvement made "THE MORE YOU SAY THE LESS PEOPLE In the condition of the schools, and in the facilities for instruction now en-joyed by both officers and teachers. Teachers should labor earnestly to have essons well prepared so that they can perform their duties successfully. The children rendered in an inspiring manner "The Cause of Truth," and the benedication was offered by Supt. Griggs, and the meeting adjourned for month.

The Twenty-second ward school will furnish the music at the February meeting of the Union.

A BUSINESS CHANCE. The board of directors of the old Elgin

Dairy company has filed a petition in

the Third district court praying for

# SAPOLIO

REMEMBER." ONE WORD WITH YOU

50 Cents Each.









