

member the ceremonies distinctly.

The Chairman—Do you remember any portion of it?

Mr. Roberts—Only in a general way.

The Chairman—Do you know, Mr. Roberts, of any change in the ceremony performed in the endowment house and as it is performed to day in the temple?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir.

The Chairman—The ceremony is the same. Now, will you state to the committee what that ceremony was, or is, as nearly as you can?

Mr. Roberts—Well, the ceremonies consist of what would be considered a series of ceremonies, I take it, of which I only have a general impression.

The Chairman—You have something more than a general impression in your own case?

Mr. Roberts—No, I think not.

The Chairman—How many days did it take you to go through the endowment house?

Mr. Roberts—Well, part of one day.

The Chairman—Who were present at the time? Do you remember?

Mr. Roberts—No, I do not remember.

The Chairman—Can you tell the committee any portion of that ceremony?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir.

The Chairman—Why not?

Mr. Roberts—Because I consider myself in trust in relation to those matters, and I do not feel at liberty to make any disclosures in relation to them.

The Chairman—It was then a secret? Mr. Roberts—Yes.

The Chairman—Does this religious communication have, as one of its ceremonies, secret obligations or covenants?

Mr. Roberts—I think they could not be properly called secrets. Of course they are common to all worthy members of the Church, and generally known by them.

The Chairman—Well, secret from the world?

Mr. Roberts—Secret from the world.

The Chairman—The obligations and covenants which you then say are not at liberty to disclose?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir; I would be led to regard those obligations as similar to those who perhaps have passed through masonic fraternities, or are members of masonic fraternities.

The Chairman—Then your Church organization in that particular is a sort of masonic fraternity?

Mr. Roberts—I am analogous, perhaps, in some of its features.

The Chairman—You say you can remember, of course, what occurred, but you do not feel at liberty to disclose it, and for that reason you will not disclose it?

Mr. Roberts—Not specifically. I do not wish, however, senator, to be understood as being in any sense default in that matter.

The Chairman—That is not so understood, Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts—I do not wish to put myself in opposition or raise any issue here at all.

The Chairman—The reason you have assigned is accepted. The obligation, whatever it is, taken in the endowment house, is such that you do not feel at liberty to disclose it?

Mr. Roberts—That is right.

The Chairman—Should you do so, what would you expect as the result?

Mr. Roberts—I would expect to lose caste with my people as betraying a trust.

Senator Overman—Do all members of the Church have to go through that?

Mr. Roberts—All members.

Senator Overman—What proportion of them, and how is it regulated?

Mr. Roberts—It is governed chiefly by worthiness—moral worthiness.

Senator Bailey—And it is somewhat a matter of degree, is it not, in Masonry? I believe they have several degrees.

The Chairman—Do you recall whether any penalty was imposed upon a person who should disclose the covenants?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir.

The Chairman—You do not remember?

Mr. Roberts—Beyond the disfavor and distrust of his fellow members.

The Chairman—Have you ever been present at a marriage ceremony in the temple?

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir.

The Chairman—Could you tell what that was?

Mr. Roberts—I could not, only in a general way. The ceremony is of some length. I remember performing the ceremony in the case of my own daughter when she was married, and not feeling familiar with the ceremony, so that it was placed in my hands and I performed the ceremony, but I could only remember the general terms of it.

The Chairman—If the members who have gone through the endowment house, then, keep faith with the Church they will not disclose what occurred?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir.

Senator Bailey—Do you feel at liberty, Mr. Roberts, to say whether or not there is anything in that ceremony that permits a man—I will adopt a different expression—that abridges a man's freedom of political action or action in any respect, except in a religious way?

Mr. Roberts—I do not quite understand whether you mean by your answer to say that you do not feel free to answer that, and there is nothing.

Mr. Roberts—I mean that there is nothing. (1: 740, 742.)

The Chairman—I want to ask Mr. Roberts one further question. What is there in these obligations—I will not use the term "oath"—which makes it necessary to keep them from the world?

Mr. Roberts—I do not know of anything especially, except it be their general sacredness.

The Chairman—Their general sacredness? Ought sacred things to be kept from the world?

Mr. Roberts—I think some sacred things ought to be.

The Chairman—Would you name one sacred thing in connection with the ceremony that should be kept from the world?

Mr. Roberts—No, sir.

The Chairman—Why? Because you can not remember that, senator?

Mr. Roberts—Well, I could not say that, I would not say that, senator.

The Chairman—You do remember it, then—the sacred thing that you mean?

Mr. Roberts—Some sacred things I do.

The Chairman—But you can not state to the committee what they are?

Mr. Roberts—I ask to be excused from stating them.

The Chairman—But I can not understand exactly how the Church organization has things that the world must not know of. I did not know but you could give some reason why.

Mr. Roberts—No, I think I could throw any light upon what I could.

The Chairman—All right; I will not press it. (1: 743.)

Mr. Worthington—Would it be like to ask, Mr. Roberts, whether this obligation or ceremony to which you refer in the endowment house relates entirely to things spiritual or whether it relates to things temporal also?

The Chairman—Could it be better, Mr. Worthington, to let him state what the obligation is?

Mr. Worthington—Yes, so far as I am concerned, I would very much prefer it, but I understand the suggestion by Senator Overman that it was interpreted that which he would state.

Of course do not know anything more about the members of the committee do, but I think it might be well to let him state whether he is allowed to state, and if he properly says, that he would answer here as to anything that related to any temporal affairs; but as to things related to matters between him and his God, or which he conceived to be between him and his God, he would not answer here or anywhere else, and that would not be an interpretation, but would simply be taking the protection which I understand the law gives to every man—that as to things which relate directly to religious matters they are matters which he has a right to keep within his own breast.

The Chairman—Your question was whether these obligations related to spiritual affairs or temporal affairs.

Mr. Worthington—Yes; that was my question.

The Chairman—The trouble is he is unable to find a thing which is unknown and unobtainable to us, and which he considers spiritual.

Mr. Carlisle—What he considers spiritual we might consider temporal, if the matter itself was disclosed.

The Chairman—It seems to me that the witness having refused to state what the ceremony is, or what the obligations demand, ought not to be questioned and permitted to state what he did not convey, or what obligation, if imposed, or what it did not impose. The committee can judge of that.

Mr. Worthington—Of course, we are here not representing the witness, but representing only Senator Smoot.

The Chairman—Yes.

Mr. Worthington—And it is the witness pleading a privilege and making the refusal, and not Senator Smoot or his counsel. We would like to have this clarified.

The Chairman—What is the question?

Mr. Worthington—The question is whether this obligation refers to things spiritual or temporal.

Senator Bailey—I do not think it makes any difference to the committee in the end, or will affect its conclusion, whether that is answered or not. I am partly responsible for that line of question myself because I really intended to inquire of a citizen, that the committee was entitled to know what that was, and if it did not, then I had no further interest in it.

The Chairman—Let the witness answer that question.

Mr. Roberts—May I have the question read?

The Chairman—Certainly.

The reporter read as follows:

Mr. Worthington—I would like to ask Mr. Roberts, whether this obligation or ceremony to which you refer in the endowment house relates entirely to things spiritual or whether it relates to things temporal also?

Mr. Roberts—I regard them as relating to things spiritual, absolutely.

Mr. Taylor—If we were in a court of justice, and insisted upon it, I think that opens the door so wide that the witness could come in.

The Chairman—Mr. Taylor, too.

Mr. Taylor—But I do not care to do it. (1: 745, 746.)

The next witness called on behalf of the protestants was A. M. Cannon. After his examination by counsel for the protestants was concluded he was further examined by the chairman of the committee on this subject, and his testimony was as follows:

The Chairman—Do you remember the covenant which you went through the endowment house?

Mr. Cannon—Oh, yes.

The Chairman—Could you state the ceremony?

Mr. Cannon—I would not like to.

Mr. Cannon—Because it is of a religious character, and it is simply an obligation that I enter into to be pure before my Maker and worthy of the attainment of my Redeemer and the fulfillment of love of my children and their mothers, and departed ancestry, and my coming descendants.

The Chairman—What objection is there to making that public?

Mr. Cannon—Because it is sacred.

Mr. Cannon—How sacred?

Mr. Cannon—It is a covenant that I enter into with my Maker in private.

The Chairman—All the tenets of your religion are sacred, are they not?

Mr. Cannon—Sir.

The Chairman—They are all sacred, are they not—the teachings?

Mr. Cannon—All of those are sacred; yes, all of those things.

The Chairman—Do not quite understand why you should keep them secret?

Mr. Cannon—It is because it is necessary to keep them secret. If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, we admit only the purest of our people to enter there.

The Chairman—People like you and the president of the Church? I suppose the president of the Church is admitted?

Mr. Cannon—The presidency of the Church, if he continues in good standing, and if he is a member in good standing, and is deemed worthy of proper recommendations are permitted to enter there.

The Chairman—Do you enter into any obligation not to reveal these ceremonies?

Mr. Cannon—I feel it would be very improper to reveal them.

The Chairman—I say, do you enter into any obligations not to?

Mr. Cannon—There are sacred obligations connected with all the higher ordinances of the Church.

The Chairman—In words, do you promise not to reveal?

Mr. Cannon—I feel that that is the trust reposed in me, that I will not go and

The Chairman—I think you do not understand my question. Do you promise specifically not to reveal what occurs in the endowment house?

Mr. Cannon—I would rather not tell what occurs there. I say this, Mr. Chairman, I think, Mr. Cannon, you do not understand me. Do you promise not to reveal what occurs in the endowment house when you go through?

Mr. Cannon—I feel that that is an obligation I take upon me when I do that.

The Chairman—When you go through the endowment house do you take that obligation upon you in express terms?

Mr. Cannon—I think I do.

The Chairman—You know, do you not, what you do not say? Why do you take that obligation not to reveal these things?

Mr. Cannon—Because we are—I do not want to be disrespectful to this committee.

The Chairman—I know you would not be.

Mr. Cannon—The Lord gave us to understand that we should not make common the sacred things that He committed to His disciples. He told them that they were not to let their feet be seen by the people, and that they should keep them under their feet and

The Chairman—Do you remember whether there was any penalty attached if they should reveal?

Mr. Cannon—I do not remember that there is any penalty.

The Chairman—None whatever?

Mr. Cannon—I do not remember.

The Chairman—Has there been any change in the ceremony of the endowment house since you were through it, up to the present time, that you are aware of?

Mr. Cannon—No.

The Chairman—No change in the ceremony or obligations?

Mr. Cannon—No. (1: 791, 792.)

The next witness called by the protestants was Mr. Thatcher. After counsel for the protestants had finished his examination of Mr. Thatcher, the following occurred:

The Chairman—One other question: The endowment house, I believe, has been taken down?

Mr. Thatcher—That is as I understand it. It has been taken down.

The Chairman—Has the ceremony of the endowment house been wiped out also, or is that performed now?

Mr. Thatcher—I am just trying to think what I have been through the temple in the light of which I went through the endowment house, to give you a correct answer on that, but my impressions are that the ceremony has been changed.

The Chairman—You have seen the ceremony in the temple? You have witnessed it?

Mr. Thatcher—I think I have heard it.

The Chairman—And you think there is no change in it?

Mr. Thatcher—No, sir.

The Chairman—When did you go through the endowment house?

Mr. Thatcher—My impressions are when I married the wife of my youth.

The Chairman—Will you state to the committee the ceremony in the endowment house? I do not mean the ceremony of marriage; but did you go through the endowment house when you were an apostle?

Mr. Thatcher—No, sir; it was not necessary.

The Chairman—You have been through the endowment house, then, but once?

Mr. Thatcher—Yes, sir.

The Chairman—Will you state to the committee the ceremony of the endowment house?

Mr. Thatcher—I think, Mr. Chairman, that I might be excused on that. Those were held to be sacred matters and only pertaining to religious vows.

The Chairman—Are you obligated not to reveal them?

Mr. Thatcher—Yes, I think I am.

The Chairman—Why would he be so effect if you should disclose them?

Mr. Thatcher—There would be no effect except upon my own conscience.

The Chairman—That is all?

Mr. Thatcher—That is all.

The Chairman—But you are under obligation as a part of the ceremony not to reveal it?

Mr. Thatcher—Yes, sir; I feel myself under such obligation. (1: 1048, 1049.)

This was all the testimony on the subject of the alleged oath or obligation taken during the sessions of the committee held in December, 1904. The last session when testimony was taken during that spring occurred on the 2nd of May, 1904. When the taking of testimony was resumed in December, 1904, counsel for the protestants and the committee on this subject, the substance of whose testimony will now be stated.

J. H. Wallis, Sr., who had been a Mormon but who had formally notified the bishop of his ward, seven or eight months before he was examined, testified that he no longer considered himself a member of the Church, testified that on several occasions he had taken his oaths in the temple at Salt Lake City. He testified that he had taken the oath of the so-called "oath of vengeance" and that those who took it promised and vowed that they would never cease to avenge the blood of the prophets on this nation, and that there was nothing in the ceremony which in any way imported hostility to the United States, or to the government thereof. That he was perfectly clear about that.

He also said he did not remember that the name of Joseph Smith was used in the ceremony. He did recall that there was in the ceremony a quotation from the Scriptures, and upon hearing read verses 3 and 4 of chapter 3 of Revelations, he said that it was something like that, that that was about the extent.

One of these verses, it will be remembered, was referred to by the witness Wallis.

The two verses are as follows:

"Nine, And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, Oh Lord, how long, and how long, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

Being asked whether there was anything in the obligation which indicated hostility to the government, Mr. Noon said:

The very reverse. I have never heard any people taught only loyalty to the government of the United States. (2: 775.)

Mr. Noon was recalled and asked the same question that had been propounded by Senator Knox to Mr. Douglall, and he answered the question in the following manner:

William Hatfield was a Mormon until he was 23 years of age, after which he drifted away from that Church, when he was not quite 21 years of age took his oaths as a preliminary to his marriage, which was solemnized in the endowment house. He said that neither he nor his wife had any obligation in opposition to his duty as a citizen either of the Territory of Utah or of the United States. He was not cross-examined. (2: 796.)

John P. Meakin, who was a Mormon until he was 23 or 24 years of age, left the Church because he did not believe in polygamy. (2: 796.)

He went through the Endowment House when he was 18 years old. He stated that he had no recollection of all of any obligation of vengeance or retribution, and that nothing was said at the time with reference to promising or vowing to importune heaven to avenge the blood of the prophets on this nation, or to avenge the blood of Joseph Smith on anybody; that there was nothing in the ceremony which imposed any obligation in opposition to his duty as a citizen either of the Territory of Utah or of the United States; that he was very clear about this. (2: 799.)

He also said that there was nothing in the endowment ceremony about praying the Almighty to avenge the blood of the prophets on this generation. (2: 801.)

Elas A. Smith, cashier of the Deseret Savings Bank in Salt Lake City, in answer to a question by the chairman, stated that he had conscientiously refused to divulge any part of the endowment ceremony. (2: 854; but in answer to a question by Senator Foraker there was nothing in any obligation of the Church which imposed upon its members, in connection with marriage or any other occasion, inconsistent with fidelity as citizens of the national government or to the state, government, and in no way was in the obligation he did not feel at liberty to state what was in it. (2: 855.)

Richard W. Young, who was a graduate of West Point and of the Columbia College, New York City, and who had served in the volunteer army in the Spanish war, in the Philippines, and elsewhere, is a member of the Mormon Church, and is, no, a polygamist. (2: 950-952.) He was asked by the chairman if he had any objection to disclosing what he took place during the endowment ceremony, and he replied that he considered himself under an obligation not to do so. (2: 969.)

He was asked later by counsel for the respondent if he had any objection to stating whether the ceremony imported in any way or shape, any invocation of vengeance or retribution against this nation. Senator McComas suggested that the witness should state the whole of what he said, and thereupon an extended argument was made at the end of which the witness was asked by counsel for the respondent:

"In that ceremony is there anything which relates to your duties or obligations to your government or to this nation?"

The chairman ruled that if the witness should answer this question he would be required to state the whole ceremony, and thereupon the witness declined to answer. (2: 985, 104.)

Reed Smoot testified positively that there is nothing in the endowment ceremony about avenging the blood of the prophets or avenging anything else on this nation or on this government. (3: 185, 184.)

As already stated, the case was reopened during the present session of Congress for the purpose of allowing the introduction of further testimony on behalf of the protestants, and four additional witnesses were produced with reference to the matter of the alleged obligation. No further testimony on the subject was taken on behalf of the respondent.

The four witnesses referred to were W. J. Thomas, J. P. Holmgren, H. W. Lawrence and W. M. Wolfe.

The witness Thomas testified that he passed through the endowment

testified that she had left the Church in 1897, the following occurred:

Mr. Worthington—Was it before or after the death of your husband?

Mr. Elliott—Why, it was after.

Mr. Worthington—What time in 1897 did he die?

Mr. Elliott—He died in October.

The value of the testimony of this witness may be judged by the fact that the husband who followed her to this country not only did not die in October, 1897, but was living at the time Mr. Elliott gave the testimony in question, and was subsequently called as a witness on behalf of the respondent. (2: 1,015.)

He testified that she had obtained a divorce from him about six years before he gave his testimony, and that she was living when she said he was dead.

On behalf of the respondent a number of witnesses were examined on this subject, and the substance of their testimony was as follows:

Hugh M. Douglall, who is a farmer and a cattle grower, and is postmaster at the town of Springville, in Utah, was expelled from the Mormon Church about 1874, and since then has not been in any way connected with it. He took his oaths when he was about 25 years old.

He testified that according to his recollection the obligation was, in substance, that those who took it imported heaven to avenge the blood of the prophets and the martyrs on this generation, and that he did not remember the name of Joseph Smith being mentioned at all. (2: 759.)

Mr. Douglall was subsequently recalled and asked by Senator Knox this question:

"Are you willing to say whether the oath obligated you to anything incompatible with your giving full and sincere allegiance to the United States or the State of Utah, or to anything incompatible with your fully performing your duty as a citizen of the United States and that state?"

He answered, "Not one thing." (2: 781.)

Alonso A. Noon left the Mormon Church voluntarily about 1870, when he was 32 years of age, having taken his oaths when he was 25 or 30 years old. He stated that there was nothing in the ceremony about promising or vowing to importune heaven to avenge the blood of the prophets on this nation, and that there was nothing in the ceremony which in any way imported hostility to the United States, or to the government thereof. That he was perfectly clear about that.

He also said he did not remember that the name of Joseph Smith was used in the ceremony. He did recall that there was in the ceremony a quotation from the Scriptures, and upon hearing read verses 3 and 4 of chapter 3 of Revelations, he said that it was something like that, that that was about the extent.

One of these verses, it will be remembered, was referred to by the witness Wallis.

The two verses are as follows:

"Nine, And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of the testimony which they held;