member the ceremonies distinctly, The Chairman-Do you remember any portion of it?

Mr. Roberts-Only in a general way senator.

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 tomple

Mr. Roberts-No, sir.

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

Mr. Roberts-Well, the ceremonies consist of what would be considered a series of ceromonies. 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 r.ot. The Chairman-How many days did it take you to go through the endow-

ment house? Mr. Roberts-Well, part of one day. The Chairman-Who were present at

e time? Do you remember? Mr. Roberts-I do not remember.

The Chairman-Can you tell the com-mittee any portion of that ceremony? Mr. Roberts-No., sir.

The Chairman-Why not? Mr. Roberts-Well, for one reason, I to not feel at liberty to do so. The Chairman-Why not?

Mr. Roberts-Because I consider myself in trust in relation to those mat-ters, and I do not feel at liberty to make any disclosures in relation

The Chairman-It was then a secret? Mr. Ruberts-Yes.

The Chairman-Does this religious denomination have, as one of its cere-monies, secret obligations or cove-

Mr. Roberts-I think they could not e properly called secrets. Of course they are common to all worthy mem-bers, of the Church, and generally known by them.

The Chairman-Well, secret from the

Mr. Roberts-Secret from the world. ar. Roberts-Secret from the world. The Chairman-The obligations and covenants, whatever they are, then you are not at liberty to disclose? Mr. Roberts-No, sit: 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 soft of masonic fraternity? Mr. Roberts-It is analogous, per-baps, in some of its features.

The Chairman-You say you can re-member, of course ,what occurred, but you do not feel at liberty to disclose and for that reason you will not

disclose it? Mr. Roberts-Not specifically, I to not wish, however, senator, to be un-derstood as being in any sense defiant in that matter. The Chairman-That is not so under-

stood, Mr. Roberts at all. 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 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? members. Mr. Roberts-Not all

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

Mr. Roberts-It is governed chiefly by worthiness-moral worthiness. Senator Balley-And is it somewhat a matter of degrees, as it is in Ma-

sonry? I believe they have several The Chairman-Do you recall wheth-

er any penalty was imposed upon a person who should disclose the cova-Mr. Roberts-No. sir.

The Chairman-You do not remem-

The Chairman-Your question was whether these obligations related to spiritual affairs or temporal affairs. Mr. Worthington-Yes; that was my

The Chairman-The trouble is he in terprets a thing which is unknown and unsceable 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 ab-ligations demand, ought not to be questioned and permitted to state what he thinks it did not convey, or what obli-gation it imposed, or what it did not impose. The committee can judge of

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 vit-

nes pleading a privilege and making the refusal, and not Senator Smoot or his counsel. We would like to have this question this question answered.

The Chairman-What is the question

Mr. Worthington-The question

whether this obligation refers to things spiritual or things temporal. Senator Balley-I do not think it makes any difference to the committee in the end, or will affect its conclusions, whether that is answered or not. I am partly responsible for that line of questions, and I asked the first question myself because I really intended to insist, if it related in any way to the duties of a citizen, that the committee was entitled to know what that was,

and if it did not, then I had no further nterest 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 obliga-tion or ceremony to which you refer in the endowment house relates entirchy things spiritual or whether it re-

lates to things temporal also? Mr. Roberts-I regard them as relat-ing to things spiritual, absolutely. Mr. Tayler-If we ware in a court of justice, and insisted upon it. I think

that opens the door so wide that the whole oath would come in.

The Chairman-I think so, teo, Mr. Tayler-But I do not care to do it. (1: 745, 746.)

The next witness called on behalf of the protestants was A. M. Cannon, Af-ter his examination by counsel for the protestants was concluded he was furcommittee on this subject, and his testimony was as follows;

The Chairman-Do you remember the covenant you took when you went through the endowment house? Mr. Cannon-Oh. yes.

The Chairman-Could you state the

Mr. Cannon-I would not like to.

The Chairman-Why not? Mr. Cannon-Because it is of a re

ligious 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 fellowship and love of my children and their mothers, my departed ancestry,

and my coming descendants. The Chairman-What objection is there to making that public?

Mr. Cannon-Because It is sacred. The Chairman-How sficred?

Mr. Cannon-It is simply a covenant that I enter into with my Maker in pri-

vate The Chairman-All the tenets of your

religion are sacred, are they not? Mr. Cannon-Sir? The Chairman-They are all sacred.

ire they not-the teachings? Mr. Cannon-All of those are sacred; es, all of those things,

The Chairman-I do not quite understand why you should keep them se-

It is because it is neces.

Mr. Thatcher-My impressions are had testified that she had left the when I married the wife of my youth Church in 1897, the following oc--in 1861. The Chairman-Will you state to the curred:

dead.

through the endowment house when you became an apostle?

Mr. Thatcher-No, sir; it was not pecessary. The Chairman-You have been

through the endowment house, then, but once? Mr. Thatcher-Yes, str. 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. The Chairman-Why?

Mr. Thatcher-For the reason 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-What would be the effect if you should disclose them? That is, is there any penalty attached? 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 bligation as a part of the ceremony not to reveal it? Mr. Thatcher-Yes, sir; I feel myself under such abligation. (1: 1048, 1049.)

This was all the testimony on the ubject of the alleged oath or obligation taken during the sessions of the ommittee held in the spring of 1904. The last session when testimony taken during that spring occurred on the 2nd of May, 1904. When the taking of testimony was resumed in December, 1904, counsel for the protest-ants produced and examined certain witnesses on this subject, the substance of whose testimony will now be stat-

J. H. Wallis, Sr., who had been a Mormon but who had formally notified the hishop of his ward, seven or eight months before he was examined, he no longer considered himself a member of the Church, testified that on several occasions he had taken his endowments in the temple at Salt Lake When first examined he said Chtv. that he did not know whether he had exactly right; but that the substance the no-called "oath of vengeance is that those who took it promised and cowed that they "will never cease to mportune high heaven to avenge the blood of the prophets on the nations of the earth or the inhabitants of the earth." He added that if his memory served him, he thought that was about right, and that a passage of Scrip-ture is quoted from the Revelations, sixth chapter, rinth verse. (2; 79.) The next day Mr. Wallis was recalled and testified that in repeating the

obligation he had made a mistake; and that he should have said "upon this nation" in stead of 'upon the inhabit-ants of the earth." (2: 148.)

Two witnesses were called on behalf of the respondent to impeach Wallis. One of them Moroni Gillesple, whe had been a member of the police force a Salt Lake City for 11 or 12 years testified that he knew Wallis' general eputation for truth and veracity he community in which he lived; that t was had; and that he would not believe him under oath. Wallis had testified that he had never been ar-

ested. This witness testified that he was present in the police court on one oc-casion when Wallis was under arrest earth." (774.) Being asked whether there was any-thing in the obligation which indicated and pleaded guilty to the charge of drunkenness. Gillespie further testl-fied that he had known Wallis for sevhostility to the government, Mr. Noon eral years, and that, in his opinion, he was not altogether of sound mind. said:

heard any people taught only loyalty (3: 317. 318.) to the government of the United States." (2: 775.) The other witness as to the veracity of Wallis was William Langton (2, 1022; 3, 143, 144). Neither his testi-nony nor that of Gillespie was con-Mr. Noon was recalled and asked the same question that had been pro-pounded by Senator Knox to Mr. Doutradicted or impaired in any way. His gall, and he answered the question in slusion, from what he had seen of Wallis, was that the man was crazy, He further testified that, in his opinion, the same way. (2: 781.) William Hatfield, who was a Mormon

had testified that she had left the

Mr. Worthington-Was it before or committee the ceremony in the endow-ment house? I do not mean the cere-mony of marriage; but did you go Mrs. Elliott--Why, it was after. Mr. Worthington--What time in 1997 did ba did

1897 did he die? Mrs. Elliott-He died in October, (2: 191.)

mittee what you mean by anointing. The value of the testimony of this Was your whole body anointed or your arm anointed; and, if so, was anywitness may be judged by the fact that the husband who followed her to thing said when that was done? this country not only did not die in October, 1897, but was living at the Mr. Thomas-My head was anointed and my right arm. I do not remem-

house in 1869. His examination on this | and whether it is in writing or merely

Mr.

times

heard.

the prophets?

drep's children

directed against.

vengeance?

Mr

Did

Mr. Lawrence-Yes.

ness,

Lawrence-I; is administered

Of course the

orally by different persons at different

Mr. Carlisje-It may be, then, that

there is a different form of the oath? Mr. Lawrence-It may be adminis-

substance is about the same, but there

may be some men who administer it a little different from others. I have no doubt that it is, from what I have

Mr. Carlisle--You may take the wit-

Senator Knox-Was this vengeance

to be executed by the person taking the oath, or vow, or were you to implore the Almighty to average the blood of

Mr. Lawrence-As I say, it was a lit-

the ambiguous in regard to that. Of course you take an oath to avenge the blood of the prophets and teach the principle to your children and chil-

Senator Knox-I think you do not

understand me. You stated a moment ago that there was some ambiguity in the oath as to whom the vengeance is

Senator Knox-Now, 1 am asking you

Was the person taking the vow or oath

to execute it or were they to implore by prayer that God should take this

serted in it for the Lord to do it. They simply took upon themselves the oath

to do it; but I say it is almost impos-

cause those men that committed the

based on the exact language used by

based on the exact inguage used of Professor Wolfe yesterday. He said that he heard the oath taken very re-cently, and that they would or promised that they would pray

to Almighty God to avenge the blood of the prophets. I think it is quite ana-

terial, and I want to know what your

Mr. Lawrence-That was not inset.

Mr. Worthington-Tell us about how

many times you were present when this oath was administered?

Mr. Lawrence-1 could not say. It yould go into the hundreds, probably, Mr. Worthington-Several hundred

would say from one to three years,

Mr. Worthington-And on each occa-

Mr. Worthington On all occasions

when you heard it administered to

others, or when it was administered

o you, did you ever hear any reference o the nation of the United Status

Mr. Lawrence-During my adminis-tration the word "nation" was not

Mr. Worthington-Do you mean you

administered the oath? Mr. Lawrence-No, sir: yes, sir, I mean I officiated there with the rest

Mr. Worthington-Then you both ad-

ministered the covenant, and you hear i others administer it?

Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir. Mr. Worthington-You administered it hundreds of times, and you heard it administered hundreds of times; is that

Mr. Lawrence-I was there off and

Mr. Worthington-Did you adminis-ter it hundreds of times?

Mr. Lawrence-I will say yes. (4; 110

Mr. Worthington-Now, I come back.

During all the time you administered

the oath, or heard it administered by

others, did you ever hear the "nation" or the "l'nited States," or the "govern.

nent of the United States" referred to

was the subject of that covenant?

iny way as the object of vengeau

Mr. Lawrence-I will say that, at that

line, it was not connected with the ob-

ernment has always been blamed for allowing that deed to be perpetrated. Mr. Worthington-Don't let us de-

Mr. Lawrence-No, sir; not in writ-

Mr. Worthington-It was communi-

Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir. Mr. Worthington-You do not re-

Mr. Lawrence-1 do not remember

Mr. Worthington-It was given to you

as the traditional oath of the temple,

Mr. Lawrence-It was given to me to

Mr. Worthington-You have said to

varied from time to time. Did you ever

hear it given in any other form than

that you have told us about? Mr. Lawrence-Yes. I will explain

that. I have said that there were dif-ferent parties that officiated at differ-

ent times, and from what I had heard they had changed it a little. Inasmuch

as it was orally given, one man would administer it a little different from

Mr. Worthington-You know that by

Mr .Lawrence-I know that by hear-

Mr. Worthington-Referring to this

ceremony, and the covenant of ven-geance, as it is called, do you remem-

was any passage in the Book of Revel-ations of the Bible?

Mr. Worthington-What is that? Mr. Lawrence-That is used in con-nection with this as a justification for

Mr. Worthington-Can you give us

the verse and chapter of Revelations? Mr. Lawrence-I think it is a chap.

ter from Revelations. It is probably chapter six. It is taken from Revela-

tions. It is simply referred to. I will

answer that that quotation is referred

Mr. Worthington-Was it not a nart

of the teaching of the Church, when

you were connected with it, that the Constitution of the United States is

Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir. Do you want

Mr. Worhington-I have all the answer I care to have, sir. If there is anything you wish to add to take away from the

effect of your testimony, you have that privilege, provided it is not a speech. Let use read the ninth and tenth verses

of the sixth chapter of Relevations,

Lord?" It is just a quotation. Mr. Worthington-I will read the

two, and see if those two verses, or either of them, are the ones to which

scal I saw under the altar the souls of

them that were slain for the word of

God, and for the testimony which they

'And they cried with a loud voice

saying, How long, Oh Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the

Mr. Lawrence-That is part of it in

Mr. Worthington-We would like to have the whole of it. Just show us all

that was referred to in your ceremony

Mr. Lawrence-"How long, Oh Lord, holy and true."

'And when he had opened the fifth

long, Oh

an inspired document?

you refer:

held

earth

there.

connection with this,

cured

an answer to that?

ber in that connection whether

Mr. Carlisle that there is no doubt that he had seen that the language of the covenant was Reynolds living in that

cated to you orally and you committed

memory, did you?

nember who gave it to you?

Mr.

others

hearsay'

say only. (4; 111, 112).

Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir

Mr. Lawrence-I tried to, sir.

language?

on for one or two years.

the object of vengeauce?

sion to a great many people I suppos-Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir.

Lawrence-Yes: or dozens, I

ed in my day-that is, in regard to asking God to wreak this vengeance.

ecallection is about it.

(4) 108, 109).

times?

Mr

of them.

right?

111).

probably.

sible for them to wreak vengeance,

deed have probably gone years ago. Senator Knox-My question

Lawrence-Well, that was not in-

who was to execute the vengen

tered a little different.

subject was as follows: Mr. Carlisle-I have asked you about

whether any ceremonies took place before the oath or obligation took place? If so, state what it was.

and anointings there. Mr. Carlisle-Describe to the com-

and you vowed to avenge the blood of the martyrs upon this nation, did

Senator Knox--And your right arm was anointed to give you strength that

Mr. Thomas-That is the way I un-

Senator Knox-What did you ever do

in the line of keeping that yow? Did you ever avenge the blood of the mar-

tyrs upon this nation? Mr. Thomas-No. sir. I have enlisted twice to try and defend the nation.

S-nator Knox-Were you ever stirred up by the authorities of the Church to

the blood of the martyrs upon this na-

Mr. Worthington-Do you know of my member of the Church who did do

anything in the way of using his right arm to avenge the blood of the proph-

The witness Holmgren on this sub-

ject testified that he passed through the endowment house in 1889. His fur-

Mr. Carliste-Do you remember the ceremonies that took place at that

Mr. Carlisle-Are you willing to state the oath that was taken, or not?. If

Mr. Carlisle-In the first place, what

Mr. Holmgren-In the endowment

Mr. Holmgren-There were a number f oaths and performances that were nsignificant. I would say, until we

came to the anointing room, and in that anointing room there was some language used that I am sorry I ever

Mr. Carlisle-Can you state what it

Mr. Holmgren-In anointing my

arms, the gentleman used this lan-guage: "That your arms might be strong to avenge the blood of Joseph

The witness Lawrence, who was 70

ed that he was a member of the Mor-

mon Church until 1869, and that he had taken or administered the alleged obli-

gation in question a number of times.

The following are the substantial parts

and Hyrum Smith." (4: 76, 77.)

years old at the time he testified.

Holmgren-What I understood

you are not. I shall not press you.

Mr. Holmgren-Part of it.

and heard of it-sure,

Mr. Carlisle-Yes.

Mr. Thomas-No. sir. (4: 71, 72.)

busy in that direction of averiging

Mr. Thomas-Yes. sir.

derstand It.

Mr. Thomas-No.

ts on this nation?

follows:

Mr

mae?

guage;

locurred?

u might do so. Is that corr-

Mr. Thomas-There were washings

Mr. Worthington

judge and avenge ou that dwell on the earl

Mr. Lawrence-I t

part connected with it

Mr. Worthington--Y

Mr. Lawrence-That was used justification of the obligation.

justification of the

The Chairman-He did not justification of the covenant. Mr. Lawrence-1 said that

It will be seen that all three

witnesses flatly contradi

ants, that the obligation

party going through the tile to the United State

to the Aimighty to inflic

under consideration is W.

the endowment

ministered?

166,

WHS

follows

The other witness on t

than 12 times, the being in May, 1894, and time in October, 1902, 310

tion on this subject then

Mr. Carlisle-Will you

mittee whether the

dministered. Mr. Carliale-Carl you str

Mr. Wolfe-There is an

tity, or, I might say, a cov-

Mr. Carifsle-When

piedge to avenue a wimenn simply that the

read to you, or some re Mr. Wolfe-There is

agreement on the part of

agreement of the parts, and to average anything. Mr. Carlisis Just state mittee what it is. Mr. Wolfe-The law of

this: "You and each of y

and promise that you

never cease to pray, Al

this nation, and that

the same to your chil

children's children unt

the speaker snys: "All 1 and say, 'Yes,'"

Mr. Wolfs-Jt was do

ry time, or just one i Mr. Wolfe-It was do

to January last, was or fessors in the Brigham

asked on cross-examination

at Logan, a Mormon institu-

claired against him in-

made, to his knowledge

against him. Upon being he meant by saying that

ie answered that he pro-

a period of possibly 20 v

sition in January last;

hat this was done he

no longer pay tithing, that officers of the institu

objection to his habits o

said that they had ney

removal, or the desiral

ignation until he had

dent offered considerabl

subject was James H.

of drinking for a consid-

That

fufusing to pay tithes

Cardon, the Eishop

sent of counsel for the pro-

or leave of the committee.

ness on the subject of titbing

very material part of his evider

charge.

Wolfe was also cont

davit the witness con-

erence to a conversatio:

charges against one De-

that had been made to Mexico

iection with a

four witnesses. He

expedition Cluff was

Wolfe was a member

that on that expedition Cluff living in marilal

one Florence Reynolds

to have been Cluff's pl

thai, at the hearing of

that he had seen Cluff

By consent of counse

ants, and by leave of

stenographer who took

fore whom he made hi

subject together, the weight of it is against t

that the respondent ever ligation of hostillity to

States, Seven witnesses

definite way testified the

tion included some kind of

prayer indicating hostillt

of whom were called on

protestants, have testifie

and unqualifiedly to the c

of the witnesses who ha

chligation have been impo-their credibility, and no e

veracity of any one of ther

been introduced tending to sustain

1780 The Leader 1905

WalterBaker&Co.s

Chocolate

Itisaperfect food, highly

nourishing, easily di

gested, fitted to repair

wasted strength, pre

serve health and pro

long life.

illustrated Recipe Book sent free.

Walter Baker & Co.Ltd

Established 1780, DORCHESTER, MAS

45 Highest Awards

In Europe and America

U.S. Pat. Off. A new and handsomely

& Cocoa

that the word "nation"

tion, while 13 witnesses.

of them saving that he had not in a

way referred to the fact the

way refer to the relations between two people. (4: 302, 408, 409.)
Taking all of the testimony

seen Cluff, and Florence Reynol-ing together, and that he did not

there were filed the

statement, and the the three members of

before a Church cound

since the manifesto

was not demanded on about

lubits of drinking had grown on

so that It was no longer possible to

There was also filed on behalf of

ow him to retain his position.

respondent the affidavit of Jose

Logan, in which Wolfe lived. This

davit was admitted as evidence br

Wolfe stated in his testimory will ref.

Wolfeis

president of Brigham

rebuttal. One of the

prior to the time he

resign; .

slance.

2:1.)

tithes, (4: 26). As to Wolfe's Asti-

charges might have

harges of drunkenness had no

e said that no such charges ha

might have been preferred against

He admitted that certain

the institution had had conver

time he had given notice that he

with him in regard to his habit drinking (4: 25). He admitted

e had been required to resign his

made himself liable to such charges f

ears. 14:24.

Her admin

deinking:

officers of

cent through, (4; 7).

Senator Overman-Was th

Mr. Carlisle-Was that done?

Mr. Wolfe, for several years and

fourth generations.

avenge the blood of the

vengeance, what do mean that there is

the coremonies in the temple, are

Mr. Wolfe-There are feveral a

testified that he had passed

hous

involved a promise on the

used as a justification

in connection with ft

(4: 116, 117).

time Mrs. Elliott gave the testimony ber anything else. question; and way subsequently called Mr. Carlisle---Was anything said by as a witness on behalf of therespondent (2: 1.015). He testified that she had the person who conducted these cere-monies at the time he anointed your obtained a divorce from him she han years before he gave his testimony, which was in January, 1905. His tesright arm? Were you told what it was

Mr. Thomas-Yes, sir; he timony showed clearly that she knew he was living when she said he was very quick and I couldn't catch it all, but I remember when he anointed my arm to make it strong, and the sub-stance of it was that I would averge the blood of the prophets—prophet or prophets. I believe it was the plural. On behalf of the respondent a nunber of witnesses were examined on this subject, and the substance of their tes-

(4; 69.) · timony is as follows: Hugh M. Dougall, 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 1821, and these the Mormon Church Senator Knox-You took this yow what year?

Mr. Thomas-In 1869, Senator Knox-How long did you remain in the Church after that? about 1874, and since then has not been any way connected with it. He took his endowments when he was Mr. Thomas—I remained in the Church up until 1880. Senator Knox—That was 11 years; about 25 years old,

He testified that according to his recoffection the obligation was, in sub-stance, that those who took it importuned 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 Dougall was subsequently realled, and asked by Senator Knox this question:

"Are you willing to say whether the yow obligated you to anything incompatible with your giving full and su-preme allegiance to the United States or the State of Utab, or which obligated you 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.)

Alonzo A. Noon left the Mormon Church voluntarily about 1870, when he was 22 years of age, having taken his endowments when he was 28 or 30 years old. He stated that there was nothing in the ceremony about promis-ing or vowing to importune heaven to avenge the blood of the prophets on this nation, and that there was nothng in the ceremony which in any way imported hostility to the United States, ther examination on this subject is as ir 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 recollect there was in the ceremony a quotation from the Scriptures, and upon hearing read verses 9 and 10, chapter 6, of Revelations, he said that it was something like that; that that was about the intent.

One of these verses, it will be re-membered, was referred to by the witless 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 God, and for the testimony which they held. "Ten. And they cried with a loud volce: How long, Oh Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the

"The very reverse. I have never

Roberts-Beyond the disfavor and distrust of his fellows. The Chairman-Have you ever been present at a marriage ceremony in the temple

Mr. Robert-Yes, sir.

The Chairman-Could you tell what

that is? 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 be ing famillar with the ceremony, a copy of it was placed in my hands and I read the ceremony, but I could only remem-

ber 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, slr.

Senator Balley-Do you feel at lib-erty, Mr. Roberts, to say whether or not there is anything in that ceremthat permits a man-I will adopt a difexpression-that abridges ferent man's freedom of political action or action in any respect, except in a re-

ligious way? Mr. Roberts-No. sir.

Senator Balley-I do not quite understand whether you mean by your ans-wor to say that you do not feel free to ans ver that or that there is nothing Mr. Roberts-I mean to say 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 "oaths"-that makes it necessary to keep them from the

Mr. Roberts-I do not know of anything especially, except it be their gen-eral sacredness.

The Chairman-Their general sacradness? Ought sacred things to be kept world? from the

Roberts-I think some sacrid things ought to be

The Chairman-Could you name cae sacred thing in connection with this ceremony that should be kept from the world ?

Mr. Roberts-No. sir. Chairman-Why? Because you The

can not remember? 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

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 under-stand exactly how the Church organi-

zation has things that the world must not know of. I did not know but you could give some reason why. Mr. Roberts-I do not think I could

throw any light upon that subject. The Chairman-All right: I will not press (1, (1; 743).

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

The Chairman-Would It not be batter, Mr. Worthington, to let him state what the obligation

Mr. Worthington-Yes, so far as 1 am concerned, I would very much pro-fer it, but i understand the suggestion by Senator Pettus was that he was i terpreting that which he would state WAS ID.

Of course do not know anything more about this than the members of the committee do, but I think it might very well be that a witness might be allowed to state, and might properly say, that he would answer here as 1 anything that related to any temporal affairs; but as to things related to matters between him and his God, or he conceived to be between him and his God, he would not answer here or anywhere else, and that would not be interpretation, but would simply be taking the protection which I understand the law gives to every man-that as to things which do relate entirely to religious matters they are matters which he has a right to keep within his own breast.

sary 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 our people wheever are in good tanding and deemed worthy of proper recommends are permitted to enter there.

The Chairman-Do you enter into any obligation not to reveal these cere-

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 or-

dinances of the Church. The Chairman-In words, do you

romise not to reveal? Mr. Cannon-I feel that that is the trust reposed in me, that I will not go

The Chairman-I think you do not understand my question, Do you promise specifically not to reveal what oc-curs in the endowment house?

Mr. Cannon-I would rather not tell what occurs there. I say this-The Chairman-I think, Mr. Cannon, you do not understand me. Do you romise not to reveal what occurs in

the endowment house when you go hrough? Cannon-I feel that that is an Mr.

obligation*I take upon me when I do

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-Yoft know, do you oot, whether you do or not? Why do you take that obligation not to reveal hese things?

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

The Chairman-I know you would not

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 they must not do that lest they

trample them under their feet and rend The Chairman-Do you remember

whether there was any penalty at-tached 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 endow. ment house since you went through in 1859, 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 pro-

testants was Moses Thatcher. After sunsel for the protestants had finished their examination of Mr. Thatcher, the following occurred:

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

Mr. Mr. Thatcher-Thut is as I under-tand it. It has been taken down. The Chairman-Has the ceremony of stand it. the endowment house been wiped out

also, or is that performed now? Mr. Thatcher-I am just trying to think whether I have been through the temple, in the light in which I through the endowment house, to give you a correct answer on that, but my

impressions are that the ceremony has not been changed. The Chairman-You have seen the ceremony in the temple? You have witnessed it?

Mr. Thatcher-i think I have heard - İt

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?

reputation veracity was such that he would of believe him on oath. When Langton was asked by counsel

for the respondent to give his reasons or thinking that Wallis was of unound mind, objection was made by the counsel for the protestants and the ob-jection was sustained (3; 144). But subsequently he was recalled and alowed to give his reasons, which he did at length (3; 445). August W. Lundstrom, another wit-ness for the protestants, testified that he had taken the endowments six times, and that the obligation in quessix tion was:

"We and each of us solemnly promise and covenant that we shall ask God to avenge the blood of Joseph Smith upon this nation." (2: 151 153.)

He subsequently slightly varies this statement by saying that the prayer was: "We ask God, the Eternal Father, to avenge the blood of Jose Smith upon this nation." (2: 161.) Joseph Three witnesses were called on be of the respondent to impeach istrom. One of them, F. S. Fern-Lundstrom, strom, testified that he had known Lundstrom for about 14 years, and Lundstrom's general reputation for truth in the community in which he lived was bad, and that he, witness, would not believe him under oath. On cross-examination by counsel for the protestants the fact was brought out that Lundstrom had borrowed from his bishop part of a fund which the hishop had collected for the support of the poor, and that when asked by the bishop to return the money, Lundstrom refused to do it, saying that the Church owed him a living. (2, 1,912.)

One of these witnesses, C. V. Ander-son, testified that he knew Lundstrom's ceneral reputation for veracity in Salt Lake City, where he lived; that it was bad, and that the witness did not think he would believe Lundstrom on oath. (2; 1, 015.)

J. H. Hayward was the third witness on this subject. He testified that he had known Lundstrom for many years, the latter having been at one time in his employ; that he knew Lundstrom's general reputation for truth and veracity in Salt Lake City, where he lived; that it was bad, and that from his reputation the witness would not behim under oath.

This evidence as to Lundstrom's reputation for truth and veracity was ot rebutted in any way.

The third and last witness called by the protestants, during the sessions of the committee held in December, 1904, on this subject of the alleged obligation was Mrs. Annie Ellott, who testified that she had taken the endowments several times, and that during the ceremony "they told me to pray and never cease to pray to get re-venge for the blood of the prophets on this nation, and also teach it to my hildren and children's children." (2)

185.) On cross-examination this witness stated positively that she had never told anybody about this obligation; and that if Mr. Tayler was examining her from a memorandum informng him what her testimony would she did not know where it came from how Mr. Tayler came to get 194). On her direct examination Mrs. Elliott stated that she was married in Denmark, and that her husband followed her to this country. Her ex-amination by counsel for the protest-

ants then proceeded as follows: Mr. Tayler-Is he living now-that the husband whom you married in Denmark?

Mrs. Elliott-No, sir. Mr. Tayler-You lived with him un-he died, did you? Mrs. Elitott-Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler-Where did he die? Mrs. Ellott-Why, in Elsinore. Mr. Tayler-In Utah?

Mrs. Elliott-Yes, sir. Mr. Tayler-When 1

Elliott-In 1897 Mr. Tayler-Did you, after his death,

Mrs. Elliott-Yes, sir: I married in 1899. (2; 184.)

On her cross-examination, after she

age, afte he drifted away from which that Church, when he was not quite 21 years of age took his endowments as

liminary to his marriage. (2; 785.) He said that neither he nor any oth-ers in his hearing took the obligation which Wallis had testified to, and that he did not at that time take any obligation or enter into any covenant, yow, or agreement of any kind inconsistent with his duties as a citizen of the Territory of Utah or of the United States. He was not cross-examined. States. (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 at all of any obligation of vengeance or

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 took place which imported 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. (799.)

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

Elias A. Smith, cashler of the Deseret Savings bank in Sait Lake City, in an-swer to a question by the chairman, stated that he had conscientious scruples against divulging any part of the endowment ceremony (2: \$54); but in answer to a question by Senator For-aker he said there was nothing in any obligation of the Church which it im-road upon its members. posed 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. Mr. Smith persisted th while he had stated what was not Mr. Smith persisted that in the obligation he did not feel at liberty to state what was in it. (2; 855.) Richard W. Young, who was a grad-uate of West Point and of the law chool of Columbia college, New York City, and who had served in the volunteer army in the Spanish war, in the Philippines, and elsewhere, is a memof the Mormon Church, and Is no. a polygamist. (2: 950-952.) He was esked by the chairman if he had any bjection to disclosing what took place during the endowment ceremony, and he replied that he considered himself

under an obligation not to do so. (2: He was asked later by counsel for the respondent if he had any objection to stating whether the ceremony included, in any form or shape, any invoca-tion of vengeance or retribution against this nation.' Senator McComas sug-gested that the witness should state the whole ceremony or nothing. There-upon 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 it. (2; 985, 184.)

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; 183, 184.)

As already stated, the case was reopened during the present session of Congress for the purpose of allow-ing the introduction of further testimony on behalf of the protestants, and four additional witnesses were produced with refearence 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. Holmgrem, H. W. Lawrence and W. M. Wolfe. Dr. Kennedy's Favorite Remedy to many people, for it saved my life." Write to Dr. David Kennedy's Sona, Rondont, N. T., for a free sample bothe of Dr. David Kennedy's Parorite Remedy, the great Kidaey, Lives and Blood medicine. Large bottles \$1.00. All druggiets. The witness Thomas testified that

he passed through the endowment

of his testimony on this point: Mr. Carlisle-Mr. Lawrence, would you object to stating whether there is oath, commonly called here the oath of vengeance, taken in the endowment house; and what it is) ligation. I will say this, that the gov

Mr. Lawrence-Yes: there is.

Mr. Carlisle-Can you state it in terms or in substance? Mr. Lawrence-"You covenant and

part from the ceremony. I want to find out what took place at the ceremony agree before God and angels and these witnesses that you will avenge the when you administered the covenant. Did you administer it always in the blood of the prophets, the Prophet seph Smith, Hyrum Smith, Parley P. Pratt, David Patton"-their names are ientioned?

Mr. Worthington-Where did you Mr. Carlisle-Was that the case when ain it you took the endowment? Mr. Lawrence-I learned it from the church ritual, I suppose. It was Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir. I do not know whether they were all mentioned hat was given to me when I was there or not, but they have Mr. Worthington-Was it something nat was in writing or was it in print?

been mentioned when I have been there Carlisle-You have Mr. Dassed

through the endowment a number of times Mr. Lawrence-Yes; , I have been

there a number of times. Mr. Carlisle-You mean these names have been mentioned some of the times

when you passed through? That is what you mean?

Mr. Lawrence-Yes, sir, Mr. Carlisle-You do not know whether they were all mentioned at the same time or not?

Mr. Lawrence-No, sir.

Senator Dillingham-Do I understand witness has given the whole of the obligation? Mr. Carl/sle-I will ask him. Do you remember now whether there was any-thing said about vengeance upon the

people or vengeance upon the nation.

or what was said of that sort, if you

Mr. Lawrence-I say it has been

stated. I can not state it only as I understand it. The word "nation" was

not mentioned where I was in regard

to that vengeance, but the feeling has

always been against the nation and the

petrated. The word "nation" was not mentioned. It is a little ambiguous

entioned. It is a little ambiguous regard to that.

Mr. Worthington-You say you are

Mr. Lawrence-It was a little ambi-

The supposition is it should be

guous there who it should be executed

executed on the perpetrators of the

Mr. Carlisle-Mr. Lawrence, I will

get you to state, if you can, whether

this covenant, or oath, or whatever it may be called, is always administered

by the same person and in the same

terms, or whether it is administered

at different times by different persons,

Must Use The Knife

Said the Surgeon, but Dr. David Kennedy's Fa-

vorite Remedy was taken and the Knile Avoided.

N. Y., recently published the following in-

of 127 South Avenue, that city, was saved

from a painful operation by the use of Dr.

Mr. Adams said: "Three years ago I was

taken with kidney disease very badly; at times I was completely prostrated; in fact,

was so bad that the day was set for the doe-

tors to perform an operation upon me. But

I decided I would not submit. I had been

put in hot water baths, and, in fact, nearly

every means was tried to help me. Upon

the day set for the operation I commenced

DR. DAVID KENNEDY'S

FAVORITE REMEDY

and from that moment began to gain, and

and have had no return of the trouble since.

My weight has increased and I never was so

well as I am now. I have recommended

it was not long before I was entirely

the use of

David Kennedy's Favorite Remedy.

The Union and Advertiser of Rochester,

ng account of how William W. Adams

nbiguous or it was ambiguous?

for allowing that deed to be per-

stated.