

SHERIFF JONES EXPLAINS.

In your issue of the EVENING NEWS of Sept. 30, there is an article under the heading: "The arrest of B. W. Driggs—A Remarkable and Wonderfully Complicated Affair." The statement is from Mr. Driggs himself. He accuses me, as sheriff of this county, and my deputies, of going out of the way, so as not to serve any papers on the United States marshal or his deputies. There was never any papers placed in my hands for the arrest of the United States deputies and I never was out of the town of Montpelier, nor was my deputy. I was in company with Mr. Driggs nearly all the time that he was under arrest, and when his attorney spoke to me about having the deputy United States marshal arrested, it was 7 o'clock in the evening and I had just left Driggs' company. I walked home, and on my road I met my deputy and informed him what Driggs' attorney was thinking of doing. I informed him also that any processes placed in our hands, I would serve. I was at home that evening from nine o'clock until eleven. I was called out on official business and returned at midnight, and was at home from that time until nine o'clock next morning, when I went down to the depot and saw Driggs and Deputy Whetstone there, waiting for the train. I was within 100 yards of them. My deputy spoke to them, and Driggs did not leave Montpelier until five o'clock in the afternoon.

I am ready at all times to do my duty, and I am always ready to serve any papers placed in my hands lawfully. But in this case I never saw the papers nor do I know that there were any out. The attorneys said they would prepare them, but I don't know today that any such papers were got out.

B. W. Driggs should be the last person in the world to accuse me wrongfully. When Hobson arrested him for the charge in Utah, and Hobson was arrested for kidnapping by the constable, and the constable undertook to take Driggs away from the marshals, they tell me that there were eight deputies present, and for a while it looked as if serious trouble would occur. Deputy Hobson telephoned to my house for me. I was away but soon arrived. Hobson told me that there would be trouble and asked for my protection as sheriff of the county, and that they (the marshals) were going to hold Driggs at all hazards. I told Mr. Hobson that I saw no reason for any serious trouble in this case; that I would take Mr. Driggs and take care of him and guarantee his presence when wanted. I also spoke to Mr. Driggs and his attorney, and they were pleased that I took that stand so that Driggs would not be guarded in a saloon. I receipted for Mr. Driggs, to show my good faith to the U. S. marshal, took him to my house, and after supper let him go to his lodging house. Next day he attended to his business until noon, and about that time of the day gave me the slip, and I was unable to find him for five or six hours. When I did find him he had

walked nearly two miles and was secreted in a house. My feelings can better be imagined than described. After he had promised to me that before he would betray me he would lay in jail for ten years, and said that I was a good friend to him, which I was. I brought him on to Montpelier, after I found him, and then I had him stay in my house all night, stopped with him until noon next day (instead of putting him in jail) so that he could attend to his business. I then turned him over to the U. S. marshal and demanded my receipt.

I was then through with Mr. Driggs, and if you can censure me for the stand I took in this matter, I am willing to take the blame. What I did was done in good faith, and as far as Mr. Driggs is concerned, my confidence is lost in him, and after all I did for him he accuses me wrongfully, and everybody in this part of the country knows it. I am ready to prove everything I have stated.

JOSEPH JONES,
Sheriff Bear Lake Co., Idaho.
MONTPELIER, Idaho, Oct. 7, 1890.

COURT PROCEEDINGS.

The case of the People vs. Soren Mickelsen, charged with unlawful cohabitation, was taken up for trial.

Maria Mickelsen—Live at Fountain Green. Was married to Soren Mickelsen in Denmark. The witness could not speak English and stood aside.

Augusta Mickelsen—Live at Fountain Green. My husband's name is Soren Mickelsen. Have been married nine years. Have children by him. His first wife's name is Maria. Live in my father's house. Three blocks from Maria's. Have always lived there. My last child is two years and seven months old. I was born in 1888. My husband has not visited father's house for three years. Have been to Mickelsen's house a few times in the last three years. Never ate there. He has not eaten at our house for three years. Have never been out with him publicly. It has been more than three years since Mickelsen was with me. He quit coming to our place on account of the law. There are three rooms in father's house. I have one. Have lived there nine years. Mickelsen has sent support by his boys. He has not brought anything to me for three years. Have been at his house four or five times. Haven't spoken to him within three years.

Maria again took the stand, an interpreter having been secured—I sometimes go over to Augusta's to see the folks. Have not seen Mickelsen there. He has not been there when Augusta comes to my house. She was at my place three months ago. Mickelsen was then in the field. Augusta is known as the second wife of Mickelsen.

To Thurman—Defendant does not live with Augusta as his wife.

Augusta again took the stand and denied that she testified before the grand jury that she had visited her husband at his house. She also denied that she had staid with him all night, for three years, although

it is understood she is his second wife.

To Thurman—I agreed with Mickelsen that we would not live together, over three years ago.

James Mickelsen, son of defendant, testified—I have known Augusta, father's second wife, for nine years. She has children that bear father's name. Have seen Augusta at father's house and take meals there. Father was absent. Father sends Augusta provisions. Saw father go to Augusta's some years ago. He stopped living there three years ago last July.

Michael Mickelsen—Live with my mother, Maria Mickelsen. Augusta lives four blocks from us. Seldom have I seen Augusta at our house.

There was not sufficient evidence on this case for a conviction and jury was instructed to return a verdict of not guilty.

Court opened at 10 o'clock. The case of the United States vs. Chas. Vincent, charged with adultery, was taken up for trial.

Mr. Vincent is a single man living in Provo, and is said to have gone to Fairview sometime in July and committed the crime of adultery with Nancy J. Sanderson, a married woman.

Nancy J. Sanderson testified—Am nineteen years old; have been married to John M. Sanderson for three years and live at Fairview, Saupete County; while my husband was absent Charles Vincent, the defendant, had intimate relations with me; have had no children by him.

Zina Young—I am sister of Nancy Sanderson, and was with my sister in July last; saw Charles Vincent there; he was acting properly; there is but one room in the house; Charles staid after the rest went home; I went to bed at 11 o'clock; they were sitting and talking, don't know when my sister went to bed; they were together the Sunday prior; when I would go to bed I would blow out the light, leaving them (Charley and Nancy) sitting in the dark.

Joseph Titcome—Know Charley Vincent and Nancy Sanderson; they were at my house some time in July; they were playing games; never heard of Vincent being married.

The prosecution rested.

A number of witnesses were put upon the stand to show the bad reputation for truth and veracity of Nancy, as were a number of witnesses for the prosecution brought forward to prove that Nancy had an excellent reputation prior to this trouble occurring.

The case went to the jury with brief argument and a verdict was returned of guilty as charged.

The case of the United States vs. George C. Hales, charged with adultery and polygamy, was called, but several witnesses were absent. The bonds of Mary O. Mellor were declared forfeited. The bondsmen are John F. Mellor and Warren E. Davis.

The case of the United States vs. Hyrum S. Crane, accused of adultery, was called and a jury empaneled.