DESERET EVENING NEWS THURSDAY NOVEMBER 23, 1899.

HON. B. H. ROBERTS **DEFENDS HIMSELF**

Full Text of His Answer as Written by His Own Hand for the New York Times, and Published by That Paper.

To Refuse a Representative a Seat Where He Has Been Legally Elected is a Proceeding Utterly Without Precedent - As to Expulsion, No Member Has Ever Been Expelled by the House for an Alleged Defect of Moral Character-Those Who are Responsible for the Present Agitation to Encompass Expulsion, Says Mr. Roberts, are Aware of the Weakness of Their Position, and are Taxing Their Ingenuity to Have the House Act Without Regard to Precedents or Legal Rights.

The Associated Press on Sunday last | onveyed to the country the synopsis an article written by Congressman B. Roberts for the New York Times, and published in that journal on that The article in question is a reew and statement of facts concerning controversy occasioned by Mr. Roben's election and is published in full the "News" for the information of its readers. It is as follows:

INTRODUCTORY.

Those engaged in working up a pubsentiment against the representae from Utah demand of the House of presentatives cither that he be not owed to take his seat, to which it is nitted that he was legally elected, be being admitted, that he ufter That the House can do either these two things is extremely doubt-To refuse a representative his seat has been legally elected-no ad charged in the election returns, untest made by opposing candidates the office, and it is admitted that representative possesses all the incations prescribed by the Constion of the United States-is a pro-ing utterly without precedent and ogether so absurd as to be out of the on. As to the proposition to exthe member from Utah after seat-him, while it is conceded that the nts of the House are not altoher harmonious on the subject of of members, it is perfectly to say that it never yet has exed a member for an alleged defect moral character. The clause of the fitztion that grants to the House power to expel a member is as fol-"Each house may determine the more for disorderly behavior, and. th the concurrence of two-thirds, ex-May punish him for a member. conduct. disorderly May him for what? Evidently for disict of a more aggravated which the house is disturbed usiness interrupted, or its dignity honor infringed. Certainly not for alleged misdemeanor which, if comtted at all, was committed before the aid member's election, was well known his constituents, was charged against im during the campaign in which he as elected and punishable under the ws of the State from which he comes. I think those who are at the bottom of he present agitation to encompass the apulsion of the member from Utah are wate of the weakness of their posla from a legal standpoint, and hence are seeking by all the means their ind Representatives to act without regard recedents or the legal rights involv and to that end they have started elclous societies the present agitation of only against the member from Clah, but against the whole Mormon Rople. I have no fear, however, that e House will act without regard to a precedents established or my legal hts. Nor do I believe the members the House will be much influenced by clamor of sectarian religious lles, for the reason, first, that it is a satter clearly outside the sphere of the and, second, because the whole agitation is based upon misrepre of facts and absolute falsehod. And as many well-meaning peo-peand Christian ministers, outside of ah are misied by the falsehoods of use at the bottom of the religio-polital scheme to unseat Utah's represen-ative and thus defeat the expressed will of the people of a soversign State, I point out some of the false charges on which the agitation is based:

Constitution, while the part of the law efining and punishing continuous ing in polygamons relations was dis-carded. Why? Because there was nothing in the enabling act that denanded the disruption of those exist ag marriage relations which had been ntered into under the sanction of the "Mormon" Church, It only required that 'polygamous or plural marriages" should be prohibited for the future. When it was suggested to the gentleman who introduced the resolutio making the above settlement that the part of the law defining and punishing uniawful cohabitation should also be included in the Constitution, he replied in effect that those were conditions he

was not aiming to meet; that the en-abling act only required that po-lygamous marriages for the future should be prohibited, and that is all should be promoted, and that is an that was done. All this appears in the officially reported and published de-bates of the Convention. That was the settlement of this question. That is the compact between the United States and the people of Utah. Those were the forms of far as polycomy was conthe terms, so far as polygamy was con-cerned, on which Utah was admitted into the Union. And I affirm positive-ly that that compact has been kept on the part of the people of Utah. The people of my State are not covenant breakers, as her enemies charge. There s no attempt made to repeal or annul the parts of the Constitution prohibit-ing polygamous or plural marriages. There is no desire to disrupt that com-pact with the United States. The "Mormon" Church has not violated the com pact and has no desire to annul it, but on the contrary, the venerable head of the Church has officially avowed his

determination to adhere to this settle-ment of the question. The representative to Congress from Utah has not violated this compact, the assertion of his elemies to the con-trary notwithstanding. When the little colerie of sectarian ministers and dis-appointed would-be political bosses in Utah who have this sectation say Utah who began this agitation say that the Mormon Church or its mem-bers violate the compact between our State and the people of the United States because a few men in Utah feel morally bound to fulfill their obligations to the women they married under sanction of the Mormon Church, pre-vious to the issuance of the Church manifesto of 1890 discontinuing polygamous marriages—when they say this is a violation of the compact with the United States, they say that which they know to be untrue; disrupting and discontinuing those polygamous relations was no part of the compact. It was not demanded by the enabling act. It was not any part of the action of the Constitutional Convention, but, on the contrary, steps were studiously taken not to disrupt those relations by con-stitutional provision, by discarding the parts of the anti-polygamy law which would have brought about that result. And, indeed, was not that a just and statesmanlike settlement of the vexed question? What good would come to the people of the United States by a disruption of those plural families? What good would come to either morality or religion to turn those plural wives and their children adrift? What christian woman's home would be the securer for knowing that a Mormon plural wife's home was now destroyed? And let it be remembered that the home and family of that plural wife was es-tablished under the tablished under the sanction of-to -a holy church ceremony, and with the approval of all her people. A broad mind and a Christian spirit will approve of the settlement that was made of that question. The fountain of the evil was dried up, the people of the United States can be generous enough to allow the streams that flowed from it to take their course until lost in the oblivion of death. Since her admission into the Union, Utah has been under the strictest surveillance. The whole nation has watched her. Even sectarian priests in Utah, according to their own reports to church conferences and articles to the press, left somewhat their high calling as ministers of the gospel and turned spotters and spies upon their Mormon neighbors, to see if they could catch them violating the agreement with the government; and yet all they can truthfully charge is that some men-the number is few and rapidly growing less-who entered into plural marriage relations previous 1890, when the Church formally and of-ficially discontinued such marriage, and hence, of course, previous to the settle-ment of the question by the compact of our State Constitution, have felt it morally binding upon their consciences to fulfill the obligations of their marriage vows to those polygamous familles. This is the only "polygamy" that has existed in Utah since the admission of all ship? of the State or since 1890, in fact. And yet these cases have been so ingeniously reported by the present agitators as to make it appear that they were new cases of polygamy; that the Mormon Church was "resuming" the practice of "polygamy;" that the State of Utah was

grannannannannannan THERE'S A SHOE

In our window that tells the tale quicker and better than we can. It is one of our \$3.00 shoes. Worn over a year by a bricklayer-tested thoroughly, Every shoe we build for man or boy Is just as good.

ROBINSON BROS'. CO., SHOE BUILDERS, . 124 Main St. Burunnunnunnunnunt

refrain from any effort to express the contempt one naturally feels for those who like to deceive, and bear false witeess against their neighbors. A con-empt increased by the recollection that to be the most part this despicable aglia-tion, based on misrepresentation and supported by falsehood, is the work of men posing as ministers of the gospel of Jesus and sent out to Utah, forsooth, to convert the Mormong from the error of their wave! of their ways!

TE NOT A CHURCH MATTER. It is faisely charged that the "Mor-Church controls the politics of

Cish, and that the representative from Utab was nominated and elected by 'Mormon' Church influence. The political convention which nominated the representative from Utah was the regularly called convention of the Democratic party, conducted under the regulations usually governing such bodies, and in which both Gentiles and "Mormons" sat as members. From the several candidates for the nomination Roberts was chosen on the first ballot, and no question of the regularity of the convention or of its proceedings was ever raised by Democrats, either on the part of Gentiles or "Mormons," and both classes worked enthusiastically for his election. The "Mormon" Church had nothing to do either for or against the representative's election. It is true he had "Mormon" Democratic friends who worked for his election, but it is also true that there were "Mormon" Republicans-and a number of them high in the councils of the Church-who as earnestly sought by every honorable means in their power to encompass his defeat. The representative carried every non-"Mormon" stronghold in the defeat. State, and lost many almost exclusive-ly "Mormon" settlements, (because the majority of the people in them Republicans), and came out of other almost exclusively "Mormon" countles with greatly reduced majorities; and he is today representative from Utah rather by reason of Gentile than of "Mormon" support. It is not true that he was either nominated or elected by 'Mormon" Church influence.

III. NO TEST OF AMERICAN SENTI-MENT.

It is falsely charged that the "Mormon" Church leaders sought to have Roberts elected to test the sentiment of the people of the United States as to whether Utah would be held to the agreement in the matter of the abandonment of polygamous or plural marrlages. This is the first time the "Mormon"

leaders were ever charged with abso-lute stupidity. Any question about the people of Utah being held to their agreement to abandon polygamous or plural marriages, as provided in their State Constitution, has never existed. There never has been in the minds of anybody at any time a doubt about it. The struggle for toleration of a plu-ral marriage system, running through balf a century, attended as it was with the suffering inflicted upon the "Mor-mon" people under special legislation and vindictive crusades: with its orced exlie and imprisonment for those who out of an honest thought believed they were but doing God's will-all this, and much more, is not forgolten. The "Mormon" people know the views of the reaches of the Unit of the views of the people of the United States on that subject without testing it again. There never was a more puerile sugges-tion than that the representative from Utah was elected to make such a test. It is too slily to require refutation.

standing the Utah Constitutional prohibition of such marriages. The only evidence adduced in sup-port of the charge is a quotation from a magazine article, written some two years ago by him in response to inqui ries of a number of gentlemen in New York, who asked on what grounds the "Mormon" Church in the past had justi-fied the doctrine of plural marriage. The question was presented in such form that it involved the consideration of whether or not the Bible sanctions polygamy; and my answer to that ques tion is now so misrepresented as to make it appear that I am an advocate of polygamy in the sense of ing plurat marriages now. wherea: every way I stand committed to sus-tain the settlement of that question as fixed by the terms of the Utah Consti-tution forever prohibiting plural marriages; and my art/cle merely the grounds on which the Church in the past breed its justifica, tion of plural marriage. Would the men trying to unstat the representa-tive from Utah hold that one may no make an explanation of past conditions without offense? Are these sectarian ers who are at the bottom of this agitation against this representative s ensitive over the fact that the force of repressive and harph often cruelly administered, that Mormo 643 the suppression of plural marriages rather than the Rev. Dr. Newman against Orson Pratt or their own little popyun arguments of the same subject-are they so sensitive on this matter that they can bear n on this matter that they can bear ho explanation of this past controversy without stuffing their largers in their cars and running through the nation screaming, "The 'Mormons' are advocating polymay, the 'Mormons' are threat ening the American home?" It would be interesting to learn what views thes

gentlemen entertain on the freedom of they reared? In Spain or or some petty despetism of the Orient urely they never breathed the f the great western republic free a they down from the minth or the thir teenth century? Surely they do no belong to the close of the ninetcenth

I pass by the many other falsehools that have been uttered relative to my self in this present agitation, knowing that the time is near when those who ultered them and myself will be face to face. I can then answer to the charves accusing me of being guilty of a misdemeanor in the State of Utah. I can answer to the House of Represen--the first parliamentary body i tativesthe world-if it can consent to so fai forget its dignity as to resolve itself into a police court to ascertain if one of mbers is guilty of a misden alleged to have been committed in ; distant State and punishable there. I could have answered to the accusation year ago, for it is more than that ngth of time since the clamor about it began, I could have answered then in some justice of the pence court in Utah if the complaint had been made before such a magistrate instead of before the whole American people. But to so lay the complaint did not suit the start-ers of this present activities bent as ers of this present agitation, bent as they were upon an anti-"Mormon" cru-It could not have been made to sade. sade. If could not have been made to appear by proceeding so that the "American home," enshrined as it is in the hearts of \$9,000,000 of people, pro-tected by the force of a "Christian" civilization, and shielded by American law, including the Utah Constitution-it could not have been made to unnear it could not have been made to appear that this American home was in danger if this man had been haled be-fore a justice of the peace and his guilt or innocence quietly ascertained. No: they must use this case for agitation purposes, to show the great republic what danger it is really in. I pass by all this now, however, and only point



IN

h M

PE

shir

inet

fri

1, 85

p te

FE

shin

e v

As. 1

1 45

nted

32, 5

DA

e tris

ton

ned

att

FAITH HAS NOT BEEN BROKEN.

It is falsely charged that the Mormon hurch has broken faith with the goverament of the United States in refermes to polygamy; that is, it is charged that the practice of polygamous mar-siges has been resumed by the Church. In the trst place, it must be remem-bred that ered that no compact exists between the "Mormon" Church and the government of the United States on the subset of polygamy. The only compac trating on that subject is between the reple of Utab, acting through their throat acting through their convention, and the people the United States represented by the President and Congress. To understand that compact is important, as by rea-ten of it the whole vexed question of Memory polygamy was settled, and by understanding the nature of that compact the damnable iniquity of the breast agitation appears. In the en-abling act passed by Congress authoriz-ing the people of Utah to form a State ernment it was expressly stipulated at the constitutional convention 6100dil "provide by ordinance irrevocshe without the consent of the United States and the people of said State * * that polygamous or plural mar-tiages are forever prohibited." That fiages are forever prohibited." has the only demand made upon this subject by the people of the United States, Congress could be induced to to no further, though an effort was made to have it do so. When in the Constitutional Convention the repretentatives of the people of Utah dealt with this requirement they adopted the tery language of the enabling act. In

addition to this the convention also dupted so much of a former territorial aw as defined and provided for the punksment of polynamous marriages, ad declared it to be in force in the State of Ulah. This territorial law exactly paralleled the enactments of Contress on the same subject. It defined plysamy in the same terms as the Con-Pessional enactments did, and pro-vided the same penalties. It also devided the same penalties. foed unlawful cohabit and unlawful cohabitation in the same terms as the acts of Congress, biggamous relations after the illegal marriage relations after the illegal marriage relations have been formed, and in both the Congressional and Territorial legislation was made a misde meanor, whereas polygamy was a fel-eny. This law, I repeat, the convention cut in two, and made the part punish-

ing polygamous marrying part of the



breaking its covenant with the nation

CUTICURA RESOLVENT is so pure, sweet, and wholesome that all ages may take it with pleasure and benefit. Ita mission is to cool and cleanze the blood in crema and other torturing, disfiguring homors, rashes, and irritations, while warm baths with CUTICURA SOAP cleanse the surface of crusts and scales, and gentle anointings with CUTICURA Gint ment soothe and heal itching, burning skin, Sold throughout the world. Powers Davo And Chess. Cost, Sole Props, Boston. All About Daby's Skin, free.

NOT BRIGHAM YOUNG'S PREDIC. TION.

It is faisely charged that Roberts was elected to crowd polygamy down the throats of the American Congress and people, to fulfill an alleged prediction f Brigham Young that it would yet be

done. I challenge, first of all, the existence of any such prediction. Familiar as I am with all that Brigham Young ever said or wrote that is on record, and, familiar as I am with his contempo-ratics, I never saw or heard of any such prediction until this absurd charge in made a few months are in a New was made a few months ago in a New York paper, and repeated recently by minister at an anti-"Mormon" meet-Second, I challenge ng in Boston. that such a consideration anywhere of at any time entered into my nomi m or election. It is fabrication pure and simple.

V. DOES NOT REPRESENT POLYG-AMY.

It is falsely charged that the Congressman from Utah was elected to represent polygamy. That if he is sentgressman ed and retains his seat it will mean that Congress Indorses polygamy, and that there will be an immediate re-vival of the "Mermon" plural marriage system in Utah. In the name of all that is consistent,

In the filte to know how the "Mormon" people could hope to base a revival of the practice of plural marriage-even if they had the disposition to do soon the fact of the representative from Utah taking and retaining his seat in the House. Does the House of Reprethe House. Does the House of Repre-sentatives endorse the individual views the men it admits to member If Socialists should from some Congressional district elect a Congress-man, would his admission to the House say to the world that the American Congress indersed Socialism? Surely my enemies give the "Mormon" people and even Congress little credit for common

sense when they trump up such a charge as this. I don't go to Washing ton as a representative of polygamy. I am not sent there by my constituents to ask Congress to consent to the re-peal of the clause in our State Constitution which defines, prohibits, and pun-ishes polygamy-and it should be remembered that this particular clause in our State Constitution cannot be repealed without the consent of the United States. I shall not go to Washington to advocate or even defend po-lygamy. The question has passed the point where either is necessary in the American Congress. By the settlement of the matter between the people of the United States and the people of the State of Utah the question has been taken from the field of political contro-versy. What views and beliefs individ-usly may entertain is a matter of in uals may entertain is a matter of in-difference in this connection. We have not yef undertaken, I think, the task of prescribing opinion or barring men from political preferment for mere opinions they may entertain.

VI.

"THE AMERICAN HOME." It is falsely charged that the repre-sentative from Utah now advocates polygamy-that is, the present contract. Best habit you can acquire is to make daily use of them at meals to keep the digestive organs strong and vigorous.

by reason of which many worthy peo-ple are being misled and induced to join in a hue and cry over a question, the real merits of which they know lit

he people of that State is

e or nothing. The danger to the American home, in the protection of which this present agi-tation is invoked, and which is urged as its justification, does not lurk in the sur-blessed valleys of Utah, filled with farming villages, where domestic peace and happiness rise every day to greet the morn and crown the hours with quiet joy. The good people of New quiet joy. The good people of New York City and other cities can find it much nearer home. In this city where I am writing—the city of Helen Gould —and I mention that lady's name with the profoundest respect and admiration for her good works, her womanly char-ity, and, withal, her broadmindedness and only regret that she has been misled in relation to conditions in Utah-but here in the city of her home within any thousand feet square, may be found more that menaces the American home than ever existed, or I hope ever will

exist, in the whole State of Utah. And knowing this, it looks just a little ridiculous to see well meaning reformers so far misled by misrepresentation of Utah affairs as to be found standing knee deep in the swamps of social evils about them, vainly trying to tiptoe themselves into a position where they can peek over the rugged summits of the Rocky Mountains to find some desperate menace to the American home Leave Utah alone; she is able and with work but her own salvation, if, indeed, she is not already as for along that road as any other State in the U B. H. ROBERTS. New York, Nov. 17, 1899.

TO SUPERINTEND BUILDING.

J. L. Walters, who is to superintend the musoury work on the University building for Contractor Roney, is here, ready to assume charge as soon as the work is commenced. The excavation for the normal building has been com-pleted, and part of the foundation ma-

terial is on hand. Mr. Walters is one of the most promi nent superintendents of masonry in the United States. He has been connected with the George A. Fuller company of Chicago, which has built some of the largest buildings in that elty during the past few years. He superintended the masoury work on the farmous Auditor lum building as well as other famous structures.

SEASONABLE HINTS.

Guard Your Health in Fall and Early Winter.

A change from warm to cold is always attended with more danger than ways attended with more danger than from a cold to a warm temperature, hence the greater moriality from lung and throat diseases at this season of the year as compared with spring. The best protection against colds is not so much in extra clothing as in good

digestion. If the digestion and circulation are Poor digestion causes poor circulation of the blood and when in this condition

severe colds are contracted on the slightest provocation.

slightest provocation. People who make a regular practice of taking Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets after meals are free from colds, simply because their digestion is perfect, the heart strong and regular, and the whole

beart strong and resultar, and the whole system fortified against disease. It recuires little argument to con-vince anyone that the best safeguards against colds, pneumonia and changes of temperature is a good stomach. Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets taken af-ter meals are dissolved and mingling with the food cause it to be promptly directed and statements. digested and assimilated; they do thi digested and assimilated; they do thre because they contain nothing but harm-less digestive elements, which digest meat, eggs and other food even when the stomach itself is weak and flaceld the storach their is weak and flaceld. Stuart's Dyspepsia Tablets make peo-ple well and keep them well, and the best habit you can acquire is to make daily use of them at meals to keep the