THE DESERET EVENING NEWS.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

FORTY-NINTH YEAR. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1899, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. NUMBER 79.

PROSECUTION NOW RESTS.

All the Evidence Against McCune Has Been Submitted.

DEFENSE HAS NOW COMMENCED.

Hughes's Testimony is Stricken Out — Cook's Charge is Not Against McCune—Van Cott Outlines the Defense —Ex-Sheriff Turner Testifies.

Today's proceedings in the alleged bribery case, brought to a close the testimony against the defendant. No new evidence was given. Mr. Irvine and Representative Law were recalled and briefly interrogated on one statement made by each; and the testimony given yesterday by Mr. Hughes, as to something Mr. Irvine had said to him in relation to securing Jackson's vote, was stricken out. Senator Evans testified as to his telephoning to Fisher Harris last Saturday morning after Mr. Law had made his charges, and stated the answer of denial made by Mr. Harris. Representative Cook was called by the prosecution, but his testimony was finally decided to be irrelevant to the charge against Mr. McCune, and will be heard by the committee in another connection. The attorney for the prosecution here announced that he had no more witnesses to examine, and the defense began. Mr. Van Cott outlined what the defense would endeavor to prove by witnesses, and called Turner, who was on the stand when the committee adjourned till 4 o'clock this afternoon.

LAW WAS DOWN TODAY.

Immediately upon the committee being called to order this morning Mr. Van Cott stated that it was the intention of the attorneys in the case to have counsel for Mr. Law's name down yesterday for the purpose of taking his deposition, it being understood that he was then in Salt Lake town and had sent word to the investigating "Hut," continued Mr. Van Cott, "we are informed on the best authority that Mr. Law was down town yesterday when it was stated by this committee that he was too ill to appear before it. Now, it he was well enough to come down town as stated here last night, it appears to me, to have come to this building on so important occasion as this. He is living in the Twenty-first ward and has not very far to come so we considered not to go up there, but have him come down here this morning. I see suggest that the sergeant-at-arms be sent for him with instructions to bring him here at once."

Chairman Shurtliff—Was Mr. Law seen down town yesterday?

Attorney Van Cott—He was.

Chairman Shurtliff—By whom?

Attorney Van Cott—The sergeant-at-arms. We made an effort to serve notice at 10 o'clock yesterday morning, an hour after he should have appeared before this committee.

Chairman Shurtliff—The sergeant-at-arms will immediately proceed to bring Mr. Law before the committee, providing he is in a condition to come.

Sergeant-at-Arms—Shall I take a carriage?

Chairman Shurtliff—We do not care what you take so that you bring him at once.

LAW APPEARS.

Attorney Evans had just stated that he agreed entirely with the sentiments of the chairman of the committee and remark on the other side when his client, Mr. Law, walked into the room. He carried a cane and limped perceptibly. The halt being caused by rheumatism.

MOVES TO STRIKE OUT.

Attorney Van Cott here moved to strike out the evidence of Reporter Hinckley for the reason that it was hearsay, incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial in that it was purely hearsay for the purpose of the case, and had been proved that hearsay testimony was not admissible under such circumstances. Other points were raised and should be considered. Attorney Evans requested that he be permitted to further continue the cross-examination of Mr. Irvine before answering to Mr. Van Cott. Permission was granted and he moved Mr. Irvine

"Did Mr. McCune secured your services on behalf—"

"I had but one personal conversation with him."

"When was that?"

"At the Kenyon Hotel."

"When?"

"Early in January."

"After the balloting for United States Senator had begun?"

"I think so."

"Was anything said with reference to the Jackson vote?"

"Something was said with reference to me seeing Mr. Jackson."

"State what."

"I said to the McCune headquarters and was asked by Mr. McCune if I would call. I did not."

"Is that all?"

"I was asked if I could see him."

"And did you say?"

"I said I would."

"Is that all?"

"Yes."

"You are sure there was nothing more?"

"It was the whole thing—there was nothing more to it."

"You were working in the interest of Mr. McCune at that time?"

"I was doing everything I could for him."

"You volunteered your services?"

"I acted on my own judgment."

"In pursuance of what Mr. McCune said to you did you see Jackson?"

"I did."

"What position does Mr. McCune occupy with reference to yourself—you being city editor of the Herald?"

"In the vice secretary of the Herald company, I believe; I think his name appears as such at the head of the editorial columns each morning—that is all I know about it."

"You testified yesterday that Justice Powers in the presence of Chambers said he was not a weather vane and that he has he went where he would pay to stay; that he did not want to fit about from bush to bush. Now as a matter of fact, Mr. Irvin, did not you yourself use the term and not Mr. Jackson?"

"I think it quite likely that I caused the conversation with Mr. Chambers in that way."

"Will you say that it was yourself and not Mr. Jackson that made use of the expression?"

"I never positively that one of us made use of it; I am perfectly willing to assume the responsibility for it."

"I don't want you to assume anything."

"Well, I am willing to do so if it will help you any."

"Well, what is your best recollection then?"

"That is my best recollection."

"What?"

"That I made use of it."

"That is what I wanted to know."

Attorney Dickson—If you made use of it, it was in answer to Jackson's question?

"Yes."

Representative Sorenson—Did you make use of it later in the conversation?

"I don't know; I may have done so."

HUGHES'S TESTIMONY GOES OUT.

The attorneys on either side then made lengthy arguments as to the advisability of striking out Hughes's testimony to remain on the records. Finally it was stricken out on a vote of five to two. Those voting in the affirmative were Senator Whitney, Representative Stewart, Cummings, Sorenson and Mansfield, and those voting in the negative were Senator Shurtliff and Senator Howell.

MR. LAW RECALLED.

Representative Law was present, somewhat lame, from rheumatism, and had been ill from a bilious attack, he said. Questioned by Mr. Thurman as to whether he had said that McCune had personally made appointment with him for Saturday morning, he said that the appointment with McCune was made by W. W. Dixon, and McCune's reason saw McCune on Wednesday night, for a moment, at his headquarters, but did not talk to him then.

Representative D. S. Cook was sworn. A member of the Legislature, knows Mr. Parr on the train from Logan, on Sunday two or three weeks ago. Mr. Parr, who had been voting for McCune, said—

DEFENSE OBJECTS.

Mr. Dickson—We object. The mere fact that Mr. Parr was voting for Mr. McCune, does not connect him with McCune in such a way as to hold the latter responsible for anything Mr. Parr may have said, voting for him does not make Mr. Parr his agent.

Mr. Parr, he said, came to Mr. Cook in just as incompetent as what any person on the street may have said to any other person, so far as this case against Mr. McCune is concerned. I care not what he said or to whom he said it, whether it was true or false, unless it be shown that Mr. McCune was in some way responsible for it. What Mr. Parr said or did not say to Mr. Cook, is an testimony in this case unless it be given who intends, to tie the conversation up against Mr. McCune. Senator Howell has remarked that the defense would be given with latitude under which the investigation was to be conducted, but this latitude was surely within legal rules. The investigation was to be as broad as it can be made under the specific charges heard in the assembly. The committee was instructed to consider any kind of a charge against Mr. McCune or any other senatorial candidate. There was to be no limit to the inquiry, but it must be by proper rules. Mr. Parr was no legal witness, and when nobody the experience and wisdom of centuries and those rules of evidence that have grown out of them are adopted. We are willing that this investigation shall cover every word this witness has said, and every other one who was engaged by him, has uttered, but not what may be said by parties for whom he is not responsible and with whom he is not connected.

SENATOR HOWELL SPEAKS.

Mr. Howell said he was not a lawyer, and was not going to enter upon a question of the rules of evidence, but he thought Representative Cook ought to be heard. The question on the floor of the assembly had been referred.

MR. EVANS ARGUES.

Mr. Evans said: A number of witnesses have been called charges on the door against this member he heard might be heard. It may that the principles of good have common sense was the rules of law and rules of evidence. Mr. Cook is entitled to Mr. Cook, to the opportunity to state what he knows or what he has been heard.

REPRESENTATIVE STEWART INQUIRES.

Representative Stewart asked, is this not really a charge against Parr, rather than against Mr. McCune. Ought not some kind of connection be established before we permit this testimony to go in and take it for the McCune case?

Mr. Evans replied: These are the people referred to by Mr. Black, as those whom he should summon for Mr. McCune; these are the men named by Parr in his statement to Mr. Cook.

Mr. Dickson—I suppose Mr. Parr made the remark while on his own responsibility. Mr. Evans, would you not object to Mr. Cook's testimony if some kind of connection be established before we permit this testimony to go in and take it for the McCune case?

Mr. Evans replied: These are the people referred to by Mr. Black, as those whom he should summon for Mr. McCune; these are the men named by Parr in his statement to Mr. Cook.

Mr. Dickson—I suppose Mr. Parr made the remark while on his own responsibility. Mr. Evans, would you not object to Mr. Cook's testimony if some kind of connection established before we permit this testimony to go in and take it for the McCune case?

Mr. Evans—I would object to Mr. Cook's testimony if it were in relation to what Mr. Parr said to him. Mr. Parr is not a witness for the defense. He is a witness for the prosecution. He is a witness against Mr. McCune, and Mr. McCune is responsible for what Mr. Parr said or did not say to Mr. Cook, is an testimony in this case unless it be given who intends, to tie the conversation up against Mr. McCune. Senator Howell has remarked that the defense would be given with latitude under which the investigation was to be conducted, but this latitude was surely within legal rules. The investigation was to be as broad as it can be made under the specific charges heard in the assembly. The committee was instructed to consider any kind of a charge against Mr. McCune or any other senatorial candidate. There was to be no limit to the inquiry, but it must be by proper rules. Mr. Parr was no legal witness, and when nobody the experience and wisdom of centuries and those rules of evidence that have grown out of them are adopted. We are willing that this investigation shall cover every word this witness has said, and every other one who was engaged by him, has uttered, but not what may be said by parties for whom he is not responsible and with whom he is not connected.

SENATOR HOWELL SPEAKS.

Mr. Howell said he was not a lawyer, and was not going to enter upon a question of the rules of evidence, but he thought Representative Cook ought to be heard. The question on the floor of the assembly had been referred.

MR. EVANS ARGUES.

Mr. Evans said: A number of witnesses have been called charges on the door against this member he heard might be heard. It may that the principles of good have common sense was the rules of law and rules of evidence. Mr. Cook is entitled to Mr. Cook, to the opportunity to state what he knows or what he has been heard.

REPRESENTATIVE STEWART INQUIRES.

Representative Stewart asked, is this not really a charge against Parr, rather than against Mr. McCune. Ought not