

base assassins who should have been punished, and the government never instigated or committed the crime, or approved of it. Henry W. Lawrence, an apostate, says that the government was not even intended; and so does every honest man. It has been found that there is nothing disloyal in all the endowment ceremonies.

Then the objectors fly to the sermons that have been preached, and select isolated passages. But these are not doctrine; they are not accepted by the Church in the sense in which the objectors interpret them. I say that when the Prophets Joseph and Hyrum Smith were killed; when 15 or 16 men, women and children were cast in a dark hole and buried; when scores of similar crimes were committed, the State of Illinois should have punished the murderers. The objectors here dare not deny that these murders were committed in cold blood. And there is no record of one of the murderers being brought to justice. Then 20,000 men, women and children were driven from their homes into the wilderness. Has that outrage ever been punished? But what did those people do? They came to foreign soil, hoisted the Stars and Stripes, and took possession in the name of the United States.

In 1857 word came that 25,000 soldiers were on the way to drive them again. Don't you think the people were excited? Don't you think the murder of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters and children came before their eyes again? Would you expect moderate expressions from a people in this situation? But the expressions were against the mobs who had despoiled and would despoil them, not against the government.

In 1858 the people here were living on roots. The Church did exercise a temporal power then, in one instance, and by it saved the people from destruction. It divided the food. In all the eastern journals there was not a word of sympathy for us. It was understood there that hundreds of men, women and children were dying of starvation, and one journal stated in its columns that there was at least a solution of the Mormon question, for they were starving to death. I admit that it rankled in my breast in those times.

On this came an army which we understood was to annihilate us. After the *sympathy* shown to Mormons in Missouri and Illinois; after the *sympathy* shown in rejoicing that we were starving, we were informed of the additional *sympathy* of an army coming to destroy us. Is it any wonder that wild expressions were made—expressions that today we would not make, and would not approve under different circumstances? I challenge the other side to compare the history of any State or Territory with ours, as to a law-abiding people, even with the solitary exception of a law against a doctrine of our religion.

Our witnesses emphatically state there is nothing in the Endowment that is repugnant to the gov-

ernment—that there is nothing bearing in any way upon the government. As to obedience to the Priesthood, testified to by McGuffie, Wardell, Bond and Gilmor, who also testified that polygamy was enjoined by covenant. Mr. Lawrence as well as others denied this, as far as the Endowments are concerned. Mr. Lawrence said that was the trend of the teachings outside. The witnesses say that Joseph and Hyrum Smith are included among the Prophets. It is also in evidence that the ceremony is the same for the dead as the living, showing that it has no reference to the individual action; and when Mr. Dickson could get nothing to suit him, he would end by a question which he wanted to impress on the court as meaning that the witness was not telling the truth; that question was: "Are you a Mormon?"

But the "Mormons" told the truth, and when it came to matters that were sacredly religious, they declined to answer. So because the alleged oath was shown to be a myth, the other side flew to old sermons, such as I have referred to. I will mention another witness who said there was nothing that was incompatible with citizenship in the Endowments; that there was no covenant to obey the Priesthood; that there was no covenant to avenge the blood of the Prophets; that there was no reference to the government, by inference or otherwise; and that man is E. L. T. Harrison. He is as intelligent and as respected as is Mr. Lawrence, and he declares that there is nothing in the Endowment that is contrary to good citizenship. So does Ell B. Kelsey, also a man of intelligence and reliability. There is nothing in the Endowment that is in any way opposed to good citizenship. That is the declaration of Mr. Harrison and other reputable men. It has been urged that a prayer to avenge the blood of the Prophets is antagonistic to the government. But the answer to this is that not an intelligent man understood that he was to take any part in it—that there was anything objectionable in it. Again I refer to the reason for Mr. Lawrence leaving the Church—that it had no connection with the Endowment House, but it was because of his attachment for certain friends in a question about temporal affairs. The testimony of the witnesses for the applicant has shown that these references to the government never had any existence in fact, and our witnesses are corroborated by all the reputable witnesses for the objectors.

In regard to the sensation of Mr. Wardell, it shocked the community, and there was great excitement in consequence. I suppose the attorneys brought Wardell in good faith, and thought he would tell the truth. I can understand Wardell on no other ground than that he is more a fool than a knave. He named some whom he said were present at the horrible scene. I admit that I never heard such a shocking story before. Wardell's own son, not a "Mormon,"

was sent for and he contradicted flatly his father's testimony. Then comes Wardell's wife, daughter and another son, who also state that the story is false. Wardell says Green lived at Farmington. We brought witnesses and proved that the only man named Green who lived at Farmington is still alive, in the northern part of the Territory. Joseph Follett, said by Wardell to be an eye-witness to the horrible deed, is brought, and swears that no such a thing ever occurred. The whole was a trumped-up story, with not a word of truth to base it on. And that is the case with all the noise that has been made about the "Mormons." There is not a thread on which to hang any of the horrible stories about "Mormons." They are alike baseless and untrue.

In regard to the intolerance of "Mormons," the objectors have sought among the dregs of the apostates, who are the most bitter of all toward those who were their former associates. Here the "Mormons" are on trial on the testimony of their sworn enemies. What was the story of Christ Himself, as told by His enemies? It was that He was a winebibber and a glutton; and it was left to His friends, in the four Gospels, to tell the true story of His life. I say that the testimony brought here against the "Mormons" is unworthy of consideration in a court of justice. The history of the "Mormons" has not been one of peace and comfort; it has been one of injustice and persecution, and is it any wonder that some of them have spoken bitter words?

In regard to the alleged trailing of the flag. I say that there never was one purposely dragged in the dust. There may have been one that dropped, but even Mr. Arthur Pratt, who says he would have seen it had it been trailed, declares he saw no such thing. The testimony of it is only from sworn enemies. The court speaks of the demonstration at Mr. Wells' release. This is the only place on the continent where a man is consigned to a felon's cell for contempt of court. The people rose up and manifested their distaste of such a thing.

Court—Is there any other place to confine them in?

LeGrand Young—It is the business of the government to treat us as it does people in other parts of the republic. It should have provided a place here as it does elsewhere. It has the means and certainly has had the opportunity. It has no right to discriminate against us. I say that Utah is the only place where the United States, when a witness is committed for contempt, consigns him to a felon's cell. And the people in the case of Daniel H. Wells manifested their disapproval of it. And was that treason? I say it was not. They had a right to do so. The people had a right to express themselves, just as the English people did when they strewed the path of Defoe with flowers, to and from the pillory, until the executive had to pardon him. Was there any treason in that? Not a breath. They were expressing their distaste