

been in sore trial all day over the contesting delegations from Bear Lake County. The notorious Joe Jones, the Mormon Sheriff of that county, and Sam Rich, son of the late General Rich, the Mormon Apostle and polygamist, were elected delegates by the Mormons of Bear Lake County. The Gentile delegation, headed by A. McIntosh, who were elected by a mass meeting of Gentile Democrats, contested the seats with the Mormon.

The committee on credentials wrestled with the mighty problem as to whether they would fire the Mormons and thus jeopardize the loss of the Mormon influence, or whether they would throw out the Gentile Democrats. A number of democratic delegates from Oneida, Bingham and Cassia, as well as the Gentile Democrats of Bear Lake County, stated that if the Mormons were seated they would leave the convention and support the Republican nominees.

The committee on credentials finally made a report in favor of all the delegates from all the counties excepting Bear Lake. They refused to report, either for or against, the Mormons or the Gentiles.

Mr. Agnew, of Shoshone County, vigorously denounced this lack of courage on the part of the committee, and the convention finally instructed the committee to make a report on the Bear Lake case tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

It is an open secret here that the democratic party expects the Mormon aid and influence, but counsel differs as to the wisdom of proclaiming that fact by anything so plain as the seating of the Bear Lake Mormons. It is thought a trade will be fixed up tonight, by which the Mormons will withdraw their claims, or allow themselves to be kicked out amid applause.

It is difficult for genuine anti-Mormon democrats to understand why the convention should hesitate, especially if, as they will say in their platform, they insist on the rigid enforcement of law. No Mormon can vote in Idaho under the constitution or the legislative enactments, and, in consequence, there is no more reason why they should be admitted as delegates to a political convention than Chinamen should be.

The democratic convention has certainly made a pitiable exhibition of itself on the first day, and has sadly lessened the very slim chances which that party had.

THE HANSEN CASE.

The case of Nathan Hansen, under examination on a charge of unlawful cohabitation, continued from Thursday last, came up before Commissioner Greenman at 10 a.m. Aug. 23; and incidental to it was one of the most singular cases of contempt of court on record. A lady witness, speaking perfect English, gave a strictly and literally truthful answer to a question, swore she could give no other answer, and yet was adjudged in contempt for not answering, and

ordered into confinement, all because neither the court nor the prosecutor understood her meaning, and she was unable to make them comprehend her. The particulars will appear in the course of the following account of the proceedings:

George Baldwin, of North Point, testified. Witness lived eighty or ninety rods from defendant; knew Margeret Hansen; she has lived in a house about a quarter of a mile from defendant; had not seen her since last winter; never spoke to the defendant until today about Margeret Hansen; she had no baby when witness visited her last winter, that witness saw.

Win. Langford testified—Lived at North Point, nearly two miles from defendant; had known Margeret Hansen many years; last saw her three or four months ago at her own home; she has three children; the youngest might be five years old; could not state its age definitely; visited her as a Church teacher.

Mr. Critchlow—Is the defendant a member of the Mormon Church?

Mr. Moyle—I object.

Objection overruled.

Witness—I believe he is; I think he is counselor to the Bishop; have no idea where Margeret Hansen is; it was in the winter or early in the spring when I last saw her.

Emma Hansen, daughter of the defendant, testified: Margeret Hansen has three children; the youngest is eight years old; they were all at our house this morning; I have not seen Margeret Hansen since I testified the other day; there is a trail between our house and Margeret Hansen's; went to her house to look after things two or three weeks ago; knew that she was not there.

It had previously been shown that Margeret Hansen left her home about six weeks ago, and the prosecutor tried to get the witness to tell where Margeret Hansen was, and how she knew she was not at home, when she, (witness) went to care for her house, but did not succeed to his satisfaction, and the court reprimanded the witness. Mr. Moyle insisted that the witness had answered every question.

Mr. Critchlow:—What reason had you to suppose that Margeret Hansen was not at home, when you went to her house to care for it?

Mr. Moyle raised different legal objections to this question, but the court in a determined manner said the witness must answer it.

The witness said: "The reason why I did not expect to find Margeret at home when I went to her house to look after it, was because when I went to her house she was not there."

Over and over again this question was put: "How did you know that Margeret Hansen was not at home when you went to her house to care for it?"

Over and over again the witness repeated the same answer: "Because when I went to her house I did not find her at home."

Mr. Critchlow insisted that the witness was trifling with the court.

The latter reprimanded the witness repeatedly and threatened to punish her for contempt.

Mr. Moyle endeavored to have her give a more satisfactory reason, but the witness said she could not.

Mr. Moyle insisted to the court that the witness had given the only answer she could give, but the court ruled that her answer was no answer at all and that she must give one.

Mr. Critchlow then asked: "Before you went to Margeret's house you did not expect to find her there, now why did you not expect to find her at home?"

Witness—Because I knew she was not there.

Mr. Critchlow insisted that the witness was contumacious, and persisted in refusing to give an answer to his question.

Mr. Moyle admitted that the witness had not given a very intelligent reply, but insisted that she had evidently answered as well as she could. He endeavored to have the witness give an answer which would satisfy the prosecutor, but she said she could give no other reason, not expecting to find Margeret Hansen at home than that the latter was not at home when witness was there.

The court held the witness in contempt and ordered her to be committed for twenty-four hours, until she should consent to answer.

Mr. Moyle requested that the court recite the question and the witness answer thereto, and her further declaration that she could give no other answer than the one she had given, but the commissioner denied the request.

Mr. Moyle—Very well; I presume we will be able to get the facts before the proper court.

Elizabeth Hansen, another daughter of the defendant, testified: I never saw my father at Margeret Hansen's house; she is not now at her own home; she left there about six weeks ago; don't know which way she went; saw her the day before she went.

Mr. Critchlow—Why did you testify the other day that you had not seen her since last summer?

Witness—I don't remember testifying. If I did it was because I was confused; I don't remember your asking me that question, nor giving such an answer. I was very much confused. Did not see my father at her place at the time she went away; don't know with whom she went nor where she went. Don't know that she was about to be confined; am confident that she was not.

The case was ordered continued until 10 a. m. Monday, and the court informed Miss Emma Hansen that she was in custody. At Mr. Moyle's suggestion it was agreed that her answer to the question might be taken in writing, whenever she chose to answer to the satisfaction of the court. It was apparent that the witness had no motive for not answering the question satisfactorily. After court adjourned, Mr. Moyle had a brief conversation with the witness, where all became perfectly clear. Her reply to Mr. Critchlow's question had