

shameful irregularities and abuse of treatment to which I have been subjected before and during said trial. In the first place, I was waited on by a committee claiming appointment from W. D. Burrough, P. C. I asked this committee, "Who had made complaint against me to Brother Burrough?" They answered, "No one, but general rumor had caused Brother Burrough to send them. It was proven on the day of trial that B. F. Ross had at that time made complaint in writing, which does not appear in the testimony furnished you by the church; and J. M. Downer also testified on the day of trial, that he had made oral complaint—all of which had been done prior to their appointment. Now, to show one of the irregularities to which I have been subjected; Brother Burrough did appoint B. F. Ross and J. M. Downer, who were complainants, upon the committee of investigation, which is contrary to all parliamentary usage, common law or justice. Soon after the said committee waited on me, I went to Brother Burrough, which was the 3rd Sunday in June, and asked him as my pastor to show me wherein I had violated any of the rules of our church. He said, "If I had my Discipline I could show you." I at once drew mine from my pocket and handed it to him and asked him to point it out, which he failed to do then and has never done so yet.

Another irregularity: The bill of charges was made out against me by the said committee on the 9th of July, 1898, and was handed me on the 19th of July. Brother Burrough attempted to have me tried on the 22nd of July without so much as notifying me of his intention, but I happened to hear that they were going to try me so I went down to the church. He, Brother Burrough, empaneled his jury, had the indictment read and asked me if I was ready for trial. I told him I had not been cited to trial, and the trial was postponed indefinitely. After I had gone home, he, with a few other persecutors of mine, fixed the 19th of August as the time to try me again, without asking me anything about whether it suited me or not.

At that meeting I asked him to have the specifications amended so as to show what I had done in order that I might make an intelligent defense. He refused this, and ignored everything I proposed.

He also failed to appoint a secretary, or keep a minute of the said meeting.

I was duly cited to appear on the 19th of August for trial, and I appeared for trial on said day. The house was called to order and I asked that a secretary be appointed, which was done. The attorney for the church then announced that he was not ready for trial. I asked why he was not ready and he said that Dr. Wilkins and J. M. Downer, witnesses for the church, were absent. I then asked what he wished to prove by them that I might possibly admit it. He, B. F. Ross, could not tell what he wanted to prove by these witnesses; however, Brother Burrough granted the continuance with the remark that "Some of the committee or jury were absent and they had studied the case, and he wanted them to be on hand."

Knowing that no record had been kept of the preceding meeting, I again asked that the specifications against me be amended, and began to point out my objections to them when Brother Burrough said very abruptly that he would not hear me—nor listen to me—and further stated, that there were other things against me that would be withheld from me until the day of trial.

He then indefinitely postponed the trial again. (No minutes were kept of this meeting.)

On the 20th of September I was again cited to appear for trial on the 21st, giving me only one day for preparation. I made showing of this and after great effort on my part a continuance was reluctantly granted me. The day of trial then was fixed for Sept. 28th. Pursuant to adjournment, we met, and the house being called to order at the request of the prosecutor, J. M. Downer, the third specification was stricken from the indictment; whereupon I claimed a trial before the church, according to the discipline of the M. E. church South, P. 30 and 31, which privilege was denied me, and I was forced to a trial before a committee, proceeding at once to empanel the committee or jury, placing Dr. Wilkins on said jury while he was a witness against me; thereby causing me to exhaust one of my preemptory challenges. Bro. Burrough then attempted to place N. P. Allison on said committee, or jury, and he was a member of the committee that found the indictment. The jury finally became completed, testimony was taken, a portion of which has been submitted to by the prosecution, some of which, however, is not what witnesses testified to on the stand. For instance, N. P. Allison said when asked if he had ever heard a Mormon preach, that he had not. If he had read any of their literature? "I have not." "If he had ever read the discipline of the M. E. church?" "But very little." "If he had ever read the Bible any?" "Not much." I also asked Mr. Allison this question, "Did I not ask the committee on the day they visited or waited on me, who made the complaint to the preacher about me?" and he answered that "Ross said, no one had made complaint, but the committee was appointed on general rumor." J. M. Downer also stated the same on the witness stand, then further admitting that he had also made complaint to the preacher.

A portion of J. C. Langston's statement was left out. When asked, "Did you ever ask the Mormon Elders what was meant by a certain clause in their articles of religion, which reads as follows:

"We believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly?"

Answered, Dr. Mims and I did ask the Elders what they meant by that clause, and they said "Every Bible scholar knew that the italicized words were not supposed to be a correct translation, and that clause was put in their articles of religion to meet the argument of the infidels." When J. M. Downer was on the witness stand I wished to refute some of his testimony with the Bible; and asked that he read a certain portion. This was over-ruled by Burrough. The case was given to the committee, or jury, and they were bade retire and bring a verdict according to the testimony. They were out about two-and-a-half (2½) hours, long enough in fact to convince any unbiased person that the jury was divided in their opinion. Finally they brought in a verdict of "guilty as charged." Said verdict not being signed by the committee, or jury, and Bro. Burrough did not ask the jury if that was their verdict; but very abruptly declared me "expelled from the church," giving me the severest punishment known in the discipline without giving me one word of consolation, or showing one particle of sympathy for me. Since this trial, I have been regrettably informed that the two members from my own church, who were on this committee, were in favor of acquitting

me all the time, and would not sign the verdict. The three members that found me guilty were from another church, and I am fully persuaded that if they had fully understood the case as did the two members from my own church, I would have been acquitted without a dissenting vote.

In my feeble way I have stated these irregularities, and have stated nothing but facts as they occurred, and will also state that I am no Mormon, that I have been a "Simon pure Methodist" for thirty-three (33) years trying to serve God in my feeble way; and I expect to continue doing so, by the help of God, either in or out of the Methodist church, until I am called to "cross over the river."

I hereby ask that this case against me be dismissed, and show to the world that malice and prejudice cannot prevail in our church.

Yours very truly,
B. F. LEWIS,
Appellant.

The object in view in thus expelling our friend from the pale of the M. E. church was, doubtless, to deter other Methodists from giving shelter and aid to the Mormon Elders. It will not have the desired effect in the case of Mr. Lewis and his estimable family, numbered as they are among the very best people in that part of the state in which they reside. They will find, in the sequel, that they have lost nothing by their kindness and their determination to investigate for themselves the doctrines which have been revealed from heaven in this century for the obedience and salvation of mankind. It is difficult to see wherein our friend has violated any rule or regulation of the M. E. church. Methodist ministers, in some instances, have entertained the Elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints when traveling without purse or scrip, and, in rare cases, have permitted them to occupy Methodist pulpits. So far as known those ministers have not been disciplined for their kindness, and certainly they were acting upon the instructions of Jesus Christ when giving "even a cup of cold water" to one of His disciples. It is to be deplored that bigotry and intolerance should still hold such sway among people who profess to be followers of the loving and charitable Nazarene. However, the Lord will, no doubt, overrule it all for the good of our friends who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake, and for the spread of the principles which they will do well to accept and embrace with all their hearts, and thus gain the reward of obedience to the everlasting Gospel and obtain a crown of glory which will endure forever.

THE DIVORCE INDUSTRY.

Twelve divorce cases in one day in this city is a pretty good record if judged from the standpoint of numbers alone; otherwise it is a very bad one. It would be less objectionable if more conspicuous, but the facts compel the admission that except as to the arithmetical phase of the case it is altogether too common to stand out any bolder than any other every-day matter that oscillates more or less between uncertain limits and just now has gone a little beyond the highest previous mark. It remains, however, a proper subject to comment on, no matter if it has become common.

To begin with, there is no fault to be found with the court. The laws prescribe what shall be the grounds upon which a decree of separation shall be granted, and when those grounds obtain to the entire satisfaction of a reasonable person, the duties of a judge