

for unlawful cohabitation, was postponed till Sept. 23, 1889.

United States vs. Niels Aagaard, unlawful cohabitation; an order was entered for the marshal to furnish a statement.

United States vs. Mads Jensen; sentence for unlawful cohabitation was postponed till Sept. 23, 1889.

United States vs. Andrew Poulson; May 20, 1889, fixed for sentence; the defendant is charged with unlawful cohabitation.

Samuel Oldham, of Paradise, Cache County, was arraigned in the First District Court, at Ogden, before Judge Henderson, April 26, on a charge of unlawful cohabitation, to which he pleaded guilty. Some two weeks previous he gave himself up to Deputy Marshal Whetstone, and appeared before Commissioner Goodwin. After stating his case in answer to questions from the court, he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment and to pay a fine of \$100. He was taken to the penitentiary last evening.

On the 29th of April Andrew Anderson was arrested at Huntsville, Weber County, on a charge of unlawful cohabitation. A preliminary examination was held before Commissioner Black, and the accused was placed under \$1500 bonds to await the action of the grand jury.

The following was done in the Third District Court on April 29:

The case of the United States vs. Brigham H. Roberts was called. Mr. Roberts gave himself up to the officers this morning, and was arraigned on the charge of unlawful cohabitation, the indictment naming as his wives Louisa Roberts and Celia Dibble Roberts. A plea of guilty was entered, and Mr. Young, counsel for defendant, asked for two weeks' time before sentence.

Mr. Peters opposed the request, and said that sentence should be pronounced right away. He said the defendant had been arrested in the fall of 1886, and when released the on bail had left the country. The officers had never seen him since until he came into court this morning. The bond had never been forfeited, because, Mr. Peters said, he had been unable to find it.

Mr. Young said he did not know that the government had any particular vengeance to wreak on the defendant. He had come and voluntarily surrendered himself, and the request that he be given a few days' time was not unreasonable. Such a kindness on the part of the court was not lost on those who received it.

Court—Has he a family?

Mr. Peters—Yes, sir; two families.

Court—It would be natural for him to desire to arrange for his family's comfort, since he has been away for a time. No government officer should have any personal feeling in these matters. If the court or the government officials were trifled with, that could be considered at a proper time. Mr. Roberts was then asked if it would

materially discommode him if he was not granted the time asked for.

Mr. Roberts—My family would be put to considerable inconvenience. I desired a few days to arrange for their welfare.

Court—Would a week be sufficient?

Mr. Roberts—I think, your honor, that it might be.

Mr. Young (after consulting with his client)—If your honor please, rather than have any trouble or dispute, if the prosecution will not grant the time we have asked for we will end the matter here, and will come in on Wednesday if you wish.

Court—Set it for Wednesday, May 1st, at 10 a.m.

Mr. Peters—I think the bond should be increased to \$2,000.

Mr. Young—Oh, well, we can give the bond.

Mr. Roberts was released on C. S. Burton and J. T. Little becoming his sureties.

On May 1 the following occurred:

Court—Mr. Prosecutor, have you the evidence that was submitted to the grand jury?

Mr. Peters—I have not.

Court—I would like to know what the evidence shows in this case, if you could procure it.

Mr. Peters retired to obtain the desired information. On his return he announced that there had been no minutes kept of the case. Mr. Peters said the defendant married his plural wife since the passage of the law of 1882, and had lived with both of his wives.

Mr. Young—I understand you have that from hearsay?

Mr. Peters—Yes; from the officers.

Court—Mr. Roberts, on February 14, 1887, you were indicted for unlawful cohabitation. To this indictment you have pleaded guilty. Have you anything to say before sentence is passed upon you?

Mr. Roberts—No, your honor; I haven't anything to say.

Court—This indictment charges that from March 1, 1884, to Feb. 7, 1887, you lived with more than one wife. Mr. Roberts, when were you married to your plural wife?

Mr. Roberts—In the year 1883.

Court—Have you any children by her?

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; one.

Court—What is its age?

Mr. Roberts—Four years.

Court—It would appear that right in the face of the law passed to prevent further marrying of second wives, or living with more than one woman, as wives, you deliberately, in full knowledge of the law, married another wife, and lived with her, and she had one child. You now make no statement of regret for what you have done, nor do you make any promise as to your future conduct. It may as well be understood that this law was passed to be obeyed, and will be enforced. Any failure of this people to obey it is likely to result in more stringent legislation against them. The history of legislation shows an intention that this sort of social life in Utah shall be uprooted. So far as I am concerned, I don't feel disposed to

be severe. I would desire to be relieved from passing sentence in this class of cases, but it is my duty. This case would justify the full penalty. There is no intention on your part to obey the law.

I understand that after you were arrested you concealed yourself, and the officers could not learn your whereabouts, until you surrendered yourself a few days ago. This is the first time, however, that you have been arraigned for any offense, and I shall not inflict the full penalty made by law. I hope that further reflection will convince you of the uselessness of opposing the United States, and the universal sentiment of the people. The sentence of the court is that you pay a fine of \$200 and costs of the prosecution, and that you be confined in the penitentiary for four months.

## THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

From a platform 900 feet high midgets are raising a beacon that will give light to three millions of people. The tower Eiffel is now the one landmark of Paris, and the view from its third platform will be mountainous in its reach, while the electric light will shine from a further elevation of 80 odd feet. As the exposition is given to celebrate the first century of the Republic of France, by an exhibit of the progress of free labor in that period, no more fitting cap to the work could be found than this structure which marks the reign of iron as a building material.

More useful is the parallel to this great work, Machinery Hall (La Galerie des Machines) at the other end the Champ de Mars. It is an aggregation of iron arches into an immense shell of iron and glass, 1,367 feet long, 157 feet high. The arches terminate in wedges which rest upon the foundation and move under the expansion and contraction of the iron frame of the building. The sole beauty of the tower when viewed from the grounds is found in its four arches on which it rests. The hall is the one impressive feature of the exposition; neither work could have been accomplished in any other country. The very magnitude of the undertakings appealed to the imagination of the French.

The exhibits were to be on the grounds early in April. All commissioners are busy receiving the boxes now and getting them in place. To accommodate the 43,000 exhibitors there are assigned the old exposition building, the Trocadero and its grounds reaching to the Bridge of Jena (Pont d'Jena); the entire Champs de Mars; the bank of the Seine to the Pont des Invalides and the wide Esplanade des Invalides. Steamers run along the Seine stopping at the bridges, a little, narrow gauge railway will connect the two fields, and foot bridges, cross the streets between the grounds occupied, so a visitor can go the rounds on one admission fee of the entire 175 acres covered.