

order by the members thereof. An account of its origin was revealed to Joseph the Seer in 1830.

It was concocted through a wicked compact between Satan and Cain. Cain loved Satan more than God. It was by the command of Satan that Cain made an offering unto the Lord of the fruits of the field.

And Satan said unto Cain, "swear unto me by thy throat, and if thou tell it, thou shalt die; and swear thy brethren by their heads, and by the living God, that they tell it not; for if they tell it, they shall surely die; and this that thy father may not know it; and this day I will deliver thy brother Abel into thine hands. And Satan swore unto Cain that he would do according to his commands. And all these things were done in secret. And Cain saith, truly I am Mahan, the master of this great secret, that I may murder and get gain. Wherefore Cain was called Master Mahan, and he gloried in his wickedness."

Lamech, the son of Methusael, was one who was caught in this artful snare. See Gen 4. He slew Irad the son of Enoch (son of Cain) and probably a young man also. Lamech had two wives, and he said unto his wives, "I have slain a man to my wounding and a young man to my hurt," thus revealing to them the sworn secret of the order. He slew Irad because he had learned the secret, and told it to some of the sons of Adam. "Wherefore Lamech being angry, slew him, not like unto Cain, his brother Abel, for the sake of getting gain, but he slew him for his oath's sake." Pearl of Great Price, p. 12.

These oaths, murders, and secret combinations were known to the Babel builders, and were interwoven with their religious sacrifices, temple and tower building. And it was the grand inspiration to the gigantic scheme to lay claims to the entire earth, to own, rule and govern it, by having a central temple and a mighty metropolis as the grand seat of government and religion.

All this was known to the Jaredite colony, and after some generations of pure religion these abominations made their appearance.

PROVO LETTER.

PROVO, December 21.

In the W. E. Davis murder case Judge Blackburn today made a ruling striking out the testimony of Mr. Halleck, offered yesterday afternoon, in relation to the threats of killing Davis, made by Brock and Dusel, because it was not shown that the threats had been communicated to Mr. Davis. The defense placed several other witnesses on the stand to prove that the threats had been made, but as no communication could be shown, the questions were objected to by Mr. Zane, and the objections sustained by the court. This deprives the defense of one of their strongest points.

PROVO, Dec. 21.—The prosecution in the W. E. Davis case completed their case yesterday afternoon. A map of the scene of the tragedy was placed upon the blackboard, and Mr. S. R. Thurman made the opening statement for the defense. It would be shown by the defense, he said, that three men were killed by Davis in self-defense. These three men, it would be proved, had entered into a diabolical

plot to murder Davis. Numerous witnesses would testify to hearing threats made by them to this effect. On the Tuesday morning prior to the shooting, a hive of bees, a bridle and a lariat had been missed from Davis' place. They had been traced to the Brock cabin. For the purpose of having a peaceable settlement of this affair, Davis went to the Brock cabin, taking with him Brock. After Brock left the cabin for the pasture, Davis went down to have a talk with the two men. He found Dusel outside making a fire. But instead of talk to Davis in a peaceable manner, he cursed Davis and struck at him with a club. Then was enacted the triple tragedy, as told by the witness, Frank R. Grant.

The first witness for the defense was Charles H. Halleck. He testified that he had heard Dusel say he would shoot Davis the first time he caught him out; also, that Brock had said, "Wait till I catch him up at my ranch and I'll knock him on the head with a club." The introduction of this testimony was strongly objected to by Mr. Zane, and it was only admitted after a long argument by counsel.

The following other court business was transacted during the day:

E. A. Day was sentenced to one month's imprisonment and to pay costs of prosecution on the charge of adultery.

Julius Nielsen, a native of Denmark and a resident of Sevier county, was admitted to citizenship.

Alma Hague vs. Lewis F. Bullock et al.; decree for \$2090, with interest, taxes and attorney's fee.

PROVO, Dec. 22.—In the W. E. Davis murder case, Judge Henderson yesterday afternoon asked the court to make an order for a deputy marshal, a representative from each side of the case and a physician, to be appointed by the court, to go to Westwater, exhum the body of Brock, and have the wound on the head examined with a view of ascertaining whether Brock had been shot in the forehead or toward the back of the head, witnesses differing in their testimony on this point.

Mr. Zane objected, as such a proceeding would delay the trial. The court took the matter under advisement. A little later Judge Henderson again brought the matter up, asking that the case be postponed until Friday morning, and that the necessary steps be taken for the exhuming of the body and the examination of the skull. Judge Henderson explained that the defense had been taken by surprise in the matter; they had thought there would be no question as to the defendant's being shot in the forehead.

Mr. Zane—If anything is done in the matter, we don't want any examination; we want the skull brought into court.

The court denied the application.

Judge Henderson then asked that the exhuming might be done at the expense of the defendant.

Judge Blackburn was willing to grant this, but would not permit any delay in the case.

Mr. Henderson, of Grand Junction, brother-in-law of defendant, was called and asked if Jacobs had told him that "the killing was a case of justifiable homicide if there ever was such a

case." Objected to and objection sustained.

Enoch Gray testified that he had gone to Westwater in the capacity of a deputy marshal with the defendant. While at the Brock ranch he had found a pair of chain hobbles near where Brock was said to have been shot. He produced the hobbles, which are made of leather and a piece of heavy stay chain.

A Mr. Fisher, section boss, was asked if he had heard the deceased make threats of killing Davis. As the defense did not expect to show that the threat had been communicated to Davis, the question was objected to, and objection sustained as in previous instances. Witness testified that the wound on Brock's head was on the forehead, up in the hair. Witness was the clerk of the coroner's jury which had returned a verdict of justifiable homicide. Davis had not dictated the verdict nor had a private conversation with witness as to the verdict.

The defendant was called and told the story of the shooting. His testimony was practically the same as that of Grant, before published in the News. The three deceased men had all been in his employ. Mr. Thurman, attorney for the defense, asked Davis why he went to Brock's cabin.

Objected to by Mr. Zane.

Judge Henderson stated that the defense desired to show that defendant had gone to have a talk about some money and other things that had been stolen from him, and which he had traced to Brock's ranch.

Mr. Zane—Why, they are trying to introduce a petit larceny case into the case.

The Court—I don't care if Brock had stolen all of Davis' money, he had no right to go there with hostile intent. The objection is sustained.

The defense excepted to the remark of the court and also the ruling.

In relation to the manner of Brock immediately before the shooting, Mr. Thurman asked: What do you believe he intended to do? This was objected to by Mr. Zane as calling for a conclusion of the witness.

It was held by Mr. Thurman that under the present law, permitting defendants in homicide cases to testify in their own behalf, they had a right to give their opinion as to the intention of deceased immediately prior to his death.

The court took the matter under advisement.

PROVO, Dec. 23.—Judge Blackburn yesterday morning made a ruling in the W. E. Davis murder case, permitting defendant to testify as to his belief immediately before the killing of Brock, in relation to the intention of that person. The defendant thereupon testified that he was in danger of his life or great bodily harm. Davis testified that he had never stated to Mr. Jacobs or any one else that his reason for shooting Brock was to prevent him from getting to the house and a long range gun. Grant did not have any gun at the time of the shooting.

This concluded the examination of Davis by the attorneys for the defense, and he was turned over to the buffetings of Mr. Zane. The cross-examination was very thorough, bringing to light among other things a former killing and alleged rape by Davis.