

If, however, the applicant should say "Yes," these are among the inquiries that are propounded to him, and to most of them an answer is required in the negative for him to pass.

Suppose a man was on the underground for polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, would you help him to hide or escape?

Do you believe in "Mormonism?"

Do you believe Joseph Smith to be a prophet?

Do you believe he ever received a revelation?

Do you believe certain persons in the Church have received revelations from the Almighty?

Suppose Mr. George Q. Cannon or Mr. Wilford Woodruff should say they had a revelation from God that you should go into polygamy would you do it?

Don't you believe it right to obey the direct commands of the Almighty?

Will you obey the laws of the land that may be made against any doctrine or principle of the Church?

Do you think the Bible teaches polygamy?

Don't you believe the Almighty knows what is right and what is wrong?

If the Almighty has given a command saying polygamy is right, do you say that you believe it is wrong, even in the absence of any law against it?

If you were threatened with excommunication from the Church if you did not conform to an order to enter polygamy, what would you do?

The foregoing are some of the questions asked today. One applicant replied that he believed in "Mormonism" as taught in the Bible, whereupon Judge Anderson remarked, "The Bible is good authority in this court."

During the examination one Joseph Lipman was engaged in questioning applicants who stated that they were "Mormons." Of these he would inquire:

Do you pay tithing?

Are you in good standing in the Church?

Do you believe the revelations contained in the Doctrine and Covenants?

Was polygamy taught when you joined the Church?

Don't you have to believe all the doctrines to become a member of the Church?

Is not polygamy a cardinal doctrine of the Church?

What do you have to do to become a member of the Church?

Many others of a like character were also asked. To A. P. Lindholm, Lipman objected because he could not read or write the English language, and therefore could not vote intelligently.

The court held that as Mr. Lindholm could read and write in his native language and could talk English, the objection was not well founded.

Objection was made to several others on trivial grounds, and were overruled, but the

climax today was reached when August H. Nordvall came. He passed the Court's examination satisfactorily, and Mr. Lipman said—I object to his admission because he is a member of the Mormon Church, and must therefore accept and believe in all of its doctrines. If he does not, then he should be excommunicated, and if he believes in its doctrines he should not be admitted to be a citizen.

Lieut. R. W. Young had been a silent listener to the proceedings thus far, and at this point he arose and suggested that many members of the Church did not regard polygamy as compulsory, as was shown by the history and status of the people, as well as the declarations made by many.

Mr. Lipman—If it is not obligatory, then the heads of the Church should be summoned here and be required to testify to that fact. As it is, we can't find out what is the faith of the Latter-day Saints. If the Church has any doctrines which its members are required to accept, the court should know it. There seems to be a conflict as to what Mormonism is, and I think there should be established here just what the Mormons do believe in.

Judge Anderson—I don't think polygamy is compulsory. All may have been expected to obey it, but for a number of years it has not been enjoined. The law of the land requires that a man should be of good moral character and attached to the principles of the Constitution. The fact of a man's religious belief or that he is a member of the Church in good standing is not a ground for exclusion. The standing of men in a church may be of different degrees; they may agree on the general proposition, but on many doctrines or details they may disagree. I think a man should conform to all the laws of the church of which he is a member; but this man says he will not, and he has the right to take that position. It is apparent that he has been a good citizen. He even says that he will not obey a certain doctrine of the Church—though the law does not require him to swear that; it only requires that he will obey the laws of the land.

Mr. Lipman—Suppose there was a gang of men banded together for horse stealing, and one member did not believe in stealing, yet contributed means to its support, would he make a good citizen?

Court—Let me give you another illustration: In Iowa we have a prohibitory liquor law. Many people believe it wrong. I am myself in that class. We worked for its repeal. Yet I never heard of a proposition to exclude a man from fellowship because he opposed that law. If he does not break it he is a good citizen, even when he believes the law wrong. Your illustration is strongly overdrawn. Membership in the "Mormon" Church is not a test for citizenship under the law. I am not here to say what the law should be, but what it is. It requires that a man should conduct himself as a good citizen, and this man has done that. Let him be admitted.

The following are the names of those who were naturalized today: James J. Giles, Joseph J. Giles, John Moore, Anders P. Lindholm, John L. Brown, Chas. E. Erickson, Louis M. Erickson, Fred. Shaw, Chas. J. Erickson, Lamech Krantz, Elias M. Krantz, Charles Symmonds, John Hadley, Rudolph Blattner, Ole C. Hansen and August A. Nordvall.

DEBATE ON "MORMONISM."

We are in receipt of the report of a debate between Elder Charles G. Hyde and a minister of the Christian denomination, named Krut-singer, held at Robinson, Green County, Indiana, during the latter part of October. The challenge emanated from people belonging to the denomination named, and by the advice of President Booth, Elder Hyde accepted it.

As is often the case, this opponent of "Mormonism" deserted the propositions agreed upon as the subject of discussion, and wandered off into slander and abuse of the people of Utah. From the report of his remarks which is furnished us, there appears to have been very little sense or logic embraced in them.

Elder Hyde, on the contrary, confined himself mainly to a discussion of doctrines and principles, supporting his position by scriptural proofs. At the outset Rev. Krut-singer had announced himself ready to continue the debate as long as necessary, even till Christmas, but at the third session he expressed himself as very much disgusted with it, and blamed his friends for drawing him into it. He wanted to bring the debate to a close, but Elder Hyde objected, being desirous to further correct his slanders and explain the principles of the Saints. It was put to a vote of the people whether the debate should continue, and the majority of them being Christians, and evidently in sympathy with their champion in his dilemma, came to his rescue by voting in favor of ending the debate.

Elder Hyde appears to have thoroughly discomfited his opponent, and to have laid the doctrines of the Latter-day Saints in plainness before his hearers.

REGAINED HIS LIBERTY.

Brother Michael Vaughan, of Lehi, emerged from the penitentiary this morning after serving a nine months' sentence on conviction of adultery with his wives. His health has been good during his incarceration, and he feels none the worse for his imprisonment, but is very glad to regain his liberty. He left seventy-six of the brethren in prison, all of whom, with the exception of Brother Joseph Clark, of Provo, are in good health, and the latter was reported to be slightly improved this morning, though extremely low. In addition to the imprisonment imposed upon him, Brother Vaughan was required to pay the costs of his trial, amounting to \$53.60, notwithstanding the Judge made no mention of costs in sentencing him.