

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS' DEFENSE.

(Concluded.)

Mr. McPherson. Does this Enabling Act... Mr. Roberts. He had to pass upon the Constitution... Mr. Morris. And not passed upon by Congress, then?

understood by those who participated in the constitutional convention in Utah... Mr. Roberts—Doubtless different views on that will be entertained... Mr. Littlefield—That is, marriage as an act and not as an institution.

Now, sir, I earn all such proceedings as that... Mr. Roberts. I believe that what we do here we do with real intent of heart and without nonsense... Mr. Morris. It was approved by proclamation of the President, and not by act of Congress?

Mr. Littlefield—If the marriages were prohibited the institution of polygamy is deemed, of course... Mr. Roberts—From marriages that had been performed in the past. Quite right.

It was after this speech of Judge Goodwin and my reply to it that I have just read to you that Mr. Varian said in his remarks when he referred to it and said that he had no use for a sneek, referring to Judge Goodwin... Mr. Roberts. That was as to the primary section of your statute of 1852?

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

These religious people who are now at the bottom of this agitation, or many of them, were present, and were watching the proceedings of the convention... Mr. Roberts. Yes, sir; the Territorial statute of 1852.

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

Mr. Roberts. Yes, sir; the Territorial statute of 1852. Now, sir, I think it is decidedly clear that so far as the Constitutional Convention of Utah is concerned, I think the view of the Enabling Act that I have presented here, namely, that they were required to stop "polygamous or plural marriages" for the future, and that they were not to disturb the relations that had existed or did then exist by reason of marriages that had come down to us from the past.

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

Mr. Roberts. Yes, sir; the Territorial statute of 1852. Now, sir, I think it is decidedly clear that so far as the Constitutional Convention of Utah is concerned, I think the view of the Enabling Act that I have presented here, namely, that they were required to stop "polygamous or plural marriages" for the future, and that they were not to disturb the relations that had existed or did then exist by reason of marriages that had come down to us from the past.

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

Mr. Roberts. Yes, sir; the Territorial statute of 1852. Now, sir, I think it is decidedly clear that so far as the Constitutional Convention of Utah is concerned, I think the view of the Enabling Act that I have presented here, namely, that they were required to stop "polygamous or plural marriages" for the future, and that they were not to disturb the relations that had existed or did then exist by reason of marriages that had come down to us from the past.

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

Mr. Roberts. Yes, sir; the Territorial statute of 1852. Now, sir, I think it is decidedly clear that so far as the Constitutional Convention of Utah is concerned, I think the view of the Enabling Act that I have presented here, namely, that they were required to stop "polygamous or plural marriages" for the future, and that they were not to disturb the relations that had existed or did then exist by reason of marriages that had come down to us from the past.

Mr. Littlefield—In other words, it was section 1 of the Edmunds Act, and not section 3. That is about it, is it not, Mr. Roberts?

unlawful cohabitation—and Mr. Rawlins said he had no objections on that ground whatever against them. Of course, Mr. Rawlins being a Democratic senator, I take it that it was a matter of formality, only, to register the law, to call his attention to the Utah appointments.

Mr. Roberts—On the 4th of April, 1853. The code had been adopted in January, previous.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

The Chairman. Notwithstanding the view you have stated was taken in the Constitutional Convention...

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

place. The fact that the story was a false was telegraphed to some of the newspapers in New York and they were asked if they wanted the contradiction of the story. They did not want it.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

Mr. Roberts—Yes, sir; and I was merely calling attention to the fact that the general opinion prevailed that there was no law in the State of Utah with reference to the subject of unlawful cohabitation, while as a legal proposition, of course, the law existed.

The Chairman—No; he was invited to discuss the other propositions.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.

Mr. Roberts—I think I understand the committee on that subject, and I am quite content to leave that matter with the authorities cited and the certificate of citizenship. But the contention I make is that there can be no question in regard to my citizenship, and therefore I take it my prima facie right has been fully established before this committee in the argument which has been produced.



The Tea for 1900. What matters it, if the ground be white. And the sky a leaden hue? The opening of the year is bright. To those who daily brew—

Pride of Japan Tea. Best that comes to America in package.

from them in religious convictions. Now, the situation in Utah has presented a tempting field for pecuniary and other people whose zeal is not always balanced with justice or with judgment.

But when this question of polygamy was regarded as settled and every seemed satisfied with the terms of its settlement, and gentle and Mormon were approaching each other, the social distinctions that had existed in the past were breaking down, and gentle were visiting Mormons and Mormons were visiting gentle homes, and marriages between the classes were being made.

Such are the circumstances surrounding this case, such the circumstances surrounding the settlement of the polygamy question in Utah, and such the peculiar conditions that obtain owing to the beliefs of that people, that broad-minded statesmanship and every consideration of good policy require that the settlement of this vexed question of polygamy should remain under the terms fixed by the Constitution of the State of Utah and the acceptance of the State by her admission to the Union.

When President McKinley sent his call to arms in the recent war, the number of his sons that were called for. Her batteries were sent to distant Manila, and the dark night when the battle of Manila was fought and the success or failure of the battle hung in the balance, it was Utah guns, manned by Utah men, whose flashes mimicked the lightning flashes of the fierce simoon that was raging and covered the infantry that was marching to the attack.

Such are the circumstances surrounding this case, such the circumstances surrounding the settlement of the polygamy question in Utah, and such the peculiar conditions that obtain owing to the beliefs of that people, that broad-minded statesmanship and every consideration of good policy require that the settlement of this vexed question of polygamy should remain under the terms fixed by the Constitution of the State of Utah and the acceptance of the State by her admission to the Union.

When President McKinley sent his call to arms in the recent war, the number of his sons that were called for. Her batteries were sent to distant Manila, and the dark night when the battle of Manila was fought and the success or failure of the battle hung in the balance, it was Utah guns, manned by Utah men, whose flashes mimicked the lightning flashes of the fierce simoon that was raging and covered the infantry that was marching to the attack.



To Pearline Users Only. You have confidence in Pearline. You must have, or you wouldn't be using it. But what do you do with it, besides the ordinary washing and cleaning? There's a long list of things in which Pearline ought to be helping you. Why isn't it doing so? For every purpose for which you would use soap and water, Pearline is better. You ought to be ready enough to believe that, with what you must know of Pearline.