

A.—It hardly paid expenses at times, then.

The witness was questioned as to how the Theatre originally came into the hands of the Church with its subsequent history, which he explained, and said that in the settlement of President Young's estate it was turned over to the Church as part of what was owing.

As to how the 30,158 sheep were acquired, President Cannon said they were the identical property contributed by the people of the Church throughout the entire Territory. These flocks had been the accumulation of a long period of time, the object being to supply the wants of the poor in many instances. The proceeds derived from the sale of these sheep were handled under the direction of the Trustees-in-Trust. No portion of this fund went to the relief of the members of the Church outside this inter-mountain region.

Q.—These expenses, if met by the Church generally, included what?

A.—A great deal was spent for temples and meeting-houses, upon the poor, and helping settlements. I may say here that one of the causes of there being so much talk about Church and State among us has been the fact that we have endeavored to practically carry out the teachings of the Savior concerning helping the poor. In many of these settlements the people could not have lived had they not received help.

Q.—Part of it was expended in promoting various business enterprises?

A.—Yes, and developing the country—that is, if you call helping people in their straits business purposes.

Q.—Has the fund been used to pay the expenses of circulating Church publications?

A.—No, not nearly so much as ought to have been.

The witness next described the method of disbursing the funds among the poor for their relief, through the Bishops of their respective wards. He stated, further, that the transport of grain and the building of store houses and granaries had involved a large expenditure.

The subject of education, involving voluntary contributions, was next referred to by Mr. Rawlins, who was putting certain questions to the witness when Mr. Dickson objected.

Mr. Varian then took the witness in hand, and asked—Were not many of the meeting houses and the property on which they stood acquired by donation or taxation for school purposes?

A.—Unfortunately we have built meeting houses all over this country, and because of the inexperience of our people in relation to the school law, after these houses were erected, in some instances they allowed a tax to be collected to repair them or make some addition to them. We have thus lost the property and have had to erect new meeting houses in their place. That is one reason why so large a sum has been needed of late.

Q.—If I understand, the fund that you have spoken of, excluding that raised by the Relief Society and from fast day offerings, is the fund that is derived by the law of tithes?

A.—Well, it has been called so.

Answering other questions, President Cannon said the regular payment

of tithing was evidence of a man's good standing and good faith in the Church. There was, however, no fixed sum which members of the Church were required to pay as tithing, that he was aware of. This was left entirely to the individual's own sense of right. The Church had no source of revenue except the people themselves.

Q.—It depends, then, for all purposes of financial support and prosperity upon these contributions, or tithes?

A.—That is, voluntary donations as we now term them, which they actually are. The Church has no other fund upon which to draw. He could recall no business enterprises to which the Church funds had been devoted. In order to derive income, means were certainly put in Z. C. M. I., and the income from that went to and was used as part of the general fund. The struggling settlements have received aid in building dams, constructing canals, and purposes of that kind, to assist them in their straitened condition. Those have generally been donations to the people needing them.

President Cannon was next interrogated by Mr. Varian as to whether during the last six or seven years the Church funds had not been disposed of in matters of litigation. He replied that before 1887 the Church had very little litigation; therefore means were not expended in that direction.

Q.—From 1883 down to 1887 were there not a large number of poor people belonging to the Church who unfortunately got into difficulties?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And did not they require assistance—those who were unable to help themselves—in paying fines and costs?

A.—I think perhaps they did. We did not pay any fines but assisted their families when the men went to prison in cases where it was absolutely necessary.

Q.—I refer to what is sometimes termed the crusade against your people in cases known as polygamous marriages, under the Edmunds law. People charged with offenses under these laws, where they could not protect themselves the Church protected them as well as it could from the fund? Wasn't that so?

A.—In reply, I would say that a great deal of that assistance was independent of any fund. I would not say that the Church did not contribute at all, but I know that the greater portion of it was contributed by private individuals, aside from the Church fund for that special purpose. I have contributed myself for that object.

In answer to questions relative to the employment of counsel to defend the cases in regard to Church property the witness said they were employed by the Church which was defending its rights and this was within the purview of its authority.

Mr. Varian minutely cross-examined the witness in reference to the use of Church funds in the dissemination of literature, such as books, pamphlets, tabulated statements, etc., and was answered to the effect that such works depended upon their sales for compensation, or private donations outside of Church funds, and that the Church had not expended from these funds any money for that purpose, nor to

avert congressional legislation. President Cannon stated that while in Congress he never expended a dollar for any such purposes.

Questioned by Mr. Richards as to what was known as the "Defense fund," witness said it was a separate and distinct fund entirely from that in the hands of the Receiver, and had no connection with it. All the counsel employed in the cases of individuals had been paid out of that "defense fund."

Mr. Richards—Has it not been the practice all the time when there was a surplus of funds in hand for the First Presidency to invest it in some manner, to bring in an income?

A.—Yes, and that income would be appropriated to religious and charitable purposes.

The witness was next asked to explain how the appropriations had been made to poor Indians.

Witness—We formed a settlement of Indians who desired to dissolve their tribal relations, at a place called Washakie, in Box Elder County, and employed teachers, also farmers, blacksmiths, carpenters and other mechanics to instruct them in the industrial arts. We have a school there where the Indian children are taught the English language, a saw mill, etc. We have also a settlement in Thistle Valley, sustained in a similar manner, and another in Deep Creek; but the Indians have scattered further. We have pursued this policy for many years in the Territory, on the principal that it was cheaper to feed these Indians and try to civilize them than to fight them. This money always came out of the Church fund.

Mr. Rawlins then interrogated the witness further about the Theatre and elicited the explanation that the Theatre was turned over to the Church by the executors of the Brigham Young estate in settlement. This was necessary because when there was a surplus of Church funds, it was customary to invest them that they might accumulate, and in some cases the title was in the name of Brigham Young. The Church made a claim at his decease for certain properties, and a settlement was made in which the Theatre among other properties was turned over to the Church.

The facts were further made clear by some questions propounded by Mr. Richards and the protracted examination of the witness closed.

PRESIDENT WILFORD WOODRUFF

was the next witness. In reply to Attorney Richards he said he was 84 years of age and was born in Farmington, Connecticut. He had resided in this Territory since July 24th, 1847, and had held his present position in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints since April, 1889. He issued the manifesto now produced, on September 25th, 1890 [The manifesto was filed as Exhibit A], his object in doing so being to announce to the world that plural marriage had been forbidden by the Church, and could not be practiced thereafter. When that manifesto was presented to the Council of the Apostles and accepted by them and was unanimously adopted at the General Conference, about ten thousand officers and members were present. He had never heard any objection expressed to it by individual