kept of the meeting where he was released?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; not that I am aware of.

Senator Beveridge. It is not as formal a matter as that, then?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; it is simply a consent on the part of his associate to yield their claim upon his services in the church to become a candidate before the Legislature.

Mr. Worthington. Is it anything more than a leave of absence?

Mr. Smith. That is all. It is practically that.

Senator Beveridge. One or two questions were asked you by Senator Dubois, Mr. Smith, which suggest something to me. Did the fact that you gave consent to Mr. Smoot to be a candidate for the United States Senate in any wise interfere with your giving consent to any other member of the apostolate, if they had asked it?

Mr. Smith. Not in the least.

Senator Beveridge. Would you have given consent to more than one?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir; if they had asked it.

Senator Hoar. Was a similar consent given to Mr. Cannon when he came to the Senate?

Mr. Smith. How is that?

Senator Hoar. Was Mr. Cannon, when he came to the Senate, given official consent?

Mr. Smith. Let me ask you which Cannon you mean.

Senator Hoar. The only one who came to the Senate.

Mr. Van Cott. Frank J. Cannon.

Mr. Smith. He is not and never has been an official member of the church, in any sense or form.

The Chairman. What do you mean by an initial member?

Mr. Smith. I said an official member.

The Chairman. I misunderstood you. Was he not at one time an elder in the church?

Mr. Smith. Well, that is not an official position at all. Nearly every male member of the church, Mr. Senator, is an elder.

Mr. Tayler. There was something said here about this written rule of application.

Mr. Worthington. Here it is. There is some memoranda there, which is no part of it, but that we understand to be that rule.

Mr. Tayler. I have seen it printed several times.

Mr. Van Cott. If you do not find it we will furnish you with a printed copy.

Not in Harmony.

Mr. Tayler. In relation to this subject of consent, what would have happened to Mr. Smoot if he had persisted in running for the Senate without the consent of the apostles and the first presidency?

Mr. Smith. He would no doubt have been considered in poor standing with his brethren.

Mr. Tayler. He would have been deposed from his apostleship, would he not?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; not necessarily.

Mr. Tayler. Not necessarily?

Mr. Smith. No, sir.

Senator Dubois. He would have been out of harmony with his quorum.

Mr. Smith. That is all.

Mr. Tayler. Your quorums are generally in harmony?

Mr. Smith. They are generally in harmony.

Mr. Tayler. It is very rare, indeed, that you are not a unit?

Mr. Smith. I am very happy to say, sir, that is the fact.

Mr. Tayler. And that all the twelve and the three agree, as a rule?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir; as a rule.

Mr. Tayler. And it is seldom it has ever been otherwise?

Mr. Smith. Quite so; although, let me add, Mr. Tayler, it has been so. It has not always been unanimous. There are exceptions to that rule.

Mr. Tayler. Exactly. Can you give us a recent exception to that rule?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. In what case?

Mr. Smith. In the case of Moses Thatcher.

Mr. Tayler. What was the trouble with him?

Mr. Smith. He was not in harmony with his council for a great many years.

Senator Foraker. Did he remain an apostle all the while?

Mr. Smith. All the while.

Mr. Tayler. He did not remain all the while, did he?

Mr. Smith. He remained all the while for years.

Mr. Tayler. Yes; until—

Mr. Smith. Until final action was taken on his case by his quorum.

Mr. Tayler. And they deposed him?

Thatcher Deposed.

Mr. Smith. They deposed him.

Mr. Tayler. Did he have a formal trial?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. He was present?

Mr. Smith. That is to say, let me say to you, a time, an appointment for a trial was set, and he was urged to appear, and notified to appear by his council.

Mr. Tayler. Yes.

Senator Beveridge. What was the occasion of his being out of harmony with his quorum?

Senator Hoar. Let him finish his answer.

Senator Beveridge. Very well.

Mr. Smith. And he refused to appear, and absented himself from the council, declining to answer or respond to the call to be there.

Mr. Tayler. Were charges formulated against him?

Mr. Worthington. He has not finished his answer.

Mr. Tayler. Very, well, I thought he had.

Mr. Smith. And long prior to this circumstance he had been out of harmony with the other members of the quorum, and had absented himself from their meetings many times in succession.

Mr. Tayler. But you asserted the right at that time, and so proclaimed, did you not, that you had the right—that is to say, the first presidency and the remaining eleven apostles had the right—to depose him at any time, without trial and without hearing?

Mr. Smith. Oh, no; we never do that.

Mr. Tayler. Are you not on record as so stating?

Mr. Smith. Oh, no.

Mr. Tayler. That he was not entitled to be heard, that it was your right to depose him?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; I think there is no such record.

Worthington Intervenes.

Mr. Worthington. The practice in our courts is, that if a man is asked if he has signed a writing or has done something by writing, the paper should be produced.

Mr. Tayler. That is so technical that I do not think it is worth while discussing it.

Mr. Worthington. My friend says he does not consider it worth discussing. I would like to know the opinion of the chairman and the committee about it.

Senator Foraker. The witness has answered the question, anyhow, without hesitation or qualification.

Senator Pettus. Mr. Tayler, if you have it I would be obliged to you if you would read that rule of the church.

Mr. Tayler. It is in the protest.

Mr. Worthington. Extracts of it are in the protest, but the larger portion of it is carefully omitted.

The Chairman. There is a controversy about that, Mr. Smith. Can you furnish the rule?

Mr. Smith. I could, Mr. Chairman, if I had the time. I think I would have to send home for it, unless it could be found here.

Mr. Van Cott. We have a copy of it.

Mr. Tayler. My recollection is that it is as Mr. Smith has given it, in substance; but I think we had better get a copy of it and put it in the record. I understand he has stated the substance of it correctly, as I recall it, at least.

Mr. Richards. Mr. Chairman, may I confer with the witness a moment?

The Chairman. Certainly.

Senator Hoar. Mr. Chairman, we are inquiring as to a rule of the church of its head, and it seems to me it is hardly worth while, when the head of the church is stating what he understands to be its rule, to trouble ourselves too strictly about producing a written document. If there is a call for it, it can be put in later.

The Chairman. This is the rule of the church.

Mr. Richards. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smith is now prepared to offer a copy of the rule.

Copy of Rule Offered.

Mr. Smith. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there is here a copy of that rule.

The Chairman. Have you examined it?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; I have not examined it.

The Chairman. So you can not say whether it is a copy or not?

Mr. Smith. I could not say at present.

Senator Hoar. It can be put in and corrected afterwards if mistakes are found in it?

Mr. Smith. Yes; it is understood it was furnished by the historian's office to Mr. Smoot.

Mr. Tayler. It has been frequently published, and we have here a printed copy. It may not be accurate, but we will get it in the record.

The Chairman. Let the rule, or what purports to be the rule, go into the record, and then if it is erroneous it can be corrected.

Senator Beveridge. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he examine it tonight and produce it tomorrow in his testimony, when it can go in the record.

Senator Dubois. I suggest that the counsel agree as to what they shall put in.

Senator Foraker. Let us understand that the rule will be inserted at this point.

Mr. Tayler. Yes.

Senator Dubois. The witness and the counsel agree to the existence of the rule, and that is the substance of it.

Senator Beveridge. That is the substance of it. Now, let Mr. Smith go over it, and if he finds it correct, let it go in.

The rule referred to is as follows:

Here Is the Rule.

TO THE SAINTS.

To the officers and members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in general conference assembled—Dear Brethren and Sisters—Every Latter-day Saint will recognize the value of union, not only in action, but in matters of faith and discipline. As to the rights and authority of the priesthood of the Son of God, it is of the highest importance that there should be no difference of opinion among the officers and members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Feeling the necessity of a correct understanding of this principle, we deem it proper, at this sixty-sixth anniversary of the organization of the church in these last days, to prepare and present a statement on the subject, embodying the doctrine which has always prevailed in the church and our views upon it. We are prompted to adopt this at the present time because of events which have happened during the late political contest. A great diversity of opinion on the subject has been expressed, and even by leading elders in the church, which latter fact has naturally led in some instances, to considerable division of sentiment.

It is of great importance that we understand each other and that there be harmony in our teachings. It is especially important that these teachings shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations and doctrines which have been taught and which have prevailed from the beginning until the present time, having not only the sanction of undisputed usage, but the approval of all faithful leaders in the church and of him in whose name and by whose authority they act.

In the late exciting contest, to which reference has been made, the presiding authorities in some instances have been misunderstood. In other instances they have been misrepresented, which has led to a wrongful conception of their real views. It has been asserted too freely, and without foundation, that there has been a disposition on their part to interfere with individual liberty and to rebuke in some men a course which was applauded in others. In a word, that they have appeared to desire to assert and maintain an unjust and oppressive control over the actions of the members of the church, and in thus doing have endeavored to effect a union of church and state.

In the heat of political discussion assertions have been made and arguments used conveying to the public mind a false idea concerning the position of the officers of the church, and leaving the impression that there has been and was now being made an attempt to accomplish the union above referred to. Now that the excitement has passed, and calmer reason has resumed its sway, we think it prudent to set forth, so that all may understand, the exact position occupied by the leading authorities of the church.

In the first place, we wish to state in the most positive and emphatic language that at no time has there ever been any attempt, or even desire, on the part of the leading authorities referred to, to have the church in any manner encroach upon the rights of the state, or to unite in any degree the functions of one with those of the other.

Peculiar circumstances have surrounded the people of Utah. For many years a majority of them in every portion of the Territory belonged to one church, every reputable member of which was entitled to hold, and did hold, some ecclesiastical office. It is easy to see how, to the casual observer, it might appear singular that so many officers of the church were also officers of the State; but while this was in fact the case, the distinction between the church and the state throughout those years was carefully maintained. The president of the church held for eight years the highest civil office in the community, having been appointed by the National Administration Governor of the Territory. The first Secretary of the Territory was a prominent church official. An apostle represented the Territory in Congress as a Delegate during ten years. The members of the Legislature held also offices in the church. This was unavoidable, for the most suitable men were elected by the votes of the people, and, as we have stated, every reputable man in the entire community held some church position, the most energetic and capable holding leading positions. This is all natural and plain enough to those who consider the circumstances; but it furnished opportunity for those who were disposed to assail the people of the Territory to charge them with attempting to unite church and state. A fair investigation of the conditions will abundantly disprove the charge and show its utter falsity.

On behalf of the church, of which we are leading officers, we desire again to state to the members and also to the public generally that there has not been, nor is there, the remotest desire on our part, or on the part of our coreligionists, to do anything looking to a union of church and state.

We declare that there has never been any attempt to curtail individual liberty—the personal liberty of any of the officers or members of the church. The first presidency and other leading officers did make certain suggestions to the people when the division on party lines took place. That movement was an entirely new departure, and it was necessary, in order that the full benefit should not be lost which was hoped to result from this new political division, that people who were inexperienced should be warned against hasty and ill-considered action. In some cases they were counseled to be wise and prudent in the political steps they were about to take, and this with no idea of winning them against their will to either side. To this extent and no further was anything said or done upon this question, and at no time and under no circumstances was any attempt made to say to voters how they should cast their ballots. Any charge that has been made to the contrary is utterly false.

Concerning officers of the church themselves, the feeling was generally expressed in the beginning of the political division spoken of that it would be prudent for leading men not to accept of office at the hands of the political party to which they might belong. This counsel was given to men of both parties alike, not because it was thought that there was any impropriety in religious men holding civil office, not to deprive them of any of their rights of citizenship, but because of the feeling that it would be better, under all the circumstances which had now arisen, to avoid any action that would be likely to create jealousy and ill feeling. An era of peace and good will seemed to be dawning upon the people, and it was deemed good to shun everything that could have the least tendency to prevent the consummation of the happy prospect.

In many instances, however, the pressure brought to bear upon efficient and popular men by the members of the parties to which they belonged was of such a character that they had to yield to the solicitation to accept nomination to office or subject themselves to the suspicion of bad faith in their party affiliations. In some cases they did this without consulting the authorities of the church; but where important positions were held, and where the duties were of a responsible and exacting character, some did seek the counsel and advice of the leading church authorities before accepting the political honors tendered them. Because some others did not seek this counsel and advice, ill feeling was engendered, and undue and painful sensitiveness was stimulated; misunderstanding readily followed, and as a result the authorities of the church were accused of bad faith and made the objects of bitter reproach.

We have maintained that in the case of men who hold high positions in the church, whose duties are well defined, and whose ecclesiastical labors are understood to be continuous and necessary, it would be an improper thing to accept political office or enter into any vocation that would distract or remove them from the religious duties resting upon them, without first consulting and obtaining the approval of their associates, and those who preside over them. It has been understood from the very beginning of the church that no officer whose duties are of the character referred to has the right to engage in any pursuit, political or otherwise, that will divide his time and remove his attention from the calling already accepted.

It has been the constant practice with officers of the church to consult—or, to use our language, to "counsel"—with their brethren concerning all questions of this kind. They have not felt that they were sacrificing their manhood in doing so, nor that they were submitting to improper dictation, nor that in soliciting and acting upon the advice of those over them they were in any manner doing away with their individual rights and agency, nor that to any improper degree were their rights and duties as American citizens being abridged or interfered with. They realize that in accepting ecclesiastical office they assumed certain obligations; that among these was the obligation to magnify the office which they held, to attend to its duties in preference to every other labor, and to devote themselves exclusively to it with all the zeal, industry and strength they possessed, unless released in part or for a time by those who presided over them.

Our view, and it has been the view of all our predecessors, is that no officer of our church especially those in high standing, should take a course to violate this long-established practice. Rather than disobey it, and declare himself by his actions defiantly independent of his associates and his file leaders, it has always been held that it would be better for a man to resign the duties of his priesthood; and we entertain the same view today.

In view of all the occurrences to which reference has been made, and to the diversity of views that have arisen among the people in consequence, we feel it to be our duty to clearly define our position, so there may be no cause hereafter for dispute or controversy upon the subject:

First—We unanimously agree to and promulgate as a rule that should always be observed in the church and by every leading official thereof, that before accepting any position, political or otherwise, which would interfere with the proper and complete discharge of his ecclesiastical duties, and before accepting a nomination or entering into engagements to perform new duties, said official should apply to the proper authorities and learn from them whether he can, consistently with the obligations already entered into with the church upon assuming his office, take upon himself the added duties and labors and responsibilities of the new position. To maintain proper discipline and order in the church, we deem this absolutely necessary, and in asserting this rule we do not consider that we are infringing in the least degree upon the individual rights of the citizen. Our position is that a man having accepted the honors and obligations of ecclesiastical office in the church, cannot properly of his own volition make these honors subordinate to, or even co-ordinate with, new ones of an entirely different character. We hold that unless he is willing to consult with and obtain the consent of his fellow-laborers and presiding officers in the priesthood, he should be released from all obligations associated with the latter before accepting any new position.

Second—We declare that in making these requirements of ourselves and our brethren in the ministry, we do not in the least desire to dictate to them concerning their duties as American citizens, or to interfere with the affairs of the State, neither do we consider that in the remotest degree we are seeking the union of church and state. We once more here repudiate the insinuation that there is or ever has been an attempt by our leading men to trespass upon the ground occupied by the State, or that there has been or is the wish to curtail in any manner any of its functions. Your brethren,

Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith, first presidency; Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, Brigham Young, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, George Teasdale, Heber J. Grant, John W. Taylor, Marriner W. Merrill, Abraham H. Cannon, apostles; John Smith, patriarch, Seymour B. Young, C. D. Fjeldsted, B. H. Roberts, George Reynolds, Jonathan G. Kimball, Rulon S. Wells, Edward Stevenson, first council of seventies; William B. Preston, E. T. Burton, John R. Winder, presiding bishopric.

Salt Lake City, April 6, 1896.

Note.—The reason the signature of Apostle Anthon H. Lund does not appear in connection with those of his quorum is because he is absent, presiding over the European mission. He, however, will be given the opportunity of appending his signature when he returns home.

Cause of Thatcher Controversy.

Mr. Tayler. Mr. Smith, what was the immediate occasion of the controversy with Moses Thatcher at the time of his deposition?

Mr. Smith. The immediate, that is, the principal, circumstance which led to the final investigation of his status was his becoming a candidate for a political office without consulting with his associates. That was the beginning of the investigation.

Senator Dubois. What office was that, did you say?

Mr. Smith. I could not tell you now what office it was. I think he was a candidate for Senator, or something of that kind.

Mr. Tayler. United States Senator?

Mr. Smith. I am not sure, but I think that was the case.

Mr. Tayler. Mr. Smith, do you recall a document published by the Deseret News, entitled "The Thatcher episode: A concise statement of the facts in the case. Interesting letters and documents and review of M. Thatcher's claims, pleas and admissions?"

Mr. Smith. Yes; I recollect the journal.

Mr. Tayler. Published in 1896?

Mr. Smith. I remember.

Mr. Tayler. That was intended, was it not, to give the church's side of that controversy?

Mr. Smith. The church had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Tayler. I understood you to say that Moses Thatcher——

Mr. Smith. With the publication of this book, I mean.

Mr. Tayler. It was published by the Deseret News, was it not?

Mr. Smith. That is very true, but it was done for the author.

Mr. Tayler. Do you know who was the author?

Authors of Pamphlets.

Mr. Smith. There was one pamphlet of that character published by C. W. Penrose, and there was another one also on that same order published by a man by the name of Nelson, and they were their own personal views.

Mr. Tayler. Exactly. C. W. Penrose is the C. W. Penrose of whom you have spoken.

Mr. Smith. Yes.

Mr. Tayler. And the editor of the Deseret News?

Mr. Smith. Yes.

Mr. Tayler. Do you know whether the document I have and now show you is the one Mr. Penrose prepared?

Mr. Smith. I could not tell you.

Mr. Tayler. Can you tell me, Mr. Van Cott? I do not want to get any confused statement.

Mr. Van Cott. I do not know. I could find out for you this evening, probably.

Mr. Tayler. All right.

Mr. Smith. Is there no title to it?

Mr. Tayler. There is no signature.

Mr. Smith. I rather think, sir, that C. W. Penrose is the author of that, but I do not know.

Refreshes His Memory.

Mr. Tayler. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection as to the authorship of this so as to be more definite, if you can. [Reading:]

"Recent occurrences in the church render it necessary to present in a popular form some of the reasons for the action taken by the council of the twelve apostles in reference to one of their number."

Then follow other general observations. "This pamphlet is therefore prepared for general dissemination among the members of the church, that they may not be in the dark concerning the step which the quorum of the twelve found it their duty to take after much patience, forbearance and charity."

Mr. Smith. Well, sir, I do not know whether that is Mr. Nelson's or whether it is—

Mr. Tayler. Who is Mr. Nelson?

Mr. Smith. His name is N. L. Nelson. He is a professor in one of our schools.

The Chairman. In what school?

Mr. Smith. In one of the church schools.

Mr. Tayler. Whereabouts?

Mr. Smith. At Provo.

Don't Know Where Tanner Is.

Mr. Tayler. We offer that book in evidence. It is identified sufficiently by its name. There may be some lead-pencil notations in it. We do not offer them. Do you know J. M. Tanner?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. Where is he?

Mr. Smith. I do not know.

Mr. Tayler. Where are his labors supposed to be carried on now?

Mr. Smith. His labors, in the line of his duty as superintendent of church schools, lie throughout all the church.

Mr. Tayler. He is superintendent of church schools?

Mr. Smith. He is.

Mr. Tayler. Is he a polygamist?

Mr. Smith. That is the reputation he has.

Mr. Tayler. What position did he hold before he was appointed to that place?

Mr. Smith. I think he was at one time president of the faculty of the agricultural society or school.

Mr. Van Cott. College.

Mr. Smith. Agricultural college.

Mr. Tayler. Where?

Mr. Smith. At Logan.

Mr. Tayler. In Utah?

Mr. Smith. In Utah.

Mr. Tayler. Do you recall how he came to leave that position?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. It was because he was a polygamist, was it not? I do not want to take up time. It was because the law forbade any of the appropriation to go to agricultural colleges—

Mr. Smith. No, sir; the law did not forbid.

Mr. Tayler. Then tell us why. I was only trying to hurry along.

Why Tanner Retired.

Mr. Smith. There was some publication, some newspaper talk, about an appeal being made to Congress to stop the appropriation to the college if a polygamist was to be continued as the president of the faculty, and, to avoid anything of the kind, Mr. Tanner resigned, is my understanding of it.

Mr. Tayler. Then was he immediately appointed to the succeeding place, the place which he now holds?

Mr. Smith. No, sir.

Mr. Tayler. What was it that intervened?

Mr. Smith. He took up the profession of law. He is a law student and a lawyer, and he took up the profession of law in Salt Lake City, and practiced law for a number of years after he left the college.

The Chairman. And then what?

Mr. Smith. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Carl G. Maesar—

The Chairman. I want to know when he became superintendent of the schools.

Mr. Smith. I can not tell you exactly the date, but I was going to tell you how he was chosen. He was a student under Prof. Carl G. Maesar, who was, previous to his appointment, the general superintendent of church schools throughout Utah. Tanner was one of his pupils, and was thoroughly posted in regard to the methods and teaching and all the practices of Carl G. Maesar, who was a very eminent teacher, and because of his knowledge and his eminent fitness to succeed Carl G. Maesar at his death he was chosen to succeed Mr. Maesar.

The Chairman. By whom was he chosen?

Mr. Smith. By the general board of education of the church.

Tanner a Polygamist.

The Chairman. He was a polygamist when he was on the faculty of the college?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. And a polygamist when he succeeded to the superintendency of the Sabbath schools?

Mr. Smith. Just the same. He is in precisely the status that I am myself, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Overman. Has he been chosen since 1890?

Mr. Smith. Yes, I think so. It has been only recently that he was appointed. It was not very long ago.

Senator Dubois. Which is the office of higher dignity, would you think, that of superintendent of all the church schools, or that of president of the agricultural college?

Mr. Smith. The agricultural college is a State and Government institution, and is considered of very great importance in the State. The office of president of that institution is regarded as very dignified and a very responsible position. There is nothing we have in the church capacity that can be compared with it, sir. Our institutions are small concerns in comparison to this grand institution of the State.

Senator Overman. Did the apostles have anything to do with the appointment of this man as superintendent of schools?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; it is a board of education. There is organized a general board of education. To make it quite plain to you, Mr. Senator, I will say that I am also a director in that board, in connection with all the rest of the institutions with which I am associated.

Senator Overman. And the twelve apostles are not members of that board?

Mr. Smith. One or two of them are.

Senator Overman. As a body, I mean?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; not as a body. I think there are one or two apostles, I recall now only one apostle, and that is Mr. Rudger Clawson. He is the only one I recall. There might be one other, but I can not recall any other than him.

Duty of Superintendent.

The Chairman. What is the duty of Mr. Tanner, the superintendent of schools?

Mr. Smith. His duty is to visit the church schools throughout the State of Utah, and throughout the church in Utah, Arizona, Mexico and Canada, and also in Idaho, where we have one or two schools.

The Chairman. And give instructions?

Mr. Smith. And give instructions, and superintend the conduct of the schools.

The Chairman. How many wives had he when he belonged to the faculty of the agricultural college?

Mr. Smith. I do not know anything about how many he has at all. I never was in his house, to my knowledge.

The Chairman. Do you know a man by the name of J. E. Wilson, connected with the college at one time?

Mr. Smith. Which college, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. The Agricultural college, at the time Mr. Tanner was one of the faculty?

Mr. Smith. No; I do not remember the name.

The Chairman. Do you know of any one else who was a polygamist connected with that college as one of the faculty, aside from Tanner?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; I do not.

The Chairman. Go on, Mr. Tayler.

Brigham City Trouble.

Mr. Tayler. Have you had your attention called, Mr. Smith, to a recent controversy arising at Brigham City?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. That is some trouble between some of the people down there and some of the church officials, is it?

Mr. Smith. A tempest in a teapot; yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. A tempest in a teapot?

Mr. Smith. That is all it is. It is simply a newspaper furore, and there is absolutely nothing in it at all.

The Chairman. Is that in Box Elder county?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Senator Foraker. What was that?

Mr. Smith. It was this: A band of musicians were employed by a committee on amusements of Brigham City.

The Chairman. Let me ask you right there, was it a committee of the church or a committee of citizens?

Mr. Smith. It was a band of musicians and a committee on amusements organized among the people.

The Chairman. A committee of citizens?

Mr. Smith. Yes; a committee of citizens.

The Chairman. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. Smith. And the musicians were employed by these people to play for theaters, musical entertainments, concerts, and so on. In course of time they became very arbitrary about their prices. They demanded higher prices than the committee could afford to give, and refused to engage with the committee for the sum that they proposed to give them, and withdrew and started to build a dancing pavilion of their own. The committee on amusements employed other musicians to carry on their entertainments and amusements, and the result was that this band of musicians got left out in the cold. The people did not patronize them, and they commenced raising a hue and cry and a howl, which was published in the newspapers that the church authorities were interfering with their liberty. Gentlemen, that is exactly the status of the case.

Mr. Van Cott. And you do not know anything about it of your own knowledge, either?

Mr. Smith. I know nothing about it, except I tell you this, that on account of the newspaper notoriety that was given to the circumstance, I myself sent two of my friends to that place to investigate it and to sift it to the bottom. I have simply given you their report to me, which I know is reliable. It is simply nothing at all.

The Chairman. Have you anything further, Mr. Tayler?

Mr. Tayler. Yes; one or two questions that I want to close up with. Mr. Smith, do you remember a letter on the subject of polygamy and polygamous cohabitation, written by Lorenzo Snow, and published in the Deseret News in January, 1900?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; I do not remember it.

Snow's Letter on Polygamy.

Mr. Tayler. Let me read that and I think you will recall it. It is on page 13. He said:

I feel it but just to both Mormons and non-Mormons that, in accordance with the manifesto of the late President Wilford Woodruff, dated September 25, 1890, which was presented and unanimously accepted by our general conference on the 6th day of October, 1890, the church has positively abandoned the practice of polygamy, or the solemnization of plural marriages in this and every other State. And any member or officer thereof has no authority whatever to form a plural marriage or enter into such relation. Nor does the church advise or encourage unlawful cohabitation on the part of any of its members. If, therefore, any member disobey the law, either as to polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, he must bear his own burden; or, in other words, be answerable to the tribunals of the land for his own action pertaining thereto.

Mr. Smith. I remember it very well, sir.

Mr. Tayler. That is correctly represented, and represents the attitude of the church on this subject?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. Then and now?

Mr. Smith. Then and now.

Mr. Tayler. Mr. Smith, have you read what purports to be a copy of your testimony—and I infer you have from a remark you made early in our inquiry—appearing in the hearings of the Committee on Territories of the United States Senate, in relation to a bill for the local government of Utah, in 1892?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. Or, rather, I should say, quotations from testimony given by you before Judge—

Mr. Smith. Before the master of chancery.

Mr. Tayler. Before a master in chancery?

Mr. Smith. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tayler. That is a correct transcript of your testimony in that case, is it?

Mr. Smith. I do not know. I have not seen it.

Mr. Tayler. You have not seen it?

Mr. Smith. No, sir; I presume it is, but I have not seen it. I could not say that it is.

Mr. Worthington. May I ask what printed publication that is?

Mr. Tayler. It is the report of the committee. I think it is what you have. I want to identify it. Mr. Richards was here and put it in himself, and I do not want any technical difficulties in the way unless it is intended that they should be made.

Mr. Van Cott. We can examine it tonight and tell you.

(Concluded next Week.)

WINTER ECZEMA

Gentlemen:—I suffered with Eczema on the hands and face for over a year. It was not only annoying and painful, but very unsightly, and I disliked to go out in the streets. I tried at least a dozen soaps and salves, which did me absolutely no good, and became very much discouraged, until I read in the papers of the cures performed through the use of S. S. S., and determined to give it a month's trial at least. I am pleased to state that I soon noticed a slight improvement, sufficient to decide me to keep it up. After the use of six bottles my skin was as soft and smooth as an infant's. This was a year ago, and I have never had any trouble since. MISS GENEVA BRIGGS.
216 S. Seventh Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

I tried doctor's medicines, salves, washes and all kinds of local applications, treating Eczema of long standing, but with only temporary relief. The itching and burning from Eczema was more than I can describe. Many nights I was unable to sleep on account of the awful itching. Seeing S. S. S. advertised I began its use, and after taking it for some time the dry eczematous eruptions disappeared and I was entirely relieved of this awful itching and burning. It is a boon to Eczema sufferers and I can conscientiously recommend it to them, believing confidently that a permanent cure will be effected in all such cases where it is taken according to directions.
Urbana, Ohio. R. F. D. No. 1. C. OTTO.

All skin diseases have their seasons; some are active in the summer, while others lie dormant until cold weather, when the first breath of winter brings them to life and they remain to torment us until spring. Through the long hot months Winter Eczema sleeps in the system, and when cold weather begins it breaks out. The head, hands and feet are the parts usually attacked, but other parts of the body may be affected by this "flesh fire." The skin becomes feverish, hard and dry, cracks open and often bleeds, and the itching is terrible. While the trouble shows on the skin the cause is far deeper. This eruption is but nature's way of telling that the fountain of all health—the blood—is diseased and must have relief. It is filled with uric acid and other poisons which are forced through the pores, causing the natural oils, which should keep the skin soft and pliable, to dry up. These acids are constantly forming in the system to be absorbed by the blood, and thus the trouble is kept up. The treatment of this disease with local applications, such as washes, salves, powders, etc., is useless in effecting a cure, because they cannot get to the seat or beginning of the trouble. The best they can do is to give the patient relief for a little while. The blood must be cleansed of all acids and poisons and the system toned and built up before a cure can be had. S. S. S. cures by going into the blood, searching out all foreign matter, and making it strong and healthy again. S. S. S. is a purely vegetable remedy, and therefore cures this disease safely as well as surely, and from a condition of torture the patient is brought to one of healthful pleasure. Book on Skin Diseases mailed free, and our physicians will give advice, without charge, to all sufferers.

SSS

THE SWIFT SPECIFIC COMPANY, ATLANTA, GA.

The Most of Our Product Is Put Up Under Our

Eureka
TRADE MARK REGISTERED.
FAUST CREAMERY & SUPPLY CO.
SALT LAKE CITY.

This is the best and most favorably known brand of butter on the market. It is better now than ever before. The only method of making it still better is used in making our

Hazelnut Brand Butter

This costs us more and therefore costs you more. Pay your money and take your choice. Your grocer can get them for you.

FAUST CREAMERY & SUPPLY COMPANY

HAMILTON'S

EARLY SPRING GARMENTS

Our buyers are now in the New York market, where they have selected the most exclusive styles for early spring wear.

We are receiving daily shipments of Tailor-made Suits, Coats, Skirts, Waists and Hats. All prices.

Our New Shirt Waist Suits are models of beauty.

New Spring Neckwear.

A few Odd Garments left from the fall stock. One-half off.

Hamilton's
CORRECT DRESS FOR WOMEN
216 SOUTH MAIN ST.

Second Annual
Book Clearance Sale
A. R. DERGE & CO.
SALT LAKE.
Begins Monday, Feb. 20
ENDS SATURDAY, MARCH 4.
3000 volumes at—
One-Half to One-Third Off.
Send or telephone for classified list.

BE WISE
As an old owl and don't forget the dark places of your plumbing.
NEGLECT OFTEN CAUSES sickness, doctors' bills and funeral expenses.
We can save you a whole lot of such expenditure by having your plumbing attended to as soon as needed. Remember, a stitch in time saves nine. We're artists in our line, do the best of work and at reasonable prices.
Electric Fixtures and Wiring.
I. M. HIGLEY & CO.,
HONEST PLUMBERS.
109 E. 1st So.
'Phones: Bell, 2428-X; Ind., 752.

Dependable Groceries

Whether you be a new customer with your first order, or the oldest of our acquaintance, you are absolutely sure of the best in groceries at this store. It's a matter of pride, as well as a fixed business principle with us to send you only such groceries as will cause you to praise us.

T. E. Harper
"Good Things to Eat"
77 EAST SECOND SOUTH ST.