Want ads. need not be "next to pure reading matter," for—as a rule—they are, themselves, real reading matter, of the widest human interest.

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

10 PAGES—LAST EDITION. MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1906. SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH. FIFTY-SIXTH YEAR.

The proper classification of your ad. means the building of a broad and straight road to it for every reader of the paper who would be at all interested in it.

Majority and Minority Reports in Senator Smoot's Case

SENATE NOW HAS THE SMOOT CASE

Burrows Presents Views of Majority of Committee on Privileges and Elections.

FORAKER PRESENTS MINORITY

Former is Radical, Revolutionary, Hostile and Bitter in the Extreme.

Other Just, Recognizing Senator Smoot's Right to His Religious Belief and Seat in the Senate.

(Special to the "News.")

Washington, D. C. June 1.—Immediately after the reading of the journal in the senate, Senator Burrows arose and presented the report of the majority of the committee on privileges and elections, which has had under consideration the question of Senator Reed Smoot's eligibility to a seat in the United States senate. Senator Burrows presented his report in the most formal manner, and made no comment. As soon as Senator Burrows concluded Senator Foraker arose and presented the views of the minority on the case. Senator Foraker gave notice that he would call the Smoot case up in the senate as soon as the business of that body would permit of its consideration. He also asked and secured consent for the printing of 10,000 copies of the majority and minority report for the use of Congress, and for general information.

Senator Bailey made the statement to the effect that while in the main he agreed with the report of the majority, he had just a few words to add to it, which he would have had incorporated in the report but, unfortunately, he arrived at the Capitol this morning, too late. "He agreed," he said, "with the majority report in that Senator Reed Smoot is not entitled to his seat," but under the Constitution he believed that Mr. Smoot could only be removed through a resolution which would call for a two-thirds vote expelling him.

BURROW'S REPORT.

The reasons for the action of the senate committee on privileges and elections in declaring, by a majority vote, that Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat in the senate as senator from Utah, are stated in a report submitted to the senate today by Chairman Burrows and signed by Senators Burrows, Dolliver, Dubois, Pettus, Bailey, Overman and Frazier, to be as follows:

MAIN CHARGE.

That Mr. Smoot is one of a self-perpetuating body of men, known as the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormon Church; that these men claim divine authority to control the members of said Church in all things, temporal as well as spiritual; that this authority is, and has been for several years past, exercised by the said First Presidency and Twelve Apostles as to encourage the practise of polygamy and polygamous cohabitation in the state of Utah and elsewhere, contrary to the constitution and laws of the State of Utah and the law of the land; that the said First Presidency and Twelve Apostles do now control, and for a long time past have controlled, the political affairs of the State of Utah, and have thus brought about in said state a union of church and state, contrary to the constitution of said State of Utah and contrary to the Constitution of the United States and the said Reed Smoot comes here, not as the accredited representative of the State of Utah, in the senate of the United States, but as the choice of the hierarchy which controls the Church and has usurped the functions of the state in said State of Utah."

CLAIM POLYGAMY ENCOURAGED.

The report says it is shown beyond reasonable doubt that the authority of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles is so exercised over the members of the "Mormon" Church as to inculcate a belief in the divine origin of polygamy and polygamous cohabitation. Quotations from the Book of Mormon and other publications are cited to prove the alleged "Mormon" belief that the revelation on the subject of polygamy is of higher authority than the manifesto forbidding the practise.

"It is very evident," the report says, "that if polygamy were discountenanced by the leaders of that Church it would very soon be a thing of the past among the members of the Church. On the contrary, it appears that since the admission of Utah into the Union as a state the authorities of the Mormon Church have countenanced and encouraged the commission of the crime of polygamy instead of preventing it, as they could easily have done."

ALLEGED INSTANCES CITED.

A sufficient number of specific instances of the taking of plural wives among officials of the "Mormon" Church since the manifesto of 1890 have been shown by the testimony, says the majority, "to demonstrate that the leaders, the First Presidency and the Twelve Apostles, connive at the practise of taking plural wives and have done so ever since the manifesto was issued, which purported to put an end to the practise.

"It has been shown by the testimony, so clearly as to leave no doubt of the fact, that as late as 1896 one Lillian Hamlin became the plural wife of Abraham H. Cannon, who was then an Apostle of the Mormon Church. George Teasdale, another Apostle of the Mormon Church, contracted a plural marriage with Marion Scholes since the manifest of 1890. It is also in evidence that Walter Steed, a prominent Mormon, contracted a plural marriage after the manifesto of 1890. Charles E. Merrill, a Bishop of the Mormon Church, took a plural wife in 1891, more than a year after the issuing of the manifesto, the ceremony being performed by his father, who was then and until the time of his death, an Apostle in the Mormon Church. It is also shown that John W. Taylor, another Apostle of the Mormon Church, has been married to two plural wives since the issuing of the so-called manifesto. Matthias F. Cowley, another of the Twelve Apostles, also has taken one or more plural wives since the manifesto."

It is asserted that Abraham H. Cannon and Lillian Hamlin were married on the high seas, off Los Angeles, by Joseph F. Smith, now President of the "Mormon" Church. Of the marriages of the apostles the report says:

APOSTLES TAYLOR AND COWLEY.

"While the proof that Apostles Taylor and Cowley have married plural wives since the manifesto may not be so free from all possible doubt as in the proof in the case of Abraham H. Cannon, the fact that the proof presented to the committee showing such marriages by Taylor and Cannon stand wholly uncontroverted and the further fact that Apostles Taylor and Cowley, instead of appearing before the committee and denying the allegation, evade service of process issued by the committee for their appearance, and refuse to appear after being requested to do so, warrant the conclusion that the allegation is true, and that said Taylor and Cowley have taken plural wives since the manifesto."

Taylor and Cowley have recently been dropped from the list of Apostles and this action by the Church is offered as amounting to an admission by the first presidency and Twelve Apostles that Apostles Taylor and Cowley have each taken one or more plural wives since the manifesto.

SAY FIRST PRESIDENCY KNEW.

Several instances of plural marriages by other church members are cited and the report adds:

"It is morally impossible that all these violations of the laws of the State of Utah by contracting plural marriage could have been committed without the knowledge of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of the "Mormon" Church. Furthermore it is shown by the testimony of one of the Twelve Apostles and other witnesses that "under the established law of the Church no person could secure a plural wife except by the consent of the President of the Church.'"

On intensely interesting chapter of the report is devoted to the charge that testimony was suppressed by "Mormon" leaders, through the sending out of the country of the apostles and other officials who were charged with taking plural wives since the manifesto. The report says:

ABSENTEE WITNESSES.

"It would be nothing short of self-stultification for one to believe that all these most important witnesses chanced to leave the United States at about the same time and without reference to the investigation. All the facts and circumstances surrounding the transaction point to the conclusion that every one of the witnesses left the country at the instance of the rulers of the "Mormon" Church and avoid testifying before the committee. It is furthermore a fact which cannot be questioned that every one of the witnesses is under the direction and control of the First Presidency and the Twelve Apostles of the "Mormon" Church. Had those officials seen fit to direct the witnesses named to return to the United States and give their testimony before the committee they would have been obliged to do so. The reason why the said witnesses left the country and have refused to come before the committee is easy to understand, in view of the testimony showing the contracting of plural marriages by prominent officials of the "Mormon" Church within the past few years.

"Aside from this it was shown by the testimony and in such a way that the fact could not possibly be controverted, that a majority of those who give the law to members of the Church are now and have been for years living in open, notorious and shameless polygamous cohabitation. The list of those who are thus guilty of violating the laws of the state and rules of public decency is headed by Joseph F. Smith, the First President, "Prophet, Seer and Revelator" of the "Mormon" Church.

LIST OF ALLEGED POLYGAMISTS.

"The list also includes George Teasdale, an Apostle; John W. Taylor, an Apostle; John Henry Smith, an Apostle; Merriner W. Merrill, an Apostle; Heber J. Grant, an Apostle; M. F. Cowley, an Apostle; Charles W. Penrose, an Apostle, and Francis M. Lyman, who is not only an Apostle, but the probable successor of Joseph F. Smith as President of the Church; Brigham H. Roberts, one of the presidents of the Seventies and a leading official of the Church; J. M. Tanner, superintendent of the Church schools; Andrew Jenson, assistant historian of the Church; Thomas H. Merrill, a Bishop of the Church; Alma Merrill, one of the presidents of a Church stake; Angus M. Cannon, a Patriarch of the "Mormon" Church; a man named Greenwald, who is at the head of a Church school; George Reynolds, one of the presidents of the Seventies and first assistant superintendent of Sunday schools of the world; George Brimhall, president of Brigham Young university, and Joseph Hickman, teacher in Brigham Young university.

"The officials named were appointed, either directly or indirectly, by the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles; and in the case of J. M. Tanner, his appointment to his present office was made after he had been compelled to resign his position as president of the agricultural college because of the fact that he was a polygamist.

"These facts abundantly justify the assertion made in the protest that 'the supreme authorities in the Church, of whom Senator-elect Reed Smoot is one, to-wit., the First Presidency of Twelve Apostles, not only connive at violation of, but protect and honor these violators of the laws against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation.'"

Another chapter is devoted to the manifesto and the statement of one witness set forth, that "the manifesto is only a trick to beat the devil at his own game."

SENATOR SMOOT'S POSITION.

The majority report characterizes as "wholly untenable" the position that because Smoot himself does not practise polygamy, and there is no evidence to show that he has personally and individually encouraged the practise in others, he ought not to be condemned because of the acts of his associates. It is charged "that Smoot is an inseparable part of the governing body of the "Mormon" Church, and those who compose that organization form a unit, in entirety, and whatever is done by that organization is the act of each and every member thereof, and whatever policy is adopted and pursued by the body which controls the "Mormon" Church Mr. Smoot must be held to be responsible for as a member of that body.

The report declares that Smoot knew the polygamous practises of President Smith and other Church officials he has sustained by his vote as an Apostle, and at no time uttered a word of protest against the conduct of his associates, but on the contrary has sustained them by his silence. The report continues:

NOT ENTITLED TO SEAT.

"In the judgment of the committee, Mr. Smoot is no more entitled to a seat in the senate than he would be if he were associated in polygamous cohabitation with a plurality of wives."

The report discusses the political domination of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of the Church, which is described as most injurious to the interests of the state.

ELECTION, HOW OBTAINED.

"Not only is Mr. Smoot one of those by and through whom the political affairs of Utah are dominated," says the report, "but his election to the senate was, it is believed, the result of such domination. When Mr. Smoot concluded to become a candidate for the senate he was careful to obtain the 'consent of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles to his candidacy.' But this so-called 'consent' of the rulers of the Church was naturally regarded by the people of Utah, who were familiar with the ways of the "Mormon" High Priesthood, as being under the circumstances equivalent to an endorsement, and made it impossible for any one else to become an aspirant for the same position with any hope of success.

ALLEGED OATHS.

The final chapter of the report just preceding the conclusions of the committee quoted at the beginning of this abstract is devoted to the oath of vengeance, administered to those who go through the ceremony known as "Taking the endowments." The committee says it was proven that an oath was administered expressed substantially in this form:

"You and each of you do covenant and promise that you will pray and never cease to pray Almighty God to avenge the blood of the prophets upon this nation, and that you will teach the same to your children and to your children's children unto the third and fourth generations."

"There can be no question," declares the committee, "in regard to taking the oath of vengeance by Mr. Smoot. He testified that he went through the ceremony of taking the endowments in the year 1880 and the head of the 'Mormon' Church stated in his testimony that the ceremony is now the same that it has always been.

"An obligation of the nature of the before mentioned would seem to be wholly incompatible with the duty which Mr. Smoot as a member of the United States senate would owe to the nation. It is difficult to conceive how one could discharge the obligation which rests upon every senator to so perform his official duties as to promote the welfare of the people of the United States and at the same time be calling down the vengeance of heaven on this nation because of the killing of the founders of the 'Mormon' Church 60 years ago."

THE FORAKER REPORT.

The undersigned members of the committee on privileges and elections, having had under consideration senate resolution No. 205, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, adopted Jan. 27, 1903, being unable to agree with the majority of the committee, submit the following minority report.

They attach hereto and make a part hereof a full statement of the case, showing all charges affecting or intending to affect the right and title of Reed Smoot to a seat in the senate as a senator from the State of Utah, together with an abstract of all the material, relevant, and competent testimony offered with respect thereto, and their conclusions deduced therefrom.

They ask that the same may be printed for purposes of reference as a part of this report, and respectfully refer to the same as a more complete statement of the following findings and propositions, and the testimony and arguments in support of the same, upon which they base their dissent from the conclusions and report of the majority of the committee.

SENATOR SMOOT'S QUALIFICATIONS.

Reed Smoot possesses all the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution to make him eligible to a seat in the senate, and the regularity of his election by the Legislature of the State of Utah is not questioned in any manner.

CHARACTER IRREPROACHABLE.

Aside from his connection with the "Mormon" Church, so far as his private character is concerned, it is, according to all the witnesses, irreproachable, for all who testify on the subject agree or concede that he has led and is leading an upright life, entirely free from immoral practises of every kind. He is not a polygamist; has never had but one wife, and has been noted from early manhood for his opposition to plural marriages, and probably did as much as any other member of the "Mormon" Church to bring about the prohibition of further plural marriages.

HAS RIGHT TO HIS BELIEFS.

So far as mere belief and membership in the "Mormon" Church are concerned, he is fully within his rights and privileges under the guaranty of religious freedom given by the Constitution of the United States, for there is no statutory provision, and could not be, prohibiting either such belief or such membership.

Moreover, having special reference to the Mormons residing in Utah and their peculiar belief, it was provided in the act of Congress, passed July 16, 1894, that the people of Utah should provide in their Constitution "by ordinance irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of said states—

"1. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship. Provided, that polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited."

In consequence there was embodied in the constitution of the State of Utah a compliance with this requirement, and thereupon the territory was duly admitted as a state of the Union.

Accordingly, members of the Mormon Church, open and avowed believers in its doctrines and teachings, have been admitted without question to both houses of Congress as representatives of the state.

GROUNDS OF CONTEST.

There remain but two grounds on which the right or title of Reed Smoot to his seat in the senate is contested. They are:

1. That he is shown to have taken what is spoken of in the record as the "endowment oath," by which he obligated himself to make his allegiance to the Church paramount of his allegiance to the United States; and

2. That by reason of his official relation to the Church, as one of its Apostles, he is responsible for polygamous cohabitation which yet continues among the "Mormons," notwithstanding it is prohibited by law.

As to the "endowment oath," it is sufficient in this summary to say that the testimony is collated and analyzed in the annexed statement, and thereby shown to be limited in amount, vague and indefinite in character, and utterly unreliable, because of the disreputable and untrustworthy character of the witnesses.

UNRELIABLE WITNESSES.

There were but seven witnesses who made any pretense of testifying about any such obligation. One of these was shown by the testimony of two uncontradicted witnesses to be mentally unsound. Another, to have committed perjury in the testimony given before the committee on another point. The third was shown by the uncontradicted testimony of a number of witnesses to have a bad reputation for truth and veracity, and to be thoroughly unreliable. A fourth admitted that he had been for years intemperate, and was shown by indisputable testimony to have lost his position on that account, and thereupon and for that reason to have withdrawn from the Church and to have assumed such a hostile and revengeful attitude as to entirely discredit him as a reliable witness. The other three witnesses were so indefinite as to their statements that their testimony amounted at most to nothing more than an attempt to state an imperfect and confessedly uncertain recollection.

CONTRADICTED BY SENATOR.

All that it is attempted to show as to the character of this oath is positively contradicted by Reed Smoot and a great number of witnesses, whose standing and character and whose reputation for truth and veracity are unquestioned, except only in so far as their credibility may be affected by the fact that they are or have been members of the "Mormon" Church.

Upon this state of evidence we are of opinion that no ground has been established on which to predicate a finding or belief that Mr. Smoot ever took any obligation involving hostility to the United States, or requiring him to regard his allegiance to the "Mormon" Church as paramount to his allegiance and duty to the United States.

HIS RESPONSIBILITY.

The only remaining question is whether or not by virtue of his official relation to the Church as one of its Apostles he has any responsibility for the continuation of polygamous cohabitation by members of that Church.

The testimony on this point is also carefully collated and analyzed in the annexed statement.

It will be found by an examination of that testimony that he has never at any time, and particularly he has not since the manifesto of 1890, countenanced or encouraged plural marriages; but that on the contrary he has uniformly upheld the policy of the Church, as announced by that proclamation, by actively advocating and exerting his influence to effect a complete discontinuance of such marriages, and that in the few instances established by the testimony where plural marriages and polygamous cohabitation, as a result of them, have occurred since 1890 they have been without any encouragement, countenance, or approval whatever on his part.

As to polygamous cohabitation in consequence of plural marriages entered into before the manifesto of 1890, there is no testimony to show that he has ever done more than silently acquiesce in this offense against law. In view of his important and influential position in the Church, this acquiescence might be regarded as inexcusable if it were not for the peculiar circumstances attending the commission of this offense.

SOME HISTORY RECALLED.

To understand these circumstances it is necessary to recall some historical facts, among which are some that indicate that the United States government is not free from responsibility for these violations of the law. Instead of discountenancing and prohibiting polygamy when it was first proclaimed and practised the Congress remained silent and did nothing in that behalf. While Congress was thus at least manifesting indifference, President Fillmore and the senate of the United States, in September, 1850, gave both recognition and encouragement by the appointment and confirmation of Brigham Young, the then head of the Church, and an open and avowed advocate and representative of polygamy, to be governor of the Territory of Utah. When his term of office expired under this appointment he was reappointed by President Pierce and again confirmed by the senate.

FIRST ANTI-POLYGAMY ACT.

There was no legislation or action of any kind by Congress on this subject until the act of July 1, 1862, which was in language, as well as legal effect, nothing more than a prohibition of bigamy in the territories and other places over which the United States had jurisdiction.

After this act, for a period of 20 years, plural marriages and polygamous cohabitation continued in the Territory of Utah practically unrestrained and without any serious effort on the part of the United States to restrict the same.

LAW OF 1882.

Finally, in response to an aroused public sentiment, Congress passed the act of March 22, 1882, by which it prohibited both plural marriages and polygamous cohabitation, but legitimized the children of all such marriages born prior to the first day of January, 1883. Under this act prosecutions were inaugurated to enforce its provisions, but it was soon demonstrated that public sentiment was such that only partial and very unsatisfactory success could be secured.

EDMUNDS-TUCKER ACT.

Then followed what is known as the Edmunds-Tucktr act of March 3, 1887, by which, among other things, the rules of evidence were so changed as to make it less difficult to secure evidence in prosecutions for polygamy and polygamous cohabitation. Again, by the terms of this act, all the children born within 12 months after its passage were legitimized.

THE MANIFESTO.

This statute was upheld by the supreme court of the United States, and efforts to prosecute such offenses were redoubled with such success that on the 26th day of September, 1890, the then president of the Church, Wilford Woodruff, issued what is known as the manifesto of 1890, forbidding further plural marriages. So far as the testimony discloses there have been but few plural marriages since, perhaps not more than the bigamous marriages during the same period among the non-"Mormons."

NUMBER OF POLYGAMISTS.

The evidence shows that there were at this time about 2,400 polygamous families in the Territory of Utah. This number was reduced to 500 and some odd families in 1905. A few of these families may have removed out of the State of Utah, but so far as the testimony discloses the great reduction in number has been on account of the deaths of the heads of these families. It will be only a few years at most until all will have passed away. This feature of the situation has had a controlling influence upon public sentiment in the State of Utah with respect to the prosecutions for polygamous cohabitation since the manifesto of 1890.

Whether right or wrong, when plural marriages were stopped and the offense of polygamy was confined to the cohabitation of those who had contracted marriages before 1890, and particularly those who had contracted marriages marriages before the statutes of 1887 and 1882, the disinclination to prosecute for these offenses became so strong, even among the non-"Mormons," that such prosecutions were finally practically abandoned.

CHILDREN LEGITIMIZED.

It was not alone the fact that if no further plural marriages were to be contracted poylgamy would necessarily in the course of time die out and pass away, but also the fact that Congress, having by the statutes of 1882 and 1887 specifically legitimized, the children of these polygamous marriages, it was inconsistent, if not unwise and impossible, in the opinion of even the non-"Mormons" to prohibit the father of such children from living with, supporting, educating, and caring for them; but if the father was thus to live with, support, educate, and care for the children, it seemed harsh and unreasonable to exclude from this relationship the mothers of the children.

Such are some of the reasons assigned for the lack of a public sentiment to uphold successful prosecution for polygamous cohabitation after 1890. It is unnecessary to recite others, for it is enough to say that whatever the real reason or explanation may be, the fact was that after 1890 it became practically impossible to enforce the law against these offenses, except in flagrant cases.

PROHIBITION OF POLYGAMY.

Such was the situation when the territory applied for admission to the Union and Congress passed the enabling act of July 16, 1894, by which the people of Utah, in order to entitle them to admission into the Union, on terms prescribed by Congress, were required to incorporate in their constitution a proviso that "polygamy or plural marriages are forever prohibited;" not polygamous cohabitation, it will be observed, but only polygamous marriages. The testimony shows that there was a common understanding both in Congress and Utah that there were not only to be no more plural marriages, but that prosecutions for polygamous cohabitation had become so difficult that there was a practical suspension of them, and that time was the only certain solution of the perplexing problem.

This sentiment has not only ever since continued, but with the constant diminution of the number of polygamous families and the rapid approach of the time when all will have passed away, there has come a natural strengthening of the sentiment. The testimony in this respect is set forth at length in the annexed statement, but we make the following quotations in order that it may appear in this summary that there is this common disposition, among non-"Mormons" as well as "Mormons."

JUDGE M'CARTHY'S TESTIMONY.

Judge William McCarthy of the supreme court of Utah, a non-"Mormon" and an uncompromising opponent of polygamy, who has held many important offices of trust, among others that of assistant United States attorney for Utah, and who, as such, was charged with the duty of prosecuting these offenses, testified as follows:

"I prosecuted them (offenses of polygamous cohabitation) before the United States commissioners up until 1893, when the United States attorney refused to allow my accounts for services for that kind of work, and then I quit and confined my investigations before the grand jury in those cases."

In explanation of his action he testified—we quote from the annexed statement:

"That he found the press was against the prosecutions; that the public prosecutor, whose attention he invited to the matter, refused to proceed. From this and other facts which came to his knowledge, Judge McCarthy reached the conclusion that the public sentiment was against interfering with men in their polygamous relations, who had married before the manifesto."

E. B. CRITCHLOW'S TESTIMONY.

E. B. Critchlow, a non-"Mormon" attorney at law of Salt Lake City, one of the principal managers of this proceeding against Mr. Smoot, who gave the case his personal attention, attending most of the meetings of committee, testified before the committee, again quoting from annexed statement:

"That after the manifesto of 1890 there was no inclination on the part of the prosecuting officer to 'push these matters as to present cohabitation' 'thinking it was a matter that would immediately die out;' that it was well known that Apostle John Henry Smith was living in unlawful cohabitation; that non-'Mormons' generally made no objection to it; that they were disposed 'to let things ago,' and that was the general feeling from the time of the manifesto in 1890 'down to very recent times—pretty nearly up to date, or practically up to date.'"

Mr. Critchlow further testified that the non-"Mormons" were disposed to overlook the continuous polygamous cohabitation of those who had taken plural wives before the manifesto, because they, the non-"Mormons," felt satisfied that there would be no more plural marriages; that the thing would work itself out in the future, and that where the polygamists had their wives in separate houses and simply kept up the old relations without the offensive flaunting of them before the public, it had been practically passed over.

HON. O. W. POWERS.

Orlando W. Powers, Esq., a leading lawyer of Utah, who was associate justice of the supreme court of the territory, and who showed by his testimony much hostility to the "Mormon" Church, testified that there was this general feeling after the manifesto not to interfere with those whose marriages were prior thereto. He then added: "There is a question for statesmen to solve. We have not known what was best to do. It has been discussed and people would say that such and such a man ought to be prosecuted.

"Then they would consider whether anything would be gained; whether we would not delay instead of hastening the time that we hope to live to see; whether the institution would not flourish by reason of what they would term persecution. And so, notwithstanding a protest has been sent down here to you, I will say to you, the people have acquiesced in the condition that exists."

He explained that by "the people" he meant the Gentiles.

The following quotation from a speech by Senator Dubois, reported in the Congressional Record of Feb. 5, 1903, page 1729 et seq., is to the same general effect.

DUBOIS QUOTED.

"Mr. Dubois. * * * Various causes operated to cause the 'Mormons' to abandon polygamy. There was a feeling among the younger members of the 'Mormon' Church, and a

(Continued on page two, column six.)

THIS IS TOO SUDDEN, BRYAN'S COMMENT

On His Recent Endorsement for President by Various Democratic Conventions.

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM.

Distinguishes Between Them—Party Platform Must be One of Progress and Reform.

Berlin, June 11.—"This is too sudden," said William J. Bryan, with a laugh, when he was told today of the adoption by recent state Democratic conventions favoring his nomination for the presidency of the United States in 1908.

"This is the first announcement of the news to me," Mr. Bryan continued. "I have been off the main caravan route for some time and have been absorbed in what I have been seeing and doing."

Mr. Bryan had been moving so rapidly since he left Vienna on Friday that letters and telegrams for him did not reach him until today. As to the possibility of his nomination he had little to say, declaring it is too early to speak of that question, but taking up the subject of the political requirements of the day he said:

"Before leaving home I tried to distinguish between Democracy and what can properly be called Socialism. Democracy recognizes competition as legitimate and tries to protect the competitive principle from attack. Socialism sees competition as an evil to be eliminated by public ownership and operation of all means of production and distribution. While this distinction between Democracy and Socialism cannot be overlooked the Democratic platform must be one of progress and reform and not merely of opposition to Republican policies or Socialistic ideas. In our fight for the absolute elimination of private monopolies and for the regulation of corporations in general, it is necessary that the party shall be free from any suspicion of alliance with the corporate interests that have been dominating American politics. To this end campaign contributions must be limited to those who have the public interest to advance. I trust that public sentiment will require all parties to keep their books open so that hereafter no party will be under private obligations to shield corporate offenders."

Alluding to conditions in the meat industry, Mr. Bryan said:

"The beef trust is not different in character and methods from other trusts. The inevitable tendency of a private monopoly is to increase the price of product and to lower its quality. Why should anyone expect anything else from a trust than the lowering of quality when a monopoly is established? Observe, I have used the words private monopoly, not public. In a private monopoly a private interest is set up against those of the whole people. Quite a different principle comes into operation when the interest of all is alone in view."

Herman Ridder, of the New York Zeitung, and Mr. Bryan had a long talk today on the political situation in the United States. Mr. Bryan will leave here for St. Petersburg tomorrow, and from there will visit Sweden and Norway. He will arrive in England early in July and will then visit France, Italy and Switzerland. He expects to sail on the steamship Princess Irene from Gibraltar on Aug. 30 and to arrive in New York on Aug. 29.

ASKS SALT LAKE FOR SCHOOL MONEY

San Francisco Board of Education Makes Appeal for Building Fund.

TO BE CONSIDERED TONIGHT.

Wherever One State Contributes Enough for Building State Name Will be Given.

A matter of considerable importance will be brought to the attention of the city board of education at its special meeting tonight when some action will probably be taken towards giving aid to San Francisco in rebuilding its school houses destroyed in the recent disaster. City Supt of Schools Christensen has received a communication from Supt. Alfred Roncovieri of San Francisco in which it is stated that contributions have been received from many cities throughout the country and, as the finances of that city will be such that the schools can probably not be rebuilt for several years, it was considered advisable to accept aid from the outside.

The letter states that 34 school buildings were destroyed at a loss of $6,000,000, and the contributions received have been from the school children and teachers. All money received from this source will be placed in a special building fund and it is the intention that where any one state sends sufficient money to rebuild one building such building shall be named after that state. It is quite likely that the board of education will tonight decide to ask the school people and children for donations for that purpose.

At the meeting tonight the board will also consider the report of the committee which examined applicants for certificates to teach in the city schools. Sixteen teachers took the examinations and of that number only five passed while 11 failed. Of those who passed four will receive primary certificates and one a grammar grade certificate. Four of the certificates will be renewable and one not renewable.

UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Bp. Potter Speaking of Their Relationship, Says No Love Lost Between Them.

FRIENDLY RELATIONS "GUSH"

That Was His Comment, Declaring They Are Entirely Superficial.

To British Reporter He Said: Americans Wash Dirty Linen in Public; Englishmen do it in Private.

New York, June 11.—Bishop and Mrs Henry C. Potter arrived yesterday on the White Star liner Celtic, after a trip to Great Britain and the continent. On the way up from the quarantine the bishop talked of his experiences while abroad. Referring to the relationship between Great Britain and the United States, he declared that there was no love lost between the two countries. This remark came when he was asked whether the beef disclosures had reached Great Britain before he left there. He replied that they had, and with much amusement told of his meeting with reporters there.

"Representatives of the press met me when I arrived in England," he said, "and asked me if I would give them my impression of the insurance scandal. I replied that I would, if they would print it. They agreed to do this, and I said: The insurance scandal amounts to this: In the United States we wash our dirty linen in public, but in great Britain they do it privately. I looked carefully in the papers, but could not find my statement."

Bishop Potter was then asked if he thought the friendly relations existing between the two countries were superficial. He replied:

"Yes. It is gush. Prosperity, you know, is not conducive to friendly relations."

"Is it true that in Great Britain they think the Americans are grafters?" was asked.

"The more acute thinkers," he replied, "do not think we are grafters, but that we are easily tempted by gain."

Visiting Egypt, the bishop said, he went up the Nile to the first cataract, and in describing the change that had come over the country in the 30 years since his last visit quoted Lord Cromer, who had remarked to him:

"You can change the face of the land by canals, railroads and irrigation, and you can lift the physical condition of the people by introducing a better government and good hospitals, but you cannot change the mind of the oriental in a quarter of a century."

The bishop added:

"This is a fact which we must recognize in all our dealings with the oriental." While abroad Dr. Potter, as bishop of the American Episcopal churches in Europe, visited many American Episcopal churches in Florence, Milan, Munich, Dresden, Geneva, and Paris. He spent the winter in Egypt. In the three weeks which he spent in England, he said, he made some interesting discoveries concerning the ancestry of Gen. Washington and Laurence Washington. He said the Washington coat-of-arms was not stolen from a manor house at Selgrave, Northampton, but was taken from an entablature in a church in Wilkeshire, sold to an American and taken to Southampton.

"It has been recovered," he added, and I am now having it mounted in the wall of Garsdon church."

When asked about his remark at the London Pilgrims' club that the American Eagle had it's tail between its legs in the streets of Cairo, Bishop Potter said:

"I had reference to the advertising of certain specifics in Cairo in which the American flag was used."

PRESIDENT ENDORSES GOV. GUILD'S COURSE IN CASE.

Boston, June 11.—Gov. Guild made public today a telegram received by him from President Roosevelt in which the president, after pointing out that he had been requested to interfere with the execution of Charles L. Tucker, declares that in his judgment Gov. Guild's decision not to interfere with the carrying out of the sentence on Tucker seemed to him entirely sound and commended his hearty sympathy.

Tucker is under sentence of death this week, probably tonight, for the murder of Mabel Page at Weston, March 31, 1904. President Roosevelt's telegram follows:

"The White House, Washington, June 10, 1906.

"Gov. Curtis Guild, Boston, Mass.

"Have been requested on behalf of certain parties in Boston to interfere with the execution of Tucker, it being alleged that it is my duty so to do inasmuch as I have the power under the federal laws.

"No showing has been made to me that I have such power but without regard to this I desire to state to you that in my judgment your decision not to interfere with the carrying out of the sentence of Tucker seems to me entirely sound and commands my hearty sympathy. It seems particularly a case in which there should be no interference with the carrying out of the sentence. (Signed)

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

Tucker awoke in the cell at the Charleston prison today with a realization that his last day on earth had arrived. He continued to demonstrate his remarkable nerve and informed the death watch that he had enjoyed a good night's sleep.

After breakfast the prisoner began preparations to receive the sacrament of baptism. It was for the purpose of administering this rite that Tucker's spiritual adviser, Rev. Thomas W. Bishop secured a postponement of the death sentence, Tucker having consented at the last moment to become a member of the Methodist Episcopal church. It is the general belief that Tucker will be sent to the electric chair shortly after midnight tonight.