people, who interpreted it as a validation of the charges and petitions. The following excerpt of his testimony, which was distributed nationally, illustrates both the substance and tone of his testimony:

MR. TAYLER: Is there not a Revelation published in the Book of Covenants here that you shall abide by the law of the State?
MR. SMITH: Yes, sir.
MR. TAYLER: If that is a revelation, are you not violating the laws of God?
MR. SMITH: I have admitted that, Mr. Senator, a great many times here.
MR. TAYLER: But do you mean to say, at your pleasure, obey or disobey the commands of God Almighty?
MR. SMITH: Yes sir [. . .] I obey or disobey at my will.
MR. TAYLER: Just as you please.
MR. SMITH: Just I please.
MR. TAYLER: And that is the kind of a God you believe in?
MR. SMITH: That is exactly the kind of a God I believe in.[82]

While this publication may have been construed to incite anti-Mormons, it nonetheless represents the view received by non-Mormons of President Joseph F. Smith and the LDS Church's view of the dilemma between obedience to temporal laws and ecclesiastical commandments.

Apostle Francis M. Lyman's testimony followed, which, combined with President Smith's, outraged the national public. As president of the Quorum of the Twelve, Apostle Lyman admitted to cohabitation and his intention to continue the practice, even though it contradicted the laws of the land and the law of God as articulated in the Manifesto.[83] The committee asked for President Smith's assistance in encouraging the other subpoenaed witnesses to appear before the committee, but Smith responded that "As this is a political matter and not a religious duty devolving on them or me, I am powerless to exert more than moral suasion in the premise."[84] The missing witnesses and the church's uncooperative attitude plagued the Smoot trial and the LDS Church's national reputation for several years.

During this period the *Deseret News* reported that the committee intended to subpoena Owen; however, a letter to Owen from Reed Smoot indicated that no formal subpoena had been made:

> I see by the papers and also learn by telegraph that you have not been subpoenaed as a witness in my case. This coming