

authority. Not that I think for a moment that any sane person would be so woefully deceived. I wish to refer to a manufactured sensational piece in the issue of Sunday the 15th inst., that has been called to my attention, headed a "Red-Hot Address;" also a short editorial on the subject in which the truthful (?) editor states it had been "forwarded by a friend." O, *tempora!* O, *mores!* It purports to be a "stenographical report of Bishop West's harangue in the Juab schoolhouse, Sunday, March 9, 1884, reported by 'Tobias Tobey' for the Salt Lake Tribune." Then follows an address which charity would suggest had been written by an insane person or worse, the offspring of a deadly corrupt heart, a miserable disgrace to the *genus homo*, worthy only to rise to "shame and everlasting contempt."

Now, the facts are these: It is all a gross fabrication. Juab is a small town occupied by hotel and boarding-house keepers, a store or two, and the railroad hands, there is a small branch of the Church presided over by Elder James Wilson, who is very much respected, but no Bishop. On the Sunday referred to there had been a washout and all the hands were busy, so that there was no meeting held on that day; and as far as the "Bishop West" is concerned, there is no such Bishop there or in the "Mormon" Church, and who "Tobias Tobey" is no one knows.

I have been requested to inform you of these facts, and kindly request that you will waive any feeling of dislike you may have to, in any way, refer to the existence of such a sheet, for the sake of our young Elders on missions, who might perchance meet with this shockingly vile fabrication.

Very respectfully,
GEORGE TEASDALE.

The perpetrators of the outrageous slander, finding their anti-"Mormon" bubble burst, made this magnanimous explanation.

"The case of the 'Red Hot Address' has been cited, which was corrected as soon as the managers of this journal found they had been imposed upon."

They supplemented this miserly pretense at doing justice by publishing the following piece of unmitigated infernalism:

"There was not a thing is that bogus sermon which has not been taught in the Tabernacle harangues."

This is uniform with the policy of the same journal now. In the face of the fact that William Green is living at Spanish Fork, a town only sixty-five miles distant from this city, it insisted, only the other day, that the Wardell story, told on the witness stand, was true, and that he was murdered by "Mormons" near Green River, because he had apostatized. This shows that there is consistency even in villainy.

That bogus address bore its legitimate fruit. It was sent into the Southern States and so inflamed the passions of the populace against the Latter-day Saints in different places that a terrible tragedy was the result. A mob thus incited

surrounded a house on Cane Creek, Tennessee, on the 10th of August, 1884, and murdered, in cold blood, Elders John H. Gibbs and W. S. Berry; also J. R. Hudson, stepson, and Martin Condor, son of James Condor, the proprietor of the house where the massacre was committed. Mrs. Condor was also shot and so severely wounded that she never entirely recovered, being rendered permanently lame. David Hinson, one of the members of the gang, was also killed by young Hudson. This fearful scene of blood was traceable to the bogus West address, which was carried around by a sectarian preacher, who read it to the populace with comments in harmony with it, until they became infuriated and bloodthirsty.

This scrap of history of a few years ago, is of a piece with present manipulations of a like character and the reproduction of the story is therefore appropriate.

DANGERS OF CONFISCATION.

SINCE the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker act, which contains a clause directing the confiscation of the property of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the sentiment in favor of seizing, for public uses, the possessions of other religious bodies has had a rapid growth. This is a natural effect of the unconstitutional statute. Malignant measures beget their likeness. Enactments of a like nature, intended to apply to other than the "Mormon" people, have already been conceived in the public mind, and unless the evil genius as a whole is wiped out, their delivery is inevitable.

The rapid growth of skepticism, which too often excludes all respect for religion of any kind, renders the situation more and more dangerous. As a result of the flagrant innovation upon human rights perpetrated in the enactment of the measure named and the growth of skepticism combined, we have been enabled to quote in these columns, at different times, expressions from prominent journalists and publicists favoring the confiscation of the property of the Catholic Church in this country, some going so far as to advocate the seizure of the possessions of all religious bodies.

As a pointer in this direction we are enabled to present an extract from a letter received from a gentleman in New York by a friend in this city:

"You have little idea how rapidly

radical views are spreading, in relation to religion, politics and sociology. We are rapidly nearing the precipice. Nor do I think it possible for the world to check its downward career. There are many who hope for a peaceful solution of all social difficulties—but I think that impossible. Already there is talk of confiscating the immense wealth of the Roman Catholic church in the United States. And why should the Episcopal church be exempt? Trinity church alone owns \$150,000,000! This confiscation business is going to be a big job before it is through. I heard a prominent lawyer here say that European nations had been obliged, as a matter of self-defense, to confiscate the immense wealth of the Roman Catholic church, and he thought the same thing would have to be done in the United States. I heard Hugh O. Pentecost, lately a Baptist minister, advocate, in public, the overthrow of all existing political and religious institutions, denouncing rich men, landowners and politicians as "thieves" and oppressors. Had a "Mormon" talked as he did, he would have been prosecuted for treason and inciting to riot. He has a large following."

Such special confiscatory measures as the one aimed at the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are unconstitutional in two prominent particulars. They are violations of the clause which provides that private property shall not be taken for public purposes without due compensation. The law referred to takes the property of the "Mormon" people without any compensation whatever. It is also violative of the first amendment to the Constitution, which inhibits Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion. In other words, that there shall be no established religion, or a religious system preferred legislatively above others by the State. To the extent that the Edmunds-Tucker act is a special measure, aimed at only one religious body, while all the others are exempt from its pains and operations, to that degree are the others preferred and made the State religions. Should the views of the anti-Catholics prevail, and that religious body also be subjected to the confiscation process, it would be but a step in advance toward making the more favored systems the religions of the State; and so on until there might be but one remaining, which would be an establishment of religion by preference exhibited by non-interference.

Whether the confiscation process is extensive or limited, it is a dangerous expedient, and one that must inevitably lead to disaster.

TRYING TO UNITE.

THE five states of Central America, Guatemala, Honduras, San Sal-