

death? I think there is. I will refer you to one in the Book of Leviticus 20th chapter and 10th verse:

"And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death."

"That was the law of God in the days of Moses. It was the law of God previous to the days of Moses, as you will find by reference to the Book of Genesis. It has been the law of God from the beginning."

The address then deals with the question as to the execution of the death penalty, and shows most emphatically that while murderers should be put to death, and that if the law of God was fully carried out, adulterers who commit this deadly sin after enlightenment by the Holy Ghost and having made special covenants with God to abstain from such transgressions, would also suffer the same punishment—as the only atonement possible for their crimes—it can only be inflicted by the officers of the law. Page 31 says:

"If a man commits a crime he is to be delivered over to be dealt with according to the laws of the land. The Church can withdraw fellowship from him, but the Church has no authority to execute the death penalty. A man may be deserving of death; but it is not in the province of the Church to kill; he must be delivered over to be dealt with according to the laws of the land."

It was not to be expected that Judge Anderson would quote extensively from this address. But having picked out part of a paragraph which appeared to suit his purpose from page 18, then jumped to page 36, and then skipped over to page 43, common fairness would have suggested that he should make at least one quotation to show the gist, and object, and whole tendency of the address. But no, not a word does he give as to this. For instance, he might have cited this from pages 35-6:

"The law of the land says that if a man kills he shall suffer death. But the laws of the land don't say that the adulterer shall be put to death. Therefore the penalty however deserved cannot be inflicted."

Also in regard to the opinions of leading men in the Church, he might have made this selection from the address:

"The law of God is paramount. When men give their views upon any doctrine, the value of those views is as the value of the man. If he is a wise man, a man of understanding, of

experience and authority, such views are of great weight with the community; but they are not paramount, nor equal to the revealed law of God."

The revealed law of God, as shown in this address, is that if any man commit crime he shall be delivered up to the law of the land, that members of the Church shall not kill, and that if they do they shall not have forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come. And the sentiments of the leaders and the people on this subject are emphatically expressed. Why did not Judge Anderson cite this passage from the address:

"All this shows that the Lord does not delight in the shedding of blood, neither do His servants. We are told that we shall not be blood shedders. We are to be temple builders. David of old was not allowed to build the temple because he was not clean from the blood of his generation. And the people called Latter-day Saints, from the head of the Church down to the humblest member, have a horror of the shedding of human blood. They are not a bloody-minded people. They are a forbearing people, as our cowardly persecutors are well aware."

Judge Anderson, in his partial and biased opinion, made no mention of utterances of the leaders of the Church which were presented in evidence and were utterly at variance with his sanguinary conclusion. He dismisses all this class of testimony with the words:

"An effort was made to show that the blood atonement as preached by Brigham Young and Jedediah Grant is not now the doctrine of the Church."

This is a misrepresentation of the facts. No such effort was made. The proof offered went to show that no such doctrine as that alleged by the objectors was ever entertained by the Church. It is true that it appeared in evidence that there had been no teaching for a great many years in regard to the ideas advanced by the preachers named, and that the address on blood atonement quoted from was delivered in answer to the erroneous ideas concerning it set forth by anti-"Mormons." But no such semi-admission as the Judge insinuates was made during the examination. It was denied then, and is denied now, that any Church authority ever declared the doctrine that men should be killed for apostasy.

And we challenge Judge Anderson, or whoever prepared the one-sided document that bears his name, to produce from the evidence presented in this case any proof whatever that the "Mormon" Church

holds or ever did hold the monstrous doctrine asserted by the Judge and which we have quoted at the beginning of this article. As to its practice, the best answer we can give to the accusation that men have been "blood atoned" for apostasy, is that offered in the address which the Judge has so honorably (?) cited:

"Has there ever been a case of blood-shedding by the authorities of the Church, or by the sanction of the Church, outside of the regular operations of the criminal law? I say there has not, and let those who say there have been such instances bring forth their proofs. The burden of proof is upon them." P. 33.

"Well, the best answer to all these stories is, that they cannot produce a single case of 'blood atonement'—cannot produce one individual case of a man or a woman in this Territory who has suffered at the hands of the Church, this penalty which President Young said ought to be inflicted upon persons guilty of capital crimes." P. 42

Even Judge Anderson was ashamed to mention the only attempt made to prove a case of this kind, which failed so signally as to cover the authors of it with contempt and expose them to the ridicule of all classes of the community. We do not care to express our feelings in view of the gross misrepresentation of our faith and principles contained in the paragraph we have taken from the Judge's decision. We only present the truth. And let those who pervert the doctrines we hold, whether for political or other purposes, remain in the hands of Him who shall deal out justice to all in His own due time.

#### PRESIDENT HARRISON'S MESSAGE.

THE President's message, as delivered to Congress Dec. 3d, at noon, is presented to our readers in full in this issue. It is a voluminous document, but, considering the scope of its subjects, the varied interests of which it treats, and the importance of the issues involved, it is not by any means too verbose, but touches directly each topic brought to the attention of the country. So far as we can judge from a cursory inspection of the message, it is an able state paper and one worthy of the attention of the thinking portion of the American people. We have neither time nor space today to comment at any length upon its text, but we hope it will be perused with interest by many of