

not men liberty of conscience here? Yes. The Presbyterians, Methodists, Quakers, etc., have *here* the liberty to worship God in their own way, and so has every man in the world. People have the privilege of apostatizing from this Church, and of worshipping devils, snakes, toads, or geese, if they please, and only let their neighbors alone. But they have not the privilege to disturb the peace, nor to endanger life or liberty; that is the idea. If they will take that privilege, I need not repeat their doom, it has been told here today, they have been faithfully warned.

Why is it that these apostates wish to cram down people's stomachs that which they loathe? That which they have no wish either to hear, think about, or digest? If the people of a neighborhood, ward, or city, wish to speak, hear, or worship, or to discuss any subject, they have public and private buildings, schoolhouses, churches, or assembly rooms in abundance. Why, then, are our streets disturbed by tumults, railings, slanderous, abusive, and treasonable language, under the name of preaching? If the city, or a large portion of its citizens, wish to discuss any general principle, here is the Tabernacle, and yonder is the State House, or the Theater—all owned by the people, and under their control. Where is the need, then, of preaching in the streets. But where is the city or community to be found, who wish to discuss that which they already know and understand? As to this *man*, or rather "*thing*," called Gladden Bishop, and his pretended visions and revelations, I know him of old. I knew him in Ohio, some eighteen or twenty years ago. I remember his name. My memory is poor in names, many of you know; but when there is something associated with a name, that stamps it strongly on my mind, I am not apt to forget it. I scarcely ever heard that name in my life, that it was not associated with some imposition or

falsehood in the name of the Lord. If he was tried before the Councils of the Church, he would confess that he had lied, in pretending to visions, angels, and revelations, and ask forgiveness. If he was excommunicated, he would join again, etc.

I never heard of him in any other light, but as a man or a "*thing*" that crept in from time to time among the Saints, with attempts to deceive the people with one imposition or another.

His difficulty all the time was, that the people would not be deceived by him. I will not put him on a level with other apostates. Where can we find one of them that has not had some influence? I know of no one that had not some followers for awhile, although none could keep them; but I never knew Gladden Bishop to gain a single follower among his personal acquaintance. He was disfellowshipped, and received on his professions of repentance, so often, that the Church at length refused to admit him any more as a member. These apostates talk of proof! Have we not proved Joseph Smith to be a Prophet—a restorer, standing at the head of this dispensation? Have we not proved the Priesthood which he placed upon others by the command of God?

I see no ground, then, to prove or to investigate the calling of an apostate, who has always been trying to impose upon this people. It is too late in the day for *us* to stop to inquire whether such an outcast has the truth.

We have truths already developed, unfulfilled by us—unacted upon. There are more truths poured out from the eternal fountain, already, than our minds can contain, or than we have places and preparations to carry out. And yet we are called upon to prove—what? *Whether an egg that was known to be rotten fifteen years ago, has really improved by reason of age!!*