

tion of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." Very different are these sentiments from those uttered not many years since by a prominent republican leader in the House of Representatives, who, when asked if he, as a lawyer, would state to the House that the measure introduced by him, and then under consideration by it, was in its provisions in harmony with the Constitution, answered with a sneer, "Why, any justice of the peace would tell the gentleman it is *not* constitutional, but it is a measure we want and one we shall pass, and by the time its constitutionality is tested, it will have accomplished the object we have in view." The same sentiments as those we have referred to were clearly and unhesitatingly uttered by members of Congress pending the final passage of the Edmunds bill. They show the drift of the party, perhaps the spirit of the times, in which the sentiments of Washington are below par. Other members, while not entertaining such views, lacked moral courage to oppose them. Some of them came privately and confessed that the Edmunds bill was an infamous measure; but, said they, What can we do? Public sentiment is against your people, and we dare not defend you; if we do, our constituents will withdraw their support, and we shall be retired." The force of such reasoning we may not comprehend, but we do feel that we have no desire to have any man sacrifice himself or his prospects for us. We are

used to oppressions, and with the help of God we can stand all the special *ex post facto* laws and bills of attainder which Congress may pass and the President approve, and we don't expect much sympathy or friendship from the outside either; for we have proven years ago that a man never has fewer friends than when he needs them most, nor more than when he needs them least. Does a knowledge of this fact tend to destroy our confidence in man? No, I think not, but it does tend, by showing how weak and unreliable man is, to increase our trust in God.

In asking for a commission of honorable gentlemen to visit Utah to investigate affairs before passing judgment upon us, we did express as I said before, a hope that we might be fairly tried before being convicted. The signers of these petitions knew, and their enemies here knew that the charges constantly heaped up against this people could be proven utterly false if a chance to do so were afforded. But that is just what certain parties did not want, fearing that a thorough investigation conducted by honorable men would defeat their plot against the people of Utah. I speak of these matters as I understand them. I am not and never have been radical, but have desired always to view things from an impartial standpoint.

Irrespective of creed or color, I think there is room in Utah for all who wish to locate in the Territory, and those who are here and others who may come hereafter, should be protected in the enjoyment of their rights, and should be free to exercise them so long as they do not infringe upon the rights of others. In these matters Gentile, Jew and Mormon should stand upon the same level.