

Now, who is it that has demanded of Congress this Edmunds' law against Utah? It has been the pulpit of our nation, the orthodox pulpit. It is at their behests this legislation has been enacted. They would destroy us; and if they could do this then they would turn their attention to somebody else—the Catholics, the Infidels, the Spiritualists—they would not be satisfied until they obtained what they call "uniformity." They do the very thing themselves that they charge us with doing, and which they pretend they desire to prevent in this Territory.

It is this principle of freedom of which I have been speaking that we are determined to maintain; we shall contend for it to the very uttermost as long as life remains. This is the feeling I have. Do you not feel the same? I am sure you do; I know you all do; I need not call for any expression of your feelings. We cannot fight law; we must submit to law, the law being more powerful than we are; but we can do as John Bunyan said: "I cannot obey, but I can suffer." We cannot renounce our religion; we cannot throw it aside; we cannot trample upon the commandments of God; but we can endure the penalty of obeying God's law, even if it be imprisonment. It is part of the contract. We know what others had to endure for the religion of Jesus, and if we expect to obtain the same glory as they, we must be prepared to endure the same consequences.

I do not make these remarks to stir up feelings of defiance. It would be a most unwise and a most unfortunate position for us to occupy, to place ourselves in an attitude of defiance against the laws of the land; but while we do not defy, we

at the same time shall maintain, I hope, the principles of liberty, and claim them for every man and woman as well as ourselves. We shall never cease our efforts, I hope, until from one end of the land to the other men and women can worship God whether they be Mormon or infidel, or whether they believe in Buddha, or are believers in the God of Israel, the Lord of the whole earth, or worship a wooden god, without interference or interruption from others as long as they do not trespass upon or interfere with the rights of their fellow citizens. All ought to have this right, and no one should seek to deprive them of it.

The most nonsensical arguments have been used against us in consequence of our claiming liberty of this kind. Say some men: Suppose there were Thugs in this country, or Hindoos who believed in burning widows as they did in India, shall the government not have the right to put down such murders and such ceremonies of cremation? Suppose that human sacrifice was deemed proper by some religious sect and should be called a religious ordinance, do you mean to say that government has not the right to interfere with and to stop the taking of life in such a way?

Certainly, I have never said it had not, neither have I claimed it when I have said that we had a right to practice this feature of our religion. There is a very wide distinction, but many do not seem to understand the difference. There are certain acts that are crimes in and of themselves; they are not made so by statutory law; one of these is murder. It always was a crime against nature and always will be. He who takes the life of a fellow being commits a crime, even if it should be in a land