

rest of the community. That is one extreme. The other is this idea, to which I have referred, the anxiety of poor people to get possession of the accumulations of the rich, and to have them divided among them, and a general leveling take place. There is no such idea connected with this order, such a thing could not stand very long; and let me say to you who find fault with this United Order, ask yourselves when you ever saw anything connected with this Church or its doctrines that was unnatural, that was not consistent with good common sense? Do you think that we can teach and practice anything that will repress people, that will destroy individual effort, that will take away from enterprise its incentive? No, there is nothing connected with this system of this character, and it is upon this point that men and women are so much deluded by the false and slanderous reports which are circulated. There never was a day since our organization as a people, according to my ideas and my reading of our early history and my subsequent experience, when there were so many falsehoods in circulation about any principle as there have been about this United Order. There is far too much ignorance among us, and men take advantage of this to deceive the people by their falsehoods. It is the intention to preserve that which we have. If a man is a man of business let him have a chance to show his business capacity, not stop him, not take his property from him and give it to somebody who never had anything. The intention is to use the skill of the businessman in elevating those who are not businessmen, to bring up the poor from their level to the broad upper level, not to pull down the upper level to the plane of the lower. That is not the

design, but it is that we shall work for each other's good; and where men have property let them take means to preserve it, not to destroy it. It is not the intention for boards of directors to use arbitrary power over men and property.

There are many cases where if a man were to put all that he has into the Order, it would be found that he already manages that property better than the board of directors could. Under such circumstances it would be better to say: "Here, you have managed this property economically, you have done well with it, we could not do so well with it if we took it. There is no object to be gained by our taking it from you; you continue to use and manage it as a stewardship, and keep up its productiveness." This will have to be done doubtless in many instances.

But as to our farming interests, we can farm together far better than separately. Instead of having so many mowers and reapers, and so many tools, teams and wagons as we have now, we can concentrate our labors and have better results from the use of a given quantity of capital and labor than under our present system; and I do hope that the Bishops in this city will take hold of this matter as they should do. Will they do it? Or will they stand in the way of the people? I firmly believe that many of our leading men are standing today in the way of the people in relation to the organization of this United Order; but if they were to do as they should do, as God requires of them, they would take hold of this principle in the spirit of it.

"Well, but," says one, "suppose I lose my property?" Suppose you do, it is not intended that you should lose it, but suppose that you do? If my property goes, what odds is it?