

had got along, and it was a great source of satisfaction to me to be able to say that notwithstanding some of our settlements had suffered from the devastations of grasshoppers five years in succession, there had been no clamor, and that no begging appeal had gone up or out from Utah to other portions of the United States, although many of our settlements had their entire crops destroyed years in succession. I distinctly remember that Wellsville, in Cache Valley had its crops destroyed five years, while scarcely a settlement in the Territory escaped a visitation of this kind three years in succession.

All these things, when mentioned, called forth admiration. Men would say—"There must be something very peculiar about your organization to enable you to manage these things so well. Were not your people overwhelmed with debt, their farms all mortgaged?" "No." "How did you sustain yourselves?" "Well, we believed in assisting each other; and if our people lived in a State like Kansas or Nebraska they would be too proud to call for help from the rest of the nation because their crops had been destroyed one year. We believe in helping ourselves; we believe in laboring and in asking the blessing of God upon our labors, and in putting our trust in him, believing that he will sustain us, and thus far he has done so."

I allude to these things because they are of public interest. So far as our admittance into the Union is concerned, it is generally acknowledged, I believe, among the members of the Senate and House of Representatives, that Utah was fully entitled to statehood, and that it ought to have a state government. And, gentlemen would say—"If it were not for your peculiar institution, you would be admitted readily."

"No," I remarked, "you mistake, sir; it is not that, there is something more than that. I know that the general opinion is that it is our system of marriage which prevents Utah from being admitted as a State, but it is a mistake, if we did not believe in that there would be something else." This they would be loath to admit, but many admitted so far as the elements of a State were concerned, in having a substantial footing in the land and being wedded to the soil, in having developed the resources of the country, agricultural and mineral, and in establishing manufactures, that Utah, with her railroads and other improvements is ahead of every other Territory. But, as I have said, the idea was that we were scarcely fit to be admitted because of our "peculiar institution." I occasionally remarked when talking on this subject to members of Congress—"You are determined to make what you call 'the peculiar institution' of Utah of national importance; you commit, according to my views, a great blunder by so doing. Suppose there is one out of every ten among the people of Utah connected with polygamy—some think that is a high estimate—and that there are one hundred and fifty thousand people in Utah, and some think that is a high estimate also, that would make fifteen thousand people in Utah Territory who are either polygamists or connected with polygamy. Now think of it, here you are the representatives of forty millions of people, and by your action in a national capacity you uplift the practices of fifteen thousand people from obscurity and give them a national importance in the eyes, not only of our own country, but in the eyes of Europe. Does it seem statesmanlike that the practices of fifteen thousand people should be