

Gospel also revealed unto him the doctrine of plural marriage; it was presented to us as a doctrine to be believed in and be governed by. Could we help it? What had we to do with it? It is a command of God; and the question is, Shall I, after having embraced the Gospel of the Son of God, and entered into covenant with Him to observe His laws and be governed by the revelations of His will; shall I, because of something that is distasteful to me, set up my will and judgment against His, and say, "Why, I shall be despised, I shall be hated;" shall I, because of a feeling of that kind violate the laws of God? No, I cannot do it; neither can you who believe in the revelation. God gave it to His servant Joseph Smith and he declared it unto us. Now, how was it? The first thing that was done, when the word of God came to us to do it—for there was a time after this revelation was given when we were not permitted to teach this doctrine publicly; but as soon as we were instructed to do so, Prof. Orson Pratt was sent to Washington to publish a paper, at the seat of government, and there proclaim our sentiments on plural marriage to this nation and to the world. This mission he fulfilled—publishing a paper called the *Seer*, and lecturing in a hall hired for that purpose, several times a week. Was there anything underhanded about this, or low, or anything antagonistic to the interest of this nation or any other nation? It was merely proclaiming certain principles pertaining to eternal lives and covenants that should exist through eternity, in our sexual relations pertaining to our association in this world and the world to come. Did we interfere with the rights of others? No; and if we had any revelations, it was not

for us to oppose them. But others do not know anything about these things, consequently they cannot comprehend our position. Have we done anything covertly? Not until we were forced to. Some few years ago, I remember being brought before a court to give evidence in a case. I was asked if I believed in keeping the laws of the United States. I answered, "Yes, I believe in keeping them all but one." "What one is that?" "It is that one in relation to plurality of wives." "Why don't you believe in keeping that?" "Because I believe it is at variance with the genius and spirit of our institutions—it is a violation of the Constitution of the United States, and it is contrary to the law of God." Now this is plain. You could not tell your feelings much plainer. This was before the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of that law. "Well," said a man to me, "Are you prepared to abide the consequences." "Always," said I, "everywhere." That is straightforward, and in saying this, I only expressed the feelings of thousands of my brethren and sisters. Well, then, whose business is it? If I do a thing and am prepared to abide the penalty, whose business is it? Do I interfere with the friends or government of the United States? No. They have passed a law for political effect which is really intended as a trap for us. One would think that a great and magnanimous nation of fifty millions, could afford to allow a few thousand people to work out a social problem, without fear of contamination. They do not understand us, we wish them no harm. Many of them know this; but they cannot always control circumstances, and many of the members of Congress who were not willing to do anything of this sort, were crowded on by