

be hastened and not retarded by it, for we would soon demonstrate to the country that we are sincere in our professions, and determined to keep perfect faith with the nation.

When Congress hears our case, if it is willing to give us an enabling act, no one will be more ready to accept it than the Democrats. I am in favor of getting such relief as we can, and would rather have some than none of the rights of freemen. I do not agree with those who claim that the change would not be desirable, and that the "Faulkner bill" was gotten up in the interest of office-seekers.

In my estimation, the abolition of the infamous veto power alone would compensate for the additional cost of the government, to say nothing of our right to elect all our officers and govern ourselves.

JUDGE NORRELL (DEM.)

Never since the declaration of the Democratic party here in favor of division on national party lines has it made a move but was clearly marked out by it at the beginning. The cry of the Republicans was that the Democrats had forced them to organize; that there was nothing else for them to do. The Democratic party has had no other idea in view except the best interests of the whole people of the Territory, and therefore conceived and formulated the Caine-Faulkner measure. The presenting of this bill in Congress again smoked the Republicans from their holes. Being satisfied that there was no possible chance for statehood, they determined to force the matter on as far as possible by introducing the Teller bill. As to this bill I do not believe it will ever become a law. The "Home Rule" bill, which I regard as a great thing for Utah, I believe will pass Congress, and receive the signature of President Harrison.

RANSFORD SMITH, OGDEN (LIB.)

The pronouncement, authorized, as it is alleged, by God, respecting the abandonment of the practice of polygamy for the present by the "Mormons," and the formal dissolution of the "Mormon" political party, and the division of the "Mormon" people on national party lines, makes a condition requiring the laws to be changed to suit the times.

The Democrats have formulated their desires and expressed them in the Faulkner-Caine bill, a wise, statesman-like and conservative measure. The Republicans have indicated their wishes in the statehood bill. That bill goes too far for the present. The Liberals have indicated that they do not want any change. I regret to say they are behind the times.

Let us have the Faulkner-Caine bill made into a law. It preserves the law of the United States against polygamy and kindred crimes and creates a special United States court to enforce the criminal laws of the United States.

All parties in Utah ought to unite in the support of the bill. It will give us the United States Constitution and laws for a constitution and permit the "Mormon" majority in the Territory to experiment in local self-government and show their good faith. It will then be in their hands to accelerate or retard statehood; or in other words, statehood will then come when it ought.

S. W. DARKE (DEM.)

thinks the bill (Faulkner) a step in the right direction, and if it passes will prepare the people for statehood. Don't think they are prepared for the latter yet, but under the operations of the bill they would "get there" fast.

D. C. DUNBAR (DEM.)

The Faulkner bill will cover all our present needs and is all we can expect for two or three years. It would give us practically all we would have under statehood except representation in Congress and under it our expenses would be no greater than if a State.

A. T. SCHROEDER (DEM.)

is in favor of the Faulkner bill and thinks that introduced by Teller a Republican scheme to beat it. Is not opposed to statehood, but believes the Republicans are intending to play one against the other and thus sidetrack both.

S. A. KENNER (DEM.)

has been in favor of statehood since he was old enough to know anything about the question. The Territorial system is not in consonance with republican institutions, and continued long after a Territory possesses every requisite for self-government is subversive of such institutions. To say there are social troubles which attrition and natural advancement cannot adjust is to place a discount on human nature and relegate logic to the scrap-heap. Those patriots who would save us from threatened evils sure to come under statehood, probably emulate the example of the geese that saved Rome by cackling.

WILLIAM NEWTON. (DEM.)

I am opposed equally to the Caine-Faulkner and the Teller bills, but have not compared the one with the other for the reason that, in my mind, the same objection exists to both—viz., that it is too early in the day. I am a deep dyed in the wool Democrat, and as such, a year ago, eagerly embraced what I considered an opportunity offered by the Democratic party in this Territory, of commencing a dissolution of all local feuds but with the distinct understanding that no advance was to be made in the direction of statehood. I may be wrong, but I cannot acquiesce in the endorsement of the Faulkner bill by the Democratic party here because I do not honestly feel that the passage of it would be for the best interest of the community, and, personally, I am exceedingly sorry for this, because, as before stated, I know nothing but Democracy and its principles, and politically cannot talk anything else. I look upon the introduction of those bills at the present time as most unfortunate and as greatly tending to lengthen the local discussion which all good citizens are anxious to see dissipated, and which must be removed before we can get fairly and squarely down to the discussion of national politics.

WALDEMAR VAN COTT. (DEM.)

I do not wish to antagonize the Teller bill, though I believe it was introduced to kill the "Home Rule" measure.

HON. C. C. RICHARDS, OGDEN. (DEM.)

I am in favor of the Faulkner bill. At intervals of forty years Congress has been taking from us the power to elect our own officers, and govern our-

selves. Less than a year ago we began to enlist the people under the political banners of the two great national parties. We have made rapid progress, in so short a time, in bringing about a condition of good feeling among all classes of people. We need not hope, however, that the bitterness and hatred of half a century's growth has been forgotten by Congress in less than a year.

The President, in his message, six weeks ago, proclaimed that we need not ask for statehood, but he did not say that he would veto a bill authorizing us to elect our officers and govern ourselves, subject to the control of Congress. With the Faulkner bill in force we would soon demonstrate just how the affairs of the new State would be conducted. Instead of delaying statehood, the Faulkner bill will hasten it. It will be the test of our sincerity. If we can stand the test—and we certainly can—the whole problem will be solved, and we will be admitted into the Union without unnecessary delay.

While we are waiting for the honors and dignity of statehood, let us have the substance—the Faulkner bill—and be governing ourselves preparatory to the millennium.

HON. JAMES H. MOYLE. (DEM.)

Having perfect confidence in the people of Utah, I have always been in favor of statehood, and always opposed to the un-American, if not tyrannous form of government under which we live, and by which the unanimous voice of more than 200,000 people—our entire population—can be vetoed and declared for nothing by a single individual who bears no responsibility to those he should serve; saying nothing of the Utah Commission, who are so empowered as to enable corrupt politicians to defeat the will of the people at the ballot box, the great safeguard of our freedom; the two offices named are worth all the expense the home rule bill imposes upon the Territory. And I regret that any true friend to Utah should place a price on freedom.

History has demonstrated that the best statesmen have always sought for that which was attainable. The Home Rule Bill is all but statehood, and satisfies every objection heretofore raised to it, and therefore would seem to be within our reach. The Enabling Act is inspired by a desire to go the Democrats one better even at the great risk of destroying everything, which I believe to be the sole reason for its finding a champion in the Salt Lake Tribune and its managers.

ELIAS A. SMITH. (DEM.)

When the Faulkner-Caine bill was first presented to me I endorsed it, believing it to be a measure that Congress would be willing to pass. The Republicans seeing that the bill was meeting with favor and that it stood a fair chance of passing conceived the idea of introducing a bill for the admission of Utah into the Union and had what is known as the Teller bill introduced. I do not believe they expect the bill to pass, but hope it may be the means of killing the Faulkner-Caine bill. While I endorse "Home Rule" for Utah and hope we may obtain it, if the Republicans are desirous of benefiting the Territory and want statehood, they will find the Democratic party always on hand to do what it can for the best good of the Territory, whether it is the "Home Rule" bill or statehood.