

that statehood for Utah is a Republican measure, and that the introduction of the bill in Congress is in keeping with the Republican policy of prompt and decisive action, as against Democratic vacillation and "innocuous desuetude;" of progress and courage as against half-way measures and betrayal of confidence.

J. L. RAWLINS (DEM.)

As to the bill for an enabling act introduced by Senator Teller, no Democrat is disposed to antagonize it, and if the Republicans can give any assurance that the President will approve such a measure providing it should pass Congress, and can prevail upon a title of the Republican members of Congress to support it, I believe that the Democrats can induce a sufficient number of their political associates to do the same and thereby make it a law. Unless they can give some such assurance and furnish some evidence of the possibility of the success of the measure, the Democrats will deem it their duty to press on for such political relief as they reasonably believe can be obtained under existing circumstances.

COLONEL S. A. MERRITT (DEM.)

In regard to the question of statehood, I think, in view of the expressions of President Harrison in his last annual message, it is reasonable to suppose that he would veto any enabling act passed to provide for the admission of Utah. I am free to say that in my judgment Utah possesses the necessary qualifications for statehood, but it is impossible to get it now. There has been doubt expressed as to the sincerity of the Mormon people in abandoning polygamy. I have no doubt whatever of their sincerity, but as practical men we must look at the situation as it exists; therefore at present and until the doubts of the public are allayed, it would be better for the people of Utah to urge the passage of the Home Rule bill introduced in Congress by Messrs. Faulkner and Caine. This if enacted into a law would give to the citizens of Utah the entire control of their local affairs, and quiet the apprehensions of some well-meaning persons in regard to their good faith on the subject of the abandonment of polygamy. One or two years of the operations of the Home Rule bill would convince everybody that Utah could safely be admitted as a State in the Union. I look upon the introduction of the Statehood bill as a Republican trick to defeat the Home Rule bill, and as not proposed in good faith. For myself, personally, I am ready for the admission of Utah at this time and think it could be done safely, but that is impracticable now.

WILLIAM FULLER (DEM.)

The Territory is large enough and rich enough to elect its own officers. It is my opinion that the "Liberals" would fight any proposition for statehood until the Powers and Burmesters et al. could run things here. The state of the present feeling of the American people is such that we could not get statehood, but the Faulkner bill would be a step in that direction, and I am heartily for it.

W. A. HODGES (DEM.)

says the Faulkner bill is a step in the right direction, "but I would rather

have statehood. Anything to knock out the Utah Commission."

JUDGE HENDERSON (DEM.)

I am in favor of the Faulkner-Caine bill. I believe it would be a great advantage over the present condition. When the bill was suggested it was remembered that the President had virtually declared in his message against statehood—and had announced his policy with respect to Utah—with the Presidential policy thus announced and with a history of fifty years of legislation by Congress constantly restricting Territorial powers it was thought that this bill asked for all that it was practical to get, and I still believe so. The only question in my mind is whether Congress and the President can be induced to go even to the extent of this bill as it now stands. But the people who were opposed to any liberal legislation for Utah undoubtedly thought that it would pass unless the people to be benefited by it could be induced to desert it for something wholly beyond our reach and impracticable. Consequently they first attacked the bill by initiating a move for statehood, which they knew was beyond reach of which they had no fear and to which they are themselves opposed. Induced, however, by this situation, a bill has been prepared and introduced for statehood. It is being used for the purpose, and its only result can be to defeat any legislation. I see some gentlemen base their oppositions to the "Home Rule" bill upon the ground that it will postpone statehood. This to me is utterly unreasonable. The Liberal party and the Republican party seem to have joined hands in demanding "statehood or nothing;" the first, because they know it means "nothing;" the latter, because they are uniting to defeat anything proposed by the Democrats. I see that one gentleman says it was a breach of faith to introduce the Home Rule bill. I know of no agreement, expressed or implied, which it violates. It seems to me that the cry of "statehood or nothing," to put it mildly, is, as between the two, the most unreasonable.

F. H. DYER (DEM.)

I think the Republicans made a mistake in asking for statehood at this time, as there seems to be no one pressing that matter except the Tribune. The President has said very plainly that Utah should not be admitted yet. The Democratic Central committee had formulated what is now called the Faulkner bill under which the people would be given local self-government, and under its operations be given an opportunity to prove to the skeptics of the east that we are not only capable of governing ourselves, but that by reason of our intelligence, our wealth, population and the law abiding character of our people. We are entirely worthy of statehood, which we can get in the winter of 1893-94. The "Liberal" cry that they prefer statehood to the Faulkner bill is simply a deception practiced upon our credulous Republican friends as a means of defeating any favorable legislation for Utah, which I think will be clearly understood before they are many days older.

The people should push the passage of the Faulkner bill as the only thing we can hope to get.

EX-GOVERNOR WEST.

I give my unqualified support to the Faulkner-Caine bill as the most probable obtainable remedial legislation for Utah. The Republican President has served notice in advance of the introduction of any bill that our Territory is not yet to be entrusted with statehood. It is not wise, in my opinion, to chase rainbows in politics. We should seek the obtainable good and not lose it in wasting our strength and energies, striving after an impossible attainment. The effect of the introduction of the Teller bill for statehood is to antagonize, and possibly defeat the "Home Rule" bill. But we are reasonably assured that under our present Republican administration it can never become a law. All the benefits to be derived from our admission as a State, will accrue to us by the passage of the Faulkner-Caine bill, except representation and vote in congress and the electoral college. In my opinion, the power reserved by congress to annul our legislation would never be used, because of the absence of occasion for it. I scarcely deem it necessary to say that the persistent and determined efforts of our "Liberal" and Republican friends to impress upon the "Mormon" people that the Democratic party, by the offering of the Faulkner-Caine bill, impugn their sincerity, will fail entirely of its purpose. The very foundation upon which our party is builded is not only that the sincerity, but the wisdom of the people, may and should be trusted in all governmental affairs. The inevitable and logical result of the happy settlement of our past local differences is statehood for Utah. The Democratic party since the conditions arose which permitted division on party lines nationally and territorially, endeavored to force Utah to the front, and to give assurance to the nation that conditions formerly existing which were urged as preventing its admission as a State no longer exist. The argument that is advanced that should the Caine-Faulkner bill be passed the burden of the expense of the administration of Territorial affairs would fall upon the people seems to me meets the full answer, in fact that the government provided by it, makes it our government. The officers chosen are the selected servants of the people and are responsible to them. Equally without force is the position assumed that the passage of the Faulkner-Caine bill would delay statehood beyond the period when we should have admission. The bill virtually is an advance upon the road to statehood, and carries us just as far in that direction as we can go by reason of the obstruction interposed by a Republican President.

HON. F. S. RICHARDS (DEM.)

Everybody knows that I think Utah is entitled to statehood, but no one can say that Congress and the President are ready to bestow it. My own idea has been that it would come sooner by patient waiting than by impatient urging. Realizing the difficulties to be overcome in obtaining admission to the Union, I favored the "Faulkner Bill," which would give local self-government to the people. I regard that as a long stride toward statehood, which, in my opinion, would