

soldiery. There is no such authority existing.

I wish to quote to you one little thing. If I had the Constitution here, I would read it to you. It is to the effect, "That the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

No matter, therefore, whether the people live in States or Territories, they possess constitutional privileges alike. The most that is said in regard to Territories and the authority of the President and Congress is, that "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States." That is speaking of it as land; and some of the most prominent statesmen of the United States have so construed it. It is property as land—territory as land they have a right to interfere with, not territory as regards the people.

I published this in the "*Mormon*" long ago, and said the Missouri compromise was unconstitutional. By-and-by, the United States' Judges gave the same decision. I gave mine, however, before they gave theirs.

It is a true principle, they have not the authority. If they have it at all, it is in the people ceding it to them, and not what they possess by the Constitution of the United States. They have sent scoundrels amongst us from time to time. If they had sent decent men, would we have opposed them? No: we would have respected them. But will we submit to such infernal scoundrels? Never; no, never!!

So far as right is concerned, then, they have no right to appoint officers for this or any other Territory; and I will defy any man to prove that there is any such right in the Constitution.

I conversed with a Judge Black, who was coming up to Nebraska Ter-

ritory on a steamboat—an intelligent man, a Democrat, of course. When talking about these principles to him, which he acceded to, I put my hand on his shoulder and said, "Judge, what are you doing here?" "I am here," said he, "according to the usage that has obtained; but if the people do not want me, all they have to do is to express it, and I will go away again." I wish we had only half such decent men as that sent here.

He tried to take another tack, which is this: He pointed out in the Constitution where the Supreme Court of the United States was made one of the branches of the Government, and the President has the appointment of its Judges. That is true—he possesses the power to appoint the greater, but not the less. How do you make that appear? Simply because one is mentioned in the Constitution, and the other is not. The United States' Supreme Court is a co-ordinate branch of the Government, and there is provision made by the Constitution for the election and appointment of its officers.

This is not the case in regard to the officers of a Territory. Out of courtesy we, as citizens of the United States, may say, "Mr. President, if you have a mind to appoint discreet persons to fill those offices, all well and good; but if you don't, you had better take them back; for we won't have them: we stand on our reserved rights as citizens of the United States."

We are not lacking for men in the United States, at the present time, who want to make it appear that the United States have a right to lord it over the Territories, the same as the British Government used to do over their colonies.

Thousands of you before me were citizens of the United States, where you came from. You had the right of franchise—had a right to say who should be your Governor, and who