The law cannot go forth from Zion unless it is made in Zion, can it? Who is going to make that law? And who is going to give the word of the Lord from Jerusalem? How are these things to be accomplished? Are we to have a lot of opposition Tickets to do it, do you think? You that feel you can manage things without the priesthood, try it and see how far you will go. Go back to your ordination and baptism, go back to the spreading of the Gospel through the land and the pouring out of intelligence upon the priesthood, and God ruling and dictating, and "The Lord shall be our judge, the Lord shall be our king, the Lord shall be our lawgiver," said Israel, "and he shall reign over us." Was not that the way we used to talk? I had a visit from some of your folks during the session of the Legislature. How was it, and which was right? None of them was right, just as it was when the Prophet Joseph asked the angel which of the sects was right that he might join it. The answer was that none of them are right. What, none of them? No. We will not stop to argue that question; the angel merely told him to join none of them, that none of them were right. Anything wrong here? Yes, considerable. There wants to be perfect freedom about all these matters, the feelings of our brethren should be consulted. A bishop has not the right to crowd or oppress, the priesthood is not given to him for that purpose; but everything should move on harmoniously, and the wishes of the people should be consulted and respected. I understand there was a little crowding in your election affairs, you were not more than ten minutes getting through your business. It is better to take ten days, than to have such shameful operations as you had here, and you would have spent your time much better doing something else. What next? Some thought there was a little pressure, that they were not properly represented. I do not know how this was, but I am inclined to think it was a little hasty. I think it would have been much better and very much more in keeping with our profession, if the leaders could have been got together, and acted in unanimity and good feeling, all anxious to sustain the principles of right and to select for office those who are good, virtuous and competent men, and men who are capable of filling offices with honor, and then do it unanimously. But as soon as a feeling to crowd is manifested on one side, the feeling on the other side, when expressed is, if this is going to be the way, we will buck against that, and if we cannot get our rights with the priesthood, we will fall back upon our political rights as men, and we will frustrate you in your operations if we can. Now both are wrong. There should have been a free and full consultation on the one hand, the right of all respected, and on the other I would rather submit myself a thousand times, even to an imposition than to act as you did—to speak plainly, if a bishop wish to crowd on me, I would let him crowd. I could stand it if he could. I am instructed to be obedient to the priesthood, and if he would do wrong he might do it, but I would not. Two wrongs never make a right. I will not say how far you were wrong, but I will say you both were wrong, and that another course would have been much better and more satisfactory and praiseworthy. What is the result, you men who would fall back on your reserved