

vote for the President; we have no vote, either directly or indirectly, for any Senator; we are without representation at the seat of the general government. It is true we are allowed to elect a Delegate to Congress; but he has no vote. He can sit there and look on—like they say the fifth calf did—but he has no vote. Well, we have no power in the election of the President; we have no power in the election of any Senator; and these persons holding their positions without any voice or vote or consent of ours, sent a man here to act as our Governor, and they always select, with scarcely an exception, somebody who has no interest here, somebody who has nothing in common with the people; he comes here a stranger. We elect twelve men to our Legislative Council, and twenty-four men to our House of Representatives. These men understand our wants, understand our circumstances, and they pass laws suitable to our local needs, requirements and conditions. But this one man, sent here without any consent of ours in any shape or form, by simply withholding his signature, can make void and of no effect the labors of the sixty days of those thirty-six men we have elected to make our laws! "But," says one, "I suppose you can pass the bill over his veto." No, sir. He has the power of absolute veto. He can cross out an Act with his pen, or withhold his signature, and that is the end of it. Well, then, we have a remarkable one-man power here, have we not? Yes; but it is not of our choosing. It is not in accordance with the spirit of our institutions. It is not a church matter. It is not "Mormon." It is anti-"Mormon," anti-Republican, anti-American. It makes us to a certain extent slaves, serfs, vassals. But that is not our

fault; Joseph Smith did not institute such a power; Brigham Young did not; John Taylor does not enforce such a power; but we cannot help ourselves.

I might go on and enumerate a great many other things that exist in our midst, that are not of our choice. We pass laws for the restriction or suppression of the liquor traffic. If we had our way we would not have any liquor sold in any of our settlements. It might be necessary, perhaps, in a city like Salt Lake City, where there is such a mixed population, to make an exception, for we have no desire to curtail the rights of anyone; but we have proved by experience that prohibition in some places has been attended with good results. We have tried the licensing system, and have found evil resulting therefrom. The liquor traffic results in more police, more drunkenness, more dissipation, and more licentiousness of every kind. Our judges—who are sent to us in the same way as the Governor, without any voice of ours—whenever they can get the chance (with but few exceptions, a few honorable exceptions), to twist a word in favor of the liquor sellers, will do it every time. In one of our cities, recently, where prohibition was established, the liquor dealers tried to establish themselves, and they were taken up and fined. They appealed their case to the Supreme Court of the Territory, and because the charter of that city said that the City Council should have power to license, regulate, prohibit or restrain the manufacturers, sellers or vendors of spirituous liquors and intoxicating drinks of every kind, the majority of the Court decided that as the charter did not say what the manufacturers, sellers, etc., were to be prohibited from doing, the City Council could