

very important position in the world. What is this Priesthood? What is this power that is conferred upon us in the holy Priesthood? What particular power do you give when you send a man to some other land to transact business in your name? You give him a power of attorney, authorizing him to transact in your name the business that you wish to be performed; and in that letter of appointment would be conveyed all your power, your authority, and ability to transact that business, even as effectually as if you yourself were present to perform it with your own hand.

It is an agency, then, though it may be said that the Priesthood, which is authority from God to act in his name, differs from that authority which is given to man to transact business for his fellows. I am willing to admit that there is a difference so far as the business for which they are delegated is concerned; for one is temporal, the other is spiritual; the one is earthly, the other heavenly. But let me ask, Where is the man who is authorized to go forth and act in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ? If I obey my own will—my inclination or burning desire to go and preach what I believe to be the Gospel, that does not authorize me to go in the name of the Lord. If I, by my own act and deed, have authorized my friend to go in my name, to give receipts and acquittances, to sign conveyances for me or in my behalf, and under my own signature he has received that authority, he then has authority in himself; that is, the authority in me is transferred to him to go and transact business in my name. Am I then bound by what he does? Yes, to all intents and purposes. Am I bound by the act of any individual authorized by another person, yet not authorized by me? No, I am not. Is the transaction of any other than my legally appointed

attorney valid to me in law? No, it is not: it is worth nothing.

Well, then, if this people have the holy Priesthood—if it has been conferred upon us, and we actually do exercise under that Priesthood, and according to the instructions that are given us from on high, is or is not the Almighty bound to respond to and to own our deeds and acts? Is he not bound upon the principles of law, even that are common among men and well known to us? Most certainly he is. Did you ever know a gentleman or agent delegated by an individual to go forth to do business in the name of that person, and yet deny that he had any line of communication with the principal or party for whom he was agent? That would be a contradiction of the position he occupied. If he claims to have authority and power to transact business, the inference is legitimate and conclusive that he has had a correspondence with the principal by whom he is employed. But what do the world at large tell us? Why, that God has not spoken from the heavens—that he has given no revelation—that he has not made known his will to man for the last seventeen or eighteen centuries. Admitting the truth of this statement, where, then, is their authority to act in that name? Their denial of any correspondence—of any communication between the King of kings, is clear and conclusive that they themselves testify, by these statements, that they have no such authority as they pretend to exercise.

To act in the name of another, then, without having the requisite authority, what does it amount to in law? Does it amount to forgery to use a name without authority? Yes, even the name of any man in business transactions.

If it is not forgery, what else would you call it? What would you lawyers