

do point to a possible danger we must admit, and we must beware of it. But, as a rule, I think we may say that we shall find that the objections proceed principally from two sources—(1) a very partial idea of what a woman's life should be; and (2) a low estimate of politics. Let us look at the last first. When we go to political meetings—men's political meetings—we hear often a great deal of what politics should accomplish; how that the end of all politics is the well-being of the people. Many are the eloquent speeches we hear on the subject. And yet they come home and tell us that politics are not for women; that it would debase and degrade them—these politics, which are to raise the whole people, would contaminate us.

How do we reconcile these two statements? Do those who make the speeches believe in what they are saying publicly, or do they say it only to catch the ear of the people, and do they really believe in their hearts that political life as a matter of fact only means a race between men and between parties for power, and influence, and place, and fame? With such an estimate of political life we can have nothing to do, and we do not wonder that any who incline toward such a view should use their best endeavor to keep us out of it. But we believe that there are grand principles which may, and which should, inspire the government of the people, by the people, for the people; and we believe implicitly in their power, when properly applied, to reform, and ennoble and uplift.

"Any of us who know anything of the lives of the poor know how the social questions which we discuss backward and forward are living, pressing realities to them. Questions about education, labor, the sweating system, licensing, the housing of the poor, the work-house system are all sternly real to them, and especially so to the women, and they are affecting them day by day. We must so believe in our politics that we shall both believe and act as if it must deal with these questions."

THE TRICKY UTAH COMMISSION.

We publish today the report of the Utah Commission for the present year, as furnished to its organ in this city, with the exception of documents that have already been printed and do not need to be republished.

It is a characteristic production, dishonest, untruthful, cunning and full of the pettifoggery, special pleading and trickery which are usually found in the later reports of that useless and expensive body. Again we notice the conspicuous absence of the name of that sturdy old warrior, Gen. McClelland, who has proved himself, all along, too honorable to endorse the subterfuges of his associate officials. It is signed by all the others.

The first part of the report deals with the political change which has taken place in Utah. It is spoken of as "sudden," and the sincerity of the people is mentioned in a doubtful way. The writers being too cowardly either to deny or confess their belief in it, but in a shifting way express the doubt that other people are alleged to feel. The "sudden" change—the disorganization of the People's party, had been contemplated and discussed for years, and it is well known was as gradual as anything of the kind could possibly be.

The Commissioners parade their appointment of Judge Zane and Secretary Sells as registration officers, as

proof that the Commission has not appointed irresponsible and disreputable persons for such places. The selection of those gentlemen was everywhere hailed as a new departure, a "sudden change" on the part of the Commission. There is no need here to give a detailed list of persons who were not only irresponsible and disreputable but whose record since has demonstrated their dishonesty and chicanery. The appointment of the two gentlemen named is viewed as the exception which proves the rule of improper selections, and that is notorious in the Territory.

The Commissioners deny that they "approved" of changes that were made by the Legislature in the election laws but which were vetoed by the Governor. They resort to the pettifoggery method of playing upon the word "approved," and say they had no authority to approve. Everybody knows they had no official authority in the premises, but every sane person also knows that the Commissioners could express their approval of the changes. And as a matter of fact, they did so, and it was largely because they did so that the Legislature passed the measure making the changes. As to the Governor's part in the matter we have nothing to say. We are dealing now with the tricky Utah Commission.

But it is on the polygamy question that these officials display their malicious and paltry untruthfulness in its vilest form. Referring to the resolutions adopted at the General Conference of October, 1891, they enter an evasive and contemptible answer. The Conference denied emphatically a former statement by the Commission to the effect that the Church dominates its members in political matters, and that a number of persons in Utah had entered into polygamous marriages since the issuance of the manifesto against them. The Commissioners now try to make it appear that the first denial amounts to a confession that Church domination in politics did exist in the past. And as to the legal polygamous marriages, say the reports on which their information was founded are on file, and that the officers who furnished it live in and are familiar with the precincts. They further plead that neither they nor these officers can have anything to gain by perverting the truth.

The language used by the Conference signified, as plain as words could make it, that no such domination as charged by the Commission had been exercised by the Church. The case of excommunication referred to in a garbled way by the Commission does not affect the matter one iota, but only shows to what miserable means those officials resort to try and make a point and divert attention from the main issue. The reference by the Conference to the appearance of a union of Church and State in consequence of men holding both ecclesiastical and civil offices, was not any admission of the charge of the Commission, but was cited in explanation of an appearance that was not a reality. The quirk by which the Commission attempt to take advantage of this exposes their pettifoggery and evasiveness.

What they charged and what the Conference denied was, that a certain number of persons during the year then last past had entered into polygamous marriages. This was also denied by the President of the Church who should know of the facts. The Commissioners now say "Denials and denunciations prove nothing." Perhaps not. Neither do unsupported assertions, particularly when after being challenged, not a scintilla of evidence to substantiate them is offered. This is the situation. Denials and denunciations do prove something under these circumstances. They prove that the Utah Commissioners either dare not bring forward their alleged proofs of information or that they have none to produce. Denials and denunciations, in the face of their failure after a year's challenge, are worth more than their trumped-up assertions for which they offer no proof.

But they dodge again from the question as to the fact of new polygamous marriages being contracted, to the question of belief in the rightfulness of such marriages in the absence of civil law against it. They quote Dr. Talmage and the statements of the Presidency before the Master in Chancery which related to the belief of the Latter-day Saints, to bolster up their own false charges about recent plural marriages. Pettifoggery again in its most despicable shape! What certain persons may possibly believe is one thing, what they are charged with doing is another and different thing. The attack upon President Joseph F. Smith is of the same sort. He denied the truth of the Commissioners' charges. His seclusion and his religious belief had nothing to do with the issue.

The culminating point in the dastardly attempt of the Commission to make it appear that the manifesto was a pretense and that "polygamy still exists;" is the assertion that: "The commission has reports of fifteen male persons who are believed to have entered into polygamous marriages during the last year and of more than three hundred persons who are known, or believed to be living in polygamous relations."

Observe the cunning way in which these charges are put, so as to do as much damage as possible and creep out of the responsibility of preferring them. They have "reports." The reports speak of male persons "believed" to have entered into these marriages, or who are "believed to be now living in polygamous relations." Shame on the cowardly officials who make these statements in this non-committal, timorous and misleading manner! If we were to tell all the lies we have had by way of "reports" to us of the doings of some of these same Commissioners here and elsewhere, they would be planting suits for libel or hiding their heads on the "underground."

"It is believed," they say. By whom? No answer. We challenge the Commissioners to produce the names of the accused and the names of their accusers. They have been thus challenged when they bore similar false witness before. But they have been as silent as the grave on this question of proof. They dare not give the names lest their craven and