

## EDITORIALS.

## THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS.

THERE is, as might have been expected, quite a diversity of opinion in relation to the Revised New Testament. The "Christian" world has so little of that unity of the faith which was one of the grand objects of the organization of the Apostolic Church, that no subject can be broached which will not raise a furious controversy if not an irrepressible conflict.

Some of the leading pulpit orators accept the new revision as a great improvement on the old text, viewing the modernizing of much of its language as a benefit to the masses, making them more familiar with the true meaning of the writers than they could be by reading the antiquated terms employed in the old version. But others view with some alarm and distaste the numerous changes that have been made. Alarm because the alterations detract from the authority of the book as a divinely inspired record to be received as the end of religious controversy, and because the common mind once cut loose from the binding force of the Book will be apt to run to the extreme of independent thought, regarding the volume as no standard of appeal. Distaste because much of the beauty of the vigorous old Saxon phraseology is taken from the record, and the modernized words sound unfamiliar and less harmonious. The common revision has always been looked upon by the cultured as a model of literary perfection.

We notice that this view is endorsed by many leading journals in this country, and that there is a pretty general feeling of disgust at the jobbery which accompanies the publication of the sacred volume in its new form. England has long had the name of being "a nation of shopkeepers," and in this instance the love of money and the desire for commercial monopoly seem to show out far more than the love of souls and the desire to disseminate saving truth. Oxford and Cambridge, the two great universities, the seats of English theological learning, the centres of orthodox divinity, have grabbed the right to issue the work in authoritative form, and the proceedings are generally denounced on this side of the Atlantic as a money-grubbing scheme conducted on the most selfish principles, profits being the main object in view.

We think the result on the whole will be good. The foolish doctrine of the verbal inspiration of a book several times translated by men claiming no inspiration, will receive a crushing blow. The controversy raised will cause comparisons to be made between the old and new versions, by which many people who would not otherwise have paid any attention to the sacred volume except as a centre table ornament, will be induced to study its interior. Many misconceptions of the meaning of texts will be removed, and the truths of the everlasting gospel when presented in their ancient and correct form will be better recognized by the masses.

As to the jobbery in its publication, the whole business of modern ecclesiasticism is conducted in the spirit of greed and followed chiefly for pay. If the book is sold as a speculation, the churches professedly founded on it are systems of merchandise in the souls of men. The priests thereof preach for hire, the preachers thereof expound for money; a field of theological labor is "a living," the value of a "call" is determined by the salary attached; and the collection box, or offertory bag, or donation plate is as essential a piece of ecclesiastical furniture as the altar, or the pulpit, or the communion table; while "give! give!" is sounded oftener than "repent and reform!"

Let the battle of the books go on. And while confusion and doubt and perplexity prevail in the divided ranks of sectarianism, let the Saints of God rejoice in having found a guide greater than all written or printed volumes—the "sure word of prophecy," "the light shining in a dark place; and let them give heed to it until the sunlight of perfect knowledge shall follow the shining of "the day star" in their souls.

## NOTHING STRANGE ABOUT IT.

THE New York Herald has the annexed paragraph:

"A Mormon leader says that in

Utah there are fewer women than men. As women are the most enthusiastic of proselyters, and as Mormon women are said, by their masters, to be the most earnest defenders of the peculiar institution, it is somewhat strange that they do not coax members of their own sex to Utah. There is a large screw loose somewhere."

The "screw loose" is in the editorial brain of our New York contemporary. The Utah situation is not understood abroad in any of its phases. The latest census shows that there are about 5,000 more males than females in Utah. The relative numbers of marriageable men and women are not given. And if it were a fact that there were more women than men here, the influx of the mining element would account for the discrepancy, the hardy men who dig and delve in the mountain gorges being generally on the list of bachelors.

As to the coaxing business, there is no need for any one to engage in it. The difficulty is to find means enough to bring here the people of our Church who are anxious to leave the old world and cast in their lot with their friends in the new. And the remark of the Herald man about the "masters" of the women, shows that he knows nothing about a "Mormon" household. The ladies of Utah are the wrong kind of material to be "mastered" much, and their character as "the most earnest defenders of the peculiar institution," has been given to them, not unjustly, by non-"Mormon" writers and lecturers.

We have lots of women in Utah, troops of unmarried and marriageable girls, and many more growing up to fill the ranks of their elders, and if the "screws" were tightened up so that the immigration of proselytes were entirely stopped, it would not materially affect the question of the "peculiar institution" in any shape or form whatever.

## A PLAIN TRUTH WELL TOLD.

THE physiological arguments and facts in support of the practice of plural marriage as revealed to the Latter-day Saints, are not often referred to in public because of the false delicacy and mock modesty of the times, which is ashamed to speak of certain things in the daylight, but will practise real immodesty and indelicacy in the dark. But occasionally the subject from this standpoint is touched upon with a skilful hand, and one of the neatest and yet most striking brief comments upon it that we have seen for some time was made by Dr. Romania B. Pratt, in a lecture before the ladies. The following extract therefrom appeared in the latest issue of the *Woman's Exponent*, and we think it worthy of reproduction in the NEWS:

"The duties and requirements of a woman, fulfilling her sphere of motherhood, absolutely demand certain periods of continence, which if not granted her through thoughtful solicitude for her welfare by her husband, or herself assumed, by virtue of the dignity of womanhood, or by the divine right of free agency, the principle of her life and health is encroached upon, and she is forced to perform her ever-increasing labors and duties with a decreasing store of vitality.

"There is nothing in the economy or requirements of man's life which requires this abstinence beyond the temperate limit of his powers of vitality, and this to me is a proof unanswerable and *prima facie* on the spheres of manhood and womanhood, of the divinity, and I believe is a necessity for the salvation of the human race, of the truth and divine origin of the principle of plural marriage.

"With this principle universal, but limited and governed by laws of marriage inhibiting sensuality and selfishness, insuring to the wife the literal fulfillment of that part of the marriage ceremony which provides that she shall be 'nourished and cherished and be provided for,' and the children be hygienically and physiologically clothed and fed and properly educated, the solution to the growing social evil would be found. Every woman could be what every true woman's happiness depends upon, a happy wife and mother, queen over her own increasing posterity, and men, honored patriarchs, which are divine rights of both, given by God as a law unto man on earth and throughout all eternity. Were this the order of the

world, abortions, foeticides, infanticides, seductions, rapes and divorces would be relics of the barbarous age, while intelligence, light, peace and good will and love would be the motor forces of the world; in short, the Millennium would have come."

## HOW THE PLOT WAS SPOILED.

THE following Associated Press dispatch appears in the Chicago papers but so far as we know was not sent any further west:

"The roll of the House of Representatives of the Forty-Seventh Congress contains the name of George Q. Cannon as a Delegate from Utah, put there by Clerk Adams. Mr. Campbell was given a certificate of election by the Governor of Utah, but Cannon obtained a certificate of the United States Court at Salt Lake City, to the effect that a certain number of votes were cast, and that Cannon received about 8,000 majority. Cannon presented this certificate to Clerk Adams, and upon it claimed his right to a seat in the House, because it showed that he got a majority of the votes cast. Mr. Campbell claimed the seat simply on the Governor's certificate. The clerk decided that Cannon was elected and entered his name on the roll. Mr. Cannon has drawn his pay since the 4th of last March as member of the Forty-seventh Congress."

This telegram has caused considerable comment. It contains some inaccuracies; indeed it would be very singular if it did not, for anything relating to Utah affairs is sure to be given to the public, by the press, the pulpit or the telegraph "a little mixed." Mr. Cannon's majority was more than double the number named; in fact it comprehended almost the entire vote of the Territory. The statement about the "certificate of the United States Court at Salt Lake City" is also in correct. But the main thing at issue is the presence of George Q. Cannon's name on the roll of the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Congress, and the absence of the name of Allen G. Campbell. That the reported action of Clerk Adams may not be misunderstood it will be necessary to make a brief explanation.

The law requires a certificate of election to the office of Delegate to Congress from either of the Territories. If Mr. Cannon's name is on the roll of the House, it is evident that he has received a certificate of such a character as to satisfy the Clerk that he was duly elected. But it will be urged the Governor gave the certificate to Campbell. It is true that that presumptuous official did issue what purported to be a certificate to the minority candidate. But another certificate, showing clearly that Mr. Cannon received the greatest number of votes, was also issued, with the seal of the Territory—not from the United States Court but from the Secretary's Office. The question is, which is the valid document? To determine this we must find out exactly what the law requires.

In the first place it is made the duty of the Governor to declare "the person having the greatest number of votes duly elected." In this instance the Governor refused to perform this duty. In violation of the law he declared the minority candidate elected. But in doing so he certified that George Q. Cannon had 18,568 votes and Allen G. Campbell 1,357, and certified that the latter was the person being a citizen of the United States receiving the greatest number of votes. This is a declaration not contemplated in the law, and altogether outside of the law. It introduces something unwarranted and altogether foreign to the law's intent.

In the second place the law declares that "a certificate shall be given accordingly." It does not say who shall give the certificate. But it does say it must be given "accordingly," that is, it must certify who is "the person receiving the greatest number of votes." Two certificates have been presented to the Clerk of the House. Both of them show that George Q. Cannon received the "greatest number of votes." This is the only point that the law provides for. The declaration as to citizenship is gratuitous and improper, and implies gross assumption of authority on the part of the Governor. It indicates that he has attempted to usurp the powers of the House of Representatives and decide upon the qualifications of the Delegate-elect,

a matter reserved by the Constitution to that body and not vested in an executive officer.

The duty of the Clerk must be clear to every unprejudiced mind. Indeed, we think it is apparent even to the most bitter anti-"Mormon" partisan. Not only is the certificate presented by Mr. Cannon valid, answering every purpose required by the law, but the certificate presented by the Governor's "delegate" corroborates and confirms it. Both the Governor and the Secretary, the latter being acting-Governor at the time of his action in the premises, certify to the fact which the clerk must recognize, while he is not required to notice any adjudication or declaration of the Governor's in relation to a question of citizenship.

Those who imagine that Clerk Adams has overstepped the law, or strained any point in favor of Mr. Cannon, are much mistaken as to the man and to the facts. He has simply performed his duty, and at the same time has kept himself out of any affinity or connection with a barefaced attempt to rob a whole Territory of a sacred political right. He has taken no risks, and the conspirators will find that his position is as sound and honorable as theirs is untenable and infamous.

As there have been many false assertions about the views of the press on this point, we here append some extracts from papers which understand the matter pretty clearly.

The Sacramento Record-Union says:

"Campbell is making desperate efforts to get his case recognized by Congress, but thus far he has had very bad success. The Clerk of the House, Adams, has put Cannon on the roll of members, despite the bogus certificate of Governor Murray, and Mr. Campbell thinks it very hard that he should not be allowed to secure the seat to which he was not elected, after his friend had gone to so much trouble to issue a certificate which was fraudulent on its face. Campbell is not advancing rapidly, in fact, and the indications are that Congress will not endorse the peculiar tactics by which it has been attempted in this case to nullify the popular choice.

The Omaha Herald remarks:

"Utah is likely to get her chosen delegate in Congress. The fraud of Gov. Murray has been repudiated by the clerk of the House."

The Providence (R. I.) Star has the following:

"The effort to exclude Delegate Cannon, of Utah, from his seat in Congress, ostensibly on account of some irregularity in his naturalization 20 or 30 years ago, but really because he is a Mormon, will probably not succeed. We know nothing about the circumstances under which Cannon became a citizen of the United States, and if his naturalization was fraudulent, it might disqualify him to sit in Congress; but Mormonism will never be checked by such peaceable attacks as the one now proposed."

The Louisville Post declares:

"Clerk Adams placed Cannon's name on the roll of the House of Representatives because Cannon was duly elected. No rational person, acquainted with the law and the facts, could decide otherwise. Cannon is entitled to the seat and no Member of Congress doubts that he will get it."

This is from the Cincinnati Times-Star:

"The indications are that Governor Murray, of Utah, does not run the United States Congress."

The annexed is from the Cincinnati Gazette:

"It is undoubtedly true that the majority both of republicans and democrats sustain the position taken by Clerk Adams in regard to the Cannon-Campbell case, notwithstanding the claims of the latter and his friends that he is entitled to the seat. The Committee on Elections were strongly of the opinion, and this without regard to party, that Governor Murray has taken an authority on himself which he has no legal right to exercise. It was also well understood at the time that the act was intended to be sensational in its character, designed to create the impression that some desired and new anti-Mormon policy had been agreed upon. President Hayes himself, however, was not understood to indorse the action of Governor Murray."

These are enough for the present.

The truth is that the plotters reckoned too much on the popular antipathy to "Mormonism." But it will be seen that although the religious charlatans and sectarian hirelings of the day are stirring up strong feelings on the "Mormon" question, the country has not departed so far from its main principles that under the republican form of government as to endorse a scheme to cheat the whole community out of the right suffrage because their religious views and practices do violence to popular sentiment. They may wile as much as they choose; they are checkmated, and their game is lost.

## A BRAVE ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

A SCENE was witnessed in a New York Court room that is very new in these latter days of expedients and quibbles and technical escapes from erroneous positions. On the 5th inst., Judge Brady, who had a few days previous granted an order staying certain proceedings in relation to a receiver for a railroad company, of his own motion vacated the order. Finding himself in error, he bravely resolved to rectify it as far as possible, preferred acknowledging himself liable and wrong to standing on dignity and taking advantage of technicalities and subterfuges, many would have done. In a voice, and with a very pale countenance, he said:

"I have sent for the counsel both sides in the suit of the people against the Manhattan Railway Company, to say that I have determined to vacate the order which granted last Friday, staying proceedings on the motion for the appointment of a receiver. I do this of my own motion. The was improper, and never should have been granted by me. I am misunderstood the purpose of application. I supposed an appeal had been taken from the order of Judge Donohue, denying defendant's motion to have the complaint more definite and certain. I will take the entire blame upon myself for the error."

Judge Brady is a brave man; is no mark of a great mind; his acknowledgement of error, liable to make mistakes, and is willing to confess when wronged, and tries to repair that which is wrongly said or done, exhibits manliness and magnanimity. Brady's example might be followed very near home to great advantage.

## A SOLITARY JURYMEN.

THE Supreme Court of New York permitted a civil case, recently decided by a jury of one. It is a novelty in law proceedings; the result is likely to be as received as a decision of a dozen. For in a dispute which has been tried in a court of law there is one dissatisfied person, and is the defeated party. A growing of time and expense is added by the one man jury, for the eleven can go about their own business and the fees are reduced to the lowest possible denomination, that kind of a jury would not to the frequent conclusion "nisi pro." If contestants agree one man jury we see no reason it would not be just as lawful as dozen served. Better than disputants were only home really desirous of settling a dispute on just principles, the cumbersome machinery of judge, jury, officials and fees might be dispensed with, and arbitration decided. Individuals ought certainly to be as nations to adopt the arbitration principle, and it would be as satisfactory in personal as in national cases. Litigation is frequently, if not generally, founded on dishonest desire, and no one possessed of a proper spirit and governed by worthy motives is anxious to employ the forces and intricacies of the law in any matter that can fairly settled without going to court.

## PAYMENT GRADED BY RESULTS.

It is very rare that either a preacher or a legislator declines pay for services rendered. The average sectarian preacher is as keen as the average state legislator in looking out his salary and perquisites.