EDITORIALS.

WOMAN'S INFLUENCE IN POLITICS.

At the fourth annual session of the National Woman Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, recently held in Boston, it was shown that the prospects of the movement were very flattering. And as one of the elements of power brought to bear in aid of the cause, the influence of women in bringing about the defeat of politicians who had worked against their principles, was proven to have been quite potent in a number of instances.

Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake traced the progress of the woman suffrage movement in New York since 1867, when the vote in a constitutional convention was 125 to 19 against woman suffrage, up to the present year, when the vote in favor of the measure in the Assembly was 67, a bare majority, which was only defeated by the change of votes of a liquor dealer and the keeper of a gambling house.

In 1878 a bill was passed giving women the right to vote at school elections, which was vetoed by Governor Lucius Robinson. The women went to work and prevented his re-election. They favored the election of Mr. Cornell, who recommended what Robinson had opposed, and the bill having been passed, he signed it and the women so far triumphed. In 1881 a bill was presented and brought to a third reading, giving women the right to vote. In 1882 the same bill was presented, but on the very day it was to be voted, the attorney-general, Mr. Russell, gave an opinion declaring it unconstitutional. The vote was deferred for a week, and at the end of that time the result of the vote stood ayes, 54; noes, 50. In the fall of that year the women relegated Mr. Russell to private life, and aided in the election of Mr. O'Brien. One of the chief opponents of the measure in 1883 was Mr. House, of New York, and when he was up for re-election the women worked against him so that he did not even receive a nomination.

Mrs. Blake argued from these successes that if the women were only active and determined they could secure the success of the movement everywhere by similar means. There can be no doubt that she is right. Women could largely influence the politics of every State in the Union, and could secure the passage of such laws as they desire, by favoring the election of men in harmony with their views and opposing those who are known to be against them. They can wield a powerful influence without the ballot. And a great many thoughtful men believe that the influence of woman should be exercised in private and not in public, and therefore are opposed to giving her the voting power.

But there has never been an argument yet advanced against woman suffrage that would hold water for a minute. And that a government which recognizes women as citizens just as much as men, and lays down the doctrine that taxation and representation should go hand in hand, and is based upon the principle that just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, should yet deny to more than one-half of its citizens that representation and that voice which are essential to true republicanism, is one of the inconsistencies that no argument can explain away.

The trouble is that men will not yield to women their political rights without a struggle, and women are not generally interested in asserting those rights. The battle of the sex is urged by but a few. When women generally are aroused to a sense of the influence they can wield in the field of politics, they will become a little more active in using their power for the election of good and proper men to office, and the exclusion of the corrupt and the venal. And when they determine that the ballot should of right be theirs and they intend to have it, in a very short time every barrier will be broken down, and there will be no such issue in the United States as the political disabilities of women.

HOW CONSISTENT!

When Rudger Clawson, convicted on the charge of violating the Edmunds law by marrying a wife, had been granted an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States he was denied the privilege of giving bail, though securities for any amount could have been furnished, and sent to the Penitentiary pending the final adjudication of his case.

When President Angus M. Cannon, convicted of a simple misdemeanor in taking his meals with his wives and children contrary to Judge Zane's strained rendering of the Edmunds law, appealed from the decision of the Third District Court to that of the Supreme Court of the Territory, his offer of ample bail was refused and he, too, was cruelly sent to the Penitentiary.

When President George Q. Cannon was arrested on the charge of unlawfully cohabiting with his wives—nothing more than a simple misdemeanor at worst—and brought back from Nevada to this city maimed and sick, bail amounting to $45,000 was demanded for his appearance for trial.

But when the grand jury of the First District Court found an indictment against Reuben A. McBride, charging him with murder in the first degree, Judge Powers admitted him to bail in the sum of $10,000.

The inconsistency of such judicial doings must be apparent to even the most obtuse minds. Possibly the leniency of Judge Powers in the last mentioned case is not misplaced, as it may not result in defeating justice or endangering the lives of others, though it would not be a safe course to adopt as rule; but we are very sure that the harshness and partisan vindictiveness exhibited in the former cases were wrong, and Judge Zane's injustice becomes all the more apparent by comparison with the act of the Associate Justice in the McBride matter.

SENATOR EDMUNDS' BIG BLUNDER.

Senator Edmunds is not enjoying much satisfaction over his assault upon the Administration. He had become so full of conceit over the power he exercised in the Senate as the leader of the Republican majority, that he appeared to think himself invulnerable and his dictum the end of controversy. The rebuffs he has experienced in the debate on the power of removal in the President have opened his eyes a little to his great mistake, and he is not nearly so great a man in his own estimation as he was before the encounter. Senator Beck's vigorous rejoinder was a heavy blow to the vanity of the icicle from Vermont, and the failure of his great attack upon the Executive, which now appears inevitable, will not improve the temper though it must lessen the self-importance of the anti-"Mormon" fanatic from the Green Mountains.

Prominent and ambitious men like Edmunds ought to have good memories, because they must preserve a reputation for consistency. For instance, before denying the President's right to make removals without explaining his reasons to the Senate, Mr. Edmunds ought to have remembered the following remarks which fell from his cold lips when he argued in favor of that power in the Republican President, U. S. Grant. He then said:

"It is cause enough for me, sir—constitutional cause—when the President of the United States, acting, if he is honest, as he always must, upon a conscientious sense of his responsibility to the people and to God, chooses to send in one man's name for a place which another holds."

Mr. Edmunds likes to be known as a great authority on constitutional questions. Is there anything in the Constitution that vests power in a Republican Executive which it withholds from a Democratic Executive? If not why should President Cleveland be denied the authority which Mr. Edmunds conceded to President Grant? The power to remove appointed officials for cause, is an exercise of executive authority. It is vested in the President. It is not a legislative act. Under the Constitution the Senate approves or disapproves of the President's nominations, but it has nothing to do with removals.

The real, actual appointing power is in the President. The Senate sanctions his appointments. It has no appointing power of itself. When it is not in session the President may exercise the appointing power without its assistance. The removing power belongs to the appointing power, and in its exercise the President is not responsible to the Senate but to the people of the United States. The Constitution bleuds, to a little extent the executive and legislative powers when it confers on the Senate authority to aid the President in the exercise of the appointing power by its "advice and consent." But this does not extend to the power to remove. That is wholly vested in the President.

There is good reason for this. In making the numerous appointments in the gift of the Executive, the advice of the higher branch of the legislative department is calculated to assist in the choice of competent persons. Senators from the several States are likely to be better informed as to the qualifications of candidates for office from their respective localities than the President himself, and to know how selections would be likely to suit the people where the appointments are to be made. The Senate becomes an aid to the President, and also a check in case he should be deceived into the appointing of unworthy persons through lack of proper information. But in removing dishonest, incapable or corrupt incumbents, the President should have full power to act promptly on sufficient evidence. He is required to see that the laws are faithfully executed, and he could not do this unless the power was given to him untrammeled to remove unfit persons charged in their sphere with the execution of the laws. The President, not the Senate, is responsible for the enforcement of the laws of the land. And without this unchecked power of removal he could not justly be held responsible. If the Senate is to share the power of removal, it should also share the responsibility if the laws are not faithfully executed.

The Senate can neither remove nor prevent removal. Why then should the President be compelled to account to the Senate for the exercise of a power over which it has no control? It is a purely executive act in its nature, and the Constitution very properly and wisely confers it upon the President alone. If this prerogative had been exercised by the President a few weeks sooner in the case of the Governor of Utah the Territory might have been saved from much inconvenience and difficulty. Necessary bills might have been passed by the Legislature for the welfare of the people. But if the Senate had power to prevent the removal, or its consent had to be asked, or the reasons for the removal had to be investigated before it could take effect, it is easy to see how the President would be trammeled and the interests of the country be impeded and imperilled. A Republican hostile Senate could block the way of a Democratic President, and *vice versa*, and the whole machinery of the national government would be dislocated.

Mr. Edmunds, in his partisan animosity, has made a big blunder. His movement shows a misapprehension of a fundamental principle in our governmental system. It is more conspicuous in him than it would be in any other man in the Senate, because he figures as the exponent and *sine qua non* of constitutional doctrine. In vulgar parlance, he has bit off more than he can chew, and it is evident that it doesn't taste good in his mouth. It has damaged him greatly as an authority and dictatorial leader, and makes one step on that downward road which, sooner or later, all demagogues take with a rush who fight against the rights and liberties of the people of God.

THE PRESS ON GOVERNOR MURRAY.

In commenting on the summary removal of Governor Murray "for cause," several newspapers refer to the great services he has rendered in putting down polygamy. It is not to be expected that the press of this country will discourse intelligently on anything that relates to Utah affairs, because the cloud of prejudice is so thick over their eyes that they cannot see the facts, and they are only willing to listen to one side of the question, so they are always in a fog.

But it seems that they might understand something on this point on general principles. If they would only reflect a little they would surely see that the powers of a Territorial Governor are so small that he cannot do much in the commonly desired direction, no matter how great his will might be. His authority is chiefly exercised at the sitting of the Legislature, which occurs once in two years, and then consists of assenting to or rejecting such measures as that body may enact. During the rest of the time he is little more than a figure head. He can issue commissions to officers appointed under the laws of the Territory, and appoint notaries public. Will some of our esteemed contemporaries show us in what way he can do extraordinary things for the suppression of polygamy.

It may be said he can stop the passage of laws in its favor. Well, bless your gentle souls, the Legislature has never passed or attempted to pass any bills in favor of polygamy. The only measure which had a bearing on the question during the session just closed was the election bill, and that contained the following oath, to be taken by all citizens before being registered and qualified to become voters and office holders:

Territory of Utah, }
County of ..... } ss.

I, ..., being first duly sworn (or affirm) depose and say that I am over twenty-one years of age, and have resided in the Territory of Utah for six months, and in the precinct of ..... one month immediately preceding the date hereof, and I am a native born, or naturalized, (as the case may be) citizen of the United States, and a taxpayer in this Territory; and I do further swear (or affirm) that *I am not a bigamist or a polygamist; and that I do not cohabit with more than one woman.*

.....

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ..... day of ..... 188...

.....

Registration Officer for ..... Precinct.

This bill the Governor vetoed. Nothing else bearing on the polygamy question came before him for consideration. Thus his action on that question was not in aid of the suppression of polygamy in any shape or form. He has done nothing of that kind in the enactment of laws; neither has he done anything towards it in the execution of the law. He has talked a great deal. He has made many misrepresentations to the Government and the public. He has posed as an anti-polygamy champion. But it was all posturing and declamation. There has been nothing more to it.

Deceiving the President into the error of sending troops here to suppress an uprising that had no existence, except in lying telegrams, did nothing towards the suppression of polygamy. It had not the remotest bearing on the matter. There is nothing in the whole career of Governor Murray in Utah which can reasonably be construed into an effective act in putting down polygamy. If his perfidy in giving a false certificate of election to his friend who was not elected is cited, that cannot be shown to have affected the polygamy question one iota. If it is claimed that it resulted in the ejection of the "Mormon" Delegate from Congress, the claim is invalid as affecting polygamy. It did not touch it in the remotest degree. Polygamy was not affected by that movement any more than the tides, or the mountain breezes or the sunlight. It did not stop a marriage or break up a family.

Nothing that Governor Murray has done in Utah or out of Utah has affected the question, except to fasten conviction of "Mormon" principles closer to the hearts of the people whom he has abused and reviled, and whose civil rights as well as religious liberties he has sought to destroy. Not an act of his can be pointed out which will justify the remarks of our contemporaries, and when they talk of what he has accomplished towards the putting down of polygamy they provoke derision in all who are acquainted with the situation.

Murray's chief exploits have been of a convivial character, and as the leader of a movement to foster the prejudices of Congress and the country, with the object of obtaining a Legislative Commission for Utah, or the disfranchisement of the "Mormons," so that the adventurers he represents may grasp the government, gather the revenue and spend the money of the industrious and peace-loving people of the richest Territory of the United States.

BETTER BE HALF DECENT.

We have no idea that Marshal Ireland will pay any attention to complaints about the doings of his deputies, if they are in the line of making things unpleasant to "Mormons." But, nevertheless, we do not intend to keep silence about their depredations when we think proper to call attention to them. We wish now to inform him and his minions, that the law does not require them to insult the people upon whose privacy they intrude, whether to serve a subpœna or a warrant of arrest.

In searching for witnesses at Big Cottonwood, this week, when they accosted a lad from whom they wanted to extort information, one of them, after roughly demanding where the lad's father was, and being told he did not know, emphatically declared "it's a lie." This is not the first time that the lie has been given to young folks and women, but they do not usually indulge in such language to men. The reason is obvious.

The drubbing which a vulgar deputy received from an irate and plucky little woman into whose room he intruded, should prove a caution to his kind of sneaks. In no other part of the United States but among the "Mormon" people would persons of that character be permitted to force their way into invalids' and old ladies' bedrooms, to serve subpœnas or comport themselves with the insolence which is common to some of them.

We do not intend these remarks to apply to all of the deputies, for there are some who endeavor to perform their disagreeable duty like gentlemen. But there are others who have none of the instincts of a gentleman, and therefore decent treatment cannot be expected of them. However, their chief could instruct them to be half decent, and to refrain from aping the role of a cross-examining attorney, and from calling people liars. And if they will not profit by such instructions, more forcible lessons will perhaps become necessary. We know they do not like the hints we give them occasionally, but we know also that they are not without their effect.

"GOING IT BLIND."

The knowledge of the average anti-"Mormon" editor of the subject on which he expatiates, is illustrated by the following editorial note from the Dillon, Montana, *Tribune*:

The extremely radical bill introduced in Congress by Woodburn, of Nevada, is just what is wanted. Polygamy must be wiped out, though the prison pens be filled with polygamists.

As the Woodburn proposed measure is not a crimes bill and does not attempt to provide any penalties for polygamy, but is simply a political contrivance to prevent monogamous "Mormons" from voting, the relevancy of the *Tribune's* remarks will be appreciated by an enlightened public. That editor endorses a bill which evidently he has never read. Like most of the rabid anti-"Mormon" scribes, he is "going it blind."

A SENSATIONAL PRAYER.

The Chaplain of the U. S. House of Representatives made something of a sensation on Saturday by his opening prayer. It was a sort of sermon in disguise. It was an admonition to rich men under the form of a petition to Deity. It was talking *at* folks instead of talking *to* them. It is not uncommon in religious circles, but we do not consider it a legitimate mode of address. When a man appeals to the Almighty in a public assembly, he is supposed to voice the wishes of the people for whom he speaks, to return thanks for favors received, and to pray for those things which they need at the time.

That is legitimate prayer; the other is not prayer, but a pretext for a scolding, and is impiously addressed to God when it is intended for mortals. Praying eloquently to an admiring or indignant congregation under the pretense of calling upon the Lord, is a frequent feature of sectarian religious services. Whether the Creator pays any attention to such orations is a matter of grave doubt.

The Chaplain's address to the "God of Jacob" must have sounded strangely on the ears of those members who are so fanatical on the "Mormon" question, that they would, in addition to dooming men who follow Jacob's marital examples to prison and disgrace, deprive of all political rights every man and woman who merely believes that the "God of Jacob" sanctions such marriages as Jacob contracted. Such references to polygamous patriarchs whom Deity delights to honor as their God as the Chaplain indulged in, were quite out of place in a body that would put those men in jail if they were on American soil to-day. He should have been more careful of the proprieties. His case calls for an investigation by a Congressional committee.

In singularly bad taste, too, was his allusion to the duties of rich men, seeing that so many plutocrats hold seats in the body for which he prays at so much per diem. And then to scare them out of their boots while their heads were bowed, over the possibilities of dynamite and kindred compounds in the hands of oppressed laborers and desperate anarchists! It was enough to make them indignant, and justified their refusal to have the prayer printed in that intensely pious and thrillingly interesting periodical, the *Congressional Record*.

Seriously, the evils touched upon in the Chaplain's prayer are important enough to challenge the attention of all thinking people. And if he really believed in the God of Jacob, and was sincerely seeking for Divine help to bring those things to the consideration of the legislators of our country, his utterances were pertinent and seasonable, and may be endorsed with a hearty amen.

The conflicts that are pending, and which will no doubt become more serious, between capital and labor, the amassing of immense wealth in the hands of a few while common necessaries are out of the reach of the many, and the awful power which modern science has disclosed as means of revolution and destruction, ought to be subjects of the most thoughtful deliberation by all the governments of the earth. And if their eyes could be opened to discern the fast approaching troubles that will overwhelm the world, they would perhaps make some preparations to meet them, and the great nation of which we form a part would find something better to do than to crush out a loyal people, who truthfully desire to serve the God of Jacob.

MATRIMONY AS A MATTER OF RELIGION.

The decrees of the Roman Catholic Plenary Council of Baltimore, which were sent to Rome for Papal confirmation and which have been returned approved, contain many doctrines and announcements of importance to the body of religionists whom they are intended to govern. Among them is a decree in regard to matrimony. It is generally known that marriage is regarded as as sacrament by the Romish Church. It cannot be properly contracted and solemnized by Catholics without a duly ordained priest and the prescribed ceremony. All other marriages of members are considered ecclesiastically void.

In this the views of that Church are similar to those of the "Mormon" Church. But they do not now-a-days occasion so much comment. When a Latter-day Saint Elder advises the members of his Church not to marry outsiders, and declares that contracts formed outside of the rites and ordinances of the Church are not valid in the sight of heaven, although they may be in the eyes of the secular law, he is denounced with a vehemence and bitterness that savor of violence. A Roman Catholic priest may utter the same precept and doctrine in regard to his Church, and scarcely anything is said about them by others. The Protestant world has become accustomed to Catholicism and has almost ceased to persecute its followers.

So with the decree just published in regard to matrimony. It holds that since marriage is raised to the dignity of a sacrament, it belongs solely to the church to whom the administration of the sacrament is entrusted, to pass upon the validity, rights and obligations of marriage. And that no legal divorce has the slightest power before God to loose the bond of marriage and make a subsequent marriage valid.

These are similar to the doctrines held by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on this important subject. And the plural marriages which that Church has sanctioned have been entered into as ecclesiastical obligations, with which the secular law had nothing to do. They were Church marriages under Church regulations and ceremonies, and asked no sanction or rec