

The Deseret Weekly.

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, . . . \$2.50.
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50.
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, . . . EDITOR

Saturday, . . . April 5, 1890.

EXTRA LARGE NUMBER.

AGAIN we have occasion to add an extra eight pages to the number usually given in the DESERET WEEKLY, the present issue containing forty instead of thirty-two pages. The contents embrace a great variety of reading matter, including much that will be of future as well as present interest and value. The records of these times are fraught with great current and future worth, and it is the aim of the DESERET WEEKLY to preserve such matter as will be likely to be useful for future reference, and to give a choice miscellany of selected articles.

WHY NOT BE DECENT.

OUR unesteemed "Liberal" morning contemporary has behaved a little better, in some respects, since its appearance in a new dress. But occasionally it exhibits its old disposition to bluster and scold, and with low-lived language bears false witness against its neighbors. We have refrained from noticing its bullying blackguardism of the DESERET NEWS for some time, but will now sacrifice a small portion of space to an allusion to one of its Sunday paragraphs. Referring to this paper, after one of its characteristic flings it says:

"Some four times during the past few days it has flatly asserted that the election bill, vetoed by Governor THOMAS, was favored by the Utah Commission. This is entirely false. The NEWS can produce no testimony to corroborate its statement."

Then follows a scurrilous allusion to one member of the Utah Commission, whom it is customary for the *Tribune* bully to assail, when the gentleman is absent.

Now, we defy any one to produce from the columns of the DESERET NEWS a single statement that "the election bill was favored by the Utah Commission." We have said nothing of the kind. It has been common for years with the infamous sheet which we now deign to notice, to make pretended quotations from

the DESERET NEWS and, in doing so, either manufacture sentences that never appeared in our columns or so garble and pervert and misquote as to reverse their meaning. In either case the wrong is usually not simple error, but wilful and deliberate lying.

In this case there is a slight thread on which the *Tribune* falsehood has been woven. We have twice alluded to the views of the Utah Commission on one particular point. But in neither instance did these relate to "the election bill." By this phrase we mean the bill designed to meet the requirements of the acts of Congress for the regulating of elections in Utah and filling the various offices which are elective by popular vote. Examination of our remarks concerning that measure, which is known as "the election bill," will show that we made no reference whatever to the views of the Utah Commission.

There were two other bills that the Governor vetoed, on which we made some remarks. One was the bill in regard to the classification of cities. In speaking of the delay occasioned by the Governor's non-action upon the bill, we said:

"Members of the Council then waited on the Governor, and after a very lengthy conversation learned verbally his alleged objections to the bill. They were chiefly in relation to the new registration provisions. He took the ground that under the Edmunds act the Legislature could not change the law in these respects. When informed that the Chief Justice, the Commission and learned counsel on the 'Liberal' side, took the opposite view, he had to waive that point in argument. But as he still objected to the changes, every section in relation to them was stricken out."

This certainly is not a statement that the Utah Commission "favored the bill." Their opinion on a single point was mentioned, that is all. Our other reference to that body was in regard to the bill making some amendments to the present registration statute, and was as follows:

"The power of the Legislature to amend the election laws, on which the Governor casts a doubt, saying nothing positive however, is not disputed even by the Utah Commission."

In no case did we assert that the Utah Commission or any member of it favored any bill presented to the Governor. In both the instances when we mentioned their views, the reference was confined to a single legal point—the same in both cases—namely, the power of the Legislature to amend the laws concerning registration and elections in this Territory.

We should think some one with influence on the *Tribune* would have sense and manhood enough to stop the lying and blackguardism which so often make it a disgrace to journalism and render it unfit to argue with. We neither expect nor desire its favor, but we think we have the right to demand that its hate of the DESERET NEWS should be restrained at the limit of lying as to what appears in our columns.

AN UNDIGESTED MEASURE.

The proposed health ordinance prepared and drafted under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce is causing a great deal of popular comment. It is mostly adverse to the measure. Its prefatory part, consisting of a verbose heraldic document, is a study of itself. It reminds one of the exclamation of the usher in a Shakespearian tragedy—"Way there for his majesty, the king." It characterizes existing ordinances on sanitation as "fragmentary and unsystematic." The prologue to the piece proper thus anticipates what the intended ordinance already encounters:

"There will doubtless be a prejudice on the part of many against the wide-sweeping innovation that will invade every man's premises, and put him to trouble and expense. But after all, how small a thing it is in the individual case; and how absolutely and unavoidably essential it is to any proper sanitary work."

As if to make it more incomprehensible to the common reader it leaves robust English and exclaims "a *sine qua non*" is a clear conception of the work to be accomplished. Latin in medical prescriptions may be tolerated, because of the alleged necessity for physic to be enveloped in mystery, but no such plea can be put up in favor of the introduction of dead language into public documents presented for the consumption of the unclassical masses. "Indispensable condition" would have been better understood than the latin phrase if it doesn't look quite so learned.

If the introduction was wordy, what can be said in that regard about the proposed ordinance? It occupied fifty pages of foolscap and its reading consumed over one hour, thus reminding one of the saying of Disraeli in reference to Mr. Gladstone. Beaconsfield said that the "grand old man" was "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." It appears as if the framers of the measure now considered must have been somewhat affected with a similar