

remove the thistles and stones, let me turn and water the soil, for we have no rain here, and then I will transplant the Western product as you wish. Believe me, no one would be better pleased than I with the success of the experiment." Such is the Sultan, says Vambery, painted without prejudice."

A FINAL ANSWER.

We are under the necessity of referring once more to a very stale chestnut which the "Liberal" organ, with its accustomed "enterprise," for the lack of something new and interesting, has raked out of the cold ashes of the past. A week ago we replied to some questions put by that paper to the DESERET NEWS. They were in reference to the Ogden Junction and the Ogden City Council in the year 1876. We were asked to affirm or deny certain statements alleged to have been made by "a gentleman" to the Tribune. We denied. This morning we are attacked in common Tribune fashion, not because there was anything in our reply that was untrue, for we are told, "of course that is in one sense true," but because it did not suit the purpose in view in asking the questions.

Reference is made to a reproduction of the Ogden City Council records in a previous issue of the Tribune, and what the Ogden Junction drew from the city treasury. Close examination of that report shows that not one statement in our reply is contradicted, and nothing is adduced that was not known to the citizens of Ogden at the time and approved by the public. And all the financial transactions brought forth with a flourish were duly published in the columns of the Ogden Junction, as reports of City Council minutes and in the quarterly official reports of the Auditor and Treasurer.

The simple facts are that Ogden City, on the building of the Utah Central Railroad, invested in one of the bonds of that road; that subsequently, when a paper was started in that city, the bond was sold and the proceeds invested in the capital stock of that paper, which became the official organ of the city; that in both instances it was deemed for the public interest to so invest these funds; that it was endorsed by the public; that when the capital stock of the company was increased for building purposes and enlargement of the paper, all the stockholders made a further *pro rata* investment, the city with the rest; that connected

with the paper was a job office that did printing for the city and received payment therefor as from other customers; that these transactions were done in a business way, in open council, and the particulars were published; that the grand jury in 1876 investigated the whole matter and found nothing against which they could proceed except to mention it in their report.

One thing which the Tribune did not think it worth while to mention we may as well allude to. That is, the Junction paid dividends to the stockholders up to the date mentioned, of 65 per cent. altogether on the amount invested. But of course that was a trifle that did not come in the line of what was wanted by that very ingenuous organ. Its report says:

"The News makes a denial through its editorial columns, though the matter in controversy does not seem to involve that paper, but its editor."

If that is so, why did it commence the attack in this way:

"A gentleman brings us an item which we would like to submit to the DESERET NEWS for confirmation or denial."

Again it says:

"The Tribune does not make a statement that it does not believe true; when convinced that it has made a mistake it invariably retracts."

This would be news to the people of Salt Lake if any sane persons could be found who would believe it. That paper has been convicted times without number of wilful lying. It has never been known to make a fair, square retraction, no matter how plainly and certainly it has been shown to be in the wrong. Usually, when driven into a corner, it tries to crawl out, in the most sneaking manner, and squirts venom and falsehood worse than its original calumny.

We repeat, "there was no business connected with the junction company's affairs that was not straightforward, square and open, and there was no need for concealment of any of its transactions;" and the same may be said of the acts of the City Council during the same period.

Now as to the Assessor and Collector: It is well known that the full amount of the year's taxes was charged up to him, under the old law, and he was required to settle at a certain date. It was evident to the Council at the time that he was unfortunate but honest, and his note was taken for part of his dues which we believe he paid in full. There was no embezzlement, no defalcation nor any loss to the city.

It may be quite interesting to a certain class of minds to rake up almost forgotten affairs, in order to fling mud and cast insinuations at one who may be unable to recall particulars, and thus secure an opportunity for unresisted slander. But only mean and paltry souls find pleasure in such pastime, and we leave the subject as one that, it is now evident, was intended as a personal assault, and therefore unnecessary to be noticed further in the DESERET NEWS.

STREET RAILROAD COMPLICATIONS

THE decision rendered Dec. 18th by His Honor Judge Zane, in the case of certain property owners and residents on First Street against the two railroad companies running electric cars on that thoroughfare was eminently proper in its principal point—that there should be only one track operated. This conclusion is reached on the grounds that the street is not sufficiently wide to admit of two lines without obstructing and rendering dangerous ordinary traffic, thus invading the public easement, and seriously depreciating the value of property in that locality.

In our opinion the learned judge did not point out the remedy. He seemed to think that it consisted in compelling both companies to use one track, one set of overhead wires and, of course, one source of electric power. This would only increase the danger which he very clearly pointed out as now existing. The remedy lies in the right of using the street for railroad transit purposes being limited to one company.

Suppose that both companies should use the one track and overhead contrivances from the Eagle Gate north to First, and up First to A Street, what would be the probable situation? The answer is clear. In order to supply the public needs for service by the respective lines in the localities east of A Street, it will be necessary to run the cars with at least as great frequency as now. Demands are already being made for an increased service, to diminish it would be a source of inconvenience to the people. Hence the car traffic over the single track would be at least equal to what now goes over both. This would involve the danger of cars of the respective companies meeting on the single track. This liability would be increased by the fact that the employees would be under separate con-