

mentioned in the official report, but it is a fact, nevertheless. And it is also a fact that Delegate Caine did make a formal and respectful demand in writing upon the Commission, while in this city, for the names, and it is another fact that they did not respond.

This should be made known to the Secretary, as doubtless it will be, and the country ought to know on what flimsy grounds the Utah Commission make damaging statements, in such a way that they escape responsibility for the fiction while they accomplish the purpose they had in view. They put this insinuation against the "Mormons," so worded that it would pass for a direct charge, in dirty hands here that they knew would wire it to the press, before their report was filed, and so the papers throughout the land would repeat the accusation until it would be generally taken as an established fact.

Those forty cases, if there had been anything to them but gossip, would have been a rich windfall to hungry officials gaping for fees. Why were they not reported to them? Why did not the Commission name them when called upon to do so? If they did not know what they were charging, why, when they found themselves without the proof, did they not frankly admit the fact and seek to correct the error which they had been the means of promulgating? One of two things they should be made to do: Either bring forward the evidence they had to justify their broad accusation, or confess they had none and only repeated the groundless gossip of anti-"Mormon" partizans. Those forty cases we believe to be forty myths and need nothing more on the part of the "Mormons" than a general denial."

#### THE "NEWS" VINDICATED BY MR. COHN.

IN THE City Council session of December 2d the subject of amending the ordinance on cemetery was taken in hand. It will be remembered that the committee on cemetery offered an amendment to the same ordinance a few weeks ago. Its object was to increase the maximum price of burial lots from \$20 to \$125, a leap that probably has no precedent in regard to this grave question in any city in the civilized or uncivilized world.

The amendment offered at that time also embodied the condition that the sexton's fee for selling lots—

ten per cent of the price—remain unchanged. Thus that officer's fee alone on a lot at the maximum price would amount to more than the highest price charged for any lot in the cemetery prior to 1888.

We characterized the proposed increase of price, the scope of the sexton's discretion in the matter of charges, and the fees connected with the proposed new condition as forming an outrage that had every appearance of jobbery. That opinion remains unchanged. Those who have read the News articles on the subject are aware that the position was sustained by facts and figures, which have not been refuted, because they cannot be overturned.

Mr. Louis Cohn, a member of the committee on cemetery, took occasion last evening to perform the "baby act." Pointing to our reporter in the Council chamber, as if the latter were the News, he said this journal had slandered the committee in treating on the subject of the proposed amendment to the ordinance. All that we have done has been to protect the people against what we regarded as an inexcusable imposition. And we defy Mr. Cohn to refute the facts and figures we have presented. We hurl the insinuation back in his teeth and state that he utters a slander when he makes any such assertion as he did yesterday evening, and we will now proceed to show that he himself, in the amendment presented by him last night and which passed the council, proved the correctness of our position throughout.

We held that the proposed increase was outrageous and excessive, that the discretion regarding prices given the sexton was too wide and lax, and that his fees were made absurdly high. At the same time that Mr. Cohn stated that this journal had slandered him because of assuming this attitude regarding the outrage he proposed to perpetrate at the suggestion of sexton Dunne, he conceded all three of the points we had insisted upon. The amendment presented by him last night proves this to a demonstration.

The measure presented by Mr. Cohn last night was entirely different in essential points from the one which drew forth our strictures. It provides thus:

That the price of lots be increased as follows: In plat C, to \$100; plat P and Q, \$50; in plat R, \$25; and that the price of "inside lots" be increased to \$35.

This concedes the position of the News on two of the three points embodied in the former proposition to which we took exception. (1) It lowers the proposed maximum price of lots from \$125 to \$100, a difference of \$25. (2) It takes away the wide discretion of the Sexton regarding the price to be placed upon the respective lots.

There only needs one more concession to cover the ground and establish fully and completely Mr. Cohn's acknowledgement of the correctness of the strictures of this journal—that is the apparent jobbery of continuing the ten per cent fee to the sexton under the increased maximum price for lots of \$125 in place of \$20. He would thus have received more than five times the amount of fee on a lot of the highest price than was allowed under the old ordinance. The amendment presented last night by Mr. Cohn, and which passed the Council, provides that on the sale of each lot up to \$25 the sexton shall receive the usual ten per cent. On all lots sold over that price a fee of \$2.50 on each sale. This covers the ground we took on that phase of the subject as fairly as could be desired. We stated in substance that the proposition on the fee question, in the amendment to the ordinance first proposed, indicated a desire on the part of Mr. Dunne to work the cemetery for all it was worth, and that the committee were evidently not far in the rear. Their proposal showed beyond reasonable doubt that they intended to assist him in carrying out his scheme. The proof of this lies in the fact that the intention was receded from. The amendment of last night, although still, in our opinion, an imposition on the people, vindicates, by its radical modifications on the former proposition, the position of the News, and it is in the nature of a confession of the most demonstrative character on the part of Mr. Cohn that he was in the wrong in the first place. He thus brands himself a slanderer of this journal, for while his tongue accused us of unjust strictures, his own act proclaimed the correctness of our position.

Perhaps the gentleman was stung by our allusion to the fact that he had been legally declared in a court of justice, a usurper to the position he occupies in the Council of this city. Perhaps he would like to characterize that as a News slander. If so this journal is in a simi-