

verter of our language and meaning says we want to prevent their "taking any thought upon National subjects." Perceive! The words which he says we did not use and which he argues would have made the meaning all right, we did use, and the idea he pretends we conveyed we neither expressed nor hinted at.

While we are on this subject we will make another quotation from his article. Here it is:

"In answer the *News* says: 'It is no earthly use to dispute with an opponent whose mind is so dense that it cannot understand how two or a dozen or more persons can be brought to understand a given idea or principle alike without losing their individual liberty.' We take it that every native-born, unlettered American citizen will have the same density of mind on this subject."

Will any "native-born, unfettered American citizen" whose brain is not befogged by drug or stimulant or cerebropathy, acknowledge that he has this "density of mind?" Is it possible that a living soul outside of the *Tribune* office will contend that two or more persons cannot be brought to understand a given idea alike without losing their individual liberty? Yet this is his contention and he thinks every unfettered American citizen will agree with him.

In one column he blackguards everybody who countenances anything tending to divide the "Liberal" party; in the next column, side by side with that denunciation he condemns all people who understand a principle alike, and finally declares them unfit to have the ballot, to hold office or to make laws under the Government.

The question may be asked, What is the use of paying attention to such a deliberate falsifier and so utterly irrational a writer? The answer is, not much. But all this misrepresentation and vicious endeavor to malign the "Mormons" is put forth for the purpose of working for the political destruction of the majority of Utah's citizens. And we want such persons as may through prejudice or thoughtlessness be carried away with the project, to see on what thoroughly false and senseless grounds its advocate founds his pretensions.

The whole argument may be thus summed up: "The Mormons are united; therefore they should be disfranchised. Some of the Mormons once practiced polygamy, the law forbade it; therefore all those Mormons who never practiced it are disloyal and should be disfranchised. Some Mormons who have never violated the law believe that polygamy is both legally and morally wrong because the law prohibits it and the Church they belong to forbids it. But they think that

if there was no legal or ecclesiastical inhibition of the practice it would not be in itself essentially criminal; therefore no Mormon is fit to have the American ballot or hold office or make laws under this Government." There is nothing more to the whole tirade, except a mass of assumptions as to what "Mormons" believe, and intentional perversions of their views and the language of their advocates.

Take out the "indecent," intentional untruths, garbled reports, reversed propositions, libels of everything and everybody that differs with its writers on any subject, and its stock of foul epithets on which it rings the changes year in and year out, and there would not be left enough of the *Tribune* to fill a single page. No wonder that it is sliding down the hill.

ARRANT HYPOCRISY.

IN our issue of Wednesday Feb. 1 Mr. Chas. Ellis identified, with unmistakable clearness, the reporter of the *Tribune* who told him that he had to fix up his reports to suit that paper regardless of or in defiance to the facts. But the challenge to name this person was only what is vulgarly called a "bluff." So was the pretended apology for the "indecent" paragraph that appeared in that paper, the author of which was the reporter in question. If the *Tribune* was sincere in its pretenses of decency, why did it strike off a number of extras containing the "indecent" paragraph the day following its original production?

Is it not a fact that the only reason exception was taken by that foul sheet to one of its own effusions, was because of the vigorous protests of respectable "Liberals" more than usually disgusted with its filthiness? Its pretended regret at one item not exceptionally bad for its columns, was one of the funniest things barring its hypocrisy which has appeared of late in a newspaper. And it will be seen that the writer of the "spicy" and salacious paragraphs that "find their way" into that sheet and of its burlesque reports of sermons and lectures, will be still employed to perform his dirty work; it suits the *Tribune* to a dot.

A RELIC OF OTHER DAYS.

WE HAVE been shown a faded relic of early days in Utah. It is in the shape of a "Mormon way bill to the mines" of California. It is a little pamphlet, about three by four inches, and printed on brown wrapping paper. It gives a detailed outline of the route, with all the leading points and way-marks defined. The proprietors of the

little work and collectors of the information it embodies were Joseph Cain and A. C. Brower, both deceased. The pages are embellished with unique advertisements. For instance J. & E. Rees inform the public that:

"We have constantly on hand all necessary articles of comfort for the wayfarer; such as flour, hard bread, butter, eggs and vinegar. Clothing—buckskin pants, whip lashes, as well as a good assortment of store goods, at our store near the Council House."

Alexander Neibaur, surgeon dentist, from Berlin, and later from Liverpool, announces that he examines and extracts teeth, besides keeping constantly on hand a "supply of the best matches," manufactured by himself.

M. Cannon, daguerreotype artist, expresses the "opinion that he can satisfy any taste as to the matter of a likeness." This pioneer photographer is the father of deputy-Marshal Bowman Cannon.

In those days "hard tack" for travelers must have been at a premium, as all the mercantile advertisers showed anxiety to have it understood that they carried any amount of *hard bread*.

The billous-looking time-worn sheet concludes with a detailed description of "The Oregon route, from Pacific Springs to Oregon City." The paper is dated 1851—four years subsequent to the arrival of the first band of pioneers.

AMERICANS APING ROYALTY.

WHETHER are we drifting? When one sees the developments taking place in religion, in society and in politics, the above question naturally suggests itself. But the news recently reported from New York completely overshadows everything heretofore published of an innovatory character. That is, that American women are adorning themselves with crowns, yea, real unmistakable crowns, not tiaras, or turbans, or any such mock imitations of European royalty. The *New York World* describes the crown worn by Mrs. W. K. Vanderbilt at the opera a few evenings ago. It was an exact duplicate of the British crown. It was made in London last summer, and cost \$300,000. The jeweler who made it had fears about vulgarizing Queen Victoria's royal symbol, but a good price subdued his political scruples.

Mrs. Vanderbilt has two crowns; the one mentioned and another bought from a German princess a few years ago. She does not wear the German crown very often, because its former owner was both obscure and impecunious. The London made crown is a thing of beauty, and in this the lady likes to make a grand display. It is an artistic arrangement of pearls and diamonds, and rises from the head in stately, graceful, picturesque fashion.