

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DENIAL.

• WITH a long and dreary repetition of exploded charges against the "Mormons," the morning "Liberal" organ fills up a great deal of space today. It is useless to take any notice of the greater part of its musty string of stale prevarications, but we find these statements among them, and take the opportunity of entering a general denial, so that the author may not be able to say "the Mormons admit," etc., which is one of his ways of "proving" the truth of his falsehood:

"Why, since the passage of the Edmunds law, the President of the Mormon Church, John Taylor, before a public assemblage of the people in a town a little way in the country, declared that theirs was the only legal government. Furthermore, he declared that the pure women who are here teaching in the mission schools were every one of them of bad character."

Where is that "little town a little way in the country" where President Taylor made that alleged declaration? Who heard him make it? When was it uttered? Give us the particulars. We deny the statement. We believe it is a lie. Not a mistake, but an intentional falsehood, manufactured to deceive and to serve as a ground for making it appear that the "Mormons" hold to something which they do not believe, and which is, indeed, the very opposite of that which is taught in the revelations of God to the Church. So much for the first of those assertions. Now as to the second. The *Tribune* has repeated that lie a great many times. Perhaps the person who reiterates it has come to believe it as true. It started with one of those pretended reports of "Mormon" public speeches, for which the *Tribune* has made itself notorious and infamous even among many of its own party. It is another lie without foundation and without excuse.

President Taylor never made any such statement and never entertained any such opinions of the teachers referred to. We know what we are talking about. No pure woman, whatever her religion or profession, was ever in any danger of slander or indignity of any kind from so high-souled a gentleman as our late President. The author of the libel is one of those dirty-minded creatures that revel in foulness and infect their low and suggestive concoctions into the columns of the *Tribune*, where they find a fitting place.

Subjection to every government under which the Latter-day Saints may live, is a duty imposed upon them by divine command in addition to their civil obligations. They show their faith in this injunction by their works. They are a law-abiding and patriotic

people. In theory and in practice this is evident to every impartial investigator. Those who try to show the contrary are compelled to resort to misrepresentation, the misapplication of some ancient remark or opinion which carries no weight of authority, or downright lying, as in the present utterance of the *Tribune*.

Non-"Mormon" school teachers, whether male or female, denominational or otherwise, never received fairer treatment or greater freedom anywhere than in Utah. They have not been abused by word or deed. They have not been molested. Many of them have been employed by the "Mormons." Some of them have sought to gain fame, or money, or both, by patterning after the sectarian preachers and the *Tribune*, and spreading falsehoods about the dangers they have incurred by working among the "Mormons." But they have never received any injury from the Saints, and there is not the slightest reason for complaint nor any foundation for the *Tribune's* libel of President Taylor.

Now the scribes who delight in such lying may go on repeating their fabrications as often as they please, but they will not, we suppose, offer any more, as proof that what they state is correct, the further falsehood that it has never been denied. Our denial is both general and specific.

"JUST AS WELL TO BE HONEST."

"THE *News* is very mean in its comments on the street sprinkling, and tells of the complaints of last summer. It is just as well to be honest once in a while. There was more sprinkling done last summer than was ever done in four or five summers before. The service was infinitely better and more widely extended than ever before, and it is only fair to say, too, that with the well sprinkled streets there was less disease, fewer funerals, less business for the doctors and undertakers, and less sorrow in people's houses; and the people in all American cities are willing to stand a fair expense to prevent the filth of the street rising in dust and blowing into the threats of their children and into their houses."

The foregoing is of course from the editorial columns of the *Tribune*. "It is just as well to be honest once in a while." Exactly. But whenever was the *Tribune* honest in regard to anything that relates to the DESERET *News* or to any matter in controversy. Here is what we said that has evoked the above quoted comment:

"Last summer there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the imported street sprinkling service. The grounds of protest were that the sprinkling district was too large, the price (8 cents a foot frontage) too high, and the service inadequate. Numbers of people

asserted that they received their notices directing payment of assessment, while the sprinkler, up to that time, had been conspicuous by its absence."

Is there a statement in that which is not absolutely correct? What is there "mean" in the whole paragraph? Did not the *Tribune* utter these complaints day after day in common with the disgusted public? Were not some streets flooded with water till they were miserable mud puddles, while contiguous and parallel streets were filled with blinding dust? Were not the water-spilling carts—not sprinklers, driven over the streaks of mud made by immediately preceding drenches, and strips alongside in the same streets left dry and dusty? Did not owners of vehicles complain continually of the mud made by this stupid and incompetent service, and did not taxpayers declaim against the importation while better work could be had from local sources?

If there is anything "mean" in alluding to the dissatisfaction of last summer, was it "mean" for the *Tribune* to give voice to it at the time? And how much "honesty" does that paper exhibit in stating, today, that the service was infinitely better than ever before, after its own reflections upon that service last summer? "It is just as well to be honest once in a while," but no one should expect that the meanest paper on earth will ever repent and be honest, even for a day.

A PERTINENT INTERROGATIVE.

THE advocates and apologists of the lynchers at New Orleans would do well to ponder on the subjoined query, which is taken from the *Galveston News*:

"Do we live in a country in which the criminality of an outrage depends solely upon the number of leading citizens who engage in it?"

That is a brief but complete answer to the so-called arguments of the defenders of mob violence and irresponsible "power in the people" sophists.

A good question for debate is, What is the difference between lynchers and Mafia members? One defies the law at night, the other in the daytime. It seems strange a civilized nation on this side the Atlantic should uphold one, and a civilized nation beyond, the other.

Reports from Plymouth, Pa., state that the condition of coal miners in that region is bad. Fifteen collieries in this district average about seven days a month. Miners are drawing only \$12 to \$20 per month. Men with families are in desperate straits.