

this desired consummation because of pride, dislike to an opposing party or any other motive than the general welfare, deserves not only to lose the present object of its ambition but to achieve defeat when larger issues and greater ambitions may be at stake:

THE "LIBERAL" CITY GOVERNMENT REBUKED.

THE Resolution adopted by a majority of the City Council on Tuesday, Nov. 24, is another stinging rebuke to the "Liberal" city government. The situation is made very clear. A scandal has been brought upon that administration because the ordinances against certain specified offenses have not been enforced. And this has occasioned the action of the grand jury and the United States Marshal, to enforce the territorial statutes touching on the same offenses.

The attempt to expunge from the Resolution the special reference to those crimes, very properly failed. If it is proper for a Judge to call the particular attention of a grand jury to the frequent infraction of given laws, it is equally proper for the City Council to particularize offenses which are common and not punished.

But while implying neglect on the part of the City Marshal and the police, does not this Resolution suggest to the public mind that possibly those officers have been hampered by such instructions as those recently brought to light as issued by the "Liberal" acting-Mayor? Is it not a fact that this "Liberal" city government was placed in power largely through the vote and influence of the elements now resolved against, and that an understanding was had from the first that they should be protected? And would it not be a breach of good faith if they were pursued as provided for by law and required by public sentiment?

A "Liberal" writer endeavors to make it appear that the present condition of affairs, with its "daily examples of lawlessness, is not attributable to "Liberal" city management. This is very funny. He says he is astonished that "Mayor Scott and the City Council should be willing to allow this disorder to go on month after month, while hardly night goes by when houses are not robbed and worthy citizens attacked on our public streets at the peril of their lives," and asks, "Could there be a greater reflection than that upon our city government?" He goes on to attack furiously both the Mayor and the Marshal, and adds that "if the members of the City Council had a quarter of the manhood we supposed

they had when we elected them, they would have" done thus and so.

He says, "the Marshal failing in his duty and the City Council failing in theirs, then the responsibility for the order of the city comes back upon the Mayor," whom he proceeds to belabor with one hand and pat praisingly with the other. He declares that the Mayor is "inactive," that he does not manifest "moral decision" nor "maintain law and order," and that "the Mayor cast his vote last summer on the side of that unmitigated curse to the city—the saloon element."

Yet after all this and a great deal more in the same style, this "Liberal" assailant of his own party officials says: "But it is useless to say the city government is responsible for this lack of order." And he is "surprised that the Mormon papers should try to make political capital out of this disorder by attributing it to Liberal rule." Then, with true "Liberal" fatuity and inconsistency he says: "But speaking for a great number of 'Liberals' who will not vote any more straight 'Liberal' tickets unless these very things are rectified, we earnestly call upon our worthy Mayor to put himself right, and set the city right, and set the party right which elected him, by devoting the remainder of his term to securing for us an orderly town."

Now if he has not made out a clear case against the city government which he says is not responsible, how could it be done? If this is not a political matter affecting the "Liberal" faction, why does he threaten that faction with the loss of "Liberal" votes if the evils complained of are not rectified? It is useless for any "Liberal" to pretend that his party is not responsible for the terrible condition of affairs in this city. To the saloon, gambling and rowdy and lawless elements the "Liberals" are largely indebted for their success. The bosses of the party are still expecting their aid. It is for this reason that they are so enraged against the United States Marshal for his proceedings. There is no security for the good government of this city under "Liberal" manipulation. The advocates of law and order should unite as against the influences that have gained control, and at the next city election a lesson should be taught to them which they will never forget.

THE REGULAR REPUBLICANS RECOGNIZED.

NOTHING that has occurred for a long time has so badly demoralized the "Liberal" bosses as the complete recognition of the straight-out Utah Re-

publicans by the National Republican Committee. This is plainly exhibited by the anger of the "Liberal" champions and the idiocy of their contradictory attempts to explain away the catastrophe. Blackguardism and balderdash are the only terms that fitly describe their mingled wrath and senility.

It appears that in addition to the action taken by the National Committee, as related in Tuesday evening's DESERET NEWS, the following resolution was introduced and adopted unanimously:

"Resolved, That in the committee elected by the convention of delegates at Salt Lake City, September 2, 1891, we recognize the Republican territorial central committee of Utah.

"Resolved, That we recommend to all of the men of Utah whose ideas of national government and policy are in harmony with the national Republican party, that they now bury their local differences and unite to rescue the Territory from the danger and dishonor of future Democratic control."

Henceforth what is left of the "Liberal" faction in Utah will be known for what it is—a local clique for mere local ends, having no connection, real or pretended, with the great national parties. Its days are numbered and the number is few.

After a spongy effort to show that Judge McBride was, after all, representing the "Liberal" cause and that his recognition was a "knock out" for Judge Barich, Arthur Brown and the other regular Republicans, the "Liberal" literary apologists partly sensed the situation and, turning a complete summersault, opened the vials of their wrath upon the head of the recognized Republican committeeman, in this fashion:

"A late dispatch last night brought the news that Judge McBride, on his own responsibility, has betrayed the great mass of Republicans in Utah; has, to suit his own purposes, betrayed the men who trusted him here, belied all the pretensions which he has held out for a score of years, and, to satisfy his own sore and distempered soul, exemplified what he has more than once before shown a disposition to do—namely, to either rule his party here or do his best to destroy it.

"He carries with him in the effort the comfort which men enjoy when they reach that point where even their own self-respect ceases to be a matter of solicitude to them."

"The great mass of Republicans in Utah" rejoice over the recognition of their party. It is only the "soured and distempered" "Liberals" who are disgruntled. Their little plot has signally failed, their memorial and resolutions are wasted, their Tatlock—whoever he may be, is rejected, and all their telegrams, pleadings, falsehoods and subterfuges are vain. But think of emptying the foregoing bucket of bile on the head of Judge J. R. McBride, who was once a most exalted