

do not believe his paper, with all its virulence and success in intimidating "Liberal" citizens, can whip into line the three Judges whom it insults with its vulgar and false insinuations and charges. The indications are that the disfranchisement fanatic is becoming a hopeless monomaniac.

#### A "DODGER" WHO IS NOT EVEN "ARTFUL."

A FEW days ago we replied to a statement in the editorial columns of the Salt Lake *Tribune* that, "Since the passage of the Edmunds law, at a public assemblage of the Saints in a little town a little way out in the country, President Taylor declared that theirs was the only legal Government on earth," and that he also asserted that "the pure women who came here from the East as teachers were all of bad character." We denied both assertions and challenged the *Tribune* to give the name of the little town, with other particulars, and the name of the persons who heard the alleged declarations.

We stated, then, and we repeat the statement now, that the assertions were not mere mistakes but LIES, fabricated by the *Tribune* for malicious and deceptive purposes. In an abortive attempt to meet this charge and pretend to substantiate its falsehoods, the *Tribune* brazenly calls our denial "bluff," and with its accustomed logic quotes, as "a sufficient answer to the ranting of the NEWS," a couple of paragraphs from a pamphlet containing copies of the correspondence between John Taylor and Schuyler Colfax, which the *Tribune* says took place in 1870, and it triumphantly points to the fact that this pamphlet was published by the DESERET NEWS Publishing Company.

There's argument for you! John Taylor, "since the passage of the Edmunds law," said so and so in a public assembly, and the proof that he did is that he wrote a letter to Schuyler Colfax. The Edmunds act was not passed in 1882, and the letter cited was written in 1870. What could be more convincing?

The two paragraphs quoted contain no statement that "theirs (the "Mormons") is the only legal government on earth," nor anything like it, and no reference whatever to "the pure women who come here as teachers." And yet they are cited as "a sufficient answer" to our challenge to produce the name of the little town where those alleged declarations were made, and the names of the persons who heard them!

This is the best answer the *Tribune* can make, and is as good evidence as

could be desired that its statements were willfully false and it is unable to meet the issue. It stretches out this thin effort to nearly a full column, and after repeating our challenge says, "The best way to answer it all will be to go back and answer it with a tract which the DESERET NEWS sells out of its office." It then relates the fact of the correspondence, and quotes the two paragraphs from that old Utah history.

To prove that John Taylor made a certain declaration since 1882, it quotes from a letter written in 1870. To prove that he said something in a public assembly in a little town in the country, it points to this letter. To prove that he abused pure women teachers, it still refers to that old letter which contains not a syllable about those teachers. To clinch this kind of proof that John Taylor did so and so, it declares that a certain tract was published by the DESERET NEWS Company. And this is "the best way to answer" a challenge for the name of the little town where the public declaration was made since 1882, and the names of the persons who heard it. *Tribune* logic again, with a vengeance!

We noticed these two wilful lies of the *Tribune*, simply that its scribes might not say, with any appearance of truth, that its statements had "never been denied" and therefore they must be accepted as facts. For, one of its common tricks is, to say "The Mormons admit" so and so, when "the Mormons admit" nothing of the kind, but simply let the lies of the *Tribune* alone as unworthy of notice.

Now if the *Tribune* can offer any evidence that President Taylor "since the passage of the Edmunds" act made the public declarations named in "a little town" or a big town, let it be produced. If not, it will be of no use to dodge behind an old tract or an old letter, even if either contains anything like the alleged declarations. And when the tract or the letter contains nothing resembling such declarations, quotations only serve to show still further the mendacity of the dodger, who demonstrates that he is not even artful, but simply idiotic.

#### MORE ABOUT THE ALLEN CASE.

APRIL 9th we offered a few comments upon the verdict of acquittal in the case of Allen, the alleged ballot box stuffer. We were in hopes that our observations would be excepted to by "Liberal" journalistic advocates of political rottenness. There is, however, this morning, a discreet silence on the subject. Yesterday the morning and chief apologist for "Liberal"

"flim-flamery" remarked, in relation to Allen, that he now stood "legally innocent." This assertion will provoke no dispute. The journal in which this mouldy nothingism appeared was careful to make no statement to the effect that the bar-tending ex-foot-racing alias-appropriating "Liberal" ex-judge of election was innocent in fact.

Just now it seems appropriate to revive a scrap of history of the recent past, in connection with this case. In September last the conduct of Allen in his capacity of election judge at poll number 2, Fourth Precinct, resulted in a contest on the basis of fraud. The Contestee—Mr. R. W. Young—contended that he was entitled to the office which was given, on the evidence appearing on the face of the returns, to Mr. P. L. Williams. He held that Allen had changed votes cast for him to the number of about twenty and placed Liberal ballots in the box in their stead, the latter being counted for Mr. Williams. Mr. Thornberg and Mr. Blair both testified to having seen Allen make the fraudulent changes. The case was tried before Judge C. S. Zane, who decided that the fraud had been perpetrated and consequently that Mr. Young was entitled to the seat on the board of school trustees for Salt Lake City.

The reasoning of Chief Justice Zane when he rendered the decision, makes—in view of the acquittal of Allen, on Wednesday April 8, by a jury composed entirely of "Liberals"—interesting reading. We quote:

"The evidence further shows beyond any controversy that there was a package of tickets near the ballot box, and that they were within reach of Mr. Allen, the judge; and it shows quite conclusively that there were tickets folded and in some of the envelopes, at least. A number of persons testify that during the day, at different times, Allen was seen with one of these tickets in his hand, or tickets that he had not received from voters. It also appears that he was seated on a high seat near the window; that the voters came to the window and delivered to him their ballots, and that he took them, and it was his duty to put them in the box. One of the other judges, Mr. Ball, states that he was checker, and that he held a list of voters, and checked off as they voted, and Mr. Woolley wrote the name down on a sheet. Their attention, of course, was occupied. Mr. Blair testifies that some of those ballots on the table that were near the box got on the floor. He opened one and found it was a Liberal ticket, and Mr. Williams' name was on it.

"It appears from the evidence in this case that about a week or ten days before the election occurred—it is shown from the testimony of Mr. Kesler, the registrar—Mr. McCallum, who was the chairman of the Liberal committee, came to him (Kesler) and told him that Mr. Greenman was not going to serve as a judge of election. He seems to have been considered presiding judge, to take the votes.