

general methods to be followed by officials in prosecuting those who do not comply with the law, and in making enforced collections of taxes.

#### WITH APOLOGIES TO OUR READERS

An editorial in the Salt Lake *Herald* of this (Monday) morning contains the following:

The DESERET EVENING NEWS, in its Saturday's issue, contained the following note on the editorial page:

Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, will speak in the Federal court room, Wednesday [Monday] evening, August 27. It is hoped there will be a splendid attendance to greet the distinguished and eloquent Republican.

What we want to know is why the NEWS hopes there will be "a splendid attendance to greet the distinguished and eloquent Republican." Is that wish to be construed as the wish of the official organ that it is or as the wish of the paper as a newspaper? The position it occupies in this Territory is very peculiar and its utterances are supposed to have special weight with the majority of the people of Utah.

Other portions of the article from which the foregoing is quoted are devoted to objections to Mrs. J. Ellen Foster's remarks in the Tabernacle on Sunday and to her having been permitted to speak in that building on that day. So far as that is concerned, we presume those from whom the lady obtained permission to deliver an address are as able to justify their action on the representation made to them in this instance, as when in a spirit of true generosity and religious tolerance they have permitted Methodists, Baptists, or educational reformers to occupy the same position. At present it is not necessary for the NEWS to take up any discussion on that branch of the subject.

To the paragraphs we have quoted there is, however, a word of reply to be given. Firstly, as to the utterances of the NEWS being "supposed" to have special weight with the majority of the people of Utah; there is no supposition about it; the *Herald* knows as well as we do—and perhaps that is what's the matter with it—that the utterances of this paper do have, and are entitled to have, the influence and special weight spoken of. One reason for this is that the NEWS is reliable in its statements; is above the level of petty trickery; is always willing to be fair and courteous to its cotemporaries and to all mankind; and has preferred a plain, straightforward course to any miserable, shifting subterfuge by which temporarily to mislead its readers, or rear a baseless fabric of criticism of another. The *Herald* writer may be unfamiliar with such notions of truth and honor; we beg to reassert them, nevertheless, and here announce once more our intention of cherishing them.

So much for the "special weight with the majority of the people of Utah," and the way the NEWS has earned and keeps it. Now for the *Herald's* impudent and insulting queries. The NEWS expressed no wish whatever, either as "the organ that it is," or "of the paper as a newspaper" (whatever that clumsy language may mean) with reference to the lecture spoken of. The "note on the editorial page" of the paper was a paid advertisement,

placed plainly in advertising type and in an advertising column. It was preceded by an advertisement and followed by others. There were announcements of a sewing machine agency, of a baking powder firm, of a farm for sale, of two theaters, of a Republican convention, of a particular brand of "pants," of a shoe store and of a dry goods establishment. At least three of these "ads." make use of the editorial "we;" but the *Herald* had no eyes for anything save the "It is hoped" in the notice of the lecture.

It is now our turn to ask questions: First, on second perusal of that particularly offensive editorial page of Saturday's issue, will not the *Herald* be manly enough to confess that its remarks which we have quoted were stupid, untruthful, contemptible and small? Second, will not the management insist on its editorial writer's apologizing to his readers for his meanness? Third, is it to be expected that a paper with the reputation and prestige of the NEWS will forever have patience to take up and correct the driveling of writers who can only see out of one eye and who talk most sensibly when they are asleep?

#### THE PROSPECT.

It may be a very unpatriotic sentiment, but the great majority of the people of the United States will feel to heave a sigh of relief that Congress has at last adjourned. That great legislative body seems to be moved irresistibly to turn, overturn and experiment with the country's business; the result is that conservative people hardly know how to draw a contented breath while the sessions are in progress. They no sooner get accustomed to one set of laws, and accommodate themselves to a certain policy, than "reforms" are thrust before them, changes are proposed, argued and adopted, and the whole course has to be gone over again. Disturbance follows as a matter of course, and either an unsettled condition or an unhealthily stimulated one invariably ensues after every change in the political complexion of the law-making body.

Of course, the motive of the members in their work of amendment and reform is a good one; they sincerely believe their plan or policy to be an improvement upon that which they set out to correct; and as nations, like individuals, learn by living and experience, it is evident that changes in program in time become necessary. It is generally deemed sufficient praise of a legislator, therefore, to say that he insisted upon only such changes as were necessary. He is to be blamed when he takes selfishness or partisanship for his motive, and destroys or disturbs heedlessly with no other hope than of personal or political advantage.

It was to be expected that a Democratic Congress would want to institute an entirely new policy with reference to the tariff. If popular elections mean anything, the Democratic party was put in power to do that very thing. It has done it, and the session is closed. The NEWS will not argue that the policy is right, or that

it is responsible for the depression in which the country is plunged. Those are political issues and concern us not at all. We will be permitted to say, however, that the uncertainty as to how far the policy might be carried, has contributed materially to the unsettled condition of business; and further, that the removal of that uncertainty now leaves the country in a good shape to go ahead and prosper. We look for, and believe we can already see the promise of, a genuine revival in commerce, industry and trade. Our nation is too great, and its resources are too many, to warrant the thought that any legislative policy can utterly ruin it. Under almost any conceivable condition—barring of course actual revolution or war—the United States must grow and increase; the people are capable of surmounting any difficulties and thriving under any circumstances if they but know what those difficulties and those circumstances are.

As to the new tariff bill, it seems to us that the politicians ought to be pretty well satisfied with it: the Democrats claim that it is a great improvement over its predecessors, and the Republicans agree that it is not half as bad as it might have been. The country will have to try it awhile, whether good or bad, and the NEWS is happy to believe that, not particularly because of the terms of the act itself, but because it puts an end to present doubt and uncertainty, Uncle Sam's land and family will start right out on a term of improvement and prosperity.

#### SATOLLI'S FAMOUS LETTER.

The letter of Papai Ablegate Satolli, in which he, some time ago, endorsed the decision of Bishop Watterson to refuse church fellowship to societies having saloonkeepers for prominent officers, is causing a great deal of commotion. The general impression at first created was that the Catholic church had taken a "formal stand against the saloons" and that the political influence of the liquor dealers would no longer be wielded for the furtherance of the plans of that religious denomination. Those interested in the liquor traffic rose in arms, figuratively speaking, and loudly protested against the interference of ecclesiastical officers against a "lawful" and respectably conducted business. They pointed out that not only were some bishops interested in wine production, but that the ablegate and the pope himself are habitually following the New Testament prescription and "taking a little wine," on account of certain infirmities. They argued that if it is not against the principles of morality to manufacture and to consume the beverage, it is illogical to prohibit its sale. On the other hand, total abstinence rejoiced, because they saw in the incident a clear indication of a mighty war on the saloon element, as far as Catholics are concerned.

At present a great effort is made by leading churchmen to explain the meaning of the ablegate's epistle. Father McGlynn in his speech at Prohibition Park, August 26, states concisely what Catholic papers and speakers already have advanced to