

the names on each being those of exceptionally good men, are residents, property owners, devoted to the welfare of the municipality, and in some cases having considerable experience. There has been a good deal of campaigning, both parties holding nightly meetings, and the enthusiasm while not sufficiently emphasized to reach us here, has been conveyed as nearly as cold types and the word of mouth could do it.

As to the outcome—we have to wait till the votes are counted, when others will know as much of it as we, and it is not probable that any of us will know more till that time comes around. The city has gone both ways—Republican by a small majority at the school election in July, and Democratic by a larger one in August. It is claimed by the latter element, however, that the former contest was not a fair trial of strength, and the lightness of the vote might or might not bear this out, depending on whether a greater proportion of Democrats than of Republicans were responsible for the falling off; and the increased vote for that party in August might also mean much or little, as it was not then a strictly local contest as previously and now. It is thus, as is readily seen, "anybody's fight" just at present.

Whichever side may prove victorious is not to us a matter of so much concern as it might be under other circumstances, for the reason already stated, that the good people of Logan are tolerably sure of a good, conservative and yet progressive administration in either event. That is the way it ought to be in all such cases, but unfortunately it is so in but very few.

The only unpleasant thing to contemplate in Logan politics is the very strong, we may say bitter feeling which seems to prevail between the respective partisans. In that we see cause for regret, and fear that unless it is moderated great evil will arise, the fruits of which will bring sorrow and trouble. We see no reason for the exhibition of such extreme partisanship.

THE TWO REPORTS CONTRASTED.

The publication of an alleged full stenographic report of "Kentucky" Smith's address on the "Home Rule" bill before the House Committee on Territories, was very poor policy for the *Tribune*. As we showed on Monday evening, it does not harmonize with the telegraphed report of the same speech, and both of them are understood to have been made by the same hand.

The *Tribune* is in a rage this morning over its own faultiness, as exposed in this paper, and with its accustomed rashness, ill-temper and sinuosity, attempts to bluster and worm itself out of the hole it has dropped into. We showed that its stenographic and telegraphed reports differed in essential particulars, and we are now told that we failed to point out any of these essential particulars. Well, if they are wanted, we will name a few, and if these are not enough we may cite a few more:

The telegraphed report stated that Mr. Smith proceeded to show that

"Utah was governed by the worst gang of pillager and scoundrels unhung." It alleged that he called the Federal officials in Utah "scoundrels, vampires and bloodsuckers."

The stenographic report contains none of these expressions, and the inevitable conclusion is that they were invented by the *Tribune's* veracious and "most accurate and honorable reporter in the United States."

The telegraphed report says that Mr. Smith "proceeded to stain Governor Thomas," stating that "the Governor would veto bills unless hired not to." That "Governor Thomas" after recommending the consolidation of elections, vetoed the bill to give the Liberal party in Salt Lake an advantage." That "Thomas invented two schemes for bagging the public, the first compelling every officer to pay \$5 for his commission and the second making the filing of bonds and articles of incorporation with the Secretary obligatory."

The stenographic report does not show that the speaker proceeded to "stain Governor Thomas," does not charge that he was "hired" to sign bills; nor does it say that he "invented schemes for bagging the people" nor that corporations are required to "file bonds" with the Secretary; and it does not charge the Governor with recommending the consolidation of elections, but states the virtual facts, namely, that in his message Governor Thomas said: "I have received letters from citizens recommending that all elections except school elections be held on the same day as that for the election of Delegate." The speaker then showed that "the Legislature and every other sane man would understand that this was a recommendation in favor of the proposition; the Legislature took the Governor at his word and passed a law consolidating elections; but on its being presented to him, instead of approving it as everybody expected he would, he vetoed it; and for the reason (he said) that the Liberals had got ready to hold an election in Salt Lake City on the 8th of that month, and that it would be an outrage to deprive them of that privilege."

The telegraphed report stated that Mr. Smith "closed with a peroration demanding relief from these vampires, which would have been hung to telegraph poles or driven out of anywhere else; but he said the good people of Utah could not take this eminently conservative and proper course because such action would bring down on them the blue jackets in arms."

The stenographic report contains no such word as "vampires," does not say hanging people to lamp-posts would be "an eminently conservative and proper course," and says nothing about "blue jackets in arms."

These are a few of the essential particulars in which the two reports differ. The evidence is offered by the exact and conscientious (?) *Tribune*, which frequently furnishes the absolute proofs of its own mendacity.

The *Tribune* accuses the News of "entire willingness to defend any falsehood which may be spoken by any one against the Federal officers of the Territory, no matter how untrue they may be." Now, what are the facts,

known to the creatures who publish this slander? Why that on the same day the *Tribune's* dispatch containing these purported charges against Governor Thomas was published, we defended the Governor and showed that they were incorrect. We expressed the sentiment that "It is not good policy, to say nothing of its morality, to exaggerate or falsely accuse an opponent." And at the same time we gave it as our opinion, that "the remarks made before the House committee had been garbled and tinted for a purpose, after the notorious fashion of *Tribune* reports of meetings, religious and political."

This fairness to an opponent is something the *Tribune* falsifiers can neither imitate nor appreciate. And the slurs they throw out this morning, in order to divert attention from their own dilemma, are the common resort of scurrilous cowardice.

Now as to the remarks about O. W. Powers' pretended replies to Mr. Smith's alleged remarks. We said they were either not made at all or were merely buncombe. We say so still. In talking to the committee, according to the *Tribune's* report, he assumed that the terms "vampires, scoundrels and bloodsuckers" had been used, and that Mr. Smith had stated that corporations were obliged to file bonds with the Secretary. Powers spoke to these points, and as they were not made at all—the proof being the *Tribune's* stenographic report, then either Powers did not make the remark attributed to him or, if he did, they were indeed merely "buncombe." And the *Tribune* twisters cannot wriggle out of this hole, either.

It is believed by a great many people that much of the stuff that has appeared as "special from Washington," has been manufactured in the *Tribune* office. Or that we do not pretend to express our opinion. But it is evident to all who read them that those effusions are largely opinion, factional and colored by malice, and utterly unreliable as to matters of fact. They are *Tribunish* and partizan, and can no more be depended upon than the reports published in the same paper of Democratic or Republican political gatherings, or of a Mormon religious assembly or discourse.

WORST THAN SOPHISTRY.

We do not know whether it is worth while to reply to the assertion, that the half million dollars or thereabout that has been invested in the Sugar industry in Utah was taken from railroads, mines and other industries and put into a sugar factory, because it would not affect the question of a temporary bounty if it were true. But the statement is made accompanied by such strong and insulting language, denouncing as intentional falsifiers those who do not agree with it, that we venture to express our opinion to the contrary, at the risk of being assailed for doing so.

If "every dollar now invested in the sugar factory was before invested in some self-supporting enterprise," as claimed, it ought to be easy to state from what enterprises of that character all these dollars