

UNWILLING AND WILLING BARKISES

The differing view taken by different men as to some of the higher public offices is at times amusing if nothing more. In no case is this more discernible than in that of United States senator, a position which ought to be looked upon by all as one of dignity, honor and prominence before the world, saying nothing of the \$5000 per annum, mileage and incidentals which it yields to the holder. But, strange as it may appear, some there be who not only look askant upon the position but could not be induced to take it. Unquestionably these are but few in number, but they are necessarily conspicuous men. One of them is the veteran journalist and philanthropist George Washington Childs of the Philadelphia *Ledger*. A member of the Pennsylvania legislature recently presented Mr. Childs' name in that body to be the successor of M. S. Quay in the United States senate, upon hearing of which the Philadelphian immediately wired the legislator as follows:

Upon no account use my name for senatorial or other political office. Would not accept the senatorship if the vote were unanimous.

Sometimes a declination is so worded that it can only be read as if concluding—"But if you must have me of course I can but yield to your wishes," and often the invisible words are the more conspicuous portion. This cannot be said of Mr. Childs; his refusal to serve is unequivocal and the demand that no attempt be made to have his name brought before the senatorial electors is peremptory and to the point. He means what he says and says what he means, which is that he does not want and will not have a senatorship or any other political office.

Another case in point is that of Henry Watterson, the brilliant and celebrated free-trade advocate who presides over the columns of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*. A contemporary, noting the fact that Mr. Watterson said he would not be a senator because he could not afford to, that he would be more likely to starve than otherwise on the salary paid, asks him in a humorously suggestive vein if he hasn't been a newspaper man for years; this elicits the following reply:

He has, indeed; and for years and years he has earned three times the salary of a senator, and still laid by no money! Yet, though a poor man, he has tried to be an honest one, having been at least his own master, and not the slave of every passing wind of popular caprice.

There is more solidity for you. An editor who receives \$15,000 a year not only would gain nothing at Washington if an honest man, which Mr. Watterson undoubtedly is, but occupies a station before the people sufficiently high and consequential—too high to justify bartering it off for a mess of political pottage. Of course all the great editors, and all of the other kind, do not look upon the situation as do the two named; far from it. And sometimes we find a professional politician or even a statesman who would really rather

stay out of the senate; these are naturally quite rare specimens and when they do exist it is usually because taking a seat there would or might injure their chances for something more to be desired. There is David P. Hill of New York, a most capable senator, who does not seem to place a very high estimate upon the honors or emoluments pertaining to his position; some say he thinks he ought to be President of the United States, and it is quite likely they are right.

In the midst of the indifference cited, it is refreshing to turn to our own Utah and see what we find here—refreshing because of the sensation imparted by reason of a return from unusual conditions to the normal state of things. Utah is not in the Union yet and may not be for some time, although there is more favorable talk of it now than at any time before. When we do get in we will be entitled to two senators. Now, about how many candidates would any one who takes an interest in politics suppose there are? Perhaps it would be a much easier task to ascertain from the list of those at all eligible just how many there are not, it would require such a smaller array of figures. Suffice it to say we are as well stocked as any of the commonwealths with patriots whose willingness to serve their country in either branch of Congress stands out in such striking contrast with those previously herein spoken of that these seem just for a moment to be lacking in patriotism and self-abnegating devotion to their respective communities. If there is any real intention to confer statehood upon this fair Territory, those who have the matter in hand need not hesitate because of fear that we have so many Childses, Wattersons or Hills that there would be some doubt about the new sovereignty being fully represented at headquarters.

THAT LIBEL SUIT.

Of course there was no surprise to Judge Powers, his attorneys, the DESERET NEWS company, its attorneys, or anybody else, in the decision of Judge Zane yesterday with reference to the libel suit instituted by the doughty Tuscarora chieftain against the former proprietors of this paper; the thing terminated as in all justice it ought to terminate and as everybody of sense expected it would.

Nevertheless Judge Zane deserves the thanks of the newspaper fraternity and of every free community for his exposition of the legitimate scope and character of journalistic criticism. His decision is in the nature of a well-timed rebuke to those thin-skinned or litigious individuals who experience no shrinking aversion to getting prominently before the public, but who have an unconquerable fear of public investigation and just censure. He elucidates the meaning of free speech and a free press as guaranteed by the Constitution, which are the surest safeguards of popular rights, and he makes clear the nice point at which the susceptibilities of a plaintiff in a case of this kind are apt to take possession of his sober judgment. For the future we imagine the owner of a

tender outline will think twice before flying to the ineffectual balm that a frivolous suit for libel may afford against the shafts of honorable criticism. Speaking for the NEWS, we take pleasure in promising that whenever it shall be found necessary to charge official corruption, misconduct or anything of the sort, the language employed will not be ambiguous enough to need judicial interpretation; those whom we may have to antagonize in this manner will be given at least the satisfaction of feeling that only by stupidity on their own part are they in danger of being knocked out by a demurrer.

A CRYING EVIL.

The astonishing prevalence of the senseless vice of profanity has doubtless caused every thoughtful person to wish that the law might step in with penalties where Christian persuasion has failed to effect a cure. One might almost welcome with joy the re-enactment and enforcement of the rigorous "blue laws" of hallowed memory—so outrageous and shameless has the practice become; and it is with no small pleasure that one hears of the revival in England of an old statute of George III, according to which a laborer must pay a shilling for every oath uttered in public, a man above the grade of laborer must pay two, and a "gentleman" five. Recent reports go to show that these penalties are being energetically imposed, and that the choice expressions so frequently dropping from the "gentlemen's" lips are being converted into coin at a rate that is likely to make quite a material addition to the public revenues. If the effect shall also be to check the practice and extinguish it altogether, the final result will be worth all that it has cost and a great deal more.

Profanity is the national vice of America, and it is growing with a rapidity that is positively painful. Our own community, free as it was for a long time from the infection, is now most grievously afflicted. The city ordinances on the subject are a dead letter, for those who ought to enforce them are themselves violators. The busier streets can scarcely be traversed at any hour when coarse, brutal oaths do not fill the air. On some of the sunnier corners, crowds of loafers congregate and utter forth in common conversation imprecations that are shocking to the ear. Old and young vie with each other in the variety and ingenuity of their swearing, and the sacred name of Deity is hourly profaned by mouths too foul to be permitted in decent society. For the sake of civilization and Christianity, for the sake of refined womanhood and pure childhood, for the sake of the law of both God and man, a sharp lesson should be taught the wretches who thus give offense.

THAT WHICH the world calls love platonic, too often deserves the designation love plutonic.

IDAHO HAS dropped the diamond industry and blossomed out as the possessor of real coal fields. By any other name, carbon comes just as high.