

to bow before." So Shearman is only a boy nursing outraged feelings and indulging in "mock heroics," while Lawrence and Morris and Park are "grown men" who are "sure of themselves." We suppose that Heber M. Wells, who lined up beside Shearman on the issue, is a boy too to "whom the accident of politics has given a little authority." And so these two men (the News confines itself to Shearman alone) "worrying about the respect" shown them by subordinates, are "brooding over slights" until the "public welfare" is liable to be "merged and lost in their own importance."

So this is the attempted explanation of Grant's henchmen. Shearman is charged with boy's play because he has the manhood to stand for his own personal rights and the dignity of the city government; but the three weak sisters are "grown men" because they sulk in silence and shiver with cold feet while an insubordinate official rides over them rough shod. All of which reminds us that a certain fellow offered to bet odds the other day that he could name at least two members of the city commission who, if the chief of police should deliberately expectorate in their eyes, would have the nerve to say nothing more than "thank you." Which prompts us to suggest that they might add something like this—"you have committed this act, chief, 'in a moment of temper' and you did not mean to do what your action 'seemed to reflect'"; that is, if the News correctly explains the attitude of these certain commissioners.

This attempt to belittle Shearman, and laugh him out of court with the reminder that he attend to his own department, is small business. Besides, when the News tries to be funny it is time to search for the nigger in the woodpile. The chief can slander and slur the city commission—and that's all right; Shearman resents it—but that's all wrong. The chief commits an act of rank insubordination, gloats over it, and gets away with it; Shearman rightfully undertakes to call him to task for it, and is ridiculed and reminded to attend to his own business. We suppose, Grant's acts are none of Shearman's business—wherefore the chief's right to comment and criticize.

We predict that, when the true story is told, there will be evidences of insubordination from still another source. Reading between the lines of the article in the News there is suggested the possibility that this particular article was inspired, or written perhaps, by another subordinate of the city commission. If this be true then may heaven brace the backbones of the weak sisters and give them courage to do their duty. If this miracle comes to pass, then let the city commission resolve itself into a high court, and bring to trial the impertinent insubordinates. The people are anxiously awaiting developments, and the whole affair is rapidly becoming a matter of prayer.

Among the records of the city recorder's office is a document marked "Report No. 126," dated November 24, 1912, addressed to the mayor and commissioners, and reading as follows:

I have the honor to recommend in the application of the Brooklyn club (colored) for liquor license at No. 515 South State street, that after a careful investigation I am satisfied these people do not own the required amount of real property, namely \$5,000.00 to entitle them to a club license. Their business has not been conducted in an orderly manner and has given the department considerable trouble. For this reason I would recommend that their application be not granted.

Yours very respectfully,

B. F. GRANT,
Chief of Police.

By interviewing certain individuals who were

nominal conducting the business of the Brooklyn, commonly known as the Dunbar club, we find that during the months of September and October, 1912 these parties had several conversations with the chief of police in which they asked to have their license renewed, but the chief was obdurate and emphatically and vehemently told these parties that their license would not under any circumstances be renewed as the place was a disgrace to the community. But lo and behold the records show the license was granted and the place has been running ever since.

What influence Mr. Chief could have brought about your change of heart and made you recede from the position you had taken in your report to the commissioners of September 24, 1912? You stated you had made a careful examination before you recommended that the application be not granted. What new light was it that appeared subsequently?

The blotter at the police station will show that there were as many crimes alleged to have been committed at No. 515 South State street during the year 1913 as there were the proceeding year 1912, yet the license was renewed again for 1914. Therefore it would appear that there has been no improvement in the moral conditions at No. 515 South State street from the time the careful investigation in 1912 and yet the license to sell liquor was renewed without protest of the police chief. Why?

Surely the taxpayers and citizens, benighted as they may be, are entitled to know through what particular channel comes the inspiration that causes the chief of police, who admits his infallibility and impeccability, to change his convictions in regard to this place.

Is it not true, Chief, that in the presence of several who were interested in having the license granted for the Dunbar club that you absolutely refused to give your approval and not only that but denounced the place in no uncertain terms, and that shortly afterwards you reconsidered your action? Did you have any knowledge of the fact that between the time of your refusal and the time of your reconsideration those interested in securing a license saw the influential gentleman who is particularly interested in seeing that the rent is paid regularly, and did you ever have any conversation with him on the subject, or anyone representing him? If not, what suddenly opened your heart after you had absolutely refused to entertain such a proposition as the recommendation of a license for this club? We think an official explanation is due from you, or perhaps Mayor Park as the commissioner in charge of police affairs, could make a satisfactory one that would clear the matter in the eyes of a great many who are interested.

There are a number of other things that need an explanation, but as yet none is forthcoming. You said, "I am satisfied these people do not own the required amount of real property, namely \$5,000.00 to entitle them to a club license." When and how then did they become possessed of sufficient property to meet this requirement? We wonder if the records show that the property was conveyed to them by those who were anxious to begin receiving the rent and then conveyed to the real owners as soon as the license was granted.

Thank heaven for the "holier than thou." Had they lived in the days of Sodom and Gomorrah, those cities of antiquity would not have been destroyed because their righteousness would have more than outweighed the iniquity of the rest of the inhabitants.

When it comes to defying the lightning, Chief Grant has old Ajax backed clear off the board. Not only does the chief insinuate that Hugh Glenn was forced out of the detective service by improper influences, but he stoutly maintains



Serve
Your
Guests
With
Our

American Beauty Beer

Or Our

"Old German Lager" Beer

The famous products that touch the spot

Phone Hyland 17 for a Case

Salt Lake Brewing Co.

5th So. and 10th East

WHEN ORDERING, SPECIFY

Castle Gate
or Clear Creek Coal

Good Coals None Better

Utah Fuel Company, Judge Bldg., City

In Selecting His Beverage

a man is governed mostly by its taste and flavor. Of course, he wants to know that it's pure and will not result in any harm to him, but, after that, it's the "taste"

FISHER BEER

is not only pure and harmless, but it "tastes good going down." Because we use a combination of hops, malt and water that is RIGHT, and we eliminate every danger of "off-tastes" by scrupulous care and cleanliness.

The Prize is IN THE BEER

A. Fisher Brewing Co., Salt Lake City