

ment of Jews those institutions would speedily become the minor rather than the major machineries of our judicial and social order. I thank God that it is not the part of true Christianity to emphasize prejudice against and inaugurate persecutions of the Jews, but it is rather to break down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles and finally bring both to the one baptism, one faith and one Lord. As a humble minister of that Christianity I stand always to share the blessings of the age, the country and the constitution with the Jews, and to partake with them in the battle against silly traditional prejudices and all other forms of petty and un-Christian ostracism.

"To say the least of it, in the United States of America, however it may be in Russia or elsewhere, it is unpatriotic, unjust and almost unpardonable to drag these gangrened methods of speech, influence and competition into the arena of business life. If you cannot compete with the Jew without such aid, then do not curse him, but go into some other business wherein you will not encounter his vigilance, diligence and enterprise. At any rate, such a change of business might free you from the necessity of mailing abroad these ungentle and un-American postal cards and of being robbed of your diamonds in such manner as to obtain a widespread advertisement."

If Small would practice toward the "Mormons," what he preaches as to the Jews, he would be benefitted by his own remarks and might appear a little more consistent. We hope to see him still further improve.

THE SIDEWALK AND PAVING QUESTION.

"The public seems to have misunderstood the object of the ordinance recently introduced by the street committee and passed by the Council creating paving districts," said Councilor Wantland yesterday. "It is true that the paving districts created cover the entire city, but it does not follow that paving will be ordered. The idea of such a measure is merely to save work when, at any time in the future, paving may be requested by those who will have to pay for it. The Council cannot order any paving done except under the law. There must be a request from a majority of the taxpayers. The same objection has been made to the Council creating such large sewer districts, and the same answer can be made to this."

We clip the foregoing from a morning contemporary. If the Councilor made the statement that the City Council "cannot order any paving done" without "a request from a majority of the taxpayers" he is very ignorant of the law in relation to the matter. This may be the case, as some of the gentlemen chosen by "Liberal" votes to govern the city cannot be accused of an intimate acquaintance with the territorial statutes or the municipal ordinances. But it may be a mistake of the reporter's without any intention to misquote the Councilor.

It is necessary, however, that the public should clearly understand this matter so that they may not be caught napping. The City Council need not wait for a request from a majority of the taxpayers before proceeding to order paving to be done or sidewalks to be laid or sewers to be constructed.

Under the act of March 13, 1890, the City Councils, in cities of the first and second class, may lay out, establish, open, alter, extend, widen and improve streets, alleys, avenues, side-walks, parks and public grounds," grade, curb and gutter, park, improve and repair in any manner they may deem proper, any park, street avenue or alley within the limits of the city," and construct and repair sidewalks of such material and in such manner as they may deem proper and necessary, and to levy and collect special taxes and assessments upon the blocks, lots or parts thereof to be benefited, to create suitable paving districts and assess special taxes therein; to levy special taxes for the cost of constructing or reconstructing sewers or drains; also to issue bonds for paving, curbing and guttering streets and alleys under specified restrictions. All this without any request from taxpayers. Salt Lake City is a city of the first class.

But this saving section is placed in the law, and it was to that we directed the attention of property owners in former notices of this subject:

"Sec. 13. In all cases before the levy of any taxes for any such improvements provided for in this act, the City Council shall give notice of intention to levy said taxes naming the purposes for which the taxes are to be levied, which notice shall be published at least twenty days in a newspaper published within such city. Such notice shall describe the improvements so proposed, the boundaries of the district to be affected or benefited by such improvements; the estimated cost of such improvements and designate the time set for such hearing. If at or before the time so fixed written objections to such improvements signed by the owners of one-half of the front feet abutting upon that portion of the street, lane, avenue or alley to be so improved be not filed with the recorder, the Council shall be deemed to have acquired jurisdiction to order the making of such improvements."

It will be seen that this is the very reverse of the statement of the City Councilor. When the announcement is made that a certain district is to be paved, or sidewalks or sewers are to be constructed therein, the property owners in the district should arrive at a common understanding of what they want, and if the owners of half the front feet abutting on the proposed improvement do not want it, they can stop the action of the Council, by written protest filed with the City Recorder within the time specified in the notice of the Council's intention.

The act of 1888 provided "the owners of one-half in value" of the property to be benefited should sign the protest, but the act of 1890 changed this to "the owners of one-half of the front feet abutting upon the street, lane, avenue or alley to be so improved."

When the notice of the intention of the Council is published will be time enough for the taxpayers to take action.

Mrs. Viola Fuller, of Mitchell, S. D., has applied for space in the Woman's building for a unique and beautiful opera cloak, the only one of its kind existing. The garment, which is fifty-seven inches in length, and circular in design, is composed entirely of certain small and particularly delicate feathers of prairie chickens.

THE COINAGE QUESTION AGAIN.

We give place today to a communication on silver from an old politician who has been familiar with public question for over half a century. With most of his propositions we are in accord. We think the demonitization of silver in 1873 was a blunder, and that the scheme was a trick designed to deceive Congress and enrich speculators in gold, but we believe Congress had constitutional power to make either a single or double standard, and that the question is one of policy, expediency and public necessity rather than of constitutional validity.

We think our friend has not clearly expressed his meaning when he says that our money "ought not to be so regulated" as to be made available as money in other countries." What possible objection can there be to that? If United States money passes current in Europe who will be injured? We agree that silver should not be merely an article of merchandise but ought to be restored to its place as money, but why it should not be received as money abroad as well as at home we fail to understand.

We would not dispute his statement that under the Constitution it is not a "duty" of Congress "to consult the wishes of other governments in regard to the kinds of coin" to be provided, but in any matter which can be better arranged with the concurrence of other governments, is it not better to consult than to ignore them? Again it is a matter of sound policy rather than of imperative duty. And since the opposers of the restoration of silver, claim that the question has important international bearings and the goldites are a great power in politics, is it not the part of wisdom to encourage an international conference at which the silver advocates can present their strong reasons, rather than to oppose it, or ignore it, or continue only on a line of policy that does not give any present promise of success?

On the necessity of placing silver in its proper place as money we have nothing to offer at variance with our friend's statements and argument. But as to the point on which he seems to think we have erred concerning its coinage, we are of the opinion that he succeeds in proving that we were right. We said Congress had not refused to "coin silver and regulate its value," and while he takes the ground that Congress has so refused, he goes on to show that silver has been coined, that its value has been regulated; and that a great deal of the white metal is in circulation as coin issued by the government nobody can reasonably dispute. What he probably means is *unlimited* coinage, or the placing of silver at a certain ratio side by side with gold at money, but that is another thing, and that cannot be established as a "duty" of Congress under the Constitution, though we agree with him that it ought to be done.

We do not care to open the "green-back" question. We regard the idea of "flat" money with no intrinsic value behind it as a financial heresy. And as it has passed for the present from the sphere of national issues, and ought not to be mixed up with the