

A SPLENDID ADDRESS.

THE visit of Mr. and Mrs. Solomon Thatcher, Jr., of Chicago, will be pleasantly remembered by the people of Utah who were favored with their presence. The address delivered by the lady on Sunday evening in the Tabernacle was delivered in a manner that went to the hearts of her hearers and was spoken so distinctly that the vast congregation heard it from the first. Our readers can judge of the excellence of the ideas and the language because we publish it today in full, as reported by Prof. Willard Done for the *Contributor*.

The shabby treatment the lady received from the "Liberal" organ in its slurring notices of her address, is characteristic of that prejudiced sheet, and shows how a sojourner among us is treated unless the lady or gentleman drinks in the poison which it distills and avoids association with the majority of Utah's people.

We believe Mrs. Thatcher's visit will materially aid in the work needful to be done to give Utah proper representation at the World's Fair. Certainly the women of this Territory will be stirred up to increased activity and will be encouraged by her inspiring words.

As to the "sandwiching" of her address between two others, so viciously alluded to by the "Liberal" organ, it was arranged at the speaker's request, and was as satisfactory to her as to the audience, who listened with close interest to her eloquent remarks. The gifted lady and her whole-souled husband, himself a speaker of great ability, let for their beautiful home in Illinois Tuesday morning, June 7th, and we wish them God-speed and a pleasant journey.

AN EXHIBITION OF OFFICIAL FOLLY

FOLLY of the majority of the new City Council has been made fully manifest. The prosecution of a barber for doing business on Sunday has resulted in a conviction. The Commissioner trying the case declared the City Council to be as blamable as the defendant. They had no right to pass such a resolution as that which deceived the barber and led to his infraction of the law. The idea that because a number of men were elected to the City Council they could authorize people to violate the laws, appears too absurd for any one outside of a lunatic asylum to entertain. And that a majority of the "Liberal" members adopted and maintained it to the extent of formulating it into legislation, is evidence of their mental calibre and their unfitness for public office. But that is all of a piece with the policy of the faction they represent.

They may, however, offer as some excuse for their proceedings, the fact that the new city attorney actually framed for them an ordinance which went still further and authorized all barbers to keep open their places of business on Sundays. This in spite of the well known statute making such conduct a misdemeanor. But then he is a "Liberal" attorney and that may account for it all.

The Sunday shaving business is stopped, and the barbers, who almost

universally objected to being compelled to work on Sundays, can take the day of rest, which they need as much as anybody, in common with other workers, and without any fear that special favors will be granted to a class or special labors be required of them, and the action of the "Liberal" majority of the City Council stands out as a glaring absurdity.

A CUNNING SCHEME.

WE have already alluded to the suit planted in the Third District Court to restrain the Treasurer of Salt Lake City from paying the increase of salary voted to two of the city officials. Some astonishment has been expressed that Powers and Hiles should be engaged in a scheme to cut down the wages of two "Liberal" city officers. The inquiry is raised, what does it mean? The explanation is simple. The new City Council, after entering upon their duties and appointing their officers, proceeded to make a new schedule of salaries, cutting down a number and raising a few so as to equalize them a little more. But they were warned that this was illegal; that they could not do this during the incumbency of the officers by the men whom they had appointed. But there are men in that body who, as in the Sunday barbering case, seemed to think they were above all such restrictions as the law imposed in these matters. So they went ahead and did as they pleased. But the act for the incorporation of cities provides:

"The Mayor and Councilmen of any city shall receive such compensation as the City Council may by ordinance direct, but their compensation shall not be changed during their term of office; and all other officers may receive a salary, fee, or other compensation, to be fixed by ordinance; and after the same has been once fixed such fees or compensation shall not be increased or diminished to take effect during the term for which any such officer was elected or appointed."

This is plain enough, or ought to be, even for a "Liberal" Councilman. But the change was made after the officers were appointed and most of them kicked vigorously because it cut down their compensation. And here comes in the explanation of the movement to prevent the increase of salary of two officials. If the suit is gained the decision will work two ways, as it is said every good rule ought to do. If the Council cannot raise the compensation of these two officials it cannot cut down the salaries of the others. And it is believed that while the "Liberal" attorneys appear to be working in the interest of law and economy, they are really scheming to secure the full salaries to the officers whose compensation was cut down. Instead of a saving to the public it will be a loss. For while the two officers will lose their increase, all the others will be secured against decrease, and the result will be a loss to the city treasury of about \$1,700 a year.

This is very cunning, of course. We do not know how it will work. But if the City Council cannot accomplish the reform it started out to effect, having the purse-strings in its hand, it

will be because its members do not really want to make a change, or they have not as much gumption as their constituents supposed they had when voting for them.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

THE political situation is one of suspense. The country is watching the movements of the factions at Minneapolis with bated breath. Is it to be Harrison, or Blaine, or neither? That is the momentous question. The foregone conclusion of a month or two ago, that Blaine was emphatically out of the field, turns out to be a matter of doubt, after all, and this is what complicates affairs and disturbs all settled calculations.

That Blaine is not a candidate is firmly believed by everybody who understands the man and the party to which he belongs. That he would refuse the unanimous call of the party's representatives is considered unreasonable, in spite of the fact that he does not desire the position which would entail upon him labor and responsibilities from which he shrinks.

That Blaine is far more popular than Harrison cannot be denied. That he would stand a greater chance of election is open to debate. The President has conducted a respectable administration, and while he is not ardently loved by the Republican masses, he has maintained their respect, and he is strong in quarters where Blaine would be weak.

We do not believe there is any quarrel between these two prominent men. It looks more as if there was a fair understanding between them. Blaine is not to work for the place. Harrison is to have every opportunity for re-nomination. If he fails on the first or second ballot, then the way is to be clear without prejudice for Blaine, if the drift of sentiment shall run in his direction. This is how the matter seems to stand.

But it is not improbable that the President will show strength enough in the start to place him once more in the front. Notwithstanding the sport that has been made for the man of Maine, the foremost of Republicans, there are a great many delegates pledged for the President and, if it is seen that he runs close to the necessary number, many of the doubtful ones will go over to his side.

As to Blaine, he cannot consistently accept the nomination after his declination, unless it comes by acclamation or by such a majority as to make it clear that the party wants him beyond a doubt. There would be much enthusiasm for him and it would be very widespread, but it would not be universal and the result would by no means be sure.

It is possible that the rival factions will so disturb affairs that neither of these strong men will secure the nomination early in the fight. A dark horse may come to the front and be found a necessity. If so, we do not believe the party will be successful. Either Blaine or Harrison may carry the country; any other man, however worthy, will, in our opinion, fail in the field and leave the victory open to the Democrats.