

of the South Pacific, and makes the fact of increasing English investments in the Sandwich Islands take on a very significant aspect. Meantime, the news will doubtless grow in interest from day to day and will be looked for with corresponding anxiety.

THE CHICAGO SCANDAL.

WE HAVE published something regarding the charges of corruption, collusion with thieves, etc., made by the *Times* against Inspector Bonfield and Captain Schaack, and the criminal suits and suits for libel brought against J. J. West and J. R. Dunlop, editors of the paper named. The two last mentioned gentlemen were taken before a magistrate for preliminary investigation on the charge of criminal libel, but both waived examination, and were held to the grand jury. This has caused Mr. Bonfield and Captain Schaack to ask that the whole subject be referred to an extraordinary court, improvised for the purpose. They have given to the public, through the papers, the following open letter:

"Chicago, Ills.—*To the Public:* The charges of official corruption made by a sensational morning newspaper against myself and Capt. Michael J. Schaack are of such a nature as to demand an immediate and searching inquiry.

"The police in all large communities are, or should be, the bulwark that stands between the lawabiding citizens and the evil-doers of all classes, and if they (the police) are charged with being corrupt, bribe-takers, or being in collusion with the criminal classes, then an emergency exists which should secure an immediate investigation as to the truth or falsity of those charges.

"I cannot, neither can the people whose lives and property are entrusted to our care, afford to wait until the courts decide as to the truth or falsity of those libels.

"The individuals making these charges in this newspaper have this day waived an examination which would have disclosed the real truth, and have thus prevented an immediate determination of the question.

"It will be months before the cases can be heard if allowed to take their regular course, and until a decision is given doubt will perhaps be in the minds of many good citizens as to whether those charges are true or false.

"Taking the above facts into consideration, I would suggest a remedy. Let the case be brought, with the consent of both parties, before a bench of three judges of the circuit court, to be named by all the judges of that court, who could hear all the evidence in a few days.

"If their decision, or that of two of them, has the effect of sustaining any one of the charges of receiving

stolen property, or assisting or colluding or conniving with any member of the police force in receiving or concealing stolen property, or in attempting in any way to suppress any evidence of such receiving by any member of the police or any other person; or of any collusion with gamblers or any other criminal class, or any criminal, or of any taking of bribes or bribe under any guise; or of any dishonesty or any dishonest act or action in my official position—then I will at once dismiss each and every civil suit in which I am plaintiff now pending in the Circuit court against the paper and its editors referred to and retire into deserved oblivion.

"Respectfully yours,

"JOHN BONFIELD."

"I have this day sent to the newspaper referred to and members of its editorial staff a communication embodying the foregoing suggestions as a definite proposition.

"JOHN BONFIELD."

"I join in the above letter, as I have joined in the communication to the newspaper above referred to and members of its editorial staff."

"MICHAEL J. SCHAACK."

On being interrogated on the subject Mr. West characterized this offer as a silly attempt to force the *Times* to show its hand, that the police authorities called in question might be able to destroy the force of the proofs it possessed.

THE OGDEN ELECTION.

OGDEN'S municipal election takes place on the 11th of next month, when a full set of city officers will be chosen. The voting will be *en masse* of course, under the ruling of Judge Henderson and the subsequent affirmatory ruling of the Supreme Court, though the intent of the law appears to us to be plainly otherwise—that is, to have the balloting by wards and thus give whichever party might be in the minority some representation, or a chance for it. As the case stands now, one of the two organizations will take everything unless there should be some extensive "scratching" one way or another—a thing that is scarcely probable when there are no votes to spare.

The "Liberals" propose to be first in the field, and to that end will hold a convention on Tuesday next to nominate candidates to be voted for. But being early on the scene is by no means a precursor of success, as the disastrous defeat of the Democratic party on the 6th of last November amply attests. We believe the People's party are in the majority in the Junction City, and that they have only to put up their best men and then give them a solid

vote to insure success. It will doubtless be a hotly contested election and will attract more attention at home and abroad than any other ever held there.

ANTICIPATED DECISION.

AN OBSERVER of human character is often amused as well as interested in noting the streaks of fat and lean which run through certain individualities. Men are often bright in one or two directions and decidedly asinine in others. We were reminded of this the other day when scanning an article in a virulent anti-"Mormon" local contemporary. It purported to give a *resume* of a letter from Mr. Moccasin McBride in which the writer was supposed to give an account of the work done by himself and his fellow anti-State lobbyists in Washington. The statement of the account embodied in the letter suddenly broke off in the form of this quotation from it:

"I listened to the argument in the Supreme Court on the Church appeal case. Solicitor-General Jenks, in addition to the legal argument, touched upon the Mormon application for statehood, and made his position very clear. He made a most lawyer-like argument on the main question, and I feel sure that the judgment will be affirmed. I never took much stock in this Church case, but Jenks's argument was such that I have no doubt of the result."

It is in that paragraph where the asininity crops out with special prominence. "I never took much stock in this church case, but Jenks's argument was such that I have no doubt as to the result." In the name of common sense, what does that mean? According to the ordinary interpretation of English, simply this: "I never took much stock in this church case because it is illegal and wrong." What else could such an expression signify, coming from a lawyer? There is nothing in the repudiating statement that would indicate that Mr. McBride had changed his views in regard to the merits of the case; consequently his anticipation of a decision confirming that of the court below is not based upon the legal status of the suit, but upon the intrinsic value of "Jenks's argument." This is not flattering to the court.

It is not made clear by Mr. McBride what portion of "Jenks's argument" his anticipated decision of the Supreme Court will be founded upon; whether it will be upon his elucidation of points on the application for statehood, regarding