

from which the American Union developed was first begotten in Holland when the Dutch Republic was established. The number of Flemish refugees that settled in England during the persecution under Philip II, disseminated in that country the principles of the Puritan and Pilgrim fathers, and it was this spirit which ultimately materialized in our republic.

At the close of the lecture Mr. George Goddard sang "Hard Times Come Again No More." The genial old gentleman was introduced by Mr. Ellis as "an old boy—not the old boy—but a man who had carried his boyhood with him through life; who would carry it with him through the grave, and who would enter the great hereafter singing 'Hard Times Come Again No More.'" The song was highly appreciated by the audience, many of whom joined in singing the chorus.

The lecture for next Sunday night was announced as a commentary on American Political Parties with some attention to the present Democratic and Republican parties.

Mr. Ellis was suffering from an attack of pleurisy and spoke at times under serious difficulty. He made a suggestion in regard to the duty of the honest voters of the city in the approaching election that was received with great applause. But his closing word to the present legislature brought the house down in great shape. If any of the legislators were present they could not fail to get a hint as to the wishes of the large audience assembled.

Although the night was extremely cold outside, the Theatre was almost too warm. It was announced that Mr. Thomas, with the Cambrian Glee Club, would sing next Sunday night.

THE TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE.

COUNCIL.

Council met at 2 p.m. today in the City Hall, the same quarters the assembly has occupied at each succeeding session for many years.

Ex-chief Clerk F. J. Cannon called the Council to order and read the certified list of members prepared by the Secretary of the Territory, and the proceedings of the legislative council of the Thirtieth Utah Legislature commenced.

At roll call all the members except Evans of Ogden, Glendenning of Salt Lake, and King of Provo, responded.

On motion a committee, consisting of Lund and Baskin, were appointed to wait upon the Secretary and inform him that the members were ready to be sworn in.

Pending the arrival of the secretary, the members, by ballot, selected their seats.

The Secretary having entered the council chamber, the members stood in a circle and the oath was administered to them by that official.

King and Evans, at this juncture, entered the council chamber, and the oath was taken by them.

Melville moved that a permanent organization be effected. Carried.

Owing to the fact that a caucus had been held by the Democratic members of the Council, at which the officers

had been agreed upon, the process of organization was brief.

The ballot for President of the Council resulted in the election of King, by a majority over Baskin of one, which was subsequently made unanimous.

King thanked the members for this mark of their esteem and said he would endeavor to preside with dignity and honor over the labors of the present Council.

J. W. McNutt, of Ogden, was elected chief clerk.

George Havercamp, of Provo, was installed as enrolling and engrossing clerk.

Sergeant-at-Arms—I. N. Hinkley, Jr., of Fillmore.

John Montgomery, of Salt Lake, messenger.

Watchman—Geo. R. Chase.

Chaplain—C. C. Shaw, of Cache county.

THE HOUSE.

The House was called to order at 2 p.m. by R. S. Campbell, Chief Clerk of the preceding House, who read the list of members elect.

Sargent moved the acceptance of the report as showing prima facie the membership of the body. Adopted.

The roll was called, all the members answering but Lawrence, Olsen and Pike. The first and last named came in subsequently, and on motion of Pierce, Secretary Sells was called in and the members were sworn in. They then signed the oath—the Edmunds-Tucker.

Organization being next in order, Pierce nominated for Speaker E. P. Ferry. Sargent nominated W. H. Seegmiller. The roll was called. Ferry voted for Kimball and Seegmiller did not vote, the result being—Seegmiller 14, Ferry 7, Kimball 1. Seegmiller was escorted to the chair by Sargent and Pierce. On taking the chair the Speaker returned his thanks and spoke very briefly, after which the election of a Chief Clerk was proceeded with.

Kimball nominated Clarence W. Hall, Mackey nominated J. R. Letcher. The result was Letcher was elected, 14 to 8—a strict party vote.

The Speaker announced as the next thing in order the election of a minute clerk, whereupon Kimball raised the point of order that there was no such office.

The Speaker held the point well taken, and the House proceeded to the election of a sergeant-at-arms. Moritz nominated J. J. Greenwald, Wright nominated N. W. Crookston, of Logan. The ballot resulted as before, 14 to 8 in favor of Crookston.

For enrolling clerk, John Boyden was nominated by Show and Kenner Boreman by W. H. Irvine; 14 to 8 in favor of Boyden.

For Watchman—J. W. Judd, nominated by Tuttle; H. W. Nichols, Jr., by Lawrence. The latter said he had once held the position and could recommend his candidate as being thoroughly qualified. Judd was elected, 14 to 8.

For Messenger—Colton nominated N. G. Kimball; Pike nominated J. M. Hanson. Eight to 14 in favor of Hanson.

The strict party voting was broken into for the first time in electing a chaplain. Terry, in a short speech, in which he commended his nominee but said the latter did not dream he

was the choice of the minority, named John Henry Smith. (Laughter and applause). Adams nominated D. Matthieson, of Iron County. On the vote being taken Marshall voted for Matthieson and Wright for Smith, the result being the same as before—Matthieson 14, Smith 8.

This concluded the organization except for minute clerk.

THE COMING ELECTION.

The city election is approaching and so far no action is being taken by any of the parties towards the issuing of notices for primaries, conventions, etc. Only some four weeks intervene, and this most important election will take place, when the voters will declare who shall govern the affairs of our large and rapidly growing city. What is the reason of so much apparent indifference in relation to such an important matter? Have the masses had a surfeit of politics as they have been conducted the past year or two? Two years ago it will be remembered that an exhaustive and thorough campaign was made by the "Liberals" on the one side and the People on the other. Since then a revolution has taken place in local affairs. The People's party has disbanded and the members have allied themselves, some with the Republican party and some with the Democratic party. But the "Liberals" have not disbanded. They adhere as a body, compact and aggressive as ever. Under the circumstances, are there any hopes for either of the national parties being able to wrest the government of the city from the hands of the party of wilful extravagance, glaring incompetence and fraud? With the "Liberals" united, exercising their tenure of office mainly in view as to how much can be made out of it, apparently responsible to none in their extravagance and squandering of the high taxes imposed upon the people, they still seem likely to secure another two-years' term, with this probable difference—that this time they may, by extensive jobbery and frauds, capture the entire city. The Third and Fourth precincts have battled nobly in the past in opposing the party of corruption, and that, too, successfully; but with the "Liberals" colonization that has been and is now going on, they may possibly fail in ability to resist any longer the encroachments of the enemy.

In a crisis of this nature, what is the duty of the citizen? Shall he yield to party and sacrifice his best interests? There are those who say that come what may, "win or lose," we must go into the battle as a Democratic party with a purely and strictly Democratic ticket. In my opinion the Democratic party have as much hope of winning the February election as of being able to make sugar out of salt. Is not this understanding the cause of such lukewarmness and indifference among the people in regard to the most important of all elections? Do they not see that to enter the contest with any than a combined ticket of the two parties is to lose the battle? Have we advanced so far as partisans that we as a community cannot adopt a citizens' ticket? The welfare of our city demands it. The extravagance and in-