portion of First East street to be affected, expecting that it would become a business street, urged the establishment of the present grade and petitioned for it to the City Council. Among them was one of the present claimants for damages, who did not at the time understand what the charge involved.

The City Engineer, then, has simply carried out the instructions of the Council, or the Board of Public Works, and while he thinks the present grade is better in some respects than the one he first proposed, is not responsible for the damage to residence property and to the Theatre nor for any of the consequences of the work. He thinks, however, that if business houses are established in that locality, a change will have to be made in the grade, for while teams can travel well enough up and down the hill, yet when drays and heavy wagons are turned and backed up to places to unload, they will be liable in winter, particularly if asphaltum is used for paving, to slide down hill, loads, teams and all.

In grading the streets and sidewalks the future as well as the present must be somewhat considered. But also, as we think, the natural conformation of the land in the locality should be regarded, and rigid lines and levels should not be adhered to in every case. There are places in town where the elevations and depressions that have been made seem utterly absurd and detrimental to public convenience. It may be that the Council and not the Engineer is also responsible for those conditions. In the case of State street it is clear that any reflection upon the latter is undeserved, and we take pleasure in making this explanation.

A WRONG POSITION.

AT the regular session of the City Council, October 20th, the question of the passage of the proposed ordinance providing for the abolition of the office of Captain of Police, was laid over for the ostensible—not real—purpose of making it the order for a special meeting to be held last evening. On Tuesday evening the point was raised by the opponents of the ordinance as to whether Councilman Pickard could, while occupying the office of Acting Mayor, in the absence of Mr. Scott, act in the capacity he was originally elected by the people to fill, by voting. He had announced himself as in favor of the ordinance, and as there were seven others occupying the same position regarding it, his vote was necessary to the success of the measure. The City Attorney, on being appealed to for his opinion, expressed himself in favor of the view that Mr. Pickard could vote, a similar question, involving the same principle, having been so decided in Congress, whose action, as the chief representative body of the nation, was good authority. Mr. Pickard, even with this support, declined to exercise his councilman's prerogative.

The object of the delay is perfectly clear. The "Liberal" opponents of the ordinance remained away from last night's meeting. As a consequence there were only seven members present exclusive of the Acting Mayor. The fate of the ordinance was thus in the hands of Mr. Pickard. It takes eight members to constitute a quorum. In the event of that gentleman declining to consider himself in the light of a representative of his constituency and insisting that he was a member of the Council, no business could be transacted. He took that position, and nothing was done. The City Attorney rather receded from his position of Tuesday, by throwing a doubt upon the correctness of the opinion he then expressed as to the ability of the Acting Mayor to vote in the capacity of councilman.

It appears to have been understood by the "Liberal" obstructionists that Councilman Smith, who favors the ordinance, was under the necessity of leaving the city by train at a late hour last night, thus preventing the possibility of passing the ordinance. The measure had only a majority of one in its favor, including Mr. Smith. Hence it cannot be passed until his return, and it is questionable whether it could be then, as Mr. Pickard appears to be an "uncertain quantity."

The point raised on this issue ought to be definitely settled. It involves a vital principle—the right of popular representation. If the position assumed by the "Liberal" obstructionists is held to be correct, it amounts to asserting that the popular will can be properly thwarted. If, for instance, a mayor of a city should, during a lengthy period, for any purpose, fail or refuse to perform the duties of his office, and a member of the council should be elected by that body to act in his stead, what would be the result if the *pro tem.* official should be deprived of his membership and of his vote? Simply, that the people who elected him to his original position would be peremptorily deprived of representation. So far as concerned the popular rights involved it would amount to a nullification of the election. Such a doctrine under a republican form of government is an absurdity and self-evidently wrong. Under our system nothing ought to be so jealously guarded as the right of the people to representation. Any position which tends to defeat the popular will, expressed at the ballot box, must be wrong in principle, being opposed to the entire genius of the institutions of the country.

GUARD THE YOUNG.

THE case of Worff, the Pleasant Green teacher, held to answer to the grand jury a few days ago, on a charge of committing a criminal assault upon one of his pupils, a young lady of sixteen years, is exceedingly suggestive. It is stated that, in addition to the outrage with which the fellow is charged before the courts, he made indecent advances to a number of other girl students of his school, and that some of them refused to longer attend while he occupied the position as teacher. The very idea of such a terrible danger as the case implies, fills the mind of every consistent parent with horror. It is no small matter to be compelled to admit that a public school is liable to become a pitfall for the feet of young and innocent girls, and it is natural to cast about for some cause for the Pleasant Green situation. Was there any carelessness on the part of any individual, official or otherwise, connected with the engagement of this fellow, whom there appears to be good reason for believing to be a moral monster of the most hideous type?

An inquiry has elicited, from a reliable source, the following information, and the public can put their own construction upon it as to the location and degree of responsibility it implies: Worff is a comparative stranger in Utah and never taught in any school here until he was employed at Pleasant Green. Notwithstanding this he held a first-class certificate from Territorial School Commissioner Boreman. He never appeared before the Board of Examiners for Salt Lake County, they being in ignorance concerning him. He was employed by the district trustees without having a certificate of examination from the board and without consultation with the county superintendent. It is presumable that his employment was based solely on the ground of the commissioner's certificate and the applicant's personal plausibility.

We hope that this case will deeply impress the minds of all persons on whom devolves any responsibility in the matter of engaging teachers for our schools, with the necessity of exercising the most scrupulous care. So far as we can learn, it appears that the county board of examiners and the superintendent were not to blame in this most regrettable instance.