

## MUCH PUBLIC SPIRIT.

It is stated that a syndicate is moving to prevail upon the government to establish the proposed public building in the eastern part of the city, and for the attainment of that object has dispatched an agent to Washington. It is asserted that a part of the scheme is to induce Congress to wipe out the Industrial Home and use the building as a portion of the intended government structure. By this means the proposed appropriation could be materially reduced.

This proposal causes great commotion in the breasts of a certain coterie among the active politicians of this city. They are determined to fight the proposal of the selfish syndicate to the bitter end. This opposition is alleged to be inaugurated on several grounds, which it may be interesting to make a note of.

A basis for contention against the scheme of the syndicate is that "It was known in advance that it would be fought with all the power that slumbers in the Mormon Church; it" (the Industrial Home) "was built as a railroad is sometimes built into the wilderness, not for what it would do at once, but for the business which its presence would eventually build up." No effort of the Church was ever put forth to defeat the establishment of the institution in question, even if the sentiments of this journal be taken on the subject as that of the Church. The News, never offered an objection to the inauguration of the Home, but did most decidedly object to the depraved and conscienceless course taken in the effort to obtain the Congressional appropriation. Slandorous falsehoods were used to deceive Congress into making it, and numbers of those fabrications were refuted by officers under the United States Government and were published in the *Congressional Record* as well as in local papers of this Territory. Neither was the appropriation asked for on the ground of future benefits or usefulness, the record showing the claim of urgency in every phase. It was represented that large numbers of people of the class it was intended to benefit—the plural wives and their minor children of polygamists rendered destitute by the operations of the anti-polygamy laws—existed and were ready to rush into such an asylum. The evidence of this gigantic falsehood existed in the fact that, if we recollect aright, the highest number

of inmates of the institution at one time since its establishment has been nine, more or less.

The opponents of the syndicate are distressed at the bare thought of the Home being, by the new proposal, placed in the light of a failure. This would result in "damaged reputations." We admit that it goes a long way towards proving the instigators and promoters of the institution to be the leading prevaricators of the nineteenth century, a position the News placed them in at the time the appropriation was asked for and when the disgusting squabble subsequently ensued over the question of who should manipulate the fund.

The opponents of the latest scheme are also worked up for the welfare of the "many thousands of people yet to be accommodated." Their philanthropic souls are agitated into a condition of fermentation in relation to future beneficiaries, when the nine shall be indefinitely and enormously multiplied.

Such far-sighted benevolence is seldom met with, being sufficiently deep to be tinged with pathos. It is perhaps just a little marred with the expressed fear of "damaged reputations," and that engendered by the possibility of a public building being located at a point distant from a situation more "devoutly to be wished."

Notwithstanding all this, we also are opposed to the proposition of the syndicate on a good many grounds. The Home should not be interfered with, and its absorption by the proposed government structure would be a mistake. The appeal to the stingy side of the government—the plea of reducing the appropriation—is small business. We cannot have too many government edifices, and instead of being opposed to them we would like to see them as thick in this city as postage stamps on a letter from the Orient. So far as relates to us, we would not object if the town were plastered all over with public structures. Anybody who imagines he can get ahead of us in desiring to see them planted here will have to get up early in the morning to formulate estimates of the number and magnitude of the edifices of that character he would like to see erected.

Like the opponents of the scheme of the syndicate, we not only object to any reduction of the possible number of public buildings, but are somewhat particular as to their location. Consequently the News must oppose the

establishment in the suburbs of the one shortly to be built. It would look like a scheme to increase the business of street car companies, livery stables and shoe-making establishments to have the site so far from the business centre of the city as the syndicate desires. We propose to stand by this position, but do not care to mix it with simulated philanthropy pointed toward future generations, nor with "damaged reputations," especially when in some cases the latter operation is a practical impossibility.

## THE PROPER PROCEDURE.

THE question has been asked, in connection with our article of Feb. 19th on the organization of the new City Council, what should have been the procedure? We will endeavor to reply, and to incidentally show the difference between what was and what should have been done, and the principles of law and justice involved. The members of a legislative body, consisting of representatives of the people, elected by the people, comprise the mass of the community, in a certain sense. They are the people in a condensed form. Now the people are presumed to know whom they have chosen to make the laws, and they have a right to determine the claims of every man pretending to such power. No single official, no one man, no matter what his office may be, has a right to take from the people the privilege of judging whom they have chosen as their lawmakers. This is the philosophy which underlies the rule that makes parliamentary bodies the judges of the election and qualification of their own members. In other words, the rule makes the people the judges as to whom they have elected to legislate for them. True, questions of this character are often carried into and determined by the courts; but the rule must first be applied and exhausted without producing a satisfactory result. Indeed the courts merely define and enforce the rule.

The procedure in organizing a newly elected legislative body must be of a character to conform to the above doctrine; otherwise the validity, or at least the regularity, of the organization is open to question. Almost any programme which recognizes these principles would be unobjectionable so long as it allowed the body to determine who should be seated. Not until this has been done can the members properly take the oath of office.