

not four "Liberal" members in that Council? Are these gentlemen to be held up for censure on that account by this "Liberal" orator? What drivel will he pour forth next, when he sputters nonsense about the People's Party?

And "the people receive no value" for their taxes! Where does the revenue go, then? Has any City Councilor, "Liberal" or People's, pocketed the taxes? What about the regularly published reports of income and expenditures? Are not the taxpayers furnished with full accounts? It is a fact that the people here are more faithfully served at less cost than in any other municipality of the same size anywhere. The remuneration received by a City Councilor is the munificent sum of \$240 a year. Is not this a marvellous financial prize to struggle for?

And then there is the water question. It has been a great vexation. The "Liberal" way with it is to growl and stir up contention but throw no light upon it. The City officials are solving the problem, quietly but efficiently. But they have never said we have no right to complain or to criticize. The People's Party have held meetings for the purpose of hearing complaints and criticism. Therefore it is a direct falsehood to say they have declared that people have no right to discuss the matter or the acts of those who have expended public money.

It is not true that "Liberals" own more than half the real estate in this city. But if they do, they who own it are not those who take the stump and pour out villification and falsehood, and at the same time pose as pure and honorable, meek and truthful citizens. These are they whose names are not on the tax list at all, or if there they contribute so little to the revenue that the whole of it wouldn't pave a rod of street or lay a single sewer pipe.

The "Liberal" platform does not favor "equal rights to all." It proposes to take away every political right to every member of a particular church. Its influence has helped to do this in Idaho, its purpose is to do it in Utah. It is neither Republican nor Democratic, nor American in any sense. Its object is to place Utah in the hands of a few, that is fifteen persons, not answerable to or elected by the people, to make laws and prepare the way for a reign of spoliation and plunder. It means the extinction of local popular gov-

ernment and the establishment of local tyranny.

If the purposes of the "Liberal" party are infamous, the logic of its public apologists and supporters would be no less wicked were it not so weak. It is simply trash of the feeblest and most worthless kind. And any People's Party voter who can be caught with such miserable nonsense put into words, ought to go over to the "Liberal" party where he would be in congenial company, and his defection would be a strength to his former associates. We hope these "Liberal" orators will continue their remarks. If they do not help to wake up dilatory People's Party voters and stimulate them to come out and sustain their own ticket on election day, it will be simply because the sound thereof has failed to reach them. Go on with the tin pan tumult!

#### TIME'S VAGARIES.

THE "whirligig of time" brings about some very curious situations and conditions. Men at any intermediate point on the ladder of fortune or fame have oftentimes been brought to either end of it almost without previous notice, and those at either end have in like manner been transferred to the other.

We can think of no more striking case in recent times than that of ex-Governor Ross, of Kansas. A personal item in an eastern paper states that he is now employed as a printer in the office of the Santa Fe *New American*. He has been engaged in printing offices, in one capacity or another, for several years, and had about dropped out of sight, the mention referred to bringing him once more to the surface.

Those who think the condition represented in being an ex-Governor all there is of the story, are advised that that is not nearly half of it. Since he ceased being Governor he has been much higher than that; in fact, it seems as though the fates had made his flight higher in order that his fall might be greater. He was elected to the United States Senate by the Kansas Legislature during the war period, and while serving in that capacity was one of those who sat in judgment upon Andrew Johnson, then President of the United States. The Executive was impeached, and after a long and memorable trial the Senate came to a vote on the last article in the indictment, the eleventh. It was a Republican proceeding and the Re-

publicans had 42 out of 53 members; it looked like a hopeless case for Mr. Johnson, as only two-thirds were necessary for conviction and his adversaries had four-fifths; but like thunderbolts upon the stalwart element of the party came first one, then another Republican vote of "not guilty," until seven of them were thus recorded and making acquittal certain, the vote standing—for conviction 35, for acquittal 18.

The names of those who thus joined the Democrats were Doolittle of Wisconsin, Fessenden of Maine, Fowler of Tennessee, Grimes of Iowa, Henderson of Missouri, Ross of Kansas and Van Winkle of West Virginia. If any one of these had voted with his party the President would have been removed from office and the civil war that had recently closed been probably reopened or one founded on different lines have broken out. Since President-removing by impeachment was and still is an untried experiment in this country, no one can tell what might have happened, but it would certainly have caused great commotion at least.

Why, therefore, may we not say of Mr. Ross that, while standing at his case and picking up type at a small amount per 1000 ems, he is still the one who saved the nation from a second conflict, perhaps preserved its entirety and its standing among the nations of the earth?

#### TRULY TERRIBLE.

WAR in its best estate is bad enough, but its horrors can be and frequently are augmented beyond anything that the situation calls for or humanity can tolerate. The manner in which the Soudanese dervishes are occasionally fought by the followers of the Khedive is an awful example.

A large body of the former were recently driven from the interior country to the Nile, by want of water, which latter the Egyptians were zealously guarding. The Mahdists were not allowed to approach the stream, and one by one they dropped to the barren sand and perished of thirst in full view of the live-giving fluid. Women and children who were sent to the river to procure water were, strangely enough, not fired upon as the men were, but they were taken prisoners and not permitted to return to their people.

Neither the English soldiers nor those of the Khedive seem to make much headway against the dervishes