

State as a whole is concerned, it need not feel hopeless or depressed on account of silver; it contains vast deposits of gold, and limitless resources of various kinds which offer the richest returns to the capital and labor that will develop them. Silver is a great big industry and problem; but with it or without it Utah is all right!

THE WARM SPRINGS LEASE.

The proceedings of the City Council in relation to the Warm Springs lease form a specially interesting episode at this time, to taxpayers particularly, with whom it should have great weight. The situation in brief is: The present lessees of the Warm Springs property are under contract to pay the city \$1,200 per year rental for nine years to come—an aggregate of \$10,800. They complained that their business had fallen off, and asked a reduction of rent to \$50 per month for the rest of the period of the lease—practically a throw-off of \$5,400. Then they asked an extension of the lease for five years from 1906, at \$100 per month. This matter was referred to a committee, and last Tuesday evening a favorable report was made on the petition.

Now comes the point: When the report of the committee was read, it was brief and in such form that it could be passed by one not alert for a "job" on the city. But as the report was about to be voted on, Councilman Callister objected. He wanted a week's time to look into the matter. He did not believe any business man would donate \$5,400 to the lessees under such circumstances, and did not think it proper policy for the city to do so. If the lessees were losing money, he was willing to be lenient, but wanted time to look into the matter before voting the people's money away on such a proposition. Councilman Romney took a similar position, and made a similar request. But the report was adopted, four only voting against it.

But the action of Messrs. Callister and Romney has had its effect. It has drawn attention to the matter. If these two councilmen—the only members of the present Council nominated on the Non-Partisan ticket for re-election, and typical of the entire Non-Partisan ticket—if these two councilmen had not detected and resisted the report, it would have gone through without objection, and the consequence on the coming up of the lease would have been to deprive the city treasury of \$5,400. These two gentlemen only asked a brief time to investigate, and there were but two others of the Council who were willing to grant the request. Among those who voted to refuse them the opportunity for investigation by deferring consideration of the report for one week was the member of the Council who is now a candidate for Mayor on one of the partisan tickets.

Without any reflection upon the lessees of the Warm Springs, it may be said that the cutting down of the rental for nine years is one of the boldest pieces of work that has been attempted in the present Council. Of course the lessees want to get the best terms they can; and if the present rental is excessive, the city may, perhaps, properly reduce it. But would any business man, without a second thought, give the proposed reduction, a clear \$5,400? The lessees wanted the Springs for five years more at the old rate. Their saving in rent, and interest thereon compounded annually during the time when the rent was to be cut in two, would be close

to \$7,500. The entire five years' extension would cost \$6,000. Hence they were to get the extension of five years for nothing, and a bonus beside. Is that good business policy? Can the city afford to conduct its operations on that line? It might have been all right to reduce the rental for a year or so, to see how the lessees could make it, but not to the extent of cutting it in two, as proposed.

But it would be an outrage to reduce it fifty per cent for the entire period of the nine years, and then give the lessees another five years' control. No competent business man would think of such a policy in his own affairs. As for the city, it would be far better all around if the municipality should take the Springs and run them at actual cost for baths. That would be a benefit to the public, not a scheme to fleece it.

This incident gives an illustration of the character of the nominees on the non-partisan ticket, and their active interest in promoting and caring for the public welfare; and it is also an illustration of the loose—not to say worse—methods of some partisans in attempting to railroad a measure through the Council without permitting it to be carefully scrutinized. Of course the proposition is not likely to prevail now it is exposed. But the voters can all take a lesson as to where their interests are most carefully and efficiently preserved.

NOT VERY CIVIL SERVICE.

Criticism of Hon. Ben Butterworth for stumping around New York in the interest of one of the partisan candidates for mayor, when he is paid by the government and is supposed to be at his office in Washington as commissioner of patents, is by no means confined to the papers that are on the opposing side politically; some of the cleanest and most influential representatives of the Republican press attack him savagely for setting an example of pernicious political activity which all rules of the civil service, to say nothing of good taste, forbid in office-holders of lesser prominence. It is suggested that as chief of a great public department which has an army of employees, he is establishing a precedent that may prove vexing at a later day, and one which he at least cannot consistently appeal to in any attempt to improve the methods that all recent legislation has been endeavoring to correct.

With apologies to Mr. Butterworth for mentioning in the same breath a similar case in this city, it is proper once more to call attention to the high-sounding pledge upon which the county clerk of Salt Lake county was wafted into office last year, and the contemptuous disregard of that pledge by that official. All will remember how strenuously it was preached and promised that the party intended its nominees, if the dear people would only elect them, to do the work of the offices themselves—the deputy evil was going to be done away; and it was stated as plainly as it was possible to make it that a candidate on that ticket who received the nomination would guarantee personal and undivided attention to the duties required. Yet the exploits of County Clerk Dunbar as a political manager are before the community. He had hardly managed to warm the seat of clerk until he took a vacation and plunged into the management of a senatorial campaign, losing the contest of course; and, hardly has he patched up the old wounds received in that tussle than here he comes again as managing the city campaign for one

of the political parties. Pledges are thrown to the winds, deputies are doing the work of the clerk's office (we make no charge that they are doing it poorly), while Mr. Dunbar lives in a riotous whirl of brass band music and partisan oratory.

What do the people think of that kind of an officeholder anyway? Don't they imagine they have a right to suggest for the future that inasmuch as Mr. Dunbar seems to like to work for office for somebody else rather than do the work of an office secured by himself, he hereafter confine his shining talent to the former field? Many a smarter man than he has come to grief through trying to ride too many horses at one time.

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

Much is said now-a-days about the unequal, unjust and dangerous distribution of wealth. The theme is a hackneyed one among socialists and would-be reformers, and is a chief justification urged by anarchists in favor of their doctrines and measures. But it is a question that has more than one phase, each of which ought to be considered if a just and well-balanced judgment is to be formed.

Statements frequently appear in the newspapers and magazines to the effect that a few men control a large part of the aggregate wealth of this country, and the refrain of such assertions is usually: "The rich are growing richer and the poor poorer." A short time ago, on the occasion of the dedication of the Bradley Polytechnic Institute at Chicago, Hon. Lyman J. Gage, secretary of the United States treasury, and a man of great wealth, delivered an address in which he treated some phases of the subject of the distribution of wealth not often considered by popular writers and speakers. In reply to a statement by a Kansas orator that "no man can acquire \$100,000 in a long life time, unless he does it by robbery," Mr. Gage reasoned as follows:

"About the year 1770 Arkwright and Hargreaves invented machinery for spinning cotton. Within a period of 25 years the product of the spindle in Great Britain had increased from about 4,500,000 pounds a year to 37,000,000 pounds. The number of persons engaged in that occupation had doubled, the annual output had been multiplied by eight, the cost of spinning per pound had diminished more than four-fifths, while the earnings of operators for the same number of hours had substantially increased. It is impossible to measure the value to society of these men, nor can any money reward be named which would have been an over payment for their services.

"In the last century a Mr. Bakewell discovered a method of improving the breeds of sheep and cattle which so improved the culture of these animals that in a period of fifty years the weight of the fatted ox was raised from 400 pounds to 1,200 pounds, while the fleece of the sheep was increased fourfold.

"Within the personal recollection of many here present Bessemer introduced a process of making steel which reduced the cost of that article from \$300 a ton to \$30 per ton in a brief period of time. Bessemer received \$5,000,000 in royalties, but it is estimated that within a period of fifty years he saved the world the enormous sum of a thousand millions. Vanderbilt rose from poverty and died leaving to his heirs railroad securities and other property to the value of a hundred millions. He drew it not from the previously accumulated product of toil and industry then resting in the hands