

THE TOPIC OF THE HOUR.

THE "Liberal" faction is now in active order to maintain its hold upon the city. The rest of the citizens are in doubt as to the proper course for them to pursue.

There is a strong popular sentiment in favor of a combination of all parties for the framing of a municipal ticket, which, without reference to any political organization, will contain the names of solid business men of known integrity and capacity, and who could be voted for by every citizen desirous of the public welfare. This proposition is met by objections from prominent Democrats and Republicans, who think that public policy is inseparably connected with party politics. They believe that it is unwise, not to say improper, to attempt to fuse the two parties for any purpose involving the suffrages of the people. They argue that as Utah is going through a sort of formative process, an educational development in politics, a union of this character would stop or retard the movement. Also that a Council elected from different elements would be in danger of becoming a quarrelsome and turbulent body.

While not taking any decisive stand on this important question, which is still open for debate, we must say that we regard these objections as rather feeble. If there are no others we do not think they ought to prevail.

How a movement to educate the people on the relative principles of the Republican and Democratic parties would be stopped, or even retarded, by a union of men of all parties on a matter of great local moment, we fail to discover. We do not believe it will affect it in the remotest degree. Democrats and Republicans have occasionally fused for municipal purposes in many parts of the country; with the object of establishing law and order and putting down similar elements to those which have so dominated and degraded Salt Lake City. At the same time, on national questions they have retained their identity and lost nothing of their vigor. In doing this they surrendered none of their party principles or permanent party interests.

If it should be deemed for the best interests of one city in this Territory to let party politics rest for the time, making the issue not the comparative superiority of any party or its principles, but a union of the best elements of all parties and classes for the maintenance of public order, peace, morality and economy, that could have no possible effect upon the question of which

national party is the best or has the greatest claim upon the faith and support of the people.

As to the danger of a Council composed of members of different parties developing into a quarrelsome body, there appears to us no reason or foundation for alarm. Is it necessary that a municipal government shall be entirely composed of members of one political faith? Are not more important legislative bodies so composed, all over the country? What sort of a Congress and national government should we have if there was no "opposition?" And could we have a more "quarrelsome" body than that which disgraced this city when the Council was all "Liberal?"

Members elected on a ticket such as that proposed would be responsible to their constituents—the public, just as much as if elected by a party or faction. Their "policy" would be the public interest on local affairs. It would have no special reference to national party questions. A city government run in the interest of any party, in our opinion would be undesirable. We have had enough of that. The public welfare should be promoted entirely regardless of party. And we do not see wherein the doctrines of Democracy or the principles of Republicanism necessarily enter into the management of the affairs of a municipality like that of Salt Lake.

We desire to see the best results for the city and the Territory. We think the matter should be well considered, and we are sure that if any party, for its own interest, stands in the way of anything that would be for the best good of the general public, it will damage that party more than any fusion could, and injure its prospects in the formative process and educational work that is now in progress in Utah.

PURJURY MOST FOUL.

THE failure in the Parsons case has been followed by a collapse in the Barton case. The girl Forkner, who was engaged in the attempt to depose the Marshal, was the chief witness in the case against the Superintendent of the Reform School. Her unreliability in the former case was such that her testimony, vile and direct as it was, failed to receive any notice from the Commissioner in making his decision. In the Barton case it was even worse, and alleged deeper criminality on the part of the accused. But when dissected by the skillful hand of Judge Henderson it showed up as rank and reckless perjury, and the District Attorney, foreseeing another defeat, threw up the

case in disgust and asked the court to discharge the defendant. Mr. Barton was acquitted without waiting for a verdict from the jury.

This shows the danger of taking the word of disreputable and criminal persons in cases of this kind. No man's character would be safe if, on charges made by such creatures as have accused Mr. Parsons and Mr. Barton, he may be held up to the public by the press as the most lecherous of libertines, and epithets such as have been heaped upon the Marshal may be launched at him with impunity.

Mr. Barton is to be congratulated on his escape. The evident falsehood of the girl who accused him, when cross-examined in the Marshal's case gave confidence to counsel in this defense. The Forkner girl, the pet of the libellous sheet that opened the budget of nastiness against the Marshal, now stands before the public not only as a shameless reprobate, but as a self-confessed perjurer. Her word is worth nothing in any court. And those who seek to use her base charges against any reputable man, simply place themselves on her level and show the villainess of their cause.

A prosecution for perjury is the proper thing for the false witness, a prosecution instead of a suit for libel is the correct thing for those who join with the strumpet and false-swearer in seeking to destroy character and eject a political opponent from office. When foul accusations are made against anyone, it is always wise to wait until we have heard the other side.

CONQUERED AT LAST.

GENERAL CONNOR is dead. After struggling with the common foe for many days he at last succumbed to the great conqueror of the race, whose victories will prevail until He who is the resurrection and the life shall destroy death and him that hath the power of death, and deliver universal humanity from the grave.

Patrick Edward Connor was born in County Kerry, Ireland, March 17, 1820. He came to this country with his parents in his boyhood and resided in New York. He received only a limited education and when nineteen years old enlisted in the army, serving in the Florida war. In 1844 he returned to New York and was employed in a mercantile house. In 1846 he was again in the field as a soldier. Having moved to Texas, he joined the volunteers and served in the Mexican war, obtaining the rank of Captain. He was a prominent figure in many battles and was severely wounded in the left