

The report of the Mayor that he had executed relinquishment deed to the Hydraulic Canal Company was approved.

The city treasurer's report referred to the committee on finance.

Four reports from the committee on water works were received and adopted.

The report of the committee on fire department, and the report of the chief of the fire department recommending the adoption of the report, was received and adopted.

The report of the committee on claims on the bills of the gas company and Salt Lake Power, Light & Heating Company, recommended that the bills be allowed. Also on the bill of the supervisor of streets, recommending allowance of same. Adopted.

The committee on claims recommended the appropriation of the amount claimed by J. W. Fox. Adopted and the amount appropriated.

The bill of Engineer Brooks for January, for \$172.50, \$81.50 and \$86.25, for his services and those of his assistants was allowed and the amounts appropriated.

The report of the superintendent of sewer construction was referred to the proper committee.

Alderman Riter introduced a bill to fix the treasurer's bonds at such a sum as will comply with the statute, by increasing the amount from \$50,000 to \$200,000. Passed.

The Council then took up the investigation of the charges against the Mayor and Marshal, made by the defunct grand jury.

Mr. Houtz testified that he had been assistant city attorney for one and a half years; was cognizant of the fact that detectives were employed. Either Mr. Salmon or the marshal informed me that there were detectives at work to ferret out Sunday liquor selling and houses of prostitution. My understanding was that they were not the regular police force; I didn't know but what they were paid at first; I understood it had been usual to detect these crimes in that way. I deemed it to be an incidental power of the marshal. I first learned that the party employed received a contingency about the time the first case came up; I then understood they were to be paid an amount proportionate to the amounts received. I protested against the paying of the witnesses according to the fines collected. I understood that kind of testimony to be competent, but not entitled to much weight. I didn't find it to be illegal. I deemed it an impudent thing to do. The accused raised that question. It was then found that all the detectives were paid a salary and none of them had any contingent. Coltrin was on the stand in two or three cases. I think there were convictions on his testimony.

Mr. Young asked Mr. Richards whether there is an ordinance authorizing the employment of detectives.

Mr. Richards said he knew of no such ordinance, but he considered there was an implied power.

Mr. Houtz, continuing, said it was the rule not to put Coltrin on the stand in these cases. He was only on the stand in one or two cases.

Justice Pyper said he had been employed in the police court office for about fifteen years. During this time detectives were employed in this class of cases.

Mayor Armstrong said he had been in office four years. This detective work had been done ever since he had anything to do with it; never knew Coltrin or spoke to him till the work was over. He claimed that he had lost money on it. He was to get 40 per cent. or that rate of all the fines collected, to be paid out of the marshal's contingent fund. I approved the detective vouchers as I approve all vouchers of the heads of departments.

Mr. Riter moved that Mayor Armstrong and Marshal Solomon be exonerated from any intentional wrong in making the appropriation of moneys for detective services as had been done.

Mr. Sowles said he had made up his mind that they be exonerated from any intentional wrong, though he thought the methods questionable.

Mr. Young thought this was a practice in other cities. He held that there was no wrong. He was utterly opposed to detectives. He would rather see crime go stalking abroad than employ them, but he thought these men acted in entire good faith.

The motion of Mr. Riter was carried, all of the members voting in the affirmative.

The committee rose and reported accordingly, and the report was adopted unanimously.

The council adjourned till Friday evening at seven o'clock.

THE LATEST DECISION.

THE news of the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States had affirmed the constitutionality of the Idaho test oath law Feb. 3d, created a profound sensation in the community. We must say that, so far as our observation extended, if the anti-"Mormon" element were jubilant over the matter, their exultation was of a subdued character.

Perhaps it occurred to the more thoughtful portion of them that the decision boded no good to this Territory, providing its probable fruits should be applied to Utah. If so the reflection was correct. It can be stated as an infallible philosophical truth that no considerable portion of the people of a commonwealth can be placed at an unqualified disadvantage without the whole suffering severely from an essential sympathy of interests, if for no other reason. When those placed under the political cloud constitute the overwhelming majority,

this truth has all the greater potency and more widespread effect.

Whether thoughts in that line had or had not an influence on the minds of the minority and prevented them from exhibiting satisfaction in unseemly and exuberant outbursts cannot, of course, be definitely stated, but the fact exists that thus far since the reception of the news, their attitude has not been nearly so boisterous as might have been anticipated.

Upon the majority of the people the intelligence induced a general spirit of seriousness, consistent with the gravity of the situation. Their courage was not daunted, however, for such an effect is almost impossible of production under the most trying situations.

Neither was there an undivided concern regarding the probable future results of the decision in their own case. The welfare of the nation shared a portion of the anxiety felt by them. They could see in this action of the head of the judicial branch of the government a fulfilment of predictions made by the Prophet Joseph Smith on the subject of invasions of the safeguards of the constitution, and his prophetic forecast of the dire results that would in consequence accrue to the Republic at large.

The Constitution is an instrument which defines the rights of the people who adopt it and the duties and responsibilities of their rulers. One of its chief objects is to protect minorities from the encroachments of majorities. Froude, the eminent English historian, in his Lives of the Caesars, asserts, in substance, that if history has taught any one thing it is this: That when from any cause a republic denies any portion of its people the rights and privileges of its constitution, the constitution itself falls to pieces from sheer incompetence for its duties, and the breaking up and decay of the government is no longer distant.

Viewing the decision from our standpoint it denies a vital guaranty of the Constitution to a portion of the people in this great nation—that of full religious liberty. Any position assumed that this right is not invaded appears to us to be disingenuous. To claim that the law sustained by it only relates to the disqualifications of voters and for holding office is merely technical. The whole spirit of the Idaho statute is inhibitive of religious freedom. No mere play on words or terms can hide this patent