

at Chicago and Milwaukee. The review says:

"Throughout the West and South, the fine crop prospects give encouragement, almost the only complaint now coming from New Orleans, of drought in the adjoining region. In the Northwest continuous rains have made the prospect unsurpassed. Chicago reports larger receipts than a year ago of flour, wheat, cheese, hides, and three times as much wool; smaller receipts of oats, rye, barley, and but one-third as much of crude meats; with full trade in dry goods, and bright prospects generally. St. Louis notes a fair volume of trade, Milwaukee great improvement from rains, and St. Paul also, while at Minneapolis the lumber trade is unsurpassed. At Omaha and Denver trade is fair, and at Kansas City dull because of too wet weather. At Louisville the outlook is good, but at Nashville a heavy dry goods failure causes some depression, and there is no improvement at Memphis. New Orleans reports trade dull, cotton in fair demand, sugar active, molasses dull, and rice quiet and lower. At Savannah trade improves and at Jacksonville is quite steady."

The iron trade has improved. The boot and shoe trade is quiet, wholesale merchants being averse to credit. In dry goods it is noted that there is no talk of prices. Cotton goods are being sold very low in many cases. Wool moves slowly, but yielding at the West gives a better prospect. In breadstuffs the decline continues, and wheat is 2½ cents lower, corn 2 cents, oats 1½, and cotton also declines three-sixteenths.

Business failures for the week mentioned were, for the United States 24, and for Canada 13. For the corresponding week of last year the figures were, for the United States 179 and for Canada 26.

JUSTICE AT LAST.

THE decision of the Supreme Court of this Territory in relation to the usurpation of "Liberalism," in holding seats in the City Council to which they were not elected, was rendered June 13th, and will be found in another part of this paper. It will be seen that the ground taken by the usurpers was entirely technical. There is nothing in their appeal from the decision of the District Court to show that they were legally elected, or that they had any right to the offices which they have persisted in holding for about sixteen months out of a two years' term. The Supreme Court sweeps away their cobweb demurrer and confirms the decision of the court below.

This judicially establishes the fact beyond question that the "Liberal" holders of the seats for Councilmen from the Fourth Precinct "usurped and intruded" into those offices. And that the People's candidates were duly elected and are entitled to the offices out of which they have been kept so long. Costs are assessed against the

illegal incumbents. A suit to recover the salary unlawfully drawn by them will now lie, unless satisfactory arrangements can be made in settlement.

This only disposes, formally, of the three seats in the City Council for the Fourth Precinct. But the case of the Third Precinct is precisely the same. It is not to be supposed that any further opposition will be made to the three People's Councilmen from the Third Precinct taking their places. Further litigation on the part of the intruders and usurpers would only result in expense and trouble to them. It is fair to presume, then, that they will at once vacate and that the six lawfully elected Councilors will take their places.

There could scarcely be a more striking example of Utah "Liberalism" than the usurpation of these offices. It was clear from the first that the law was against it. The courts upheld the law. Everybody knew that the offices were illegally possessed and illegally retained, and that the salaries received for them were illegally drawn. But it was entirely consistent with the whole "Liberal" scheme to capture the city. It was founded in fraud, conducted infamously, consummated corruptly. It will surely end in the death and condemnation of the disrupted clique that conceived it and carried it into execution.

The claimants for the seats in the City Council are to be congratulated over their victory and complimented for their persistency in contending for their rights, which are rather the rights of the People who elected them to office.

THE "MORMONS" AND PARTY POLITICS.

It is claimed by the advocates of Utah "Liberalism" that, "The great mass of the Mormon people are not acquainted with the character of the government of the United States; they neither know, appreciate nor reverence these principles."

The main fact advanced in support of this statement is that now the People's party is dividing on national party lines, a great many of the "Mormons" do not know whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

We are pretty well acquainted with the "masses of the Mormon people," and we know that the idea which prevails that they are unacquainted with the character of the Government under which they live is erroneous. We know further, that the assertion that they do not appreciate or reverence the principles of that system of gov-

ernment is maliciously false. It would be found on fair investigation that the masses of the "Mormon" people understand better and are more devoted to those principles, then people of their class and the same time of residence in the country in other parts of the Union.

But that many of them are now hesitating as to which of the two great national parties has the better claim upon their support is a fact, and is evidence rather of their familiarity with constitutional principles and the theory of popular government and of a desire to be right than of ignorance or apathy. And the style of argument in use among professional politicians and strong partisans on either side, does not serve to give them confidence in making an immediate decision. Instead of a clear distinction being drawn between the conflicting doctrines of the two parties, appeals are made to prejudice and passion, and the misrepresentations indulged in tend to confuse instead of enlighten the inquiring mind.

We maintain, what we have shown many times, and that long before the present political movement was inaugurated, that the differences in principle between the two parties, when the truth is closely adhered to, are few and not so radical as many advocates on either side have claimed.

Both parties believe in the autonomy of each State and the supremacy of the Federal authority in national affairs. Neither believes in the right of the National Executive to invade a sovereign State or unsolicited interfere in its domestic affairs.

Each party advocates a tariff. One, it is true, says it should be for revenue and the other for protection. But when it comes to actual practice, both want revenue by means of the tariff. And in the tariff measures of each party, some articles are placed on the free list and others are made dutiable. Absolute free trade or universal protection is not demanded or considered practicable by either party. There are free trade Republicans and protectionist Democrats.

On the silver question there are advocates of free coinage and others of limited coinage in both parties. One party tends to centralization of power in the General Government, the other to the strict limitation of that power within defined lines. But neither party would extend the power beyond what it believes to be constitutional restrictions, not cripple it so that national affairs could not be maintained with honor at home and abroad.

With these considerations, there is no wonder that people who have not