

leasing system prevails, but the contract is not made on the public bidding system. The terms differ materially from those obtaining in the other cities mentioned.

The Berlin street railways are all controlled by one company, horse power being used exclusively. The public and city authorities are demanding electric power, but as all the roads revert to the city in a few years, the present company will not make any improvements. The company pays the city for the use of the street a tax of 4 per cent. on its gross income. But if that income exceeds 15,000,000 marks, then the tax is raised to 8 per cent. Besides this a real estate and income tax is also collected. And then stockholders must pay a tax on their dividends. The city is empowered to regulate the rate of fare.

Buda-Pesth is the only city in Europe that has a direct working electric railway. The wires furnishing the current are in a conduit underground, access to which is obtained by using a split rail for one of the tracks. A new system of electric road is now in process of construction. The car runs upon a single split rail, drawing its power through the open space from the conduit underneath.

The underground system of railways in London is found to be of vast convenience to the public, but financially they are a loss, owing to the expense of construction. Paris sadly needs a rapid transit system, and public opinion is demanding something in the underground line. Berlin has an elevated road which is giving immense satisfaction in the way of rapid transit. In Liverpool an elevated road is now being built by a private company along the line of Regent's road, and by the water front of the entire city. Paris has two systems of elevated road under consideration, with little probability of either being constructed.

The English are ahead of Americans in handling urban and suburban traffic. In the Broad Street station of the North London suburban road, during the month of August, 750 trains daily were handled, and 40,000,000 passengers are moved annually. At the Liverpool Street station in London the daily average of passengers in and out is 170,000. Its daily average of suburban trains is 520. Improvements are now being made in the station or depot which will cost \$10,000,000. St. Lazzare, in Paris, is the only station in Europe which approaches these in extent of traffic.

The report contains information that will be of immense interest to the

managers and directors of American railroads, both urban and suburban, as well as interstate. Chicago railroad men should make a special study of this report as a preparation for 1893.

### MORE "LIBERAL" LOGIC (?)

"SAVE us from our friends!" might reasonably be the cry of decent members of the "Liberal" faction. Objection to the enforcement of the laws of the Territory for the preservation of public decency and order is enough to expose any party to public odium. Yet this is the present attitude of the chief champions of the "Liberal" organization. And it is carried to the extreme of actual abuse of the officers of the law sworn to uphold and aid in its execution.

More than that. The anger of the assailants of those officers is carried to the verge of idiocy. It is still argued that the officers, instead of arresting "lawless saloon keepers" caught in the commission of crime, should have told them to shut up and not do it any more. Now, where in the name of common sense does either law, or custom or official authority require a constable, when he sees a public offence committed, to turn lecturer and judge at once and after explaining the wrong tell the culprit not to do it again? The law and his oath require him to arrest the lawbreaker and convey him before judicial authority.

It is still objected that the arrest of "lawless saloon-keepers" should not have been made because the officers making the capture have not seized any hold-ups and footpads. That is to say, because one class of criminals not seen by the officers have so far escaped, offenders detected in the commission of crime must not be arrested. A child who would contend for this would be thought deficient in ordinary intelligence.

Next we are informed that persons who for the purpose of proving a case against a "lawless saloon keeper," call for liquor over his bar on a Sunday are criminals as bad as himself and therefore the "lawless saloon keeper" ought not to be arrested. More babyism, or, in other words, "Liberal" logic? The violator of the Sunday law must go scot free because it is alleged that the officer who uses the only means of proving a case against him, partook of his offense in doing so. Softening of the brain must be the cause of such attenuated drivel.

It is within the memory of some of the most recent settlers in this city that "lawless saloon keepers" detected in

their violation of the city ordinances, escaped punishment because the complainants could not swear positively that what was sold over the bar was a drink that is commonly known as intoxicating. In these cases the detection was complete and was made in the only way to perfect it. That is why the "Liberal" defenders of lawlessness kick so hard.

We are brought to task because it is alleged we "dodged the point that the Deputy Marshals failed to stop offenders in view, by neglecting to notify those in charge of saloons found open to close them." Is that so? Well, let us see. Here is what we said:

According to 'Liberal' logic (?) no officer of the law should arrest a saloon keeper who breaks the law, unless the saloon goes to the officer. No gambler should be arrested unless the gambling house goes to the policeman. And further, when a criminal is detected in his crime, the officer, instead of arresting him should kindly "warn" him to quit and that what he is doing is "in violation of the law." Detectives, on this theory, would be played out. Peace officers would have a new occupation, and sheriffs, constables and policemen would become evangelists of the law instead of its executors.

Does the law authorize the United States Marshal and his deputies to preach or to lecture law-breakers, or to "warn" them of what they are doing? No, it says they "shall each of them cause all offenders against the law in his view to enter into recognition."

Not much "dodging" in that. The "dodging" is all on the other side. The territorial statutes make the opening or maintaining of a place where liquor is sold on a Sunday a misdemeanor. Now, will the "Liberal" defenders of the "lawless saloon keepers," without "dodging," show us their authority for limiting officers of the law to giving those lawbreakers a warning to "close up?" Does not the law require the officers to arrest offenders "in their view?" If an officer saw a footpad "holding up" a citizen, if the former course be proper should he warn him that his act was unlawful or should he arrest him on the spot? If so why should not any other offender "in his view" be treated to a lecture or warning instead of being arrested.

There is one more question: Why were the Marshal and his deputies applauded for "doing their duty" when they arrested offenders, whom the police would not touch in Ogden, and are now berated and maligned by the same persons because they have done the same thing in Salt Lake City? This should be answered without "dodging," or the assailants of the officers should hold their peace. And sensible "Liberals" should put a muzzle on the yelpers who seem to have lost their senses in their rage at the enforcement of the laws.