

to one piece of cloth. Both classes of extremists have no reason to be proud of their respective positions.

We belong to the conservative class in that respect, but would have been much more inclined to charity for the Major—on the ground of his inexperience—had he not been guilty of so much dress parade business, in having his expertness in responding to false alarms for practice, formulated by himself, published in that portion of the press that sustains him at the expense of truth, common sense and sound public policy.

Some people swallow such quack advertisements as signs of efficiency, but they are simply indicators of conceit. When a man performs a public service, it is then time enough for the press to give him recognition. Otherwise it is mere puffery.

There is another constituent which operated against the chief in his conduct at the fire; he carried to it not only the evidences of inefficiency, but those of arrogant pugnacity. His assault upon Mr. Jennings, a relative of the gentleman whose property was on fire, was an inexcusable act of brutality, as well as a breach of the peace; neither was it creditable to his courage, being within a few feet of a number of policemen when he committed the offense. It would perhaps be well for the gentleman to be more discreet, as he might in resorting to such unseemly methods of expressing his disapproval, strike the wrong man's nose.

This incident of the fire was made the subject of a resolution of censure at a session of the Council held May 20. An effort was made to table it, which was only accomplished by Mayor Scott throwing in his vote on that side of the question, the members present being equally divided upon it.

The logical inference to be drawn from the position assumed by the Mayor and the others who voted to table is that they consider the matter complained of—the act of a public officer committing a personal assault on a private citizen, while the said official was in the discharge of his duty—is not censurable. This attitude has a decidedly incongruous aspect and is a curious comment upon some people's views of official prerogatives as compared with the rights of private citizens.

Without passing upon the propriety of introducing the resolution, seeing that it was offered

the Mayor and Council were given an opportunity of taking a position that would have had a tendency in the future to prevent the recurrence of assaults upon citizens by pugnacious officers, who are absurdly and theoretically presumed to be the servants and not the pummellers of the people. The disposition made of the resolution, if it has any weight at all, must have the effect of increasing the sum of official pugnacity and depreciating the protection of private citizens. Basing the conclusion upon the result, it would have been better to have let the matter sleep so far as the Council was concerned.

We learn that a twenty-five cent subscription has been started in one of the saloons for the purpose of paying Major Stanton's fine. We hope for that gentleman's sake—if for no other reason than that the accumulated quarters smell of sour beer and bad whiskey—that this involuntary mark of respect does not have his unqualified endorsement. It appears that some men who are conspicuous in the community—not for non-partisanship—have signed their names to the testimonial and tossed their two-bits to the receiver of the fund. If there is any dignity in thus expressing a sentiment in opposition to official good conduct and the peace of the public, those who want it are welcome, so far as we are concerned. We must say, however, that some things look rather small from our standpoint.

Should another occasion arise for the services of Chief Stanton to be brought into requisition—we hope it will not—we shall be pleased to note the fact that he and those who are unreasonably holding him up by the seat of the unmentionables shall be justified to some extent by his solid and efficient work in saving the jeopardized property of citizens. We will be much more gratified to note such an exhibition of ability than to animadvert upon his shortcomings.

#### A DISINGENUOUS DISCLAIMER.

To a student of mental philosophy the motives of a man who resorts to cunning and double-dealing are often as clear as those of men who disdain to resort to processes of concealment. The key to discovery in this connection is to make a special point to observe what the individual placed under analysis is interested in placing in the shadow. After arriving at a

reasonable inference on that point, if he is found resorting to concealment in relation to the matter he is interested in keeping in the dark, the presumption is fair that he is being read as one could peruse the pages of a book.

By this operation, scan this expression, alleged to have been made by Governor Thomas on May 18th, soon after his return from Washington:

"The bill authorizing the Governor to appoint certain county officers is still in the hands of the Judiciary Committee. I did not hear a single reference to it in Washington, and I do not think it will be pressed pending the consideration of the test oath bill, though its fate will be decided by Mr. Edmunds, and I don't know his purpose in the matter."

The gentleman was interested in promulgating an understanding that he had nothing to do with the work of suggesting, formulating or pushing the bill which aims to constitute him Arthur I., King of Utah, by robbing the people of the right to elect county and Territorial officers and vesting him with power to appoint them, because his connection with the measure would exhibit a piece of the most disreputable autocratic self-seeking known to the Nineteenth century. It is safe to say that a premature defense, being ahead of an accusation, is second cousin to a confession of guilt. Shakespeare showed his knowledge of the human heart when he put into the mouth of one of his characters—"Methinks the lady doth protest too much."

It must have appeared to Mr. Thomas all the more necessary that he should disclaim any knowledge of this infamous measure, because it is publicly known that it was conceived by him, having been recommended in his last report to the Secretary of the Interior. How is it possible then that he can escape the suspicion of having given birth to it, the latter operation being the natural result of the former? It is therefore, under the circumstances, unreasonable to presume that Senator Edmunds can be viewed as holding any other relationship to it than foster parent. True, Mr. Thomas' recommendation did not specify the particular "Federal authority" that should, in his opinion, be vested with power to appoint the officers that are properly elective by the people, but everybody understood that it meant the Governor, with, perhaps, the Utah Commission acting with him as a cabinet, or a sort of subordinate sinecure organization.