

river, carrying with it the famous and venerated statue of St. John of Nepomuk, the patron Saint of the ancient city of Prague and of the Bohemian nation.

Without attaching undue importance to the fears and terrors of the Bohemians, who regard as the worst of omens the disappearance of the statue of St. John—a statue which was visited every year by thousands of pious pilgrims—it must be admitted that many Europeans have every reason to view the approach of the coming winter with fear and apprehension.

### SMASHING THE "LIBERAL" PLATFORM.

ONE of the leading planks in the "Liberal" platform issued before the February municipal election was that contracts for public work should be let to the lowest responsible bidder. If there is one promise that has been made by the party that has not been broken, we fail to recall it. It was insisted by their organ and campaign speakers that where public work was not conducted upon the basis of advertising for bids and letting the contracts to the responsible persons who made the lowest offers, there was a "nigger in the fence," in the shape of a job.

In view of the platform promise referred to and the "Liberal" logic which formed the basis of its insertion in the code which was to govern the party, it may be interesting to place them in juxtaposition with a proceeding in the Council meeting October 14th. The "Liberal" officers have failed completely to live up to the particular plank in relation to contracts for public work. Last evening an attempt was made to pass an ordinance in conformity with it. The proposed act provided that such work as the laying of sewer and water pipes, grading of streets, etc., should be done by contracts to be awarded to the lowest bidder. The ordinary repairing of streets was very properly excepted, in the proposed ordinance, from this rule, considerable of that labor being done by prisoners of the city.

If the officials in power were honestly seeking to carry out the professions of the party which elected them by "tricks that are dark"—always keeping in mind that six of them were never elected at all—they would readily have supported the ordinance in line with the "Liberal" platform. Not so, however. It was killed by a tie vote.

There were ten councilmen present, the votes being equally divided. "Scott, Scott; George M.

Scott" held the deciding vote, which he declined to use. He sat serenely astraddle the fence, knowing full well that the ordinance was already assassinated without his aid, in public capacity at least. He could not, perhaps, have saved its life by voting, as it requires the concurrence of a majority of the Council to secure the final passage of an ordinance, but he had an opportunity to place himself on record, and failed to do it. The reason for only two-thirds of the members being present when the measure was considered, may be conjectured. The whole aspect of the transaction has the appearance of a piece of trickery. If the absentees or any of them favored the breaking of the "Liberal" plank regarding public work, they should have at least the courage to make the fact known by being at their post of public duty.

Now it is plain that public work is not to be done on the plan of the "Liberal" platform, which is constructed of rotten stuff throughout. According to the former logic of the "Liberal organ" and of the wild-eyed party campaigners, this means corruption and jobbery. It is not long since that the morning anti-"Mormon" organ announced the startling fact that there were at least "four bad men in the Council." It will soon be in order for that paper to increase the number.

Unparalleled burdens have been put upon the people, in order to place an enormous amount of money in the hands of the present officials of the city, and if the statements and logic of the chief "Liberal" organ be taken as a basis, this is done that they might reap a plethoric financial harvest. That is putting it mildly. Immense sums of money are appropriated for street and other purposes. How it is expended is a mysterious matter, the public not being informed as they were under the rule of the People. The mystery is deepened when we consider such statements as the following, clipped from the Salt Lake Tribune Wednesday, October 15th:

"A prominent city official is disgusted with the way the street department has been conducted. As far as he can see, the continual bawling of dirt on the streets the past season has made them even more of a quagmire than before. The mud is as deep as it was last winter when the Saints had control, and the road roller does not pack down the soil so that it will shed rain, or anything like it. It is mud, mud, mud, everywhere."

It is more than likely that the "prominent city official" who enunciated a truth with which

every citizen is conversant was not among those who voted against the ordinance providing for the performance of public work by contract accorded to the lowest responsible bidder. The process which that enactment would introduce would probably militate against the mode of making a small return for a large consideration.

It is stated above, in the fourth paragraph of the article, that Mayor Scott did not vote. Reporters who were close to him when the action was taken did not hear him vote, and felt certain he did not. An examination of the record today shows that the Mayor voted "No." It appears as if other parties to the plot had insisted that he place himself on record against the letting of contracts for public work to the lowest responsible bidders.

### A FEW "GROUNDS" FOR OUR CHARGES.

ON Tuesday, Oct. 14, we briefly alluded to the bitterness and rancor with which the anti-"Mormon" press has treated the movement of the "Mormons" to place themselves in harmony with the laws of the United States, and the evidences of insincerity on the part of those who clamored for such a step, and when it was taken berated it with all the venom of acrimonious tongues and gall-dipped pens. The "Liberal" organ quotes our words, calls the News "craven" and "brazen" and asks:

"What ground has it to think that the opposition press are sorry for the manifesto? What ground has it for thinking that the demand for this renunciation of one feature of the creed was insincere and that when it was made it was received with sorrow?"

What ground? Why the ground furnished by the writer of the questions and the author of the epithets which continually blister his venomous and mendacious lips when he speaks about the "Mormons." The frantic efforts he has made through the organ of slander and hate to make it appear that the actions of the "Mormons" was a fraud. The lying dispatches he has caused to be sent over the wires to deceive the country. The vile names he has heaped upon the leaders of the Church and upon all who have spoken in support of the Declaration. The blasphemous and filthy burlesques of religious utterances in the Tabernacle which have appeared in the Tribune. The manifest chagrin of that paper, at the endorsement of the manifesto by the Conference.