

Pharisee as the typical Jew (from the rabbis of this time we have the saying, that a Jew who is not married is no man,) found no favor with the Essene. Marriage was to him an abomination. Those Essenes who lived together as members of an order, and in whom the principles of the sect were carried to their logical consequences, eschewed it altogether. To secure the continuance of their brotherhood they adopted children, whom they brought up in the doctrines and practices of the community. There were others, however, who took a different view. They accepted marriage as necessary for the preservation of the race. Yet even with them it seems to have been regarded only as an inevitable evil. They fenced it off by stringent rules, demanding a three years' probation, and enjoining various purificatory rites. The conception of marriage, as quickening and educating the affections and thus exalting and refining human life, was wholly foreign to their minds. Woman was a mere instrument of temptation in their eyes; deceitful, faithless, selfish, jealous, married and misleading by her passions."

These dark delusions gradually found way into some branches of the apostolic churches, and led in after years some church fathers to denounce marriage. Some deluded individuals fled to the deserts in order to avoid "temptations." Others formed "brotherhoods" and "sisterhoods" for the same purpose.

But these doctrines and the practices founded thereon were never countenanced by those who understood Christ's teachings. They were denounced as "damnable heresies." They are foretold as one of the doctrines of an apostate church (1 Tim. 4: 3.)

From this source Tolstoi's ideas are derived. They may appropriately be called "damnable heresy," but they can never be called Christianity.

### THE AMENDING POWER.

THE power to revise, amend or repeal any act of a legislative body is inherent in that body. It needs no special grants from a superior power to confer it. This authority is included in the right to enact. There may be some limits to its exercise and prescribed methods by which it is to be used, but it is part of the power of legislation itself.

The city councils of the respective cities of Utah may, therefore, revise, amend or repeal any ordinance or resolution of their own passing. The act of 1888 in relation to the incorporation of cities provides in Article I, Sec. 13, that,

"All ordinances and resolutions in any city or town when it shall organize under this act shall continue in full force and effect until repealed or amended."

This is a recognition of the right which belongs to all city councils.

The same act in Article III, Sec. 10, provides that,

"No vote of the City Council shall be reconsidered or rescinded at a special meeting, unless at such special meeting there be present as large a number of Councilmen as were present when the vote was taken."

Here is a restriction or regulation of this inherent power. There is nothing in any charter or other enactment in relation to City Councils which makes any ordinance, resolution, vote or determination unchangeable and irrevocable. Any vote may be reconsidered or rescinded, under the above provision, if the rule in relation to it is observed.

Where, then, did the City Attorney get his notion that when the City Council "determine" anything, they cannot change, amend, rescind or do anything to it except enforce it? Article XIV of the same act, section 2, provides that

"At the regular meeting of the City Council in the month of June of each year, said Council shall, by ordinance or resolution, levy on the assessed value of all real and personal property," etc.

This levy is to be made by ordinance or resolution. It was either by one or the other that the City Council of Salt Lake City levied four mills on the dollar, under the provision we have quoted. Any ordinance or resolution is to be in force until amended or repealed, and any vote may be reconsidered or rescinded. Why, then, should the City Attorney deny the power of the City Council to reduce the levy so made, when petitioned to do so by the great mass of the taxpayers?

The more his opinion is considered the more absurd and unfounded it appears. The fact that our City Masters wanted such an opinion, as an excuse for overriding the wishes of the citizens, ought not to have influenced a lawyer with a legal reputation to maintain, in pronouncing judgment upon so simple yet important a matter. At any rate no board or council or revising body should attach importance to such a one sided opinion.

### "LIBERAL" IMPROVEMENTS.

One of the most amusing things in "Liberal" manoeuvres is the boast of the "Liberal" organ that the streets of this city have been wonderfully "improved." As an offset to the charge that the "Liberal" City Council have emptied the Treasury in six months, the "improvement" of the streets is paraded, as though that was an unanswerable answer.

The fact is, the streets were never,

in the fall of the year, in such a horrible condition as they are now. It is impossible to drive along any street in the city without encountering obstructions that are dangerous to vehicles and to passengers. The "Liberal" organ talks about "boulevards" "rolled smooth so that the drive is a delight." And it boasts of the "grades" that have been made, which are really a detriment to property, of no benefit to the public and a waste of money that is deplorable. It says "The amount of work performed cannot be comprehended at all except by a careful examination." Quite correct. It would require a microscopic examination.

We have no doubt that figures enough can be produced to show expenditures in this direction. The same sheet boasts of the big payroll of the city. Nobody disputes this. Everybody knows that money has been freely poured out. The question is, where are the extraordinary improvements. They are not visible to the naked eye. And the places pointed out are, most of them, in an awful condition for traffic.

If the streets have been so wonderfully improved that to drive over them is "a delight," why does the organ say in the next breath that, "men cannot comprehend it except by making an actual survey, going up one street and down another." Such "smooth," "delightful" "boulevards" ought to be "comprehended" without any careful examination or geodetic "survey." A drive "up" or "down" the streets, instead of being a "delight" is a vexation and a cause of profanity.

The same sheet, on its editorial page brags of the "sprinkling" as superior to anything heretofore performed in the city, and on its local page echoes the epithets of all classes of the people about the alternate streaks of mud and dust and the stupidity and inefficiency of the service.

The streets are really in an abominable condition, and whatever may be the result when the work that is costing so much of the people's money is completed, at present they are so rough, rocky, furrowed, obstructed and torn up, that the impudent boasting of the "Liberal" organ affords but very temporary amusement to those who have the misfortune to drive in a hurry or who seek pleasure in a carriage ride. "Liberal" expenditure is only equalled by "Liberal" brag.