

A SALUTARY CHECK.

THE City has had too many "inspectors." Most of them have been appointed for private instead of public benefit. Some of them have been a positive detriment, and something ought to be done to check this disposition to create offices for political pets. The resolution introduced by Councilman Rich on Tuesday evening is a movement in this direction. If it prevails it will form a check on these appointments and will, to some extent at least, aid in securing competent persons where inspectors are really needed in the public service. It is to be hoped that the committee, to whom the matter was referred, will take favorable action upon it. If they do not, and refrain from giving good and substantial reasons for their disapproval, it will be equal to a notice to the public that places will continue to be found as political rewards, without regard to public necessity or the fitness of the persons who are to be thus rewarded at the public expense.

THE PROPOSED CREMATORY.

WE suppose it is settled that a crematory shall be established for the consumption of the city's garbage. It is not settled yet where the establishment shall be located. This is a matter of some importance and care ought to be taken to select a place which will be the least offensive to residents of the city.

We understand that many of the City Council are in favor of a spot near the Warm Springs. We hope they will not forget that this is a popular resort likely to become more popular as the city increases in size, also that a hospital is to be erected in the vicinity and probably a large hotel.

The transportation of the garbage is also a serious consideration. The place to which it is taken should be of as easy access as may be, and the route should be one which will create as little opposition as possible from the people who live along its lines.

The whole subject ought to be well canvassed and the whole area of the suburbs be looked over before a decision is reached. No matter where it is located some objection will be found and some protests will be heard, but the public good ought to be paramount while as little injury as possible should be done to private interests and valuable surroundings.

FATAL DEFECTS IN A STORY.

OUR esteemed cotemporary the *Herald*, in its issue of this morning contains an article under the head of "Contract labor." The story told under this caption is, in a nutshell, about as follows:

"The last legislature passed a law providing for the appointment of a coal mining inspector." A Liberal named Gomer Thomas applied to the Governor for the appointment, the request being backed by the signatures of a number of prominent men of the Territory. In case these endorsements should be deemed insufficient by his Excellency the applicant offered to

procure "from Cornwall or Cardiff, Wales," other certificates as to his competency. The Governor appeared to be favorable to granting the request and making Gomer mining inspector, but was surprised, on calling on him, to be greeted as follows:

"Hem! I am sorry, Mr. Thomas," said the executive, "but I am afraid that the position is already filled. In fact there is a man already on the way here, who will fill the position. Good day!"

Here is the closing paragraph of the article:

"This is the story told on the streets by friends of the applicant and they further insist that the man who is to be made mine inspector of the Territory sailed for Utah from Cardiff, Wales, a week ago!"

As a matter of justice to Governor Thomas it ought to be stated that the article referred to—the intention of which appears to be to reflect upon him—embodies some fatal defects. In the first place the last legislature did not pass a law providing for the appointment of a coal mining inspector.

In respect to the last paragraph quoted from our cotemporary it need only be said that the Edmunds-Tucker act requires that every person appointed to office in this Territory shall take oath as to his possession of certain qualifications, among which is citizenship of the United States. The absence of the law providing for the appointment of the officer in question of course kills the whole statement without anything further, but the law against persons holding office who are not citizens is here cited merely to show that even a story told on the streets is not always infallible.

A POPULAR ERROR.

AN exchange contends, as will be seen by the following, that both President and Vice-President may be chosen from the same State:

"It is a time-honored popular impression that the President and Vice-President of the United States can not constitutionally be elected from the same State.

"No party has ever put two citizens of one State on its Presidential ticket. Of course there are obvious political reasons for selecting the candidates from different parts of the country. But many have assumed that there is a constitutional veto upon the selection of a Vice-President from the same State from which the President is taken.

"Hence, when the election of Mr. Cleveland as President, and the choice of Mr. Whitelaw Reid as Vice-President begins to loom up as a political possibility, it is not surprising that the question should be widely asked whether such a combination is not contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution.

"If the effect of the third party movement should be to throw the election into Congress, as the leaders of that party boast it will be, says the New York *Herald*, the President would be chosen by the House and the Vice-President by the Senate. The House, being Democratic, would of course elect Mr. Cleveland. The Senate, being Republican, would choose Mr. Reid if constitutionally eligible. Is such a result contrary to the Constitution?

"It will doubtless surprise most readers to learn that the popular impression on this subject is entirely erroneous, and that there is nothing in the constitution to prevent the election of both President

and Vice-President from the same State either by the House and Senate or by the members of the electoral college. The constitution says:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves."

"It will be noticed that this does not prohibit the electors in general from voting for the President and Vice-President resident in the same State.

"It simply declares that one of the candidates voted for shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with the voters. That is to say, the citizens of New York may not vote for two citizens of New York for President and Vice-President. But there is nothing in the language used to prohibit the electors of any other State from voting for two residents of New York or of any other State except their own.

"It is obvious, then, that a President and Vice-President may be elected from the same State without violating the letter of the Constitution. It is equally true that such a result would not be contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. The best proof that the framers of the Constitution did not intend to embody in it that spirit is that they used no language capable of such construction.

"Little importance seems to have been given to the clause under consideration in the constitutional convention. It did not figure in the debates and commentators on the Constitution have paid no attention to it. Bancroft gives this account of its origin:

"Williamson proposed that each man should vote for three candidates. Governor Morris accepted the principle, but desired to limit the choice of the voters to two, of whom at least one should not be of his own State. This Madison approved, believing that the citizens would give their second vote with sincerity to the next object of their choice.

"The convention was then discussing the mode of electing the president. No mention had been made of the office of vice-president. The plan was to allow each elector to vote for the two candidates for president, and it was thought that the smaller states would have a better chance of getting a president if the electors in the larger states were prohibited from voting for two of their own citizens. Without any stress being laid upon it the principle was adopted in the original constitution, when the vice-president was not voted for separately and it was retained in the twelfth amendment, which introduced the present system of separate and distinct ballots for vice-president.

"It is not likely that the people will ever have a chance to vote for two citizens of the same State as president and vice-president, though such a contingency may arise in congress. But there is no constitutional bar to it in either case."

THE PERILS OF TRAVEL.

ABOUT eight years ago Robert Bruce left Quebec, Canada, for Melbourne, Australia. In his new home he did not thrive well. Though a marine and locomotive engineer, his success in Australia was very poor. He could not obtain regular employment, and about four months ago he wrote to his wife and children in Canada for means to return. They sent him a ticket good for transportation to San Francisco. A few days ago he arrived by the steamer "Alameda," but as he had no money and looked somewhat weather stained the immigration inspector, McPherson by name, decided