

by the exigencies of the time. These are encouraging signs. They foreshadow a vigorous campaign and a thorough arousing of the *bona fide* citizens to a sense of the situation. A complete reorganization of the party in this city seems to be a present need.

This will be considered, no doubt, in the convention, which will be composed of energetic and capable citizens who have the interests of the community at heart. The issues of the hour have to be met. The policy and principles of the People's Party should be set forth with no uncertain sound. A strong and efficient central committee suited to present emergencies is wanted. The former committee has done excellent work. But the labors before it are enlarged, and therefore it needs expansion and enlargement itself.

The duties lying before the party, however, must not be heaped upon the shoulders of a committee however numerous and vigorous. The whole body must be set in motion and every member be vitalized and stimulated, that all may take part in the labors to be performed and share in the victory to be achieved. Until the election in February 1890 there must be no cessation of interest and of exertion. After that we can rest and rejoice in the result.

THE FACTS IN THE CASE.

On August 30th we furnished our readers with a succinct statement of facts concerning the application of the Utah Western for a franchise to secure a right of way along Fourth West Street. We purposely refrained from making any comments on the controversy which has arisen over this matter. We took neither one side nor the other. We said nothing either for or against the granting of the franchise. We simply presented facts which had been carefully collated by reliable hands.

Next evening we published a letter from one of the residents of the west side, who is opposed to the granting of the franchise, and who seems to be incensed at the *DESERET NEWS*, and at persons who favor the project. We eliminated some personalities from the communication because they ought to have no place in a mere dispute as to facts.

We are in receipt of another letter on the same subject which we do not publish for three reasons: First, because it is utterly irrelevant to the matters set forth in this paper; sec-

ond, because it is scurrilous rather than argumentative and impugns motives instead of setting forth figures and facts; and third, because the writer has not waited for its appearance in the *NEWS* but has rushed into print elsewhere. The effusion needs no reply, as we think will be conceded by all who read it.

Although the writer of the letter we have published has objected so strongly to the information we gave to our readers, he has not, so far, refuted anything we have set forth. His first assertion is that about 60 per cent of the frontage on Fourth West Street (as far as it is inhabited) is owned by *bona fide* residents. He is mistaken on that point. The street is inhabited from North Temple to Fifth North streets. This gives ten blocks, or 400 rods, of frontage. Of this, 219½ rods is owned by non-residents, leaving 180½ rods to resident owners or about 45 per cent instead of 60 per cent.

He accepts our statement of twenty-eight as the number of families on the street. The signatures of seven of the heads of these appear on the petition asking for the franchise; all but one of these own the homes they occupy. Four heads of families have taken a neutral position, allowing the property they live on. Where his twenty-four opposing families out of the original twenty-eight come from, remains unexplained.

By a careful and thorough canvass of Fourth West Street north of North Temple, the standing in regard to the franchise of every person, firm or corporation owning land upon it, has been ascertained, and the amount of frontage owned by each determined by an examination of official records. Unless owners of land on that street have changed the position they first assumed, the figures are as follows:

Out of the 400 rods of frontage, the owners of 199 rods signed the petition asking for the franchise, or promised to do so. The owners of 104 rods stated that they were neutral upon the question, and would not sign a petition for or against. The owners of the other 97 rods were, from the outset, opposed to having the road laid upon that street. These figures were carefully verified by a representative of this paper, before the article upon the subject appeared in our issue of Friday last.

It is but proper to state that we have learned that a few persons—the names of three having been given to us—have changed their

positions upon the question, since they first defined them; of such changes, however, we had no information until today.

The owners of the uninhabited portion of the street lying north of Fifth North, are solidly in favor of the road, with the exception of one who is neutral.

Since the city council reconsidered the granting of the franchise, the owners of three pieces of land on the street have offered to sign the petition in favor of the franchise.

As to "the right or prerogative of any man, corporation or company," to decide as to the right of way for a railroad when the people in the neighborhood are opposed to it, our friend should consult a lawyer or read the Statutes of Utah on the subject. The law provides how this can be done, and the principle of it lies in the rule that "the greatest good of the greatest number" must be considered, in preference to local interests and personal prejudices.

He is quite mistaken on our remarks when he says that it was "urged because the road is born in the city there is no reason why it should not be let out." We said nothing of the kind. We have not advocated the letting out of the road nor its birth or death or anything for or against it. It is better when appearing in print to be exact, particularly when attempting to state another's language or position. We simply stated that we failed to grasp the logic of the proposition that, "a railroad started in this city should not be allowed a way to get out, as cheerfully as one started in some other place is granted a way to get in." If our friend can show the reason or right of such a proposition we would like to see his argument.

Now, as to the change of mind of the City Council on the question of the franchise, we have nothing at present to say. The reconsideration does not prove they were wrong in their first decision nor that they were right in the second. They may change front again; we do not know as to that. We have neither praised nor blamed them for either act, and we repeat we have not advocated or opposed the granting of this franchise, and all attempts of excited people to make it appear that we have are improper and unwise.

It may be that this agitation will yet result in the removal of all the railroads to some point further west, and that will please many residents of the region where this controversy exists. But whether this