

plains are away down in the list. For the whole country the average is lower than any previous year. In the figures here given, 100 is rated as a full crop: In 1890, the lowest previous year, the crop was rated at 77; this year it is 74, as against 86 in 1893. Before the crop of 1895 comes in, therefore, it is probable that the market price of potatoes will be well up, considering that there are but six bushels now where there were seven last year.

As to the localities which will have potatoes for shipment and those which will require supplies, with their geographical relation to each other, the following figures, indicating the condition of the crop, will make the matter clear. As in all the government agricultural estimates, 100 is rated as full crop: Maine, 93; New Hampshire, 95; Vermont, 98; Massachusetts, 82; Rhode Island, 75; Connecticut, 68; New York, 92; New Jersey, 53; Pennsylvania, 73; Delaware, 93; Maryland, 77; Virginia, 81; North Carolina, 93; South Carolina, 79; Georgia, 87; Florida, 90; Alabama, 95; Mississippi, 88; Louisiana, 64; Texas, 79; Arkansas, 87; Tennessee, 84; West Virginia, 73; Kentucky, 78; Ohio, 69; Michigan, 76; Indiana, 80; Illinois, 63; Wisconsin, 51; Minnesota, 55; Iowa, 41; Missouri, 86; Kansas, 69; Nebraska, 38; South Dakota, 42; North Dakota, 68; Montana, 100; Wyoming, 108; Utah, 103; Idaho, 100; Colorado, 87; New Mexico, 85; Arizona, 80; Nevada, 98; Washington, 97; Oregon, 101; California, 94. Considering the situation of Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota and other states where Utah potatoes find an outside market, these figures will be an inducement for more than ordinary care in this locality with the potato crop, since it promises to bring good returns in cash before the time in 1895 for new potatoes comes around, though in the local market in the early fall prices may not range quite as high as producers would like them to be. As to production in wheat, potatoes, hay, fruit, etc., Utah this year is ahead of her average, no falling off in fruits of the soil being reported in any direction.

### THE IRRIGATION CONGRESS.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 23, 1894.

Editor *Deseret News*:

Your able editorial in the *News* of the 22d overlooks the advantages of having representatives at the Denver Congress to represent Utah to discuss the very matters you speak of.

There is nothing in the address to the people to contravene your ideas; quite the contrary. In fact there has never at any time such a thing been thought of regarding the cession of the arid or national lands until all these questions have been settled and which the nation has to bear the expense of.

If you will consult the address of the Commission to the people, you will see that the questions 5 to 8 inclusive involve matters of really more import than 5 alone, since the enabling act really gives us all the arable land existing within the Territory to Utah as a State.

Cordially admitting that this is a matter to be carefully studied, and that it will take five or more years to bring about a result, there is the strongest reason that Utah at the coming Congress should be represented by the very strongest men we can send, and any neglect to do so will be a disgrace to Utah.

Will you kindly suggest any better way of doing this for Utah?

Today this Territory has a prestige second to none, and its representatives will be listened to at Denver as no others will; and now the object of the Commission is to get as many delegates to go there as possible without any regard to their views—except as they represent the best for Utah.

On the eve of becoming a State there is all the more reason why she should be heard. We ask you and your paper to request the people to send delegates and answer a few statistical questions.

Very truly yours,

C. L. STEVENSON,

Secretary.

The *News* is very pleased to publish the foregoing letter; one good reason being that Col. Stevenson appears to have imbibed the idea—as have others from whom we have lately heard—that this paper was rather opposed to the Irrigation Congress at Denver, and was inclined to throw cold water upon the endeavor to have proper representation there for Utah. That this is a huge mistake and the exact opposite of the *News's* position, will be clear, we think, to every one who will read carefully the editorial referred to, which appeared in our daily issue of the 22nd. Col. Stevenson's remarks about Utah's prestige in matters of irrigation are most sincerely believed by the *News*; they were in fact given in substance and almost in identical language in the very article which, he says, "overlooks the advantages of having representatives at the Denver Congress." We overlooked none of the advantages, but on the contrary urged them upon public attention; and if anything more in that line is needed, we are ready here and now to re-assert and re-emphasize the high and imperative duty of this Territory to be fully and ably represented in the deliberations of that body.

In an address to the people of Utah concerning the "Third National Irrigation Congress," which is to convene in the Broadway Theater, Denver, September 3, the members of the Irrigation Commission for the Territory make a strong plea for the earnestness, the interest and the assistance of public-spirited Utah citizens. This commission consists of Wm. H. Rowe, who is the Utah member of the national executive committee; S. Fortier of Logan; L. W. Shurtliff of Ogden; L. Hulbrook of Provo, and C. E. Wantland of Salt Lake City, with C. L. Stevenson as secretary—well-known and representative men all of them, and energetic for the advancement of the community. Their address refers to the official call for the Denver Congress, and gives the basis of representation. They explain the duties of the commissions appointed for the various arid or semi-arid states and territories, and the valuable information that may be expected from the reports of these bodies—seventeen, we believe, is the number of them that will report at Denver. Attention is invited to the magnitude of the arid land problem and its solution, in which connection occurs this strong statement:

The country has millions of unemployed men, the arid west has millions of unemployed acres. To transfer unemployed men to surplus land is the great problem which must be met and

which the Third Irrigation Congress will consider. Utah ought to be able to secure her share of the advantages which will come to the arid west when finally the method is adopted which will secure the construction and proper regulation of the irrigation works necessary to prepare the now useless land to receive the millions who are crying for homes.

The address then urges public interest in the appointment of a sufficient number and the right kind of men as delegates to the Denver meeting—"men of experience in irrigation and colonization work and who have the general welfare at heart;" and it concludes with an urgent request for a speedy answer to a list of eight questions, together with such additional advice and counsel as the correspondent may be able to give. The list of inquiries is as follows:

- 1st. Give name and address.
- 2nd. From what stream or source is the water within your district or ward supplied?
- 3rd. Is the water of this source fully utilized, and if not, what proportion runs to waste during the winter season or how many months of the year is the water not used for irrigation?
- 4th. About what area of lands is there along the stream which can be irrigated and are not?

The first Irrigation Congress, held at Salt Lake City in 1891, decided that the best results for the reclamation of the arid lands would be secured by the cession of such public lands to the state, and the control and sale thereof be exercised by that state.

5th. Do you favor any change in the policy decided upon at the Salt Lake Congress of 1891 and endorsed by the Legislature of Utah? If so, in what particular or manner?

The platform of the Irrigation Congress held at Los Angeles in 1893, favored several departures from existing laws. We submit these inquiries in relation thereto as follows:

First. The Irrigation Congress declares—"We declare that water in natural channels and beds, is public property, and when, under the law of any state, vested rights have been secured thereto, such rights, like all other private property, may be supervised for beneficial purposes, and be condemned for public use, under the exercise of the power of eminent domain."

6th. Do you favor the principle of condemning existing water rights?

The Los Angeles platform declares—"We declare that all streams rising in one state and flowing by natural courses through one or more states, must be conserved and equally divided under Federal authority."

7th. Do you favor the division of the water among appropriators by officers of the general government rather than local officers?

Third. The Los Angeles platform declares—"We favor the limitation of the amount of land that may be taken up by settlers, under systems of irrigation, to forty acres, and predict that in the future it will be found desirable to reduce the amount still further, and we favor the restriction of the privilege of taking up the public lands to citizens of the United States."

8th. Does the limitation of land filings to forty acres meet your approval?

Now, most of these are important questions and some of them should not be answered too glibly or without due consideration. The time, however, is short in which the part of the work preparatory to the meeting of the Congress must be attended to, and realizing this, as also the fact that it