

## Correspondence.

## All About the Water.

SALT LAKE CITY,  
August 11th, 1874.

Editor Deseret News:

Although July was a rainy month the present season, and although our summers of late years have been more showery than those of former years, yet irrigation is still necessary for the perfection of fruit and vegetables, and for late crops it is most necessary at this time of the year, when there is the least amount of water to be obtained. Irrigation being necessary and the amount of available water being limited, necessitates careful supervision over the distribution of the water, which careful distribution does not exist at all times and in all places. This careful distribution naturally depends upon the water-masters, and it seems to me that the growth of this city, and the increasing conflict of interests, demand that the position of water-master be something more than a sinecure, and that it be a position of active supervision and direction. Public offices are supposed to be for the public good, and not for the exclusive benefit and aggrandizement of any person, family or clique. It is all very well to keep men in office year after year when they diligently and faithfully perform their duties, but when they do not, and other men can be obtained who will, the sooner the neglectful incumbents are ousted and more attentive men put in their places the better for the general welfare. If another and more effective municipal ordinance is needed to insure more satisfactory conduct of this irrigation business, let a new ordinance be made.

There is a great deal connected with the water question that requires constant, careful, intelligent and authoritative direction, that one portion of the citizens may not suffer while others reap undue benefits, or while waste of the vital fluid is going on anywhere. That considerable waste does occur, there can be no doubt when we see some of the streets and sidewalks irrigated freely, while fenced and cultivated lots in different parts of the city are parched and dusty, and the trees and vegetables withering. Dust grows very poor fruit or vegetables, if any at all.

There are frequent leakages through imperfect water-gates, or the incomplete stopping of sluices. There is also considerable water-stealing going on, and there is neglect of water-masters to promptly distribute the water and properly advise the citizens of their time for using the water, and the quantity they are respectively entitled to. In regard to imperfect water-gates it seems to me that it should come under the water-master's distinct and express duty to see that they are in the right place, of a suitable kind, and in good, serviceable condition for the equitable distribution of the water, the incline and force of the stream at different points being taken into thorough consideration. Everybody knows that, as things are, little or nothing of this kind is done, but the distribution at many of the various water-gates is done in the most primitive, indeterminate, and irregular way, and frequently by anybody who takes it into his head to do it, though he may thereby be undoing the work of some other equally unauthorized person, while the water-master lets things go as they may.

With the present irregular and unsatisfactory manner of doing, little pleasure is there in a man attempting to irrigate his lot, if he lives in a lower ward, and particularly if his lot is not upon a principal water sect.

It would be far better for each lot or portion of a lot to be taxed a dollar or two every year to pay a water-master who would attend to his duty, who would see that each main water-gate, at least, had its proper amount of water flowing and at the proper times, that there were no leakages, no thefts of water, no disproportionate division of water as to time or quantity. Some such complete regulation and constant attention is certainly due, and it is sadly needed, for as water matters are now often managed or rather mismanaged, there is a superfluous amount of annoyance and aggravation, to say nothing of loss of time, diminution of crops, and loss of neighborly respect

among neighbors and neighboring wards.

When boxes are put into the sects to supply cisterns or pipes for fountains or irrigation, there should be some competent regulation about it. Dick, Tom, and Harry should not be allowed to obstruct or divert a stream by boxes or gates. The water-masters should be empowered to see that boxes, if allowed, should not be placed in the stream to obstruct it, but at the side, so that their supply could be turned off or on as they might be entitled to have the water, without robbing the neighbors or other citizens who have no such boxes, and that the boxes at any time would take no more than their due share of the water.

During the present summer, for instance, I have no doubt that many hard working men would have been glad to act as water-masters for a reasonable compensation, and would have attended to their duty. As it is, the watering business is frequently a nuisance, a perplexity, a vexation, an aggravation.

I have hinted that considerable water stealing is perpetrated. This is the fact. One man will have his lot soaked and soaked, while the lot of another man, with equal claim to the water, is drying up. I am aware it is very trying to the enthusiastic or ambitious cultivator to see his garden things withering when it is not his turn to have the water, but it is much more trying to see them drying up when it is his turn to irrigate, and he cannot get the water or his rightful share of it.

In this respect it seems to me the 20th Ward is the greatest nuisance in the city. When a citizen in the lower wards has begun to water his lot, some sly, and possibly pious, 20th Warder will turn off a portion or the whole of the stream, and not once only, so that several lengthy journeys are induced to see where the leakage is and to stop it, and when it is found, perhaps the annoyed lower warder does not indulge in strong expletives—perhaps not. Now if this sort of unwarranted interference with the water arose from crass ignorance or sheer stupidity, charity might be extended to the interfering party. But the 20th Ward people can hardly be so ignorant or so stupid as not to comprehend that on certain days and for certain hours they have no right whatever to meddle with the water, for the ample reason that it belongs to others. It seems to me that some persons in that ward should be made examples of, their affection for water is so wonderful. Such people are not likely to be afflicted with hydrophobia. I might give names, but the owners of them perhaps would not like to see them in print. So I refrain, as I am writing this partly to entertain and please them.

I do not know whether that ward has got something like the "big head" about the water, but certainly the symptoms indicate some affection of that kind. The other day I asked a 20th warder what days the people of that ward understood they had a right to use the water. He said he thought they reckoned to use it four days in the week, and some of them took it whenever they wanted it into the bargain, which is probably true of some of the citizens up there. Facts seem to point in that direction.

We hear a great outcry from the more northern and northeastern parts of the 20th Ward for water. If those upper lots were taken up with the idea of claiming an equal share in the water previously going to the lower lots and wards, then the takers up have strange notions of justice. If those upper lots were not taken up with that idea, then to make a great outcry for the water belonging to the lower lots and wards shows an equal lack of justice. Of course there is a portion of the year when water is abundant for all. When there is such a superfluity, there can be no reasonable objection to those upper lots having a ditch to convey to them this surplus water, or some of it, as that would not injure the older settlers. But in a dry time, ought the old settled lots to be robbed to accommodate the upper lots? Not upon any principle of right or justice that I know anything about.

Let us go into this matter a little deeper. Twelve or fifteen years ago, the settled portion of the 20th ward was not more than a third or perhaps a fourth as large as it is

to-day, and I believe the population was far less dense in proportion. But years previously to that time the lower wards were settled, fenced, and cultivated. These lower wards had their ditches and streams of water when the 20th Ward was the smallest and most insignificant in the city. The main ditch from City Creek which now supplies the 20th Ward is not a 20th Ward ditch, it was not made by the 20th Ward. It was dug by the 12th Ward, and called the 12th Ward ditch. Yet now, I should probably be within the truth if I said that the 20th Ward uses three times the water out of that ditch that the 12th Ward does. If the 20th Ward takes so much greater a proportion of the water than it used to have, does it not obtain the excess largely at the expense of the lower and previously settled wards? If so, it is a thing neither just nor right, excepting so far as the lower wards are willing to accommodate the thirsty, greedy, and inflated 20th Ward.

The stream in this ditch is often diverted from the wards below, and spread over the upper ward, frequently to the injury of the lower wards, which have the original claim to the water. Is this right? Is it equitable? If it is technically equitable, it is not really and morally equitable. The same ditch lately has also been made to supply the 11th Ward with water, owing to the usurping and monopoly of Red Butte Creek by Camp Douglas. This may be grateful to the 11th Warders, but is it right to the other wards? Not if it infringes upon their old established water rights to the injury of their gardens, unless the other wards charitably acquiesce therein.

Camp Douglas did an ungracious, unneighborly, and very unjust thing when it robbed any portion of the city of the water which belonged to it. Such actions are altogether inequitable. They are right only upon the rule that might, physical might, muscular might, sheer brute force, makes right.

In conclusion, I may observe, that if the city streams of water were efficiently supervised, directed and managed, and infringers were promptly fined or otherwise effectively dealt with, the irrigating and the whole water business would go on like clockwork, and no person would have any reasonable cause of complaint.

IRRIGATOR.

## The Water Question.

Editor Deseret News:

Dear Sir—I am pleased to find your correspondent "Irrigator" directing public attention to the fact that "of course there is a portion of the year when water is abundant for all," and that "when there is such a superfluity, there can be no reasonable objection to those upper lots having a ditch to convey to them this surplus water, or some of it, that would not injure the older settlers." It is the consciousness of this fact that helps to create the "great outcry" from the more northern and northeastern parts of the 20th Ward for water.

In justice to the settlers and purchasers of those "upper lots" it should be said that no water privileges were guaranteed or expected at the time. But it is now found that by taking water out of the City Creek, above the flour mill, much water that is now run to waste could be obtained for, at least, domestic purposes. And, as the value of the mill would be lessened the people are willing to pay for the loss sustained. Practically, the 20th Ward water ditch now supplies water for domestic use for this locality, but it has to be carried by men women and children, in many instances several blocks. All this labor could be avoided, and used in other and certainly more agreeable pursuits.

As to old established "water rights" and the "injury to gardens," injury, vital injury, is being done by this deprivation of water, not to vegetation only, but to human beings, some four hundred families being sufferers.

That this vexed "water question" will have to be settled, and that soon, by reason of the growing necessities of a large number of our citizens living on those "upper lots," is certain, but concessions may now be made that will save much ill feeling. After spending much money, attending no end of public meetings, sending petition after petition to our City Fathers;

after reading interminable correspondence and promises without number in your columns about what was to be done for water, and seeing it still in the future, I begin to hope, sir, that when the inhabitants of these upper lots shall reach

"That country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

there will be no bother about "water rights," but, at least, that condition of things is arrived at, hinted at by "Irrigator" as being possible here in Salt Lake City, that the streams of water being efficiently supervised (!), directed and managed, "no person has any reasonable cause of complaint."

Most respectfully,  
A WOULD-BE IRRIGATOR.  
UPPER LOTS, 20th Ward,  
Aug. 14, 1874.

## FARMING.

## EMPIRICAL AND RATIONAL.

Empirical farming, as a pursuit of life, is a mere immediate application of experiments, and a passive submission to experience and usage; more or less, if not entirely, without comprehension of facts, as they exist and present themselves in the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms, in production and re-production, in the physical and chemical interchanges continually going on in the workshops of nature.

The one-sided empirical farmer knows that his cow gives more or less milk in proportion to the amount of grass it eats; and he judges from that fact that grass contains milk. But let the farmer be able to analyze milk, and the different kinds of cow-feed within his reach, and a wide scope is at once opened before him, of objects of research and economy. He knows also that manure has a reproductive power, when applied in the soil; and he judges that in some shape there is grain and vegetable in the manure; but let the farmer be able to analyze the productions of the farm, and commence to understand something about the reciprocation in nature's economy, and a new era is opened to his mind; he passes from the state of being a negative minded empirical tool of circumstances, to the master of them as a rational farmer.

Farming, reduced to a science, has, since an Albrecht, Thaer, Justus Liebig and Johnston, etc., changed the condition of farmers, and so to say, as far as it has come, lifted the farmer from comparative serfdom to full fellowship in society.

Empirical farming is like an expensive and very heavy-working machine. It is well known that individuals who apply themselves exclusively to muscular work, and neglect their intellectual development, become mere muscle men. They get their muscle developed; they work, but their intelligence to direct their labors to the most advantage, is at a minimum.

Political and social ignorance concluded that farming should be run with muscle, and with muscle alone; hard work, and hard work alone, were the opinionated conditions of farming life; and when it happened that a little less than common ignorance got mixed in among the farmers, such individuals would even commence to look round, to ascertain if a more remunerative, honorable and easy employ was not obtainable. And as this was not difficult to find, the farming community was continually drained of intelligence. History shows this, and facts demonstrate it to-day.

Compare the amount of mechanical and chemical science applied, for instance, to commercial and manufacturing purposes, to the amount of science applied in the development of farming; and it is no more a riddle why farming is in an empirical state. Only look at the United States budget, compare the expenditures in the different branches, and the problem is solved. In the future, the present state of farming in the United States can be examined in the financial accounts. Last session, it is said, there were three farmers in Congress, to represent the interests of our farming population, which is about twenty millions.

Agricultural pursuits also wield a certain moral influence over their empirical followers. The idyllic, pastoral, undisputed quietude of the farm frames the empirical mind accordingly, so much so that such

almost become a distinct class in society, whose habits are often very marked. It is an innate condition, that nature stamps ignorance, and intelligence stamps nature; in other words, intelligence will tame our wild prairies, and our prairies will make our ignorant boys wild.

We find the above-mentioned class of farmers, comparatively, to have very little interest outside their farm; preferring, generally, to a degree, social seclusion. They have a limited interest in public affairs, and political, social, commercial, scientific and literary pursuits, etc. Questions of the day do not seem to draw the attention of that class, as they do of other classes of the community. And while this state of things has been and is still extant, farming communities neglect also to maintain their political interests.

This repeats itself in history. The feudal aristocracy was made possible by the farmers' disinterestedness in public affairs; and while the latter ignorantly slept, in political, social, and moral lethargy, the captains of the country subdued them. In our day, the very same thing is going on, from precisely the same causes, but it is now monopoly, as it formerly was feudalism; its features differ only according to its day, or the different stamps of the different times. Feudal aristocracy and money-aristocracy could not have gained their aim without the indolent tolerance and empiricism of the landed classes of the community.

The stereotyped habits of empirical farming life have a tendency to resist improvements or reforms; are prejudiced, more or less, against things new, and deficient in judgment in choosing between that which is beneficial and that which is not. Hence the stagnation and slow progress of empirical farming. It is natural for empiricism to be conservative and non-progressive.

Empirical farming is not economical; it is, as stated, a mere negative-minded application of experience, or a braiding together, or intermixture, of habit and experiment. Nevertheless, by the pressure of necessity and by long process of time, farming, even in this state, has formed itself into a kind of economy. But, being formed empirically, it stands as a building whose inmates do not know, neither do they care, when nor how it was built; consequently they not knowing how to build another one, are very careful to preserve its structure. Hence the obstructions to reform.

When the re-actionary wars of the horrible French revolution had subsided, it was in places made a state-economical object to educate the farming community, and cause the different classes of society to be better balanced. This was imagined to have been secured in the United States by its republican institutions. But, lo and behold! what are the expenses of the United States, financially only, or the ruinous state of affairs which monopoly has sunk them in? Counted by hundreds, yea thousands of millions, and ten to one, it would have been cheaper to pattern after the Greek of old, and ostracize the executive ability which selfishly caused, or partly caused, the present financial and political disadjustment. But it would undoubtedly have been still better, half a century ago, to establish colleges of science, particularly applicable to agriculture, and for the education of about fifty per cent. of its population, who are pursuing the occupation of farming. As it is now, farming is more an application of muscle than intelligence; and hence, the intelligent part of the people seek more remunerative, imaginarily more honorable, and less toilsome employments, which retards the progress of rational farming proportionately.

The solution of scientific problems in the agricultural line, laws in favor of and protective to the interests of farming, improvement in implements, etc., has almost, if not entirely been effected by interested parties, not of the farming class. This abundantly proves the deficiency of scientific education among farmers.

It is nevertheless a fact, that in scientific experimental eccentricity on the unknown shore of yet unsolved problems, fortunes have been spent. Students in any branch of science need more or less