DESERET EVENING NEWS.

THE CITY COUNCIL'S ACTION.

It is said to matter people to what a ridiculous length we carry the Home rule system and keeping in touch with the business of the Salt Lake and Ogden Gas and Electric Light company. Some have avowed that the action leave but little room for the citizens right to say what is to be done with the city, by such is not the case. The council of either legislative has control of all to do with it. As to that question, the company has a certain price to grant power, the city pays it, which affects the increase demanded, and that other gas was available if it is to say all they think they. Well, the city gets along without the gas mostly. The manufacturers says it can go up to $1.50 per month per lamp and no more, and while the light company keeps down the figure there is no certain between them, that is all and both go their way. I should be in peace.

Then why did the Council grant the franchise? On the gas proposition subtly, and in the interest of the poorer people who have to use gas. Last evening's action of the Council was not a logical proceeding to assist the carrying out of the order of events ago. There is nothing fancy, terse or theoretical about it; and as it should be understood by the Salt Lakeites. The question stands up this way: The gas company mostly fixes a minimum charge for gas at $1.50 per month, although the economic might use less than a thousand feet. Consumers who had been overcharged by the company sensibly petitioned the City Council for relief, and an investigation was had, revealing the fact that the company had no right to charge the amount named for a thousand feet, the maximum price for the company that was to supply for natural gas. The City Council, which is sworn to protect the rights of the citizens in such matter, took the view that the gas company was violating its franchise by the excessive charge, and consulted the city attorney to "post the company to get back to the standard and give us a satisfactory figure," if this was in need to take steps to have the city gas's charter annulled by the district or the Supreme. The attorney says that the gas company gave no reason, and the only way the City Council could have to turn "over" matter, and was to pass the ordinance fixing the price per thousand at $1.50 in order to have the gas company return its charges to those figures. If the words rate that the gas company can fix the minimum at $1.50, then the ordinance remains as it is (if it), and it was necessary at a start to get the case into court. It does not say that the gas company cannot make a greater reduction than one thousand feet, owing to the rate, while as a standard for prices, but the ordinance does seem open to that objection.

The question is very simple. The gas people profess the right to make a minimum charge as stated. The Council says that if it is not to the State law it has no right to do those things, but that by the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts the contrary matter stands about the past amount of property a person should be taken as a minimum. Consequently the only reason why the people are not getting their gas at the lower rate is because the Council refuses to do its duty. The gas company is standing to enforce the ordinance and is ready to abide by its provisions. It would not be just to the company to say that it is not willing to do what is right. The Council has a remedy open to enforcing the law if it sees fit to do so. The gas company will not be the party to bring the matter into court. The Council has the power to act, and it is its duty to do so. The gas company is willing to do what is right