

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

STANDING DAILY, MORNINGS EIGHTH, AT NOON, ETC.

THE DESERET NEWS CO.

CHARLES W. TAYLOR, EDITOR.

JULY 20, 1862.

THE STREET SPRINKLING TAX.

There is much dissatisfaction among property owners over the street sprinkling tax. Many of them have been served with a notice that they have been assessed at the rate of seven cents per ton of freight. This came both ways on certain lots. The service has always been moderate above the "Liberal" lot, the contract to a non-resident firm and rejected all local bids. But that we do not wish now to make particular mention. The Council has recently created a new sprinkling district, and placed a tax, we remunerate rightly, at only four cents per cent.

In addition to this dissatisfaction between districts which, however, may be capable of satisfactory explanation, there is also the dissatisfaction in the supply. One portion of District 10, the contractors are sprinkled or flooded at least two times a day, in other parts of the same district only twice a day. Valuable property in the business locality which is sprinkled to a greater degree than in remote places, pays as much as their better, and almost vacant lots have to pay very large sums against small and insignificant amounts paid by valuable business houses.

More than that, it is believed that the City Council has no legitimate authority to levy a special street sprinkling tax at all. It is a public service for a public necessity, to some part of the general funds obtained by general taxation. Investigation of the charities with all its amanuenses, fails to disclose any definite benefit or power on the Council in very such a tax.

The consequence is that a number of aggrieved taxpayers have agreed to unite and resist the collection of this unequal, and as believed, illegal imposition. An injunction will be applied for, and those who fail in paying the tax until a judicial decision is reached. If the great body of the property owners take part in the suit, it will cost them not a mere trifles, and great confidence is expressed that the tax will be declared unlawful. In our special notice column will be found something of interest in "Who stands to escape this burthen, & if anyone responde to it on their part is necessary."

A TRICK OF THE TRADE.

A SAMPLE of the methods of the "liberal" law was given on Friday in the case of E. H. Parsons against C. G. Goodwin and Wm. Howell for criminal libel. The action was taken before United States Commissioner Howell on behalf of the defendants O. W. Powers, so the Tribune reports, suggested that owing to the personal relations between the Court and one of the defendants, it might be rather embarrassing for the Court to hear the case, and he went on to state that he was "perfectly willing to have the case transferred." He could agree with the attorney for the prosecution. The case was "transferred," Judge Howell refusing to hear it under the circumstances, and it went before Justice Kneller.

As soon as the case was opened Powers objected to the transfer. He stated that the Justices had no power over the defendants; that Judge Howell had no power to make this "particular transfer"; that because he had been shown why he could not have gone on with his trial, and that the change had only been made at "the suggestion of the Court."

Mr. Critchlow, evidently surprised at such an apparent trick, showed that the objection was not logical.

The objection was to the removal of the trial from the State of Utah, and took the ground that the Justice had full jurisdiction. However, the Court thought it prudent to take time to consider the question and so the case went over until Monday afternoon.

Is not this what in other places is known as "pettifogging"? And is it not quite compatible with the usual methods of the political fugitive who has obtained so much notoriety of a certain kind in this Territory? And does Wm. as though the defendants were as anxious as he makes out for a speedy and impartial trial? Powers, Goodwin and Nelson, Goodwin, Nelson and Powers makes very harmonious and are fittingly associated in this action.

INTOXICATED CONGRESSMEN.

This strange malady in a campaign pamphlet by Mr. Wilson of Georgia, that some Members of Congress attend to public business and make speeches on important subjects while intoxicated, and that drunken members rise through the aisles of the House, needs the investigation. It is to have a congressional committee. Though made for a partisan purpose we bear this in the much truth of the fact of it. No one familiar with affairs at the capital can deny, to himself, that evidence of indulgence in the intoxicating vice are often afforded to the halls of Congress and that such scenes are disgraceful to a statesman.

As to whether this vice holds its characteristic of members of one party only, there may be a difference of

opinion. There is nothing, however, in the principles of either party which gives license to such conduct. And so little the anger generated by Mr. Wilson's article is manifested that persons outside the bar have given it no consideration than the disgraceable fact itself.

It is bad enough when men, esti-

mated

with

no

right

to

speak

and

act

in

such

a

way

as

that

it

is

bad

enough

when

men

of

one

party

are

so

bad

when

they

are

so