

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

A WORD TO PROF. MILLS.

The NEWS readily recognizes that the subject of irrigation is one of the most important affecting the interests of the inhabitants of this part of America. With a lively comprehension of what irrigation means as a factor in the material progress of the people, the NEWS also realizes the necessity for having the distribution of water based upon such a foundation as will preserve inviolate the acquired rights of irrigators, and will perpetuate the system instituted in these valleys by the Pioneers—that system having been proved to be superior to any other attempted either here or elsewhere, since under it the absolute right to the use of irrigating water inheres in the owner of the land upon which the water is utilized. By that means there is reserved for the actual cultivator of the soil an element without which, in this locality, cultivation cannot be successfully carried on.

Holding pronounced views upon this subject, because of its vital importance to existence itself in these valleys, the NEWS is constrained to call attention to the attitude of Prof. A. A. Mills, of the Cache County Agricultural Society and the Agricultural College of Utah. We do so in the kindest spirit toward Professor Mills, and in the sincere hope that he will change a course which is alike injurious to himself and to the interests of Utah, because of its misleading effect upon those who listen to him. Were it not that his actions are becoming a public menace we would gladly pass them by; but our duty to the people demands that the silence the NEWS has preserved on this particular subject be broken.

There is no question that Mr. Mills has the ability to be a useful factor in agricultural education in Utah, inclusive of that branch which gives special attention to irrigation and water rights—that is, if he moves in the proper path. This he has not been doing, as every well informed person who has read his letters and heard his speeches must have observed. And since in order to be kind to him in pointing out a serious fault, there is no occasion to mince words or to be other than perfectly candid in this matter, we will state that in our view the gentleman has practically assumed this position before the public:

1. He poses as the leader, instigator and chief advocate of the idea of individual ownership of water rights in Utah, as applied to those who use the water for irrigation.

2. He decries as enemies to this system, and consequently enemies to the public welfare, men who may be connected with any corporation which purpose bringing out water for useful purposes, and also the members of the Irrigation association who are trying to secure legislation that will preserve the water rights of the people in connection with the State entity.

3. By the false position he has assumed on these propositions, he has

been able to mislead some who have listened to his assertions, until there is more or less of a division of sentiment as to what legislation is necessary—such division being so serious as to impair the prospect of securing, confirming and maintaining a large proportion of water rights, present and prospective, in the State of Utah.

As to the first position, we desire to call attention to the fact that Mr. Mills' virtual claim in this respect is incorrect. He is not a leader or representative of the idea of individual water rights referred to, nor did he institute the plan. That was done, if we mistake not the gentleman's age, in Utah before he was born, by the Pioneers—certainly nearly half a century before the gentleman's advent in Utah.

Regarding the second proposition, we will state that some of the very men he assails are those who are the leaders he would assume to be. His assaults upon them we regard as an outrage, and his oft repeated assertion, that these men, some of them associated for nearly fifty years in building up the system of water rights now in vogue, are operating inimically to the best interests of the people or to the perpetuation of that system, is a piece of impudence only tolerable where patient forbearance has become a marked trait in the individuals affected. There is not a blot in connection with the business of any corporation either of them may be connected with to deprive any individual of an iota of acquired water right; they could not do so if they wished. Neither is there the least desire for legislation injuriously affecting such rights; the opposite is the end sought.

On the third point, the danger comes from the fact that by reason of a false cry regarding declared State ownership of water and of unappropriated water rights, a division has been caused by making some people believe there is an effort to disturb or impair existing water rights, whereas the purpose is to confirm and maintain them; this division tending to prevent a very necessary action for the State to secure to the people their rights as against encroachments of neighboring states. In defense of its very existence as a prosperous commonwealth, the State of Utah must declare its ownership of water within the State boundaries; it must appropriate for the benefit of the citizens all unappropriated water, conveying title to future individual appropriators. But it must not, and cannot, because of any declaration of abstract ownership of water, abrogate any title already acquired to the use of such water. The distinction is quite marked.

After this somewhat prolonged statement of a subject on which much more might be said, the NEWS makes to Professor Mills the suggestion: First—that he allow due credit to those who inaugurated the system of irrigation and water rights in Utah; second—that he cease his uncalled-for attacks upon men who have as much interest in the agricultural class as he has, to say the least; and, third—that his future efforts be for uni-

fication of the people for such legislation as will place the State in a position to maintain existing rights and to defend the rights of individual citizens in any water dispute that may arise with neighboring states.

USE OF TEA AND COFFEE.

Leading medical men in Europe and America are fast reaching the conclusion, long recognized in theory at least by most of the people of Utah, that tea and coffee are medicines, not foods, and, if drunk at all, should be used as drugs in definite and carefully prescribed doses, and not as common beverages. Discussing the subject in a recent article, Modern Medicine mentions a series of facts that go to uphold the view that medicinal use is the only one justifying the drinking of tea and coffee, which can be taken safely only in limited quantities. It refers to the injurious effects their use as a beverage has upon digestion, and cites that caffeine, the active principle in tea and coffee, is nothing less than a strong stimulant which, being added to day after day in the human body, by daily drinking, impreguates the system with a deadly poison. Upon the same subject the last issue of the Literary Digest has a translation from the Medical Week, which tells of the recent careful study of two French physicians, Drs. Gasse and Gilles de Tourette, who have made their report to the Society of the Hospitals of Paris, in which chronic intoxication by these beverages, especially coffee, is dealt with at great length. The report says:

Caffeic dyspepsia resembles closely alcoholic gastritis, being characterized by phlegm in the morning, pain in the epigastric region, with radiation toward the back, coated tongue, distaste for solid food, etc. The most important symptoms, however, involve the nervous system; there is insomnia, or sleep is accompanied by frightful dreams; when the patient stands upright he suffers from a sensation of emptiness of the head, and frequently from vertigo. In addition the muscles of the calf and thigh are affected by painful attacks of cramp, especially at night, which contribute toward making sleep impossible.

Regarding the cure for these troubles it is said the symptoms disappear with the cessation of the use of the beverage, being much less persistent than those of alcoholic poisoning. The individual who is best off, however, is the one who does not invite ill of the character referred to, by a habit as unnecessary as it is injurious.

WAR NOT PROBABLE.

As the first excitement caused by the publication of Salisbury's reply to Secretary Olney and President Cleveland's message to Congress on the matter subsides, and a calmer view of the situation is rendered possible it is evident that the probability of a war between the United States and England on the Venezuelan boundary question is too remote to cause any alarm. Such eventualities would be the result of circumstances beyond the control of statesmen.

Venezuela is but a small country