

were pursued at different times by the court, and each is condemned when the other was being followed.

It is admitted in the report that the several selectmen presented bills to the court "for services rendered for viewing roads and bridges," and then it is said that the labor on the roads was paid for without the "written approval of any county official who claimed to have personal knowledge that the work charged for was actually and properly done." This is on a par with the rest of the report. The members of the county court personally examined the work, in an official capacity, and then paid for it without securing from some one a "written approval." And for this the court is charged with being "grossly culpable." The same line of reasoning is adopted as to other instances.

The surplus canal is made an object of attack. The record is quoted from, and the assertion made that the court "refused to make any appropriation." Then it is said that when Mr. Fox made some payments "on his own authority," the court approved them. The record as quoted in the report shows that no refusal such as was claimed ever was made, and the statement regarding Mr. Fox is proven to be untrue by the subsequent language of the report relative to the final action of the county court upon the surplus canal, the substance of which is that of the \$19,200 which the canal cost, one-third was paid by the county, one-third by the city, and one-third by the inhabitants along the line of the canal, and that each party receives about equal benefit therefrom.

The subject of canals is also manipulated in a way to deceive. It is stated that the county funds were diverted and misappropriated to the "building of these canals upon the pretense that it was a benefit to the county." Is there any sane man who is acquainted with the results of taking out the Jordan water who will not say that this benefit is no pretense but is a solid fact, from which the county has received many times the amount expended, and the inhabitants been benefited to an enormous extent? The subject of canals is dismissed with a reference to the hydraulic canal and the one-sixth interest held by the county in the dam and the Jordan. Of this it is said, "we do not believe the county ever had the slightest shadow of a title to any waters of the Jordan River," and gives as a reason that "the whole volume of

the river was vested in individual appropriators long prior to the building of the so-called county dam." This is a misstatement, and the fact must be known to the jurors who have resided here any length of time. If the water was appropriated long before the dam was built, how is it that the canal companies get water at that dam under a deed from the county? Or how could the water be appropriated until the dam had been made to store it and bring it to a level where it could be taken out and used?

Reference is made to the fact that George Crismon, as collector, owed the county \$22,024.04 which was charged to relief account. But the report carefully conceals the fact that the great bulk of this was uncollected taxes, which Mr. Crismon was not in equity responsible for. Nor does it refer to that which the grand jury as "an arm of the district court," must have been aware of, that the settlement with Mr. Crismon's bondsmen was made by suit in the Third District Court, with the present chief justice on the bench.

"We find the defalcation of D. Bockholt, late county clerk, to be \$11,038.60." That is all the report says on the matter. Why is it silent on the point which is a matter of record in the Third District Court, that Mr. Bockholt was indicted, and died before his case could be brought to trial?

The detective service of the county is made an object of disapproval. The report actually says that the county paid for one detective, and the sheriff at various times paid for additional detective work. What if he did? Is he confined to one, when the public welfare in the suppression of crime requires more?

The county court has paid fees for employing extra attorneys when it was considered that the circumstances made it necessary. This is made the ground of another objection, and the "*Vandereock habeas corpus* case" is cited, with the remark that the "records nowhere show that the county was a party to the suit." The records show that Deputy Marshal Vandereock was arrested, and as the case was brought under the law of the Territory, it was the county's duty to carry it just as far as the county went. This is shown by the record and the statute, as the jury ought to know.

The manner in which the jury treats the management of city affairs

is so manifestly unjust that the intelligent reader can perceive the animus and misrepresentation at a glance, if he has taken pains to inform himself at all upon the subject. The efforts of the Mayor and Council to procure an adequate water supply receive special attention. The arrangement entered into with farmers who had claims upon Parley's Creek to exchange for irrigating water from the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal and the purchase of two mill sites are referred to as egregious blunders; the procuring of a deed for an additional one-sixth interest in the Jordan dam and its storage capacity is placed in the same category. The report says:

"So for the canal the city once owned, which conveyed one-sixth of the water of the River Jordan, and \$45,635 cash, the city is the happy possessor of a dry ditch on East Bench and two mill properties, which are hardly worth the powder necessary to blow them up with."

This is untrue and misrepresentative in several particulars. Instead of the mill properties being valueless, if we have been correctly informed the city has been offered for them a larger price than that for which they were purchased, on account of the increased value of the land attachments. It is correct that the Parley's Creek canal was, during a large part of last season, practically a dry ditch. This was the case for the same reason that nearly all the streams which usually are ample for the needs of the people were practically dry throughout this entire mountain region, including not only Utah, but Idaho. It was beyond the power of the Mayor and Council to make a contract with the management of the atmospheric conditions to favor the country with plenty of moisture. No one but an idiot would argue otherwise than that, had it not been for a contingency over which the corporation had no control—a two years' drouth—which parched the country and dried up the streams—there would have been no difficulty about water. Only for this unpreventible freak of nature the measures adopted by the city authorities to obtain water for the people would have been a demonstrated success. We do not doubt that the future will yet generously justify their actions in that respect, by proofs that will place their judgment beyond dispute.

The assaults on Mayor Armstrong, a most energetic and capable officer, are paltry and disingenuous. Purchases of lumber, etc., were