

000, by being made available for cultivation. Yet those who are building it are poor people; most assuredly they are industrious and wise in their time.

Their procedure in the present instance is not new; but it is none the less praiseworthy on that account. It is in accord with the system by which Utah's irrigation methods were made a success. The settlers needed the land, and land was valueless without water, which could be secured only by great outlay. The settlers had no cash, but they had time and muscle, and also brains—as the results show. By a co-operation of labor they accomplished all that cash capital could do, and more. They got the streams out, taking their pay in shares of water for their land, and accomplished it to the exclusion of all possible "jobbery" which so often characterizes extensive enterprises of this kind when worked out for cash payments.

The action of the Riverside people is merely a suggestion of what yet may be done in many localities by new settlers. The lessons taught by the builders of Utah have not been half learned in this regard throughout the West. There are very many tracts of land, now waste brush like the west side of Snake river in Bingham county, which can be made productive by irrigation, if settlers will only co-operate in their labor, build canals, and bring out the water; and the men who do so co-operate are benefactors to the country.

In connection with canal building of this class, a very important element consists in the fact that thereby the owners of the land also become the owners of the water. This feature is a key to success in all irrigated sections, as proved conclusively by Utah's experience. The ownership of the water separate from land ownership is a principle fatal to the prosperity of irrigators. The farmer who owns and cultivates a tract of land, and who has to hire water for irrigation, not only stands in imminent peril of being crushed in his financial operations by someone else's caprice, but is in a state of serfdom which brings steady monetary injury. He is in a situation different to men who are steadily engaged in industrial pursuits for which they draw a regular cash stipend. The farmer in an irrigated section always has spare time on his hands from regular farm labor. This spare time is part of his assets which he can and does apply to advantage in doing his portion at keeping canals and ditches in good condition. This he is always able to do when he has an ownership in the canal in the way suggested. But if he has to pay a cash or produce rental for his irrigating water, he not only loses his spare time but also a portion of his farm products which he earns when he is busy. Thus hiring water is a double loss; and any scheme which contemplates an annual rental of water, without ultimate ownership thereof in connection with the land benefited, must result disastrously to those who have to pay the rent.

It may be urged that some canal enterprises cannot be carried on without the assistance of cash capital on the part of persons who have no interest in irrigation schemes except as they bring direct returns from money

invested; and that capitalists will not invest if there is a prospect that they will have to dispose of the canal stock to the land owners or work the land themselves. The proposition may be a topic for discussion, in view of the fact that when the needs of the settlers are recognized, and the people determinedly unite to supply them, experience goes to show that co-operation of labor has achieved the desired result. But laying aside any controversy on that point, practical tests have established this fact: that where the cultivator of the soil in irrigated sections has no direct ownership of the water, but has to pay regular taxes on the land made valuable so far as government assessment is concerned by that which does not belong to him, and then has to pay a further tax for using the water which gives to the land all the value it possesses, without being able to meet that burden by utilizing his ability to labor in his spare time, he becomes discouraged and wishes himself in more favorable circumstances. The certainty of discontent of this nature, based upon such substantial grounds, is a flat destiny which marks for failure all schemes operated on the purely rental system.

With the People's canal builders, however, and all others similarly situated, it is different. They have an incentive to press on, and whenever the value of their land is increased it is in conjunction with improvements of which they also are the owners and which are the chief of factors in the enhancement of land values in irrigated sections. We hope to see more enterprising work of the character now engaged in by the good people of Riverside.

HOKE SMITH'S OPPOSITION.

It is announced in the dispatches that the national administration "has determined to fight the Ute bill." The antagonism to the measure is credited principally to the secretary of the interior, Hoke Smith. Mr. Smith has considered carefully the condition of the Indians as reported to him, and on the examination made he thinks it unwise to treat them as suggested.

The Ute bill referred to is a measure backed by Colorado congressmen, and relates to the occupants of the Southern Ute Indian reservation in southwestern Colorado. It proposes to make allotments in severalty to the savages, of a part of the land now embraced in the reservation, and to throw the remainder open for settlement and occupancy by the white men. The Indians affected are those who recently came over into San Juan county, and who are now returning by Secretary Smith's direction.

The attitude assumed by the secretary on this proposition should receive the unqualified support of all friends of the Indian race. Every consideration of justice and humanity demands that the Ute bill should be defeated. It is not a greater outrage, it is equally as great an imposition on the Indians as was attempted on the San Juan settlers by sending the Utes into that county; and whatever influence Utah's Delegate in Congress can bring to bear on the subject in the national legislature might be well directed to-

ward bringing the proposed measure to ignominious failure.

The Indians on the Southern Ute reservation are no more fit to be subjected to the provisions of the bill as a law than is a five-year old boy to be turned out and left to make his own living. The child might beg and eke out a miserable existence; but it would be a crime to require him to do it. Yet it would be no greater offense against humanity than to adopt the suggested measure. It means simply death to the Indians by a slow and painful process.

Within the area of the present reservation there is a comparatively small amount of agricultural land. There is considerable grazing country, much of broken and mountainous district, and probably a good mineral region. The aborigines are thoroughly wild blanket Indians. They live by hunting, a little stock raising, and the annuities which come from the government. If allotments in severalty are made the hunting and roaming will be stopped, and the extent of grazing country left to the Indians will be so limited that they cannot obtain sustenance for their sheep, cattle and ponies. They are unfitted to engage in farming or industrial pursuits because they are uncivilized, and the result of the intended change would be to compel them to either starve or be supported entirely by the government, while at the same time the restrictions necessarily placed around them by the allotment rule would be as injurious to their physical condition as it would be to a civilized person to confine him in a disease-infected pesthouse.

The attempt of Colorado to get rid of the Indians, by inducing them to invade the San Juan country, even at the risk of having an exterminating war waged against them, is not one whit worse than the present proposed legislation, which might well be entitled a bill to provide for the extinction of the Southern Utes. In opposing the Ute bill the secretary of the interior in particular and the administration in general are interposing a barrier to the wholesale destruction of human life. May this latest scheme to rob and destroy the Indian meet with the fate it merits in a civilized nation!

IN A letter to Kate Field's *Washington*, written by Mrs. Marion Muir Richardson, from Richardson, Grand county, this Territory, occurs the following sentence:

We have been seven or eight years trying to build up a Gentile settlement in Utah, and I assure you we have had our trials.

We know of people who have been in some cases forty-seven or eight years trying to build up settlements in Utah, and we assure Mrs. Richardson that they, too, have had their trials.

Again the lady says:

Though, living in Utah, I have necessarily been dead to the finer values of life for many years, I am live enough to take them up again, and will write more this winter.

Why "necessarily" in the above connection? The people we have spoken of, "though living in Utah," have not been the least bit "dead to the finer values of life" during any part of the long period referred to.