

were having matters pretty much their own way, to the great annoyance of Division Supt. R. H. Pratt. Brother Hill said he would break up the gang if Mr. Pratt would stand by him so he would not have to do two jobs at the same time. He entered upon the work. He dogged the cappers. When they caught a greenhorn George followed them right up to the door of their den, and as each dupe was about to enter he called him on one side and told him what kind of characters had him in tow. The monte men sent word to him that if he did not desist they would shoot him. He replied—"Tell them when they undertake that they had better be quick about it, and that they're welcome to all the advantage they can get over me." The gang got to shooting among themselves, broke up and left the town. The railroad company thought so much of him on account of this affair that for ten years afterwards he had only to make a request to be passed over the road to any point he desired, for it to be granted.

In 1874 George was engaged in colonizing Indians on the Malad. This caused a great hubbub among the residents of Corinne, who asserted that an Indian attack upon them was intended. They demanded that the red men be dislodged. Their request was granted, troops being sent to the spot for the purpose. However, the colony was removed to a new location further up the Malad River, and now exists there, a peaceful community engaged in supporting themselves by agricultural pursuits. For some years subsequently Brother Hill acted as Indian interpreter.

His life has been one of devotion to the benefit of others, his own personal interests being a matter of subordinate consideration. He was a humble and unobtrusive man, of deep religious convictions, and his memory will not only be cherished by his wife and six children, but by all who knew him and appreciated his worth.

A FEW DEEP CREEK QUERIES.

Is it a fact that the Deep Creek railroad project will fall through, if its manipulators do not obtain possession of a block of land belonging to the people of this city for less than half its value? If so, then there is not much solid foundation to the enterprise. It will take many millions of capital to build that road, and the \$150,000 offered for the Old Fort Square is a sum scarcely worth mentioning in comparison. If the Deep Creek railroad scheme will not materialize without that block, it ought to stay where it is—on paper.

We mention this because the only argument we have heard in favor of turning over this piece of public property to a private company, is the benefit which will accrue to the city—particularly to real estate dealers, from the building of that road. And the inference is, that without the block the road will not be built. If the road is to be constructed whether the block is obtained or not, why all this fuss and bad feeling because public interests and public rights are defended as against the plans of private speculators?

It is particularly noticeable that the persons and papers that advocate the transfer, do so with great rage against those who question its propriety. What is the particular inducement which fires them to so much zeal? Does it not give the whole scheme the color of a job? Does it not bring up a cloud of suspicion which overshadows the whole affair?

Let these questions be answered: Will the Deep Creek railroad project fall through, if the Old Fort Block remains in possession of the public? If so, how much bottom is there to the scheme? If not, what is the use of founding an argument favoring the transfer, on the benefits to be derived by the city from the building of the road, and the losses that will ensue if the road is not built? And where is the sense and justice of abusing men who think the block ought to be kept for public purposes, and calling them "obstructionists" and enemies to progress?

The present issue is very different to the case of a railroad company in doubt as to where it will make its terminus or junction, and in order to secure its presence and business the people of a given locality are willing to sell cheaply or give it land for depot purposes. If this road is to be a real *ly*, it will start from this city. It is not proposed to build it at all unless it begins or ends here. Without Salt Lake City there is nothing to the project.

The gentlemen managing the affair want to get a valuable block in the interior of the city. Failing to get it for nothing they offer \$150,000 for it. Who has blamed them? Nobody that we have heard of. It is those who object to the gift and to the sale who are berated. What for? If the road is to be built, anyhow, why are the objectors to be blamed as standing in the way of public interests? Are they not really defending public interests as against private speculation?

The City Attorney advises the City Council that they have no right to give away or sell the block in ques-

tion. In the face of that cold legal counsel, what have the City officials to back them in their desire to convey the public property to a private company? The wishes of the citizens? The vote of the taxpayers? The demand of their constituents? The voice of the community? No, indeed. Outside of some real estate dealers and others whose views are colored by expected personal advantages, the great body of the people are opposed to the surrender of the block intended for public convenience and adornment, without any benefit in return except money less than half the value of the land. And they are hostile to the establishment of another railroad depot within the populated limits of the city.

We do not wonder at the anxiety and earnestness of the gentlemen who want the block. That is very natural. But what is the matter with those agitated and abusive persons who are pushing this scheme and are not peculiarly interested in it, unless it is a fact that the scheme is to fall through if the block is not secured? And if the securing of this piece of valuable public property is essential to the project, how much certainty is there that the road will be built at all?

Now don't fly into a rage, and sputter, and spit, and call names and run all around these questions, but answer them squarely, and give us some reasons why the property of the people of this city is to be diverted to private uses against their will, and in face of the doubt as to the lawful authority to make the conveyance. We do not say there are none, but they have not yet put in an appearance and if they have any existence it is time they were brought to the front.

IT IS VERY SAD.

THE spectacle presented by the City Council of Salt Lake is sufficient to diffuse the genius of melancholia throughout the municipal corporation. This menace to the mental health of the community is not only because of the evidences of manipulative jobbery at almost every step of the public business, but on account of the undignified tableaux presented at the sessions of the alleged fathers of the city.

It is sufficiently saddening when members and alleged members (the six barnacles who were never elected) assume a perpendicular attitude and hurl large slices of slang epithets and red-eyed defiance at each other, but when men who have not a shadow of standing or membership on the floor are permitted to join in the rhetorical melee, every limit of decency is overleaped.