

duced. It seems that this sudden spasm of seeming legislative consistency about the *hereafter*, resulted in the motion to pass being lost. We trust that Mr. Cohn will adhere to his determination to "obey the law in the future." He probably had in mind the action of the entire Council on the sewer ordinance, which was passed without being read at all. It was pushed through by a "thumbs up" process, Mayor Scott being the Simon who suggested that the reading of the important ordinance was a needless formality, because it was long.

There are a few points that may be appropriate for the public as well as the Council to consider in connection with the monstrous proposition in question. The sexton receives ten per cent of the proceeds of all the sales of cemetery lots. The minimum price is \$12 and the proposed maximum figure \$125. There is no labor connected with effecting a transaction of this kind. The purchaser makes his selection, the sexton names the price and on payment of it to him he issues a certificate or deed which can be filled up in a few minutes. On a twelve dollar lot—of which there will probably be none should the proposed ordinance pass—the sexton gets a fee of \$1.25, and on one that costs \$125 he gets \$12.50. The amount of labor connected with the one transaction is no more than with the other. Can any person give a good reason why the sexton should be paid so large an amount of the people's money in the one case compared with his revenue in the other? It will be observed, also, that the sexton's fee on a lot sold at the maximum price is more than the entire price charged the purchaser at the minimum rate. Now, just look at that!

To give an idea of the bonanza Messrs. Cohn and Karrick propose to create for the sexton, and the extent of the robbery they would perpetrate upon the people, we will note the income which would be derived from the avenue it is proposed to mutilate alone. It is asserted by the committee that the partial destruction of this beautiful feature of the cemetery would provide sixty new lots, of the most valuable class. Say for instance that they would bring in \$100 each—this is about the rate stated by Mr. Cohn—that would bring in the snug sum of \$6000 from that source alone. Of this amount Sexton Dunn would pocket \$600. The sale of each of

the lots would probably take up about half an hour of his valuable time, or thirty hours in the aggregate. Six hundred dollars for thirty hours' work shows that Mr. Dunn must be a man of inestimable value. Twenty dollars an hour is not had wages. It should be remembered, however, that all the time the sale of these avenue lots is in progress, the thrifty sexton is deriving a fat return from the sale of the lots at large, the price of which, according to the new ordinance, is to range between \$12 and \$125, regulated by the discretion of the presiding genius of the people's hurrying grounds.

We would like to whisper in the ears of the manipulators of this proposed job that it is more than probable a snag or two may be encountered by them. Some people are so situated and constituted that they are not willing to have their rights trampled in the dust by ruthless officials. When the owners of the lots now fronting on the main avenue of the cemetery running north and south purchased them, they procured those that bordered directly on the main street. This position adds to their value. If another line of lots is placed between theirs and the avenue, their property is depreciated, and their vested rights interfered with. Those officials who favor this proposition will do well to get the opinion of Col. Merritt before proceeding too far. Should he favor it and the job be consummated, it is not unlikely that the merit of his opinion as well as of the transaction may be tested in the courts.

We have a few shots left on the same subject, which we will hold in reserve for another occasion.

#### ADDITIONAL ABOUT THE ALLEGED "FEMALE DETECTIVE."

IN THE correspondence published in another column from Dr. Brush and Mr. F. Beers, of Pleasant Grove, mention was made of an interview between a representative of the *American Fork Independent* and Miss Inez Coulter, the young woman who has been posing as a martyr at the expense of truth. The following courteous letter, from the publisher of that paper, and the annexed statement of the interview in question are self explanatory, and need no comment:

To Editor *Deseret News*:

In answer to your published request for information we enclose the account of an interview had with Miss Inez Coulter (you have it Jennie Coulter) as published in the *Independent* of Oct. 24. The statements about Dr. Brush are surely erroneous. He resides at Pleasant Grove and is a Gentile. There was no violence offered Miss Coulter at American Fork or Pleasant Grove, or, for that matter, in this end of the County. Even the fact that Miss Coulter was in town was not generally known until after she had left. She departed on the 8:30 a.m. Union Pacific train for Salt Lake the day after the interview. We write this as a Gentile who wishes to refute any charge that the people of American Fork are other than law-abiding and peaceful citizens who would scorn to attack or injure, in any way, a woman.

Respectfully yours,  
PUBLISHER AMERICAN FORK *Independent*.  
AMERICAN FORK, Nov. 12th, 1890.

Here is the account of the interview:

"An *Independent* reporter called yesterday at the residence of the Misses Taylor to have an interview with Miss Inez Coulter, recently from New York concerning the articles that have appeared in the papers about her statement to Gen. O'Brien, superintendent of immigration at New York City.

"Miss Coulter was asked: 'Had she seen the articles as they appeared in the Salt Lake papers?'

"She had not."

"A copy of the *Herald* of October 5th was then produced. After reading the article, Miss Coulter was asked: 'Was it in substance, what she said to the General?'

"As a whole it was not."

"Had she made the statement in regard to gold being used as an inducement to the prospective convert?'

"So he had not made such statement. She had never known of their using gold for this purpose or any other, in fact; she thought gold rather a scarce article among them."

"Did she know of any instance where young girls were solicited for converts and brought to America?'

"She did know of just such an instance. While recently in New York twenty young girls, without parents or lawful protectors, were brought over in the company of three Mormon Elders. These girls were detained by Gen. O'Brien at Castle Garden and sent back to Norway."

"Why had Miss Coulter written this statement for Gen. O'Brien?'

"Because the General, knowing that she had been in Utah for two years, asked her to do it, as he wished to have some legislation in regard to the bringing over of Mormon converts."

"Had Miss Coulter come out in the service of the government as a detective, as was stated in the *Herald*?'

Miss Coulter laughed and said "she had not that honor. She would probably follow her old vocation of teacher in the Presbyterian schools."

The lady denied saying that the converts were turned adrift by the Elders for the sake of getting them more in their power. And that the best looking of the women were taken by rich, old Mormons and became "sealed wives." She was not interviewed by Dr. Drumm nor was she requested to make a second statement."