have a bearing on the subject, and which may either change or confirm the view expressed on what is stated. As the inquirer does not furnish information upon which to base a definite reply, it cannot be given him. The matter of water rights is so susceptible of being varied by adverse claims in every degree, that the circumstances must be thoroughly and clearly understood to express an opinion thereon which the people can feel they may be safely guided by.

WATER DRINKING CURE.

The Medical World has an article on how drinking mineral waters cure many ailments. In some instances these waters are pleasant, and more readily quench the thirst than the ordinary liquid, though this refers more to aerated waters, meads, etc., than to those strictly known as mineral waters. As to the use of the latter, the Medical World tells how, when a patient reaches a mineral water health resort, he is examined by the resident physician and ordered to drink certain quantities of the water at certain times during the day until the maximum quantity needed reached. He is ordered to drink one or two glassfuls upon rising, two or three glasses between breakfast and dinner, the same quantity in the afternoon, and a couple of glasses before going to bed. The patient is urged to take it whether he wants it or not. He may say that he is not thirsty, but that makes no difference; he must take it as a medicine. The quantity is increased until sometimes thirty glasses per day have been taken.

On this point the medical paper suggests that part of the benefit derived by the patient is because of the rest and change of scene; a part, perhaps, is from the small quantity of the salts and other bases contained in these waters (not speaking of cathartic or chalybeate waters), but the benefit from this source is very slight. The secret of the cure is in the quantity of water taken. If the water be pure, free from organic matter, and taken in sufficient quantity, the results will be substantially the same, regardless of the "traces" of litute, and small quantities of sodium chloride and other salts.

The medical authority quoted then suggests that persons can perform these cures at home with the ordinary drinking water, if of good quality, if they will require the patient to take it in the same quantity as at the springs. It is very easy to add lithia if desired; but they must not lose sight of the fact that the quantity of water (not lithia) taken is the important thing. It acts by flooding the kidneys; by washing out the bladder with a copious, bland and dilute urine; by unclogging the liver and clearing the brain. The patient feels better from day to day; he is better; irritable bladder is relieved, the kidneys act freely—are "washed out"—and many effete substances are carried out with the flood; this clears the way for the liver to act freely and normally, for there is an intimate relation between the liver and kidneys.

Thus it may be seen that often the simplest remedies cure when they are applied persistently to aid nature. The great difficulty with those who have these remedies available, and a serious difficulty that physicians have to encounter, is that those who are in a low state of health do not persist in and regularly apply the treatment which would be beneficial if it were given a fair opportunity. Yet as to the water cure, success in one ailment does not insure a like result in all others.

MAYOR'S LIGHTING VETO.

The unwisdom of Mayor Glendinning's veto message, given in today's NEWS, might easily subject his honor to scathing criticism for its reckless disregard of the public weal and of the ordinary courtesies of official communication, but for pity excited by the influences known to control. Hence it is sufficient to note that the City Council entered into a contract with the Pioneer Electric company to furnish street lights to the city for three years, at the price of $6 per month each lamp, for an all night service; that the Mayor's veto would prevent this favorable contract, but that we opine the majority of the City Council have superior good judgment and interest in the city's comfort and convenience to that displayed in the document filed with the city recorder last evening, and to come before the Council at tonight's session.

For the sake of the dignity that should attach to the mayor's office, rather than for any real merit which any of the objections contain, they will be treated as if presented in good faith. The first, as to the omission of a clause to enable the city to renew for three or six years more, is untenable in requiring that which is outside the city's legal power, in the corporation being restricted to three-year contracts. With such a provision, a contractor could legally refuse at the end of three years to allow the option, for the reason that the extension contract is invalid; while if the light company and city wished to renew the contract, the clause is unnecessary. If the city wants it, however, there is no doubt that the company would grant and abide by such an agreement, since it already has shown good faith with the people in its low bid when there were no competitors.

Objection number two complains that the contract does not prohibit sub-letting. Such an inhibition would be unreasonable and uncalled for. It might as well try to prevent the contractor from engaging certain employes or any more than a certain number. The city's business is to get a good electric light service at a given figure. It has nothing to do with the detail of the contractor's private affairs as to who is employed, or whether the electricity be generated by water or steam power. The contract provides for all the conditions of a good light service, and the means to enforce its provisions. As to the item of the 150 lamps, the contract does provide that the city can condemn them as unserviceable should they become so, notwithstanding what the Mayor says on the subject.

In this objection there is inserted an abusive reference to the Salt Lake and Ogden Gas and Electric Light company, which is wholly out of place, since that company is not in the contract at all. This is evidently done to work on the prejudices of the people, because of that company's action in asking higher prices a little over a year ago. But his honor does not tell what city official induced that company to attempt the increase, which attempt would have been successful if the Council, and not the Mayor, had not stood up for the people.

Objection number three, that a city inspector or engineer should settle any difference that might arise, is an exceedingly dangerous one to the city. The Mayor's suggestion is that the judgment of such inspector or engineer "should be conclusive upon both parties." That would be an agreement to bind the City Council by the judgment of an inferior officer, and would be unlawful as well as absurd. No sensible city councilman would make a dough-face of himself in that form. The Council is perfectly able to deal directly with the contractor in enforcing compliance with an agreement, as well as in fixing the terms thereof.

As to the suggestions in that paragraph of the Mayor's message, it is well to recall that in the contract drafted by the city attorney for the Utah Power company, which the Mayor favored, there was no bond required, there was no forfeiture clause, the street car company was given preference over the city, there was no provision for arbitration, no revocation clause, but an agreement by which the city was to pay $4800 a year for lights more than the Pioneer contract requires. In the last named contract, however, there are all the penalties and provisions necessary to its perfect enforcement, rendering a revocation clause unnecessary.

The fourth objection is pointed to an alleged unlawful combination. If it is unlawful, the State statute provides for dealing with it, and the city's power could not be substituted therefor. If it is not unlawful, the city could not prevent it, for it has no business with the light company's affairs outside of its immediate dealings and what the statute authorizes. A contract for lighting could not interfere. The Mayor asserts that the contract is proposed to be given to a "pool" which he terms an "unlawful combination." That there is no such proposition, and that in his assertion thereon the Mayor does not speak the truth, is public knowledge; hence the effort to deceive the public will fail.

One more item is the reference to an increase in the cost of private lighting. How that is affected by cheap public lighting is not made to appear. The imputation in the veto is dishonest; for the Pioneer company's franchise places the maximum limit which that company can charge for private lighting at less than the prices that now prevail, and the city has its further sovereign power to exercise under the statute should any company charge an excessive figure.

Taken altogether, the veto message expressions about protecting the community are so much hypocrisy, taken