

"WHAT A BIG FRAUD AND HUMBUGH?"

A SHORT time since we presented an array of facts sustaining the theory that the person who holds the office of city sexton was endeavoring to perpetrate a glaring imposition on the people. His effort was seconded by the City Council committee on cemetery, who recommended that the main avenue running from south to north in the original burial grounds be reduced from a three-rod to a two-rod street, and a row of lots be platted on the one rod strip; also that the ordinance on cemetery be so amended as to make the maximum price of lots \$125 in place of \$20, as heretofore. It was also to be provided that the sexton's ten per cent fee for sales remain at that rate.

The person who holds the office of sexton has, in alleged reply to our strictures, published, in the leading "Liberal" organ, what he calls "an open letter to the editor of the News." He starts by asking—"Have you ever thought what a big fraud and humbug you are?" It being unnecessary to propound interrogations in relation to a well established fact, it would be entirely superfluous to retaliate by putting a similar interrogatory to him. Even if this were not perfectly understood, his "open letter" would as we propose to show, serve to establish its truth.

In order that there may not even be an appearance of injustice to Mr. Dunne, we propose to quote liberally from his open letter, and will begin with the first part of his alleged answer.

"Now if you remember, Mr. Editor, before October, 1888, the main avenue in the cemetery, running from west to east, was three rods wide. Robert Patrick was then city sexton. What did he do? He deliberately mutilated this main artery of traffic and cut it down to two rods. * * * * *

If it is wrong to lessen the width of the north and south avenue now, was it not wrong two years ago to lessen the width of the main avenue?"

Thus it will be seen that the open letter individual seeks to screen his robbery behind what he alleges to be similar acts of his predecessor. Even if his insinuations against the former sexton were correct, it would make his conduct none the less reprehensible. But there is no parallel between what he attempts to do and what was done by Mr. Patrick under authority of the Council. The original or main cemetery was, as will be remembered, enclosed by a stone wall. The street referred to, was two rods

wide and uniform with the others. It ran parallel with the north side of the south wall. In course of time an addition to the south of the grounds was platted, including the Jewish division. In the new portion there was a one rod street, parallel with the south side of the wall. This wall was taken down, the partition formed by it being unnecessary. It was this additional rod that was platted into lots, on the recommendation of the city surveyor, because the maps and plats in possession of Mr. Fox showed a two-rod street. The change was made that these plats might be conformed to and that that portion of the cemetery might be brought into harmony with the original intention of its plan.

The street which Mr. Dunne proposes to manipulate runs through the central part of the original cemetery north and south, and is platted as, and always has been, a three rod street. The intention was to run a grass plat up the middle of it and plant it with rare trees as soon as water should be procured.

But besides all this is the main fact that the innovation desired by Mr. Dunne was made the basis for an excuse for raising the price of cemetery lots from \$20 to \$125, that being his proposal.

But this trifling yet grasping person foisted upon the people by a "Liberal" Council, has discovered that Mr. Patrick—who acted under authority—had a gigantic incentive to alter the width of the avenue referred to:

"Let me also remind you that Robert Patrick, who reduced the width of the main avenue, did so with a particular end in view. The records show that your assistant editor, John Nicholson, got one of the new lots facing on the main avenue, and paid the munificent sum of \$15 for the same, his deed, No. 2880, showing this consideration."

According to this the object Mr. Patrick had in view was to sell to the gentleman named by Mr. Dunne one of the cemetery lots for \$15. Now the lowest price charged for lots is \$12, and the highest \$20. Add to this the fact that the fellow who talks about fraud knows that the record shows that every one of the lots along the line in question was sold at \$15 each. It will therefore be observed that this absurd insinuation issuing from his peanut soul, stamps him with the brand of fraud.

Dunne's logic is this:—Because Mr. Patrick changed the width of a street, under authorization, in order to make it conform to the original design and the plans and plats of

the cemetery, he (Dunne) is justified in contracting the main and central avenue running north and south, and thus marring the beauty of the grounds. Because Mr. Patrick charged \$15 each for the lots thus formed and was satisfied with a fee of \$1.50 on each sale he (Dunne) would be justified in seeking to procure the authorization to charge, in his discretion \$125 for any lot in the cemetery and pocket a fee of \$12.50 for each sale made by him at that rate. Because Mr. Patrick, under authority, conformed a portion of the cemetery to the plats and maps in possession of the surveyor, he (Dunne) is justified in rendering the completed maps and plats partially useless and misleading, by changing the face of the cemetery to a condition not shown by them.

It will be seen as we go along, that it would be unnecessary and superfluous for anybody to ask the present sexton if he has ever thought what a fraud he is. If he has not done so it is simply because he is as deficient in discriminating judgment as he appears to be in honesty. The evidence is ample.

The next question is simply immense! It shows that the "open letter" is consistently idiotic throughout:

"Now let me call your attention to another matter. Prior to the time when Robert Patrick became city sexton no lot in the city cemetery sold for more than \$12. During his administration the price of lots rose to \$20. Why did you not object then to the increase in price? If it is wrong now to raise the price for lots, why was it not wrong in Mr. Patrick's day?"

In the first place the price of lots was not raised during Mr. Patrick's administration. It was fixed by the cemetery ordinance, which was in existence before Mr. Patrick's appointment. He exclaims, "Why did you not object then to the increase in price? Probably because it may be consistent to raise the maximum price of lots by adding the moderate sum of eight dollars. But had there been an attempt to boom the rate from \$12 to \$125, there would have been a most pronounced objection to such an imposition. An officer at that time who would have sought to raise the price to over ten times the existing amount would have been justly denounced as a fraud. It will be seen from this, what estimate ought to be placed on officials who make the proposal now. Then, Mr. Dunne, it is presumed, that because the maximum price of lots was increased