

anywhere near it are sickened and driven from the spot, and one well known citizen has been compelled to vacate his premises, which have in consequence gone to ruin. He has this day entered suit against the city. The following copy of the complaint presents his case clearly and the cause he has for demanding damages:

In the District Court in and for the Third Judicial District of Utah Territory, County of Salt Lake.

Peter F. Goss, Plaintiff,
vs.
Salt Lake City, a Corporation,
Defendant.

Complaint.

The plaintiff complains and alleges:

I. That the defendant is, and at all the times hereafter mentioned was, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of Utah Territory, in the county of Salt Lake and Territory of Utah.

II. That the plaintiff is, and at all the times hereinafter mentioned was, the owner and in possession of the following described land and premises, and of a certain dwelling house, barn and other improvements situated thereon. The said premises being bonnd and described as follows, to-wit: All of the east half of the south-west quarter of section thirty-two (32) in township one (1), north of range one (1) west, and lots two (2) and three (3) of section five (5), township one (1) south of range one (1) west, of the Salt Lake meridian, United States survey.

III. That ever since the year 1878 the defendant has been the owner and in the possession of a certain strip of land about four (4) rods wide and forty (40) rods long, running through plaintiff's said premises, and that a certain stream of water known as the "Surplus Canal" is situated thereon; that the plaintiff's dwelling house is located near the bank of said stream and about six (6) rods therefrom, the plaintiff's land lying on both sides of said canal.

IV. That during the spring of 1890, the defendant made and constructed a sewer from Salt Lake City to a point near the plaintiff's said premises, and from about the month of May, 1890 till the present time it has conveyed the sewage from said Salt Lake City through said sewer, and discharged the same into the said "surplus canal" at a point near plaintiff's premises and dwelling, and the said sewage matter has been conveyed by said canal onto plaintiff's land. That the said so-called canal is neither a natural stream nor an artificial channel constructed to convey water, but from the place where the sewage is discharged into the canal (through plaintiff's land), the canal consists of a series of natural hollows, which are from ten rods to forty rods in width; that the canal is an open stream and has but little fall, so that the water therein flows very slowly, and the sewer matter discharged therein by said defendant through said sewer has settled in the bottom of said canal where it runs through plaintiff's premises, as well as at other places on each side of his said land, to a depth of several inches, instead of flowing through the canal; that the said canal is, and at all the times mentioned in this complaint was, wholly unsuitable and unfit to receive the said sewage and carry the same away, and that it was and is totally unfit for the said purposes for which it has been used by the defendant, that by reason of the defendant's carelessness and negligence in the construction and maintenance of said sewer and canal, and because of the discharge of said sewage into said unfit and defective canal, the defendant has created and maintained a nuisance and has caused noxious and offensive smells, and has

tainted and corrupted the atmosphere so as to render the dwelling house and premises of the plaintiff unfit for habitation, and has compelled plaintiff to move from and abandon the same, and has thereby prevented him from renting or otherwise receiving any income therefrom, and has greatly depreciated the value of his said premises and caused irreparable injury thereto, besides injuring the live stock and other property of the plaintiff thereon. That by reason of the said acts of the defendant the plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars.

Wherefore plaintiff prays judgment:

1. That the said nuisance be abated and the defendant restrained by injunction from maintaining or using said canal, to the nuisance of the plaintiff, or permitting it to be so used.

2. That the plaintiff recover from the defendant twenty-five thousand dollars damages and his costs.

We learn from Mr. Goss that the effluvia near his place arising from the sewage is unbearable. He has not only been compelled to vacate the premises, but has had to abandon all cultivation of his land there, and all care of the place, for no living being can stand the stench. He and his family had to remove from it. Persons sent to take care of the premises returned and refused to remain. Men employed to work there had to decamp and bring away the teams, for nothing could endure the horrible nuisance.

Mr. Goss is a reliable citizen. He had a valuable place near the surplus canal until the sewer discharge ruined it. During the boom he was offered \$55,000 for it but held it at a higher figure. Today it is comparatively worthless. He has engaged the efficient services of Richards and Moyle, the popular attorneys, and they think he has a very strong case. This refers not so much to the force of the odors around his premises as to the cause he has for legal action.

How many other suits the city will have to meet if the nuisances are not abated, and some efficient means is not soon provided to dispose of the sewage, we are not prepared even to guess at. Something ought to be done to remove the evil and it ought to be done quickly.

A CHOLERA CURE.

In these times of alarm, a simple cure for ailments resembling cholera is more than ordinarily valuable. We do not believe that there is any genuine Asiatic cholera in this mountain region, although some cases have been claimed. But bowel complaints are quite common and they create fear that aggravates the disease. The *Sun* cholera mixture, which can be obtained at the drug stores, has proved an excellent remedy in such cases. We have found, in many years' experience, a remedy even more simple for cholera morbus and kindred "summer complaints." It is saturated tincture of camphor, which forms one of the main ingredients in the *Sun* mixture. For an adult give four drops on a piece of white sugar every fifteen minutes for one hour. Wait an hour. Renew the doses each alternate hour until the purging moderates. One drop for a very young child or less for an infant, either in sugar or water, is sufficient in quantity.

An efficient cure for cholera is said to be a teaspoonful of chloroform in four times as much water. A gentleman who saw it used in Cuba thus speaks of its success: "I went to Cuba to help organize the insurgent army and I had a chance to try the remedy, for a cholera epidemic broke out among the troops. My first experience was on a negro, who was in the last stages. It cured him and hundreds after him. When we marched, the officers carried bottles of chloroform, and if a man fell out, sick with cholera, the remedy was applied, and he was able to resume his place. I have seen men lying by the road side in a state of collapse, almost dead. An officer would ride up, dismount, and apply the remedy, and before the column had passed the man would be in the ranks again."

We have heard that the same remedy has been applied with great benefit in some parts of the Southern States. It may be that chloroform in smaller doses will prove specific in milder stomach diseases than genuine cholera.

FINLAND IN RELATION TO CRIME.

SOME of the public journals are commenting upon the terrible sentence upon a young married woman in Finland. Her chief crime was the murder of her husband. In addition to this she had several times forged his name to papers for the purpose of obtaining money. For the murder she has been sentenced to be beheaded. Before decapitation her right hand will be cut off, as a penalty for forgery. These punishments are inflicted under the provisions of a medieval law, which has never been repealed.

The comments of the press upon this case are mostly confined to condemnation of the judgment on account of its barbarity. The subject is, however, suggestive of some thoughts in another direction. In animadverting upon the fact that Finland is behind the times in preserving such a statute on its books, the cause of its not having been repealed ought to be considered. It is evident that that country has not advanced at the same rate as other nations in law reform because statutory changes have not been so necessary there as elsewhere. This particular case indicates that if Finland has not kept abreast with other countries in changing its laws, it has been because she has also been behind in the march toward a criminal vortex in the direction of which the world is hastening. The balance of the nations have been compelled to modify punitive processes in some classes of offenses because of the increase of crime.

The time when stealing and other minor offenses were in Great Britain capital offenses is yet within the memory of men. This was when honesty was more largely the rule than now. As crime increased modifications of the criminal statutes were demanded and conceded. The same development has been going forward in the other nations, Finland being evidently a notable exception to the rule.

As a matter of course the enlargement of population accounts, to an extent, for the appalling increase of