

EDITORIALS

A "BRUSH" WITH A MACHINE AGENT.

WE give space to a communication from the agent for the Brush electric light machine, who seems determined, if possible, to raise a controversy with the DESERET NEWS, but which we shall decline, after pointing out the fallacies and persistent misrepresentations contained in his letter. We do not propose to give him notoriety by free advertising, neither do we intend to throw anything in the way of an improvement which he or any one else may be able to introduce.

He says that in the first part of our article of October 19th we "intimate that he has come here to make a large sum of money out of the city." This is of the same character as other assertions in which he so freely indulges. We said nothing of the kind, either in the first part or any other part of the article. This untruth he makes the text for an argument to show what small profits he would reap in comparison with those of the gas company, a subject quite foreign to the tenor of our editorial and not pertinent to the question, which is simply whether the City Council shall rush into an acceptance of his proposition, or take time for full investigation. In other words, whether that body shall accept the agent's rash and reckless assertions, or find out beyond doubt the facts about the working of the light in other places.

We have not taken up the cudgels for the gas company. We have not said anything against the electric light. We have not advised the City Council to continue the use of gas for street lighting, nor touched on the question of its comparative value or cost with that of the proposed illuminator. But since this brush agent has thrust his figures forward as darts against the gas company, suppose we examine them a little. It will be observed that in drawing his comparison he counts in the cost of his plant and reckons on full payment for it in five years. Adding to this all his running expenses, he brings out a profit of ten per cent. per annum on his investment. But in stating the gas company's costs and profits, he ingeniously but not ingenuously leaves out of consideration its plant altogether, and by this process of calculation makes out a profit of \$6,200 per annum for the gas company on the street lighting. But let us give the gas company credit for its plant on the same principle as he states and reckons his own, and how will the case stand?

The gas company's plant in round figures cost \$170,000. But this is not wholly used for the city for street lighting. One-fourth of this sum will be considerably under the real amount of the outlay for city purposes, as can be easily demonstrated. That is \$42,500. Divide this into five yearly installments, and we have \$8,500 per annum to be deducted from \$12,200, leaving a balance of \$3,700. He puts the cost of making the gas for the street lighting at \$6,000. This, instead of leaving a profit of \$6,200, would make an absolute loss of \$2,500 per annum! And this estimated cost of his is simply for making the gas, counting nothing for lamp-lighting, breakages and contingencies. We are simply making the calculation on his own principle. We point out this cunning way of his of drawing a contrast, to show what kind of a reasoner, or rather sophist, he is; not to make any defense of the gas company, in which we have not the slightest pecuniary interest. But he seems anxious to attack the company, or why does he drag this comparison in, when the gas company was not called in question?

In the same unfair and pettifoggish manner he speaks of "other cities" where gas is \$3 per thousand, and street lamps are charged but \$20 each. He no doubt refers to Galesburg, Illinois, another city which he has falsely published as having "adopted" the Brush light, but which has merely had a trial of it without yet adopting it as a substitute for gas, using a liberty pole on which to hang four electric lamps. The price of coal there is probably about \$2 per ton. The cost to the gas company here, counting in the Canal needed as a mixture with other coal, is a little over \$10 per ton. It

has averaged in past years about \$13 per ton. If we wished to take up this subject fully, we could show that the profits in eastern cities on gas are much greater than in this city, and that Galesburg—which still uses gas lamps—with its \$3 per thousand paid by private citizens, gives a greater compensation than Salt Lake where it is \$1 per thousand.

And while on the subject of cost and savings, we wish to remind our readers that this city owns one-third of the stock of the gas company, from which it derives a revenue of about \$7,500 per annum in dividends. Deduct that from the \$12,200 expense for street lighting, and we have left but \$4,700 per annum actual outlay, and this will no doubt be curtailed when the ten years contract has expired, by a reduction in the charge per lamp. Burst the company, do away with gas, and hat income, with the principal, goes into a sinking fund from which it will never rise again.

He next speaks of "the comparative merits of different electrical apparatus." Reference to our article will show that this also is not a point raised nor alluded to, and we should want something more substantial than the agent's assertion to convince us of anything he puts forward in favor of the Brush apparatus, though, let it be borne in mind, we have said and do say nothing against it.

As to Wabash we neither noticed nor avoided it. We were not discussing the success or failure of the light. We merely clipped the notice of the Nantucket fizzle in explanation of a remark from the Cleveland correspondent. And the agent is simply assuming, with a great deal of impertinence, that we have read articles proving that the Wabash experiment is a success, an assertion for which he has no grounds whatever.

Now to the next point. We have on this subject.

Now as to the Cleveland matter. His "towers erected for a general illumination of the city," as a consequence of Cleveland's "adoption of the electric light two years ago," dwindle down to some posts which the Brush Company has put up at its own expense, as a test for lighting one street! And in the face of this he persists in his first statement. Has Cleveland adopted the Brush light instead of gas for street lighting? No. A statement to the contrary by one who resides in that city is a deliberate and infamous untruth. Monumental Park is an open space in Cleveland which takes its name from a monument of Commodore Perry in the center. It is lighted by 12 Brush lamps on posts 15 feet high. Gas is still used in Cleveland for street, house and business lighting, as before. Now who, with a spark of regard for the truth, will say in the face of those facts that Cleveland has "adopted the electric light in the place of gas?" His statement that "towers were being erected for a general illumination of the city" is now whittled down to, "I was given to understand that a general illumination was contemplated."

What this agent has tried to make the people believe is this: That in certain cities the Brush light had been adopted by the municipal authorities in a similar way to his proposed plan for lighting this city; that is, by lamps on a single tower, and as a substitute for gas. Whereas the facts do not bear this out, but on the contrary prove that gas is still in use in the cities named, where it was in use before the electric light was tried, and as a substitute for gas in street lighting, as we have stated all along, the electric light is still an experiment. This person makes, with the utmost confidence, assertions which are substantially incorrect, but which have just enough of truth in them to save them from the brand of utter falsehood, and just sufficient to enable him to ring the changes on, and to persist that he was right.

In view of all that has been said and shown, is it not plain enough that what we have urged is the best course for the City Council, that is to wait awhile and investigate? This person who now says he is not in a hurry, is simply an agent for the sale of the Brush machine, like a sewing machine agent. The Brush Company is not responsible for his contracts for lighting cities. He attempts this on his own individual responsibility. How far that extends we are not prepared to state, nor do we wish to discuss it. He has assumed very foolishly and incorrectly that the DESERET NEWS is opposed to the electric light,

and with that view has made accusations against us which we have proven apply only to himself. We wish no further controversy with him. We pass no judgment on the light he is trying to introduce. But we do caution the City Council and everybody else against accepting his unsupported assertions, no matter how confidently made, and advise them not to rush into contracts which they may possibly regret, but to look into the experience of others, and be sure they are right before they go ahead.

WHY IT IS PECULIAR.

OUR esteemed correspondent Justice Daniel Tyler, whose communication will be found elsewhere, while endorsing our arguments recently given in relation to the exercise of the duties of Representative to the Legislature and County Clerk by the same person, thinks there is nothing peculiar in the wording of the statute requiring a re-elected officer to obtain a commission from the Governor. He says "the language is clear, re-elected commissioned officers must be commissioned by the Governor," etc. But the statute is not so worded. And this is why we considered its language "peculiar."

The clause in the law as it passed the House reads as follows:

"Any officer who is by law required to be commissioned by the Governor, shall, when re-elected, obtain a commission from the Governor within forty days of his re-election, or his office shall be deemed vacant." (Journal of Assembly, 1880, p. 226.)

But the Council amended the clause to read as it now stands in the law, viz:

"All persons re-elected to any office, thereby becoming their own successors, shall, when so elected, give bonds, qualify and be commissioned by the Governor, as in other cases required by law."

The intention was, no doubt, to make this apply, as our correspondent renders it, to re-elected officers required by law to be commissioned when first elected. But the language is not clearly to this effect. It may be construed, without violence to the text, to apply to all persons re-elected to any office, whether they formerly held a commission or not. And that is why we said the wording is peculiar. We cannot tell how courts would construe the law, although it must be conceded by reasonable and fair-minded persons that the Legislature did not intend to compel an officer who at his first election was not required to obtain a commission, to do so on his re-election. For if he required no commission in the one instance, there is no reason why he should require it in the other.

The safest way in our opinion would be to get the commission, comply with the letter of the law, and thus save any litigation that might be started by "Liberal" or other unscrupulous persons, with the object of breeding strife, obstructing justice and creating unpleasantness. We offer no advice on the subject except this: Let every officer under the law be careful himself to honor the law.

ONEIDA COUNTY POLITICS.

THE Oneida County, Idaho, people have three tickets in the field for the approaching election. In addition to the regular Republican and Democratic nominations, an Independent ticket has been arranged; a mongrel affair, containing the names of individuals—some of them chronic office hunters, who to their chagrin have been left out of the nominations of the two established parties. They now want to be elected irrespective of party lines, principles or prejudices.

If the Democrats of Oneida County are wise, they will have nothing to do with this third ticket, a mixed and mingled thing, designed to divide them and defeat their party. We perceive that the Democratic ticket has been strengthened by the substitution of the name of Wm. H. Homer in the place of Wm. Woodard for Sheriff, the last named gentleman having resigned. This is an improvement. The nomination at the Convention was an unsuitable one. We presume that no one has anything to

advance against the gentleman nominated, personally, but while he might have served the public well in another capacity, he is not "cut out" by nature or the kind of experience which he has gained, for the office of Sheriff.

If our friends in Oneida County will stand by the nominees of their convention, keep aloof from all factions designed to divide and weaken their vote, and watch the polls closely to prevent the frauds which have been common in that county, there is no good reason why they should not triumph in November and rescue the control of public affairs out of the hands of those who have held on to it so long, by the power of corruption and with the tenacity of leeches. Unite and conquer; watch closely and prevail!

FISH CULTURE.

As there does not appear to be any Utah statute by which Territorial Fish Commissioners, to attend to the propagation and distribution of fish in the public waters of this Territory, could be appointed, the services of Professor Joseph L. Barfoot of the Deseret Museum have been retained as acting Fish Commissioner for Utah, with the Sanction of the Central U. S. Fish Commissioners and the President of the Deseret Agricultural and Manufacturing Society.

The office of Fish Commissioner was held by the late Hon. Albert P. Rockwood, and fish ova and young fish were received by him for distribution, with a view to propagation, from the U. S. Fish Commissioner, by direction of Professor Spencer F. Baird, of Washington.

It appears that owing to some misunderstanding in the various counties, where local fish commissioners may be appointed under the law, proper arrangements have not been made to receive and dispose of the young fry when they arrive, for which reason it is advisable that any persons having facilities for cultivating fish, and desirous of obtaining supplies should make known their wants to Prof. Barfoot, and if any persons have facilities for hatching the eggs of fish which may be received, they may make it known to him in writing, stating the size of hatching house, etc., and general character of the spring, or water they intend to use.

It is the intention of Prof. Barfoot to put himself in communication with the officers of the Utah Game and Fish Protective Society, so that proper steps may be taken to make known the methods by which fish may be raised artificially as well as protected, a public duty which the gentlemen composing the above society have so efficiently performed, in preserving the waters of City Creek from defilement, and thus preventing the destruction of fish.

Of the provisions made for the preservation and protection of fish by the Utah Legislature, the public may inform themselves by referring to the game and fish laws of this Territory, which only need to be enforced to greatly benefit the entire community.

As many persons have applied personally to Prof. Barfoot for information respecting fish propagation, it will be well to reduce to writing all enquiries, and should anything of general interest to the public be brought to light it will be forwarded to the News for publication.

On this subject, Professor Barfoot says:

"Attention to the growth and increase of fish is of great importance; streams and lakes now comparatively valueless can be made sources of wealth; the prevalence of insects, many of which begin life in the waters can be regulated, vegetable organisms which now pollute our streams can be utilized.

Experience has shown in the various States how much can be done to benefit the people by taking advantage of the liberal offers made by the United States Fish Commissioner at Washington. The business of the local fish commissioner being to see that the young fry is distributed so as to satisfy all sections of the Territory, provided, however, that the conditions essential to the preservation, nutrition and growth of the fish are to be found in the localities desiring to secure a portion of them, and the counties are willing to pay the proper proportion of the expense of obtaining and forwarding them to their destination.

Persons should state name in full, postoffice address, names of streams or lakes, length of river to be stocked or the area (in acres) of lakes, and character of the water. Many other things may have to be attended to, which will be made known by application to Joseph L. Barfoot, P. O. box 332, Salt Lake City."

SIEMENS OR BRUSH?

WE are in receipt of the annexed communication:

SALT LAKE CITY,
October 23, 1880.

Editor Deseret News:

An article in the *Herald* of the 22nd inst., on the electric light, leaves the inference that the London docks are lighted by the Brush electric light. Can you inform me and several friends who are interested, whether this is so or not, as I am under the impression that the Brush apparatus is not used in the docks. And oblige,

ENGINEER.

The article referred to gives as its authority the *New York Herald*. But while it speaks of the Brush patents being in use in London "for street and dock lighting and for stores," and follows this up by an account of the lighting of the Royal Albert and St. Katherine docks, and the solicitation of tenders for lighting the embankment and the adjacent bridges by electricity, and of the docking of the ship *Garonne* by the electric light, yet it does not say definitely that this all applies to the Brush patent. The reader would naturally infer this from the wording of the article, but whether this was the intention of the writer and whether he was aware of the facts in the case or not, we do not pretend to know or assume.

But the truth is that the docks above named are lighted by the Siemens light, and so is the Thames Embankment. This is well known to those familiar with the progress of electric lighting, and we have kept track of it for a long time, being convinced, as we have shown in several articles in this paper, that it would eventually be the material light of the world. And that what we have stated in relation to the docks is correct we think we can prove beyond dispute.

In the October 1st number of *Engineering*, a weekly, standard journal, published in Bedford Street, Strand, London, there appears a full account of the lighting of the docks, with a diagram illustrating the method of illumination. It is spoken of as "the most extensive installation in the world of the electric light just completed by Messrs. Siemens Brothers." The Royal Albert dock is an extension of the old Victoria dock, both belonging to the London and St. Katherine Docks Company. These docks cover an area 6,500 feet long and 490 feet wide, with quays, warehouses, graving docks, locks, jetties and an entrance dock of twelve acres. The whole space is illuminated, not by a central tower, but by twenty-seven lights on iron poles, 80 feet high, so placed that one light overlaps the other, and thus, it says, "all dark shadows are eliminated." There are twenty-seven Siemens machines in use—one for each lamp. The motive power is supplied by four 20-horse power "horizontal condensing engines fitted with automatic condensing gear, each of these engines having a cylinder 14½ inches in diameter and 2 feet 6 inches stroke, and being capable of working up to 97 indicated horse power with steam at 80 lb. pressure." There are several novelties and improvements introduced into the apparatus, which we have not space here to describe. But it should be understood that there is nothing "Brush" about the affair. The lamps are the Siemens lamps, the machines are the Siemens machines, and *Engineering* says: "All the work of the splendid installation of the electric illumination has been carried out under the direction of Mr. Alexander Siemens, who has had the management of most of the great installations carried out by Messrs. Siemens Brothers during the last two or three years."

Lest it might be still objected that this illumination is not the one referred to by the *Herald*, we will make another quotation from *Engineering*:

"In proof of the value of the light in the saving of time, we may