

place other than at said Wellsville. That he has not at the present time any intention of remaining in Salt Lake City, except as to work as aforesaid. That he did not come for the purpose of voting at the coming election, or any other. That affiants are the only persons, that now, or that ever have lived in said Wellsville of the name of either Edwin, or John W. Mitton.

That the statement continued in the Salt Lake Daily Tribune, of the 20th inst, which is as follows to wit:

"WELLSVILLE, Utah, Sept. 19, 1889.

O. W. Powers, Esq., Sir: Two men from this place have been sent to Salt Lake City. They are to vote at the next election. Their names are Edward Mitton and John W. Mitton. Left here two weeks since,"

is wholly false and without any foundation in fact whatever.

EDWIN MITTEN,
J. W. MITTON.

Witness,

A. M. BUCHANAN.

Subscribed and sworn to before before me this 25th day of September, 1889.

L. MOTH IVERSON,
Notary Public.

There are doubtless other workmen who have come into this city, particularly since the strikes that occurred some weeks since, and since the chief farming work of the season has been finished. It does not follow that because they see an opportunity to earn a little money to help them through the coming winter, they intend to remain here, or that they have any intention of voting at the next election.

But, as incautiously admitted by that "Liberal" religious local politician the Rev. Warren, when opening his mouth a little too wide in San Francisco, the "Liberals" intend to bring in "hundreds of miners and 'vote' them in February." It is quite natural that they should suspect other people of their own tricks. We know of some of their dodges and hope that in proper season they will be circumvented.

We do not wish to prevent one "Liberal" from exercising the sacred right of suffrage if he is lawfully entitled to it. We do not seek to build up a party by robbing its opponents of the elective franchise. We leave that to the so-called "Liberals." But we will do our best to prevent illegal voting and all frauds at the ballot box, by whomsoever attempted, no matter what may be his party or his politics.

And we say now, what we have stated before, that if any citizen who has removed his residence from another part of the Territory to this city has made this his actual residence, his legal domicile, intending to dwell here, he need not be deterred from exercising the lawful

rights and privileges of an American citizen, by any threats of "Liberal" intimidators or their mendacious organ. We will countenance no fraud, but we will support resident citizens in their political liberties, be they members of the People's Party or of the party in opposition.

"THE OTHER SIDE."

"There are at least two sides to every question." This saying is illustrated every day, and its truth is so evident that no argument need be offered in its favor. We have given to the public one side of the Bothwell canal scheme; that is, the side of the objectors, who form a large class composed principally of agriculturists in the upper valleys, particularly Cache, Gentile and Bear Lake. We now desire to present as fairly as we can the other side of this project.

Mr. Bothwell, the originator of the present plan for the diversion and utilization of a portion of Bear River, disclaims any intention of attempting to take a single inch of water that belongs to anyone else or of injuring any other company or individual. His scheme contemplates the utilization of large areas of land now uncultivated for lack of water for irrigation, and of affording a larger and more certain supply to farms now wholly or partly tilled. At the same time he expects to make some money for the corporation which he represents.

In filing upon any stream or tributary he says he has only laid claim to its surplus waters. And in doing that he has simply exercised the right that is open to any locator. As to Bear Lake and the streams that run into it, he thinks all objections are removed by the fact that the lake has been set apart, under Congressional provisions and the action of the Secretary of the Interior, as a public reservoir, and the unsold lands within a radius of three miles are withheld from market. He concedes that the part of his project contemplating the use of the lake as a secured source of supply will have to be abandoned. And, if we understand him rightly, his filings on the surplus water of the streams running into the lake will be withdrawn.

This will remove the antagonism to the scheme which was aroused in the Bear Lake region and leave only that part of the scheme to be considered which affects the people lower down.

The point of appropriation by the Bothwell canal is on the side of "The Narrows," or Bear River Canyon, where Bear River emerges from Cache Valley into Salt Lake Valley, above Collinston. The surplus waters only can be taken, as there are prior rights to the use of Bear River water higher up the stream. We do not see how this appropriation could be prevented, even if it was desirable to attempt to do so. The right to the use of this surplus water is open to any one who can utilize it. The person or company that does this must proceed under the laws of the Territory, and this course is being pursued by the Bothwell people.

The idea of diverting the waters of Bear River to irrigate vast tracts of land now uncultivated is not new. It has been agitated several times. No doubt it would have been made practical before this but for the immense cost. This Mr. Bothwell expects to supply, and it must be conceded that great benefits would ensue from the construction of such a canal as is now contemplated.

It is true, however, that the best policy for resident farmers is to have control of their own irrigation affairs. It is dangerous to leave them in the hands of great corporations, particularly when composed of capitalists residing at a distance. But this project is too big for the agriculturists along the line of this proposed canal, and the only question practically before them, is whether or not they will avail themselves of its advantages, and whether the cost to them is warranted by the prospective advantages to be gained. This is open for them to decide. It is an individual matter. It is explained to us that no farmer is or will be compelled to take the water nor bind himself to pay for it. If he chooses to do so, that is his own affair.

The sum to be paid is larger than we stated. It is eight dollars per acre and an annual rental of from two dollars to two dollars and a half per acre, with a grant of a right of way to the company through the land to be benefited. But though a farmer may own any number of acres of land, he will not be required to contract for any more than he pleases. He will only pay for that which he engages.

This appears to be fair and equitable in principle. As to the price demanded, that must be considered thoroughly before the terms are accepted, and each landowner will