

## EDITORIALS.

## DON'T RAISE FALSE ISSUES!

THE advocates of the sewer system proposed for District No. One very much damage their cause every time they attempt to reply to objections offered to that system. This is principally because they change the question at issue. They address their arguments to something entirely different to the subject of dispute.

The latest attempt at reply starts out with the assumption that the protestors are opposed to sewerage; and the question of its benefits to general health is sprung, backed by the "consensus of civilized opinion." It proceeds to state of the protestors:

"They object to a general tax for sewerage where the mains only are to be constructed, and where the expense of laterals will be borne locally, yet they insist that the general fund shall be levied upon to take the water to local points. They object to the first because they say the benefit is local, yet they endorse the other because its benefits are local."

Now the whole of this is outside of the subject and an entire mis-statement of the position and views of the objectors. First, they are not opposed to sewerage on general principles. They have offered no arguments on the question of whether it is necessary to health in closely populated places, or in the more thickly built portion of this city. If that question were opened, a vast array of statistics could be furnished as to the deleterious effects of sewer gas and other agencies of disease, which would startle some folks who have not thoroughly investigated both sides of the controversy. But that is not the question now. The "consensus of civilized opinion" is not disputed at present.

Next, there is nobody associated with the protest who "insists that the general fund shall be levied upon to take water to local points." That is, in the manner in which general taxes are wanted for the special sewerage benefit of a limited locality. Water is wanted for the whole city. Nobody who objects to this scheme for sewerage wants the general funds of the city to be "levied upon," whatever that may mean, for the special exclusive benefit of any "local point." Nobody "endorses" a movement to supply one district with water and leave the others out in the dry. It is the extension of the water service to every possible point that is desired and general benefits are asked for from "the general fund."

Thus the attempt to answer objections to a scheme that appears to be ill advised, is thoroughly abortive because it does not touch the points of objection. If they can be met squarely why not meet them, instead of dodging around and fighting a phantom?

The discussion of the question has developed these facts: That a majority of the property owners in the business part of town want sewerage. If there is any section of the city where it would be beneficial it is that. But the "three centre streets," for about four blocks south of South Temple Street, comprehend the locality in actual need of sewers. That the other parts of town are not in need of and do not desire the building of sewers. That out of the silence about 37% percent of the property owners in District No. One have openly protested against the movement, while many who are opposed have said nothing publicly for a variety of reasons. That the system proposed cannot possibly be made available for very large portions of the city, yet they are to be taxed for the main sewer on exactly the same ratio as those who are to receive its service. That the proposition is to tax the whole city for the larger portion of the expenses—that is, the cost of the main, the pumping apparatus, the embankment and the ground for receiving and the labor for taking care and disposing of the sewage, while only a very limited district obtains the benefit.

These facts being determined, it seems only reasonable and just that the matter should receive further consideration. That the sewer district be limited to the locality where it is needed. That the expense be borne by those who receive the benefits, or else that the matter be voted upon by all who are to contribute by taxation for the cost of the portion of the work to be paid out of the city revenue. That investigation be made to see if a less expensive main system cannot be adopted than that proposed. That full inquiry be had to see whether or not the part of town in actual need of sewerage can be relieved, and the sewage conducted to some spot, not too remote, where it can be cheaply deodorized and made into fertilizers that can be sold and thus help to defray expenses.

We do not believe there would be any great opposition to these suggestions. Let the close business blocks have what they want. But don't force people outside of that locality to have what they protest against, nor compel the whole people to pay against their will, for something from which they can never derive direct benefit. Be reasonable, be just. Treat the matter fairly. Don't raise false issues. Remember the municipal organization is for the good of the whole, not for the special interest of a wealthy part. And bear in mind that a majority of all the tax-payers should rule in matters that affect the general expense, and that they also have rights which are entitled to respect.

## SHOULD THE CANAL DROP?

THERE appears in this issue a communication regarding a proposition to drop the Parley's Creek Canal about a hundred feet below its surveyed elevation. We received the correspondence several days ago, but preferred not to publish it until the status of the question was more or less fully ascertained. As far as can be learned there is a division of opinion among the members of the Council concerning it.

From what can be gleaned it appears that the origin of the proposition is peculiar. After the canal had been brought along on the even tenor of its way to a point west of the upper part of the cemetery, one or two real estate men, who own lots in that section, made a demand for pay from the city for the right of way for the conduit over their land. When it is considered that the advent of the canal would greatly enhance the value of their property, the unreasonableness of this demand is apparent. Then came the threat to make the drop—referred to by our correspondent—from Eleventh to Ninth Street.

This brought those who had made the absurd demand for compensation to terms, and they joined with the other land owners, who were only too glad to have the canal constructed on the original line, in petitioning the council not to make the proposed drop.

That petition, together with a communication from John Carruthers, who has resided in the dry upper region for fifteen years, was presented to the council at its last session. Alderman Webber moved that the prayer be granted. Alderman Sharp supported the motion. Councilor Dooley took the same ground, holding that the proposed drop would not only destroy the contour of the canal but would make it much more difficult to manage. The subject was referred to the committee on Jordan and Salt Lake Canal, of which Alderman Sharp is chairman, the other members being Councilors Sowles, Smith, Roberts and Teasdale.

If the demand of a couple or more of real estate men was the original barrier to the conducting of the canal along its legitimate route of four feet fall to the mile, that obstacle has been swept away by their giving way. And even if they had not succumbed, it would not seem consistent to place innocent persons at a disadvantage because of their attitude. There are parties residing up there, Mr. Carruthers and family being an instance, who have lived on rain water and what they could procure from City Creek by going down and tilling up the steep side of the cañon. It is true there are not many dwellers between Eleventh and Ninth streets, but those who are there need water to drink as much as if they were a multitude. There are besides a number of owners of lots who have held them for many years expecting to get water some time and then making homes.

But the reason offered now by those who favor the drop is that there will not be water enough. If this is the case there has been some tall misrepresentation. Our correspondent asserts what has been frequently claimed—that the water obtained from Parley's Creek has irrigated nearly 3,000 acres of farming land, while he holds, and he ought to be well informed, that the amount it will have to cover in this city will not exceed 500 acres. If this comes anything near an approximate estimate, the insufficiency argument falls to the ground.

This is very conspicuous when the fact is taken into account that the tract that will be missed if the drop be made from Eleventh to Ninth Street, consists of twelve small blocks, one fourth the size of the regular city blocks. Their aggregate extent amounts to but 30 acres, an area equal to but three regular blocks of the city, the latter being forty by forty rods square, while the bench blocks are twenty by twenty rods. If watering that small tract would nullify the usefulness of Parley's Creek, it certainly must be an insignificant scheme. And if the body of water is so small, the size of the canal—six feet wide by four deep—is altogether too large.

The proposed drop has two peculiar phases. It is in direct opposition to the cry for the expansion of the city, being markedly in line with the policy of contraction, besides perpetuating the demand for water for the dry bench. It is time that cry was drowned out. It would indeed be an anomaly in these days of "North Salt Lake," "Terrace Heights," "Buena Vista," and other suburban divisions, if a most desirable portion of the city, within a comparatively short distance of the business centre should be left out of the pale of redemption by the proposed unscientific drop.

Some members of the Council have, in expressing themselves privately, suggested a very sensible plan which would appear to smash the proposition to drop the canal. They say, and very sensibly, that a gate could be placed in it so that the present upper bench ditch, on Seventh Street, could be filled where the canal crosses it to reach a higher level. Thus all under Seventh Street could be supplied in that

way. If the ditch has not sufficient capacity, it could be enlarged at small expense, and let the canal go on its way rejoicing on a proper grade, and when there is a supply of water to run in it there will be an easy flow, such as there is in every similar conduit, instead of tearing along like a lightning express train, making its control and utilization a constant trouble, perplexity and expense.

There is a point that should never be lost sight of by an important public body like the City Council—the maintenance of public confidence in its judgment. There is nothing connected with this canal enterprise but is susceptible of being pre-determined upon a sensible and scientific basis before it is operated. It is the natural presumption that the Council took the trouble to properly advise itself in advance on the subject in question. If, when the canal has reached a point within a comparatively short distance of its proposed original terminus, an abrupt and unscientific drop of about a hundred feet is made, that presumption is utterly destroyed, and the anomaly will stand as a perpetual evidence of an egregious blunder, an error more directly under the public gaze than that of a former Council—alluded to by our correspondent—and which the present city fathers have decided to remedy.

This is essentially a canal-building section. The rules and details governing their construction are thoroughly understood. Therefore, we are of opinion that the Council, with the untitled, difficult and intricate problem of sewerage in hand, will not lower public confidence in its ability to cope with it by taking a position that would show it to be incapable of grappling with the simple matter of an ordinary water ditch.

## TYPHOID FEVER, ETC., AND SANITATION.

THE Boston Herald, a short time ago, published a long article on the spread of typhoid fever, from which it appears that it is just as fatal as yellow fever, though it does not spread so rapidly nor create so much alarm. Twenty-seven new cases a day were reported in September at "The Hub."

Bad water and irregular living are said to be the originating causes of the fever and it is contagious, or infectious, the discharges from patients being considered the chief source of this danger. Emanations from drains, sewers, and filth are also promotive of this disease.

The Board of Health in Boston recommends that ventilating pipes be used from all drains, extending above the highest point of the roof of the house, in every instance, terminating at a distance from any chimney or other ventilator. This is to take away the danger that arises from the fumes from sewers and drains, with which all people are familiar who have lived in closely populated places where sewerage is established, particularly when the plumbing is imperfect or gets out of order.

The report shows that experience in Philadelphia proves the prevalence of typhoid where bad water is used, the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers being in vile condition. The Board of Health in that city reported 143 deaths from typhoid in August and about the same number in December, with 115 cases in the hospitals and 600 outside at the time of the report. The deaths from typhoid in Philadelphia are placed, at 1,000 a year. There have been 25,000, at least, during the past quarter of a century, and 250,000 persons have had the fever during that time. How this can be in a city of sewers, the advocates of sewerage as a cure-all for contagion will perhaps explain.

The Boston report states that there are more deaths from typhoid fever in Chicago, Cincinnati, St. Louis and San Francisco than in Boston, all of which cities are sewered, and that in Philadelphia there are far more deaths from that disease than from yellow fever in the South, although the latter makes such a sensation and a dread.

Typhoid fever is vastly more dangerous and fatal than either, as it spreads with fearful rapidity, and may be generated as typhoid is, from which it is not always distinguished at first, the symptoms being similar, but at a later period of incubation spots appear on all parts of the body, by which the disease becomes easily recognizable.

The death rate in Boston last year was 25.60 in each 1,000 inhabitants, or one death to each 39.89 persons living. Excluding all deaths from external causes, disease alone carried off 24 in every 1,000. The death of colored people outnumbered the births by 64. There were 57 deaths from suicide and 12 from homicide, and the population of the city is 462,000. These are interesting figures for sewer fanatics to work with and make comparisons.

Some other Boston figures are worthy of notice, as they appear in the vital statistics of that very religious city for 1887. There was one marriage to each 37.59 of the population. There was one child born to each 33.12 inhabitants. Only 27.39 per cent of the children born were of unmixed native parentage. There were 79 twin births and one triple birth. In twenty-four instances both were males, in twenty-six both were females, in the rest one was a male, the other a female. One in every fourteen children was illegitimate, and this was a better record than 1886, in which there were 1,077 illegitimates registered. Of course Boston is a highly moral city, and is anti-"Mormon" to the core.

Typhoid fever appears to be prevalent throughout the country and even in Salt Lake City numbers several victims. If the water used for drinking purposes were boiled before use, there would be fewer cases of fever. Leaves falling into water cists and wells may have something to do with the prevalence of this disease in the autumn, for decaying vegetable matter is very dangerous to health.

After a while, we suppose, our City Fathers will wake up to the necessity of a general system of sanitation for all parts of town. And when they can spare a little time from cogitations on the needs of one small district, which we admit are pressing, they will, doubtless, enforce the ordinances for the suppression of outhouse nuisances, and compel people to use dry earth in their closets and cover up, burn or remove all waste matter, now rotting and festering in the sunshine and breeding the germs of disease and death.

## THE PROHIBITIONISTS SCORE A POINT.

THE Prohibitionists will take courage from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that the law of Iowa forbidding the manufacture of intoxicating liquors for exportation into other States is constitutional. It was argued in opposition that the law was at variance with interstate commerce provisions in the Constitution of the United States. But the Court held that the Iowa statute forbade the manufacture as well as the sale of intoxicants except for mechanical, medicinal, culinary and sacramental purposes and that the State Legislature had the right to pass the law.

The public sentiment of the locality should rule in this matter. Where the large majority of the people believe and can demonstrate that the manufacture and sale of intoxicants is a public evil and productive of danger to society, for self-protection they may enact laws against it. The proper way for prohibitionists to work is to capture the several States, as fast as they can create a sentiment in its favor. By endeavoring to reach the matter through an amendment to the national constitution, they aim too high and will fall very short of the mark. It is a matter for local and not national regulation.

## HEARING FALSE WITNESS.

A LARGE number of country papers throughout the United States depend chiefly upon a few leading dailies in the big cities for editorial ideas. Sometimes they steal articles from them without change or revision; more frequently they work them over, embodying entire paragraphs and adopting all the ideas of the original. This is strikingly noticeable in articles attacking the "Mormon" Church.

Recently a number of notices have appeared of the ruling of the Supreme Court of Utah in the suits to escheat the property of this Church. They are so similar, and so many of them use the identical language of New York, Chicago and other leading papers, that the plagiarism is strikingly apparent.

The Chicago Tribune after giving the chief points in the decision, proceeds to comment upon its effects, betraying either dense ignorance of the facts or intense malice against the "Mormons." Its ideas and words have been borrowed, or stolen, whichever you please, by country papers both in the North and the South, and thus its errors have been spread, to the defamation of a system and a people already sufficiently misunderstood and misrepresented to satisfy any reasonable enemy. Here is a paragraph from that paper, the leading points of which have been widely copied:

"The final judgment and decree of the Supreme Court of Utah in the case of the United States against the Mormon Church, ends the career of that church as a corporation and relieves the Mormon people from its oppressive system of tithes. By this decree it is stripped of a large part of its power for harm, as it loses its wealth, its taxing authority, and its personal control. Hereafter it must occupy the same position as any other church and devote itself to the promulgation and teaching of religious doctrine—if the doctrine it professes can be called religious. It has no right to any corporate property except the Temple block and buildings, which it uses ostensibly for purposes of worship, and in this respect is brought to the same conditions as other churches. It must raise its money by voluntary contributions and not by compulsory taxation. It can no longer keep up its military system or its police or constabulary forces. It can no longer hold control of courts or civil administrative power, dominate elections, or dictate in secular affairs. In a word, the Mormon Church is now a church pure and simple, under the same limitations as other religious bodies, and will be free for all purposes of religious instruction. It has ceased to be the State Church of Utah, and has been brought

into subjection to the fundamental principles of republican government."

This assumes that the Mormon Church is or has been the "State Church of Utah;" that in that capacity it has had "control of the courts" and of elections, held civil power, levied "compulsory taxation" by an "oppressive system of tithes," and kept up a "military system and constabulary forces." The Newark Journal, adopting this nonsense says:

"When, as in this case, a band of knaves acquire colossal wealth by selling to dupes land free to the entry of actual settlers and exacting a tenth of their earnings afterwards, as well as plundering them in every way, it is proper that riches so acquired should go to their proper owners; and the land held unlawfully go back to the government to be held in trust for proper occupants."

Every utterance in the foregoing remarks of the two papers quoted is false, both in letter and in spirit. There has never been any "State Church in Utah;" all religious denominations have been equal before the law. The courts and the civil administration have been as separate from the Church organization as they are in any part of the country. The Church has not sold any land which was free to actual settlers, but they have always acquired it from the Government through the land office as in other parts of the public domain. There has never been a tax of one tenth, or of any amount "exact" by the Church." The tithing is a free will offering and not "compulsory taxation" and never was. The so-called "band of knaves," by which the leaders of the Church are politely designated, pay their tithing just as strictly, and perhaps more faithfully and honestly, than the majority of the members. There has been no "military system" in operation in Utah for many years, and when we had a militia here it was established by territorial statute, as in other places, and was under the civil law, and so with the "constabulary forces." And we would like our misinformed contemporaries everywhere to mark this. The decision of the court in regard to the Church property does not affect one of the matters which it is alleged to have "obliterated." Even if the allegations of the Chicago Tribune were true, and the "Mormon" Church had exercised all the powers falsely attributed to it, the confiscation of its property by the Government would not affect those powers at all. It would simply rob a body of religious worshippers of the property they had individually donated as Church or common property for corporate purposes.

If it is right, as stated by the Newark Journal, that this property should "go to the proper owners," then it would go to the people who donated it, and they are the members of the "Mormon" Church, who now form an unincorporated body of religious worshippers, if the decision of the court holds good in law.

The property of the "Mormon" Church has never belonged to the leaders. It has been held in trust for the whole people, and the men who are accused of acquiring it, of robbing the people of it, have contributed much more to it, in proportion, than most of the members who are popularly called "dupes." What property those leaders have has been acquired lawfully, individually and by business methods, and they have labored assiduously for their own support while working for the public for years. This Church property is not theirs, has not been theirs, has not been claimed by them as theirs, but belongs to the people who contributed it, they being among the number. And it is simply the power of might over right which would take it from the proper owners and use it arbitrarily for a purpose for which it was not donated, and for persons who never contributed to it a single cent.

As for the tithing and the uses to which it may be put, it remains as it was, a voluntary contribution from the Latter-day Saints for religious purposes. The decision does not affect it in the slightest degree. The people have the right, and it is just as much of a duty, to pay their tenth to the Lord for the accomplishment of His purposes on earth, as they had before the decision. And neither the ruling nor the law pretends to affect it in any way, either as to its collection or disposition.

Will the leading papers of this great country please to inform themselves on the "Mormon" question before writing about it? Or do they really desire to deceive the public, circulate error, malign a people who are noted for their many good qualities, and stir up anger on false pretenses?

We have never asked any journal or journalist in the land to favor our cause or praise our people, but we have asked, and do now request them to make some investigation, and to seek some other sources for information than hired and sonred defamers, before they "pitch into the Mormons" and bear false witness against their Utah neighbors.

Dublin, Oct. 25.—Freeman's Journal asserts that over 200 Irish policemen have been placed at the disposal of the London Times as witnesses, who may be useful in proving its charges against Parnellites, and it also declares that copies of letters belonging to Matthew Harris, seized when the police searched his house, have been given to the Times.