

THE WATER RIGHTS QUESTION.

In your Semi-weekly issue of the 2nd inst., while reading the article headed "A cause of Complaint," by "Resurgam," my mind was led to further reflection on the subject of the water supply, its cost, etc. Occasionally I hear, or see in print, evidences of dissatisfaction in relation to the matter, some claiming that their vested rights have been taken from them by the operation of distributing the water to parties after all the water from such sources had been appropriated. While I shall not deny that this has been done to some extent—though legally wrong, but not intended—the intent is the standpoint from which we must judge. The original rights of many, your correspondent among others, in the water question, have suffered materially by the loss of fruit trees, shrubbery, etc.; but fruit complaint is not the remedy nor selfishness any part of the cure.

No doubt the City Council, upon whom have devolved the control and distribution of the water, has acted for the good of all so far as possible under the circumstances. Their watermasters have given way to the importunings of the people for water who had no such rights, legally speaking; but watermasters are sometimes tender-hearted as well as other folk, and their sympathies have been wrought upon. Thereby some people have enjoyed benefits to the detriment of others, but to institute legal proceedings to recover the loss of vested rights, as some have intimated, would be all wrong. This for several reasons. It would add no more water, nor money to bring it, and would create a much worse feeling than now exists, and put money into the pockets of those who have now no claim. The remedy lies in quite another direction—in a system that will better control and economize the water, and bring it to the respective parties owning primary and secondary rights there-in respectively, for such a sum as will be just and equitable to all the parties interested. This means all citizens; for whether we realize it or not, all we who come here as Latter-day Saints come to build up a great city, such as is indicated in the laying out of the same. We cannot afford to be narrow. Our streets are not, neither is our country, nor the water privileges thereof. To say that those who came first and appropriated all the water then at hand could do this without the help of those who followed them, and are still coming, would be altogether wrong.

When emergencies arise we must meet them in a manner which is in keeping with the great object to be attained, and for which we are here, in the controlling and distributing of the water. Thus far there has not been any very great mistake. For instance, any intelligent man who has a large piece of land to cultivate knows that he cannot do it all himself, and if he is not able to hire—which was the case with us—he would say to his friend or

friends "Take a part of this land and do as I am doing, and I will divide the water which I own with you; for the land must be cultivated." There is a great object to be attained thereby, and with this crude way in which the water is now brought, the supply being insufficient, we will improve the way, and also look for a further supply; for it will take our united efforts to accomplish the great object which we have undertaken. That object may be made a great success; but if we quarrel and divide, it will prove equally as great a failure.

Now, what an intelligent man can do an intelligent community of men may do also, and even more effectually, because of the greater amount of intelligence combined in the many over the few. When such work is accomplished, almost any person can see that each individual's property is increased in value by the extent of the enterprise over and above what it would have been had the first comers been selfish enough to shut out this extra help, and consequently extra improvement, simply because they at that time could not discover any more water, or the way of getting it to the people by a less wasteful process.

Our waterworks system must in the near future take the place of ditches for carrying water through the city. The economizing of water from evaporation and the unnecessary soakage demands that the system be extended as fast as practicable, and that the waste of water be more rigidly controlled, and perhaps the use of water within the corporation for irrigating purpose confined to trees, shrubs, lawns, etc.

There could be a scale or plan devised by which every primary water right owner, also every secondary water right owner, may have the water brought to him at cost, according to his original or vested rights. The system would be simple and work with equal justice to all parties interested. It would also, in its operation from year to year, serve to reimburse, to a considerable extent, the person who may honestly and truly feel that for the time being he is deprived of his vested water right. To fully explain the plan, however, would require considerable space, and as we have not in our progress of improvement quite come to the "bridge," I will not yet attempt to pass over.

With due respect for water rights and all other rights,

AN OLD CITY COUNCILOR.

CENTERVILLE, July 4th, 1889.

THE CHURCH FUNDS.

On July 8 in the Territorial Supreme Court, Receiver Dyer filed the following report:

In the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah.

The United States of America, plaintiff, vs. The Late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints et al., defendants.

To the honorable Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah:—In pursuance of the order of June 29th, 1889, I forwarded by special mes-

senger on the first day of July, a circular letter, (a copy of which is hereby annexed) to the several banks of Salt Lake City, directing the same to the following banks:

Bank of Salt Lake, Union National, McCornick and Co., Zion's Savings Bank and Trust Co., Deseret National, Deseret Savings Bank, Commercial National, Wells, Fargo & Co., T. R. Jones & Co., and the Utah Commercial and Savings Bank.

I received replies in writing from the following banks:

Zion's Savings Bank and Trust Company, Deseret National, Deseret Savings Bank, Utah Commercial and Savings Bank, T. R. Jones & Co., which replies are hereto annexed. All the other banks failed to bid anything and as I got no written reply, I called on them personally and asked them for bids on Friday, the 5th day of July, and they all declined to bid for the loan of money.

I saw a number of sureties, as many of them as were accessible, with regard to the question of obtaining their consent to loans being made as suggested by the court. They expressed their willingness to remain holden on the bond of your receiver to the full extent of such liability as determined by law; but were unwilling to extend their liability or incur any new and uncertain obligations. That, in the opinion of many of said sureties, it was thought inexpedient to loan money for such short time, in view of the risk taken with such loans, and the certainty of the money being called for in a few months; that the amount of interest received would not compensate the risk of loaning the same.

FRANK H. DYER, Receiver.

SALT LAKE CITY, July 6, 1889.

The circular letter which the Receiver sent to the banks, and to which reference is made in his report, reads as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah,

July 1, 1889.

To—, Salt Lake City, Utah:

Gentlemen—I have in my hands as receiver of "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," the sum of \$250,000. The Honorable Supreme Court of this Territory directs me to solicit bids from the banks of this city, for the loaning of the same, for a period of four months or over.

Complying with that direction I now solicit your bid for the whole or any part you may desire to bid for. Please give me on or before Thursday of this week, at noon, your best bid, as to the sum and rate of interest for the period above stated. Very respectfully,

FRANK H. DYER, Receiver.

The only offer made was by Zion's Savings Bank, which offered $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. per month, or 3 per cent. per annum for \$75,000 for the period named. The other banks declined to make any offer whatever for the use of the money for four months.

At the opening of the session this morning, Judge Zane made the following announcement: "The