

### **GLARING INCONSISTENCIES.**

The question of municipal ownership is agitating the minds of a certain class of reformers. They have apparently been converted to the idea that the corporation could save money to the people by doing some things which it gives others the right to do. While the board of public works and common council are agitating the question of municipal lighting they are passing resolutions and ordinances giving to contractors the right to plunder and rob the taxpayer and property owner by special tax bills for sprinkling and cleaning the streets. If the city can save money by doing its own lighting and furnishing its own water, why, pray, can it not clean and sprinkle its streets, pave its highways and construct its sidewalks? Why should a few contractors fatten and grow rich at the expense of the taxpayer? Let the city do the things which it has been in the habit of doing if it can do it cheaper than by granting the rights to private parties to do it. There is a glaring inconsistency in this demand for city lighting, and at the same time surrendering the rights to sprinkle and clean the streets. Where is the special tax bill to stop? Will the board of public works pause and consider whether they are drifting?