
Los Angeles News.

FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1868.

Veto Message.

MAYOR'S OFFICE,

Los Angeles City, June, 6, '68.

Gentlemen of the Common Council:—While at all times it affords me pleasure to co-operate with your whole body, as a portion of the Municipal authority, and to give my prompt approval to all such proceedings as manifestly tend to the advancement and progress of the general welfare of the City of Los Angeles, yet still at the same time, I consider it as my important duty, devolving upon me under certain circumstances, to withhold my approval of the acts of the Common Council, and more particularly when those acts bear ostensible evidences of haste and a want of consideration, in a matter of so much importance to the present and future prosperity of the city of Los Angeles.

The Ordinance as now presented for my approval for the sale of the City Water Works to parties mentioned in said ordinance, is hereby respectfully returned without approval, for the following reasons:

1st. On the second page and fifth line there is a blank left to be filled up by some person; I cannot presume that it was intended that I should supply the deficiency. Also, and in like manner, on the third page and twenty-third line, another blank would require filling up before the same could become an ordinance, notwithstanding the signature of the President of the Common Council, which to my mind clearly shows inconsiderate haste in referring to me an unfinished and imperfect ordinance for my approval. And upon a further examination of said ordi-

nance for my approval. And upon a further examination of said ordinance, third page, tenth line, certain things are to be done within a year but no date mentioned from which to make the count, and ascertain if the contract has been complied with.

2nd. It has always been considered by my predecessors, as well as myself at the present time, that the prosperity of the City of Los Angeles depends entirely upon the proper management and distribution of the waters of the Los Angeles river. First in magnitude, will be the supply of water for domestic use, properly managed to avoid waste; but I cannot conceive the necessity of a sale of this water franchise in order to secure a supply for domestic use. This can be as fully accomplished under a lease of the franchise, as well as by a sale thereof, or by the management of the same by the City herself.

In relation to the taking of water out of the river of Los Angeles and any of the canals of the city for domestic use and sale to gardens, I find the latter term so indefinite as to ex-

In relation to the taking of water out of the river of Los Angeles and any of the canals of the city for domestic use and sale to gardens, I find the latter term so indefinite as to extent, that in the course of time great questions may arise with other vested rights of irrigation claimed by cultivators of the soil; all of which we should endeavor to avoid. Nor is the price offered, sufficient for the rights and privileges that would be conveyed by the said sale, when it is to be borne in mind that the corporation at the present time is leasing the franchise for the sum of \$1,500 per annum. Therefore with the above suggestions, and many more that might be presented, I trust your honorable body will appreciate my sincerity and weigh the reasons presented, because my convictions are based upon a general knowledge of what I know to be for the best interests of this city, which will not permit me to approve said ordinance.

Respectfully,

C. AGUILAR,

Mayor.