

Charles L. Walker, the "Dixie poet," and watchman at the Temple.

A. P. Winner, born, 1818, joined the Church in 1845.

Charles A. Terry, born 1821, joined the Church in 1843.

Joseph H. Randall, born March 17, 1822, joined the Church in early days, and one of Salt Lake City's sweet singers in "ye olden time."

Robert Gardner, one of the owners of the old grist and carding mills, on Mill Creek, south of Salt Lake City.

Others are named as arriving at where St. George now is before any settlement was made, when it was necessary to "subdue Indians, kill snakes, and build bridges" to make it possible for white men to live there. A. P. Hardy, Samuel Knight, James D. L. Pearce; also John S. Woodbury, one of the early missionaries to the Sandwich Islands. Says the Union: "We have one big gun commonly called David H. Cannon, president of the St. George temple, he has a host of little guns and some full grown Cannons, and one of them has some little guns too. Although we live in the beautiful sunny south, we have snows every day in the year, while this winter we had ice six inches thick, some of which we have stored away for the hot summer days. \* \* \* To wind up with we have one brother who came to Utah in 1856, and another that came in 1859, who still have the teams that pulled their effects across the plains in those years, and they are in fair condition yet. Now, Mr. NEWS editor, these are a few of our old s and-byes, and if you desire a right good time, hearing the good things of the kingdom spoken of, just come down here when we have from five to twenty of these veterans together and hear them tell of the goodness of God to them and the many good times they have had with the Prophet and with the Saints, hear their testimonies and it will make your heart leap for joy."

#### AS TO COUNTY WARRANTS.

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah,

February 18, 1896.

Your recent editorial in relation to House bill 64, having for its object the validating of county warrants, seems to us to be somewhat unjust under the circumstances. We trust you will investigate this matter thoroughly, and believe that upon a thorough investigation you will concede that the grounds taken by you under the existing circumstances are hardly applicable and certainly not controlling.

Permit us to call your attention to the fact that warrants issued by Salt Lake county, circulated and passed current in this community in perfect good faith.

The question as to whether or not the county had exceeded its debt limit, was not considered at the time these warrants were issued and sold, a doubtful question. The most eminent lawyers of this city were of the opinion that the reasonable and fair construction of the various provisions authorized the county court to issue all the warrants they did. Afterwards in the case brought by Mr. Fenton the question was raised in the Supreme court of the Territory, and that court after experiencing great difficulties in arriving at its conclu-

sion, finally determined that the debt limit had been exceeded. Until that decision there had been no judicial determination of the question, and while since that decision there would be no excuse on the part of the county court or purchasers of county warrants for complaining, when you look at the situation as it existed prior to that decision, you will realize that all concerned acted in perfectly good faith. The purchasers of those warrants had no judicial determination to guide them; the opinions of lawyers supported the validity of the warrants, and it does seem that under such circumstances the reasoning applied in your editorial should be so modified as not to trench upon the uncertainties that existed prior to the decision, but should be limited to all time subsequent to the decision in the Fenton case, when for the first time the statutes were construed. Counties should not be encouraged to exceed the debt limit with the hope or expectation that future legislatures would validate their acts, but such a rule should not be applied until it was definitely determined what constituted the debt limit.

After that decision, we thoroughly agree with every word in your editorial upon that subject, for every person who desires to purchase warrants can then intelligently ascertain whether they are or are not in excess of the debt limit, but prior to that decision as already stated, there was no reliable means afforded that would be sure to guide the purchaser of warrants as to whether they were or were not in excess of the debt limit, particularly so as the statutes were somewhat vague and uncertain, and susceptible in perfect good faith, of two constructions, one of which would have made all the warrants valid, and the other (which was the one adopted by our supreme court) which fixed the debt limit below the amount of warrants which had been issued. Then again, you must remember that at the present time there is no telling what the decision of the courts may be as to which of the warrants now outstanding are, and which are not legal.

The case commenced a few months ago by Stephen Hays in the district court, will fully explain and show the difficulties that are yet to be determined. It will cause endless litigation as to priorities among all the warrant holders; it will require the determination of just what contracts were outstanding when the debt limit was reached, and whether or not warrants issued in payment of such contracts are not the warrants that are within the limit, and will require a thorough accounting and adjudication between all the warrant holders of this county. It cannot be that under such a state of facts you would advise and encourage the repudiation of warrants upon the ground that they had been issued in excess of the limit when that limit had not been judicially determined; when the law fixing the limit was obscure and uncertain, and equally susceptible of construction which would uphold the validity of warrants, and when all warrants were bought in this community by persons acting in perfect good faith and when if not legalized endless litigation must and

will follow. It does seem to us, that when as in the bill proposed, the right to contest the validity of any warrant on any other ground except that it was issued in excess of the limit, is entirely fair and just to the county.

We trust you will reconsider this matter and will investigate it thoroughly, and will see your way clear in this instance, to withdraw the objections you have stated to the bill, and we join you in voicing those objections as to every warrant that has been issued since the judicial determination of the limit by our Supreme Court.

Yours respectfully,  
SEVERAL HEAVY TAX PAYERS.

#### PROTECT THE BIRDS

I wish to speak a few words for some birds which are generally regarded as injurious, but which, I feel sure, are, in reality, our friends.

Hawks and owls are usually regarded as wholly mischievous, and many people suppose that we would be much better off were they completely exterminated. Probably few birds benefit the farmer as much as these. It is true that they occasionally pick up a chicken but for every chicken they kill it is probable they destroy dozens of rats, mice and various kinds of squirrels and injurious gobbers thus paying for their depredations on the poultry yard many times over.

The magpie has a bad reputation because there is a popular belief that it "sucks eggs." I am not prepared to say that this charge is wholly unfounded, but I feel quite sure that no grocer in Utah pays so high a price for eggs as the magpie. This beautiful active bird spends most of the time from morning until night catching and destroying mice and insects. How much good it does is not likely to be known until the bird has been driven from our valleys and hillsides, and then it is too late for our knowledge to do us much practical good.

Crows are greatly misunderstood members of society. It is true they pull up a little grain in the spring and thus injure the farmer, but, like the birds already spoken of, the good they do greatly outweighs the harm of which they are guilty. They not only destroy myriads of insects but they check the too rapid increase of the pelican by eating their eggs.

The pelican is regarded as a great enemy to the fish culturist, and there is no doubt that they may become so numerous as to seriously interfere with fish raising; but in moderate numbers they probably do more good than harm. It is true they eat some fish, but they also eat frogs and thus reduce the number of tadpoles which are hatched. The grown frog is an insect eater, but the tadpole is a strict vegetarian and it eats about the same kind of food that is eaten by young carp and other vegetarians among other fish. So the pelican, in moderate numbers, probably helps the fishing interest more than it injures it.

The truth is that the balance of nature is so perfectly adjusted that it is dangerous to interfere with it. When we suppose we are striking at an enemy we may be killing a friend.

There are two steps which we may safely take at this time; one is a step