

coagulated. From that time on the progress of the destroyer was steady and unmistakable; the periods of relief became briefer and further apart, and for at least a month past it has been known that death was liable to occur without further warning. Of course all that human skill, careful attention and prayerful devotion could accomplish was done, but all to no purpose; the end has come, the dark river is crossed.

Carrie Scott Harrison was born in Oxford, Ohio, fifty-seven years ago. She was the mother of two children, Russell B., born August 12, 1854, and Mary Scott, some two years younger than her brother. Deceased was a comely, matronly looking woman, the picture of health when she visited Salt Lake about eighteen months ago. She was very much devoted to her family and home, and a more highly respected occupant of the White House never lived. We may be sure that after life's fitful fever she sleeps well.

### MR. IRVINE ACQUITTED.

The jury in the case of the State of Nebraska vs. W. H. Irvine came into court at 3:40 o'clock yesterday afternoon with a verdict of not guilty. It could not have been anything else, hence the news was not grasped so eagerly nor made so much of as would have been the case had there been any doubt regarding the result. Mr. Irvine is a resident of this city, where he is well and favorably known, his list of acquaintances being lengthy and containing the names of men in every walk of life and of every shade of opinion, all of whom will rejoice that the ordeal is over and the defendant is again free. There may be one here and there who will regret that acquittal was not secured upon the high moral ground of the inherent right of the husband and father to protect his home, that "higher law" which one of the defendant's counsel spoke of during his speech to the jury—an unwritten law but as binding as any within the covers of a book of statutes; these will regret that the jury's verdict did not exonerate, that it only discharged for the reason that the accused was not responsible for his act at the time it was committed; but all will be glad and congratulate, no matter as to the means by which the result was brought about.

### NO NEED TO STARVE.

As indicating the productiveness of the earth and its capacity to sustain a heavy population if the vegetarian instead of the flesh diet be resorted to, and as illustrative of the fact that such must of necessity be the tendency as the world becomes densely peopled, the figures of a Scotch scientist are interesting. He estimates that while twenty-two acres of land is needed to sustain a man on flesh, that amount sown to wheat will feed forty-two persons; sown to oats it will sustain eighty-eight persons; to potatoes, Indian corn and rice, 176 persons; and planted with the bread-fruit tree, over 6000 people could be fed.

The accuracy of this surprising calculation is all that is needed to dispel the fears of even the most pessimistic disciple of Malthus. A continuous diet of unbuttered bread-fruit may not be especially inviting, but it would suffice to keep body and soul together; and since even the poorest man may reasonably expect land enough for a grave—a plot so small that its ordinary product wouldn't sustain a sparrow—he could yield up his spirit with the serene confidence that out of his dust might be grown a tree from whose generous branches his children and children's children might freely pluck the staff of life until they in turn furnished the foundation for a fresh orchard.

### 'T WAS A FAMOUS VICTORY.

In the report of the committee of local business men who have been in consultation with the railroad officials on the subject of transportation charges, the citizens of Salt Lake and the people of Utah generally will find matter for the sincerest congratulation. The amended tariff, which is the result of the committee's labors, means a saving to the people of this Territory of the snug sum of \$600,000 per annum. It is easy to understand, therefore, how the Chamber of Commerce, when it received this report and was made to comprehend the details of it, should adopt the agreement proposed by the committee, and, warmly thanking them for their efforts, consent to withdraw the suit against the railroads.

The history of the agitation which has resulted so prosperously is not long, but it is interesting. About two and a half years ago the matter of organizing for mutual defense against what was believed to be the extortion of the railway companies was broached and favorably considered. Action was had upon it, too, but there was no really organized aggressive move until about a year ago, when it was decided to push the fight with vigor and carry it if necessary to the utmost legal limit. The developments during the twelvemonth need scarcely be reiterated; it is enough to say the case has been conducted with ceaseless zeal and energy, and that in many respects it was highly sensational. Through it all there was one unswerving purpose, and in the accomplishment of this the skill of Mr. Sears, manager of the transportation bureau, was reinforced by the stout courage of Colonel Donnellan, president of the Chamber of Commerce, and both were sustained by the hearty support of the large majority of the board of directors. The fight was hot but dignified, and it has been gallantly carried on. That so signal a victory should have been won without further expense of energy and time is due not more to the diplomacy of the committee of arbitration than to the completeness of the arrangements for the attack, and the moral force which always reposes on the side of the right. He who is in the right, and has as well, he might to enforce it, has small trouble in having his demands granted.

In the general joy, however, over the peaceful and happy termination of the

contest there is no wish to either gloat or criticize. All who have had a hand in it are deserving of public gratitude. Our good friends the railroads performed their part with grace and promptness, and will be remembered favorably. The commercial prospects of Salt Lake City and Utah Territory have been enormously brightened, and our material progress has been accelerated by at least one gigantic stride.

### POWERS OF COUNTY COURTS.

A southern correspondent, quoting section 261 of chapter VI of the Compiled Laws of Utah, 1888 (p. 308, Vol. 1), asks for an interpretation as to its meaning. The section reads as follows:

No member of the [county] court must be interested, directly or indirectly, in any property purchased for the use of the county, nor in any purchase or sale of property belonging to the county, nor in any contract made by the court or other person in behalf of the county, for the erection of public buildings, the opening or improvement of roads, or the building of bridges, or for other purposes.

As we understand our correspondent, he wants to know whether under this section a member of the county court may sell to the court or the county any property, such as scrapers, wagons or horses; also whether such member of the court may take a contract or take charge of any public improvement authorized by the court, and do said work or employ his own teams or workmen upon it.

It would scarcely seem possible, in view of the explicit language of the statute, that there could be any doubt of its meaning. The intent of the law, and it is expressly stated, is that there should be no connection whatever, either immediate, or remote, or contingent, between the officials by whose vote county funds are appropriated and those to whom said funds or any of them would come. The design of the law is that all possibility of collusion should be prevented; and if there had been any language that would more explicitly state this intention, there is no doubt the Legislature would have employed it. The only answer, therefore, to our correspondent's queries is that the statute forbids any member of the county court from selling to or taking contracts from the court; and that if any such thing has been done it is illegal.

A friend to whom the foregoing was read this morning stated that he had received, two or three days ago, a similar answer to certain inquiries of the same character which he had felt compelled to address to Judge Varian, United States District Attorney for Utah. The reply is so pertinent and authoritative that we avail ourselves with pleasure of the permission to use it. Mr. Varian, under date of October 22, says:

I note your inquiries of this date, concerning the lawful powers of members of the County Courts, in this Territory, which are stated as follows:

"Can a member of said court lawfully be interested, directly or indirectly, in any property purchased for the use of the county?"