

should be granted is the power to make appropriations in advance for continuing expenses, the money to be drawn out by warrant upon countersignature by the chairman of the County court, or some other officer. As the law at present stands it seems to contemplate that no appropriations shall be made except in payment of an existing "claim" for services already performed, materials already furnished or other value already received. I take it that in most of the counties a liberal construction of the powers of the County courts is indulged in and many

APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACTS are made, and many other things done which are beyond the powers of the counties. This is of course wrong upon principle and liable to lead to real abuses. Whatever powers the counties ought in reason to exercise ought to be found upon the pages of the statute books.

The laws relating to county officers are also in many particulars scanty and difficult of construction. Without attempting to enter into details, I will merely suggest the advisability of a thorough re-examination of these laws with a view to the more thorough and specific definition of the powers, duties, liabilities and compensation of officers. The laws relating to coroners and inquests will be found especially slipshod. In this connection I would suggest the creation of the office of public administrator in each county, with the powers usually conferred on such officers. In some States this office is combined with that of coroner. And in this connection I am reminded also that the Territory is in need of a law for the escheat of property of persons dying intestate and without heirs. Such provision upon this head as was contained in former statutes of descent seems to be repealed by implication by the present revised code on that subject. And the present law upon the subject is in a most remarkable condition, as will be seen by the following sections of the Compiled Laws of 1888: Section 2741, subdivision 9; sections 2760, 2759 and section 4278 to 4285.

It will be seen that no final destination for such property is provided. Cases are now pending in which the disposition of such property is involved, and any legislation on this subject should, of course, retroactively include them.

I remain, sir, yours very respectfully,
WALTER MURPHY,
County Attorney, Salt Lake County.

STATEHOOD FOR UTAH.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 18. — Senator Teller introduced a bill to admit Utah into the Union as a State. All persons qualified to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly are made eligible by the bill to be elected to a convention to form a State constitution, which shall meet on the first Tuesday in October of 1892. The bill, after reciting the usual provisions of the Constitution to be adopted, further provides that it shall secure perfect toleration of religious sentiment and forbids the molestation of any person in the State in person or property on account of any mode of religious worship. All rights to public

lands are to be disclaimed by the State, and November, 1892, is fixed as the date of the ratification of the Constitution by the people.

THE LATE WILLIAM LANEY.

Brother William Leany, who departed this life at the ripe age of seventy-six, was the twin brother to Isaac Leany, who was so terribly shot at Haul's Mill, Missouri. He was born in Franklin, Simpson County, Kentucky, on December 19th, 1815. He went to Missouri with the Saints in the year 1836, and after the mobbing, he among others had to do the best he could for support. He then went to Illinois, and arrived in Nauvoo in 1843. He worked on the Nauvoo House and on the Temple, as a carpenter. He and his family were among those who were driven out in the year 1846.

The deceased married a daughter of Father Searce. He came on to Council Bluffs and was ready to join in the Mormon Battalion, which was then being raised, but was allowed to remain to help take care of the helpless families left by those who did go. He remained there all the winter, and the following spring went on to the valley of the Great Salt Lake, where he labored faithfully to make a home for his wife and family. In the fall of 1850 he was called as one of the Southern pioneers to go under the leadership of Apostle George A. Smith and settle at Parowan, where he arrived on the 13th of January, 1851. He helped many times to quell the Indians, and was never known to fail when called upon to assist in defending his brothers and friends. When the St. George mission was formed he among the rest, being a Southern man, was called to raise cotton and tobacco. He settled at Harrisburg, Washington County, where he lived until the time of his death, which took place on the 29th day of December, 1891. Brother Leany held the office of High Priest and had attained to all the blessings of the holy Priesthood given in our day.

The funeral service was held in the meeting house at Harrisburg, under the presidency of Bishop McMullin. The speakers were Elders John Steel, George Spilsbury, Brother Leatham and Bishop McMullin, who spoke of the deceased as a good, faithful Latter-day Saint.

JOHN STEEL.

THE UTAH STATEHOOD QUESTION.

GOVERNOR ARTHUR L. THOMAS.

As between the so-called Faulkner Home-Rule bill, and the Teller statehood bill, I am unhesitatingly in favor of the latter. If the time has come when a change is to be made in our system of local government, I believe the people should, as a matter of right, be consulted as to its form and scope. As I understand it, the Faulkner bill was sprung upon the people without their knowledge or consent. Whoever prepared the measure had no sympathy with the financial necessities of the people. I believe that if Congress does authorize the people of Utah to provide a new form of government, they will adopt a system that will prove of benefit and not a burden.

SECRETARY SELLS, (LIB.)

prefers statehood to the system of things proposed by the Caine-Faulkner bill, and thinks it would be better for the Mormon people.

CHIEF JUSTICE ZANE (REP.)

My views as to the bill for an enabling act for Utah Territory, introduced into the United States Senate yesterday by Senator Teller, are that I am for the passage of the bill without any mental reservation. I further state unhesitatingly that it is my opinion that the Republican party of Utah should declare in favor of its passage and insist upon it becoming a law. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has taken a stand against the practice of polygamy, and I have no doubt that its members desire to co-operate with non-"Mormons" politically for the common good. If Utah becomes a State the "Mormons" will understand that their material and political interests, their welfare and happiness, are so related to and connected with those of the Gentiles, that laws benefitting the latter will be good for the former, and such laws as oppress and injure the one class will be detrimental to the other.

More than 200,000 people in Utah are building its cities, opening and working its mines of incalculable wealth, improving and cultivating vast numbers of productive and valuable farms and herding their flocks in its valleys and upon its hills. Comparatively speaking, these people are temperate, industrious and honest. They are sufficient in numbers and possess the requisite wealth and intelligence to be admitted into the sisterhood of States. I say, let statehood come. The "Mormon" scare has blown over. I am unable to see, under statehood, the alarming apparitions and hobgoblins conjured up by timidity and fear or by prejudice. The time has come to abandon the enmities, the contention and prejudice of the past and to lay the foundation of the State of Utah deep and sure, upon civil and religious liberty; upon the great principle of equality before the law. We are yet at the foot of the bill the summit of which will be scaled in distant ages through generations of progress and prosperity. The People of Utah, with the citizens of the United States in other parts of its wide borders, are entitled to national sovereignty, and to those powers delegated by the Constitution of the United States to the Federal government and to State sovereignty, as to those powers not so delegated. I am for statehood according to the provisions of the Teller bill, so far as they have been reported to me.

HARREL PRATT, (REP.)

In my opinion the Democratic leaders in Utah did not act in good faith with the people on the question of statehood. They gave the people to understand that division on party lines was for educational purposes, and preparatory only for future statehood. In attempting to force the Home Rule bill upon Utah they have placed their followers in a false light before the nation. I think it would have been well to have delayed statehood until the people had been thoroughly edu-