

have no doubt that the people of Utah would adopt a constitution, hoping to be relieved of the present system.

Referring again to the platform of the Democratic Territorial convention held in July last, I find the following: "Upon the subject of statehood for Utah, (we) declare that we are Democrats and that our party never has and never will favor the admission of Territories until all the necessary conditions for statehood exist." "We have no hesitancy in declaring that statehood would be a great boon to this Territory and when Utah is fully prepared, and the people desire it, that we as a party will be found as we have ever been, supporting the right."

In view of these quotations, the query might be indulged, Did the members of that convention doubt the existence of the necessary conditions for statehood in Utah? And if it be true that this home rule bill is a product of Democratic brains, may it not be inferred that the proprietors of such brains also entertained similar doubts?

But if so are such doubts supported by facts? I think not. My impression is that Utah possesses all the conditions entitling her to become a State. If so, and if it is right to admit States possessing the necessary conditions, why will not my Democratic friends join with me in "supporting the right?" and ask Congress to pass an enabling act for our admission as a State?

Referring to the question of rule. I understand that rule, in the sense used in this connection, to be, "supreme command or authority; government; empire; control and power. If this is a correct definition of the term rule, will somebody kindly inform me how the framers and advocates of this bill expect to obtain supreme control and power for Utah, yielding as the bill does, the right of Congress to withhold at will, the power asked for?

The terms supreme control and power are inconsistent with the idea of Congressional supervision and veto. In point of fact no Territory can be supreme, nor can any State, because, as the Democratic convention held last July, very truthfully asserts, "The government of the United is a national sovereignty, supreme within its sphere," and that "the several States of the Union are sovereign within their sphere."

But the Territories are not sovereign. In this country the theory is, that sovereignty is vested in the people who are supposed to delegate certain powers to their representatives, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress. All men in the States are sovereign, but persons residing in the Territories, having no voting representation in Congress, cannot be called sovereign. Why? Because a sovereign is one who possesses the highest power without control; and citizens of the Territories have no power excepting such as Congress has temporarily conferred upon them, and which the same power can take from them at its pleasure. They have no voice in the enactment of the laws of the United States which govern them, nor in the election of the President.

Bouvier describes a Territory as being "a part of the country subject to, and belonging to the United States, which is not within the boundary of

the States, and has a temporary government."

The present Territorial system was adopted about a hundred years ago, and although not provided for in the Constitution, has been engrafted upon our political system, and has thus far been consented to by the people and sustained by the courts. Do the friends of the home rule bill desire that this abnormal excrescence shall remain indefinitely, thus withholding sovereignty from the citizens of Utah?

I believe that every citizen of the United States, whether residing in a State or in a Territory, is endowed with a sovereignty. I have always held that a sovereign does not lose that attribute, does not forfeit it by removing from a State to a Territory, the same only being held in abeyance. It is an inchoate right, inalienable and can be forfeited only by his own act. True, it remains in a state of "innocuous desuetude," to be resumed and become active on the return to a State, of its possessor, or when the Territory in which he resides shall become a State.

Believing this position to be tenable, how can I consistently ask Congress to continue to hold Utah and her citizens, as they are now held, in political bondage at the expense financially of the taxpayers?—such expense probably amounting to a hundred thousand dollars annually in excess of what we are burdened with under the existing system, especially when all the necessary conditions for statehood exist, which I hold to be the case.

The home rule bill does not make any provision for the protection and safe keeping of the money of the people which may remain in the treasuries of the Territory and of the several counties on the 1st day of January, 1893, as it does not require the treasurer (or any other officers elected in November, 1892) to execute bonds; and as they are to take possession of their several offices, and any funds remaining in the hands of their predecessors, who had given bonds, on the first day of January, 1893, it will readily be seen that the people would have no security for their money, which might, if the new incumbents should prove dishonest, be lost, without a reasonable prospect of its final recovery.

As regards the conditions necessary to statehood, I repeat that they really exist. Comparing our population of 207,000 in 1890 with the much smaller number of inhabitants of Idaho, of Wyoming and one of the Dakotas, who will not admit that as to population we are amply provided? And as to our population in regard to morality, virtue and intelligence, the statistics show that we compare favorably with any of the States now in the Union.

Regarding the ability of the people of Utah to support a State government, it is only necessary to say that they were assessed for the year 1891 the enormous sum of over six hundred thousand dollars, which, being able to pay, affords evidence that they could sustain a State government.

That a majority of the citizens of Utah desire to obtain statehood cannot be reasonably doubted, I think, and I infer as much from the fact that they adopted a constitution in 1872, and asked for admission, and have asked the boon more than once since that time.

HADLEY D. JOHNSON.

## CITY COUNCIL.

The City Council met in regular session last night, Mayor Scott presiding. The members in attendance were Lynn, Heath, Anderson, Tuddenham, Spafford, Hyde, Hardy, Folland, Pendleton, Parsons and Young. Absent—Smith, James, Pickard and Karlick.

### PETITIONS

were read and referred as follows:

The Salt Lake Natural Gas Company asked for a franchise to conduct natural gas through the streets, avenues and alleys of Salt Lake City. Committee on streets.

F. F. Watson et al. asked that an electric light be established at the intersection of Fourth East and Seventh South streets. Committee on improvements.

J. K. Gillespie and thirty-one others asked the City Council not to grant a franchise to any railway company which proposed to operate its cars by steam power over Third South street, west of the Rio Grande Western. Laid on the table.

S. S. Noblit asked permission to transfer his merchant's license to Thos. O'Mara.

Henry H. Waters and others asked for an extension of watermain on First North street. Committee on waterworks.

F. D. Clift asked permission to lay sidewalk in front of his property by private contract. Granted.

A. Rowland and others asked that block 63, corner of Third South and Fifth West streets, be included in sewer district. Committee on sewerage.

W. H. Sharkey and others asked for an extension of watermain on Eighth East street. Committee on waterworks.

George A. Lowe and others asked that John H. Keene be appointed a special policeman. Referred to the city marshal.

R. E. Buttle and others asked for an extension of watermain on Fifth South street, between Fourth and Fifth South streets. Committee on waterworks.

Margaret Sharp and others complained of excessive sewer tax assessment, and asked that the rate be reduced. Committee on sewerage.

E. Wilkes and others asked for a two years' lease of five acres of sand and gravel land in plat J. Salt Lake City Survey. Committee on public grounds.

R. K. Thomas represented that he had paid \$300 for the privilege of connecting his terrace with sewer mains and that the connection had been broken by the city engineer, and he now asked for redress. Committee on sewerage.

E. H. Rippets asked that Apple Street be graded. Granted.

J. B. Cummock and twelve others represented that they owned a considerable amount of real estate contiguous to the Capitol Hill grounds, and asked that they be allowed to grade East Capitol Street, and asked that they be deeded thirteen lots in that locality for such labor. Committee on public grounds.

Dubois and Williams, contractors, asked that they be paid \$5000 on account. Referred to the city engineer.