

Chairman Godfrey—Suppose the cigar makers should endorse a ticket and ask for such a recognition?

Gen. McClelland—The cigar-makers have no political organization. Let us deal with the facts.

Mr. Williams—There are only two tickets in the field.

Mr. Parks—There are three tickets, the "Liberals," Workingmen and People.

Mr. Hurd—There are three parties that wish to be represented. If the People's Party had endorsed the "Liberal" ticket instead of the Workingmen's, would the "Liberals" have been shut out? I think not.

Chairman Godfrey (sharply)—Where is the record of your party? You have none. Make yourself a record by votes at an election. Everywhere else under the sun it is only democratic and republican except here, where it is "Liberal" and People. Make your record if you wish to be recognized?

Mr. Parks—We have made sufficient record to be organized and known as a party.

Mr. Hurd—Shall we be denied fair play because we have had no organization heretofore?

Chairman Godfrey—You have one ticket between you. Divide up your challengers with the People.

Mr. Hurd—They are a distinct party, and would object to being deprived of their rights. We only ask equal rights with others.

Mr. Parks—We ask as a courtesy that you give us fair play. We do not think you can afford to deny us that.

Mr. Williams—We are much obliged for the suggestion of protection of our reputation, but we take care of that ourselves.

Mr. Hurd—These gentlemen are the representatives of an organized political party. As such they desire challengers at the polls.

Gen. McClelland—The people have a right to organize political parties, and voters have a right to be represented at the polls.

Mr. Hurd—We think so, and ask for it. Suppose the People had put up a separate ticket? Must we go entirely without representation by challengers?

Chairman Godfrey—Will they challenge any of your votes?

Mr. Parks—They have a right to. There is one difference in the candidates, and they probably will challenge.

C. I. Robertson—I think you are off on that.

Mr. Parks—We do not desire to engage in any tricks. We want fair play and nothing more.

Chairman Godfrey—We will consider the matter and give a ruling this afternoon.

This afternoon the Commission met and announced that no more recommendations would be made in respect to challengers. The effect of this is to deny the Workingmen's request, and to leave them entirely without challengers except as the People's Party may choose to divide with them.

Wednesday, July 30, the inquiry

before Mr. Kahler, into the objections to voters, was concluded.

Isaac Hunter, objected to on the ground of being a polygamist, stated that he never was in polygamy. Objection overruled.

W. G. Young, against whom the same objection had been raised, stated that he had been in polygamy, but had been divorced legally from his first wife and afterwards married his second wife. Objection overruled.

C. P. Carlson, challenged for polygamy, said he had never been in polygamy. Objection overruled.

Alfred Solomon, objected to on the same ground, testified that he had not been in polygamy since 1869. Objection overruled.

William Ridd, objected to on the same ground, stated that he was in polygamy from 1865 to 1868, but had only one wife now. Objection overruled.

John F. Cahoone, objected to on the same ground, testified that he never had but one wife. Objection overruled.

R. Barber, objected to on the ground of non-residence, testified that he had lived in the city about nine years, and lived in the Third precinct since February last. Objection overruled.

Henry Walters, objected to on the ground that he was a polygamist, testified that he married his first wife in 1850. She died in 1863 and he had never married again. Objection overruled.

These were all who had appeared when the hearing closed at 5 p. m. The following persons failed to appear: William Calder, Orrin Call, Charles B. Taylor, Olof Johnson, Marcellus Warner, William James, J. W. Fox, John Howeroft and James T. Edwards.

In the case of B. Y. Hampton the objection was overruled.

Mr. Kahler summed up his proceedings for the two days, with the following result:

Number of Objections filed.....	61
Number served.....	53
No service.....	8
Cases heard.....	47
Failed to appear.....	6
Challenges insufficient.....	6
Number appeared.....	41
Number of objections sustained.....	6

CITY COUNCIL.

Only eight members of the city council were in their seats when Mayor Scott called them to order, and the roll was called on Tuesday evening, July 29th. When the monotonous reading of the minutes of the previous session was concluded, the usual batch of petitions was read, as follows:

J. A. Fritsch & Co., represented that they owned three different pieces of ground in the business part of the city on which they intended to build during the present year, and they asked to be relieved from laying a sidewalk in front of the same until the buildings should be completed, when they would lay either stone or cement. Referred to committee on streets.

M. Reiser and others asked to have the flowing well near the corner of Third West and Fourth South

streets, repaired. The pipe had been bent by a runaway so as to stop the flow. Referred to the superintendent of waterworks with power to act.

Carroll & Kerr were granted leave to pile building material in front of the Opera House.

The Enterprise Brick Company asked leave to lay, at their own expense, at some place in the business centre where traffic is heavy, a square of brick pavement, for the purpose of testing the brick of their manufacture. Referred to the committee on streets.

Martin and J. C. Watson asked to have Fifth South Street, between Fourth and Fifth West, repaired. Referred to committee on streets.

O. Groschell and others asked to have an offensive ditch in the north east part of the city put in good order. Referred to committee on irrigation.

N. S. Lawson asked for pecuniary recompense for damages sustained by falling into a trench left open by the city. Referred to the committee on claims.

Josephine M. Spear called attention to the dangerous condition of a bridge in the Sixth Ward and asked to have it repaired. Referred to the committee on streets.

J. M. Whitaker asked leave to lay a pipe along the bank of the canal from a spring to his residence. Referred to the watermaster with power to act.

J. R. Walker and others asked that Main Street be graded between Eighth and Ninth South Streets. Referred to committee on streets.

The Union Pacific Railway Company asked leave to unload cars on Fourth West street, temporarily, on account of the crowded condition of the sidetracks of that road.

In connection with this petition Pembroke stated that a protest against granting it had been extensively signed by the people living on Fourth West Street, who also asked further relief from the impositions of railroads. He moved that this petition be tabled to come up in connection with the protest. Carried.

C. E. Wantland and associates signified their acceptance of the franchise for a street railroad previously granted them on certain streets. Filed.

Next was read the anti-railroad protest of the inhabitants of Fourth West street as follows:

"We, the undersigned, your petitioners living on Fourth West Street, do most earnestly pray that the Union Pacific Railway Company, who are now constructing a switch on said street, over four blocks in length, from West Temple to almost Fifth North Street, be required to immediately remove said switch, as we believe said company has no franchise for constructing said switch, and are perpetrating an outrage on the residents of said street and vicinity by standing cars for weeks together on other switches adjoining and the one now being constructed, and switching cars all hours of the day and night, obstructing roads, stopping the crossing and endangering the lives of our children by day, and making night hideous by the smoking of the engines, blowing of whistles and ringing of bells, also de-