

G. M. Cannon, representing Angus M. Cannon, stated that the assessor had made some errors in assessing his property which he asked to be corrected. Clute's valuation on Mr. Cannon's property in block 8, plat A, \$32,400 was excessive, as he had bargained the entire lot for \$30,000.

John H. Rumel, jr., owned a lot in block 104, plat A, which Clute valued at \$8000, while the county placed it at \$6100. He claimed that the city valuation was at least \$2000 too high.

Wm. H. Perks objected to Clute's valuation of \$11,700 on his lot in block 17, plat E, which was on a side hill. The valuation in 1889 was \$3000. The county valuation this year was \$8500, which he considered extremely high. He asked a reduction in Clute's assessment, as he could only view it as excessive and unwarrantable.

Mrs. Henry Perks thought Clute's valuation of her lot on Centre Street \$4400 excessive to the tune of about \$1400.

J. S. Tingey objected to Clute's valuation on his lot on North Temple Street of \$5900. The county valuation on the same was \$3800.

C. B. Felt, in behalf of the estate of N. H. Felt, considered the valuation of \$12,000 on parts of lots 7 and 8 in block 94, plat A, excessive. It was more than it could be sold for, and was several hundred per cent above last year's valuation.

Mrs. M. J. Shell, protested against the assessor's valuation of her land at the corner of North Temple and First West streets.

Mrs. Lucy J. Thurston objected to Clute's valuation on her Main Street property of \$66,400.

Mrs. L. S. Stevens thought the assessor's valuation of \$17,000 on her property on Fourth South Street excessive.

Joseph Bull considered the assessment on his lot in the Seventeenth Ward, excessive. His taxes last year were \$16, as against \$44 this year.

Joseph L. Parks, protested against the assessor's valuation of his property in block 7, plat E, of \$7,400. He thought Clute was off about \$5000.

C. H. Hyde stated that Clute had valued his improvements at \$800, when they were not worth \$100.

John Meyer, of the Tenth Ward, said that Clute's valuation of \$3,150 on his little home was excessive.

Ellen E. Allen, of the Twenty-first Ward, was assessed on real estate valued by Clute at \$1,300. Clute was too high.

Real Estate Agent Lawson thought Clute's valuation of \$16,300 on his lot in the Eighth Ward was outrageously high.

T. C. Patten stated that Clute's valuation on his property was \$13,000 higher than the county valuation.

S. A. Cooper's lot in the Seventh Ward was valued by Clute at \$6200. The county made it \$2900, and he thought that high enough.

Thomas Bishop thought Clute was off his base when he valued his lot in the Nineteenth Ward at \$7650.

E. G. Holding protested against

the assessor's valuation of \$5000 on his lot in the Fifteenth Ward.

S. D. Cady objected to the valuation of \$3700 on his lot as excessive.

G. E. Howe's lot was valued at \$6350, which was considerably more than it was worth.

Jane M. Young represented that Clute's valuation of her property in the Seventeenth Ward was \$25,300, as against \$1600 by the county. She considered the county valuation high enough.

E. E. Clark's lot was valued at \$18,600, which was more than its fair cash value.

H. H. Brough called attention to the fact that Clute valued his property in the Sixteenth Ward at \$6,100, while the county assessor fixed it at \$3,600.

Mary J. S. Auer, of the Tenth Ward, objected to Clute's valuation on her lot of \$8,000.

Emma C. Fenton's property was valued by Clute at \$8,710, which she considered excessive.

N. V. Jones thought the city assessor was temporarily insane, when he valued his property at \$33,900. The county valuation on the same property was \$19,200.

Lucetta Penrose of the Ninth Ward protested against the excessive valuation of her city property.

B. H. Schettler's property on South Temple Street was valued at \$17,600. He considered this exorbitant.

D. H. Calder telegraphed from Ogden to enter his protest against Clute's valuation on his Eighteenth Ward property.

William Keyser thought the valuation on his Eighth Ward property, \$10,400 was too high.

Margaret Sharp protested against the value of her lot in the Nineteenth Ward being inflated to \$5,100.

The representatives of the estate of Hanuah Morris protested against their property being valued at \$9600. The county assessor valued it at \$4800.

S. C. Dallis, of the Seventeenth Ward, owned a lot which Clute valued at \$6800. The county valued it at \$4700, and he objected to the city appraisal.

W. H. Foster thought Clute's valuation of \$45,000 on his property was excessive.

The representatives of the estate of James Rawlings thought that Clute's valuation of \$3900 on their property was more than it was worth.

The property of the estate of Henry Arnold, in the Nineteenth Ward, was valued by Clute at \$3900, as against \$3500 by the county.

John N. Pike, of the same ward, called attention to the fact that while Clute assessed his property at \$12,700, the county assessor fixed it at \$9950.

Bessie Tolhurst, of the same ward, objected to Clute's valuation of \$9800 on her lot.

Helen M. Whitney, of the Eighteenth ward, protested against her property being valued at \$14,200.

Studebaker Bros. represented that the assessor had valued their personal property at \$55,000, when it should be \$40,000.

R. R. Anderson, of the Eighteenth ward, stated that Clute had valued his property at higher figures than dry bench property had ever sold for. The land in question was rocky and steep and a portion of it was taken up by a public ditch.

A large number of requests for remittances of taxes on account of poverty were filed and the evening's business was brought to a close.

Mayor Scott stated that as he understood it, the time for hearing protests had expired and when the board met again it would be to act upon the petitions submitted. One member suggested that the board meet to-morrow night, but this was objected to. It was finally decided to meet on Wednesday, Sept. 3, and the board then adjourned.

During its session the board has received 610 protests, and millions of dollars were represented by the protestants.

CURRENT EVENTS.

Placed under Bonds.

Aug. 25 Commissioner Greenman decided, in the case of Nathan Hansen, of North Point, to hold the accused to await the action of the grand jury. Bail was fixed at \$1500, and was given.

Under Bonds.

August 25th J. C. Sandberg was arrested on a charge of assault with a deadly weapon. It is asserted that he presented a pistol to the spotter Edward Ray, and caused him to beat a hasty retreat from Mr. Sandberg's furniture shop. Bail was placed at \$500, which Mr. Sandberg gave. The case will come up on August 30.

Incensed Delegates.

Pocatello, Ida., Aug. 28.—The delegates to the democratic convention from Bear Lake county express strong feeling at the treatment they received and threaten to knife the ticket and vote for Shoup; four straight Gentiles, one formerly a Mormon, were members of the delegation.—Herald.

Back from the East.

Brother Peter Ranck, of East Mill Creek, returned home August 26th, after an absence of two years, from a trip to the East, where he has been in search of genealogical information. Among the places visited by him were Lancaster Co., Pennsylvania, and Philadelphia. He comes back in greatly improved health, and thoroughly satisfied with the results of his journey.

He was not Johnson.

In the Olen-Johnson case August 26th, Mrs. E. Aldridge testified that she lived in the same house as Mrs. Sophia Johnson; had seen the defendant there on one occasion, in the afternoon; he was reading the paper; did not know the defendant's name.

Edward Ray, the spotter, was in attendance, but was not called.