

THE SEMI-WEEKLY NEWS

Issued Mondays and Thursdays
and Contains All the Cream of
the Daily and Saturday News.

LOCAL BRIEFS.

Hayrack Ride—The junior class of the state university indulged in a hayrack ride, winding up with a dance in the Twenty-ninth ward meetinghouse.

Class Pin Chosen—The present senior class of the state university decided yesterday to continue the class pin adopted last year. It is an open book on a large "U" with the class numeral on it.

Russian Thistle—The Russian thistle has been found in large quantities in a Weber county, and Sand ridge is reported covered with it. The people are wondering how they can get rid of the pest.

Civil Service Candidates—There were two candidates for the Federal building yesterday for the civil service positions of postoffice inspector, one for superintendency of construction, and two for meat inspectors.

Looking for Son—M. J. Kessler of 123 East Eighth South, is seeking his 15-year-old son, Reinhold W. Kessler who has been missing from home since Tuesday night. No trace of the lad can be found, although diligent search is being instituted. The boy may have gone to Davis county, where the family resided at one time.

Mrs. Douglas Ill—Word from St. Louis announces the serious illness of Mrs. C. T. Douglas, wife of the well known physician of this city. Dr. and Mrs. Douglas were en route to New Orleans on a trip, when she was taken ill at Denver, and became so sick that on reaching St. Louis she had to be removed from the train. She is suffering from pneumonia.

New Bathing Resort—John Allen, brother-in-law of the noted comedian, William Collier, has been looking over the bathing facilities at Black Rock, just this side of Gardiner beach, and finds them all that could be desired, even should the lake fall five feet lower than its present level. He proposes to build there a bathing resort, and is reported as having already made contracts with that end in view.

Application for Water—R. W. Crockett of Price has filed application with the state engineer for 27,000 acres of water from Price river in Carbon county for reservoir storage in irrigation of 15,000 acres. A second application asks for 150 second feet of water also for irrigating 15,000 more acres. The filing was made in August, but at that time the request they have been withheld from publication by the engineer's office.

The Foster Funeral—The funeral of William H. Foster will be held from the Eighteenth ward chapel Friday, commencing at 1 o'clock. The remains may be viewed at the family residence, 111 C street from 10 to 11 o'clock on the same date. Among the surviving relatives of Mr. Foster not mentioned in the "News" of yesterday is the name of his only sister, Mrs. Sarah Heath Ward, a resident of this city.

Work of Destruction—Many of the fine boxelder trees that have graced the northwest corner of Liberty park are being cut down. There seems to be no justification for this marring the beauty of that section of the park. The trees are healthy and are none too numerous and to cut them down is little less than an act of vandalism. It is a case of wanting something to do rather than that the change is desirable. Public sentiment should be aroused and the work of vandalism should be stopped.

M. F. Schiff Here—M. F. Schiff of New York, son of the noted banking magnate, and party arrived in this city last evening, and registered at the Knutsford. In the party are W. W. Miller, M. Erdman, C. F. Harlem and H. P. Wertheim, all of New York. They occupied Mr. Schiff's private car, the "Mayflower" under the convoy of Asst. General Passenger Agent F. A. Wadleigh of U. S. D. & G. The tourists are en route to Portland and other sound cities, and will tour as far south as San Diego.

Agents Organize—The local district agent of the New York Life Insurance company has organized in support of his proposed new ticket for directors, and will conduct a campaign through Utah, Nevada, southern Idaho and western Wyoming, where it is understood that every agent is proposed to the solicited international ticket, and in favor of the administration ticket. They propose to correspond with every policyholder in the district, and yesterday afternoon the agents at a conference subscribed nearly \$1,000 to meet expenses incidental to the canvass.

Zion's Savings Bank and Trust Co. the largest and oldest Savings Bank in Utah, pays 4 per cent. interest on any amount from \$1 to \$5,000. Write to Joseph F. Smith, President; O. C. Beebe, Cashier.

TRAM WANTED

C. S. Martin Coal Co. yard.
McConahay, Jeweler, 54 Main St.

Every mother and housekeeper in the west send your name and address to the Cache Valley Milling Co., Richmond, Utah and receive a beautiful souvenir, on the starting of the great flour mill.

China on display at the Charleston Shop, 122 Main Street.

I will give Ten Dollars cash, for name of person who will buy Plan. Communication confidential. N. Y. Western Piano Co., 52 Market street, Salt Lake City.

BEATY EXCURSION.

Manager Fisher Harris has already Booked Over 20.

Manager Fisher Harris of the Commercial club has booked over 30 reservations for the Bullfrog-Beatty excursion next Sunday. The excursion to have an excursion in there on the same day, so that Salt Lake jobbers are realizing they will have to step around lively if they are to get the upper hand of the southern California people in a business way, as the mining district is about equidistant between Salt Lake and Los Angeles. Held's band, as already noted in the "News," has been called on to accompany the excursion. Mr. Harris has arranged so that the accommodations on board the train will be the same as obtained on the Elly trip, and handsome souvenir badges have been ordered. An elaborate program of entertainment is being prepared by the local people for their guests, so that the time of the excursion. The special train will leave at 2:30 p. m., Sunday next, consisting of three Pullman coaches, tourist sleeper, baggage car and diner.

ELECTION JUDGES; CITY AND COUNTY

In Each District Are Two Republicans and One Democrat.

THE "AMERICANS" SHUT OUT.

Commissioners Held That Under Law They Were Not Entitled to Such Recognition.

At the meeting of the county commissioners yesterday afternoon, the judges for the coming election were named for each district in the city and county. There are three judges in each district, excepting a few from the country, and two of them are Republicans and one a Democrat. The "Americans" filed a list of names expecting that some of the judges would be named from that party but the commissioners held that under the law the "Americans" were not entitled to any of the judges. Following is the list of judges:

First District—George Baxter (R.), Louis Merrill (R.), George J. Hill (D.).
Second District—H. V. Van Pelt (R.), G. J. Yates (R.), Frank Hughes (D.).
Third District—Edward Davis (R.), Stanley C. Price (R.), D. F. Collett (D.).
Fourth District—Peter E. Hart (R.), L. L. Shepherd (R.), Robert H. Siddoway (D.).
Fifth District—J. B. Winkley (R.), Henry Giles (R.), James Moffatt (D.).
Sixth District—E. Eldredge (R.), J. P. Winkley (R.), Scott W. Winkley (D.).
Seventh District—George R. Margolis (R.), Edward Sherrard (R.), J. G. H. McAllister (D.).
Eighth District—L. P. Palmer (R.), E. E. Shepherd (R.), W. D. Woolley (D.).
Ninth District—A. J. Pendleton (R.), Harrison Spiers (R.), Joseph Young (D.).
Tenth District—Adam Proctor (R.), C. S. Kinney (R.), H. A. Reeve (D.).
Eleventh District—Thomas Hobday (R.), Archibald A. Judges (R.), Joseph S. Drake (D.).
Twelfth District—Charles Cottrell, Jr. (R.), J. M. Stull (R.), T. H. Maxwell (D.).
Thirteenth District—John E. Bushy (R.), Arthur Sperry (R.), J. W. Cunningham (D.).
Fourteenth District—D. C. Rushton (R.), Alex Buchanan (R.), C. A. Carlsquist (D.).
Fifteenth District—E. A. Wilson (R.), James W. Marsh (R.), John A. Winkley (D.).
Sixteenth District—Carl A. Eck (R.), Albert Richardson (R.), C. J. Bengtzen (D.).
Eighteenth District—Charles A. Thorn (R.), Hyman B. Clawson (R.), W. F. Oster (D.).
Nineteenth District—C. E. Cope (R.), Theodore Nystrom (R.), John F. Taylor (D.).
Twentieth District—H. O. Young (R.), T. A. Moore (R.), Thomas E. Taylor (D.).
Twenty-first District—H. E. Rawlins (R.), Charles E. Sheffield (R.), Charles W. Brown (D.).
Twenty-second District—George S. Ashton (R.), Frank Rutherford (R.), Harvey Guyver (D.).
Twenty-third District—Marion Gillespie (R.), Robert Bridges (R.), John B. Reid (D.).
Twenty-fourth District—Frank S. Tingey (R.), Alphonso B. Kessler (R.), D. O. Winkley (D.).
Twenty-fifth District—George S. McAllister (R.), Lewis B. Eddy (R.), Hugh Ripetto (D.).
Twenty-sixth District—Moses Davis (R.), William J. Silver (R.), Ed Farnes (D.).
Twenty-seventh District—T. L. Irvine (R.), Stanley A. Hanks (R.), Samuel Holm (D.).
Twenty-eighth District—C. M. Lees (R.), W. P. Gillespie (R.), John L. Nebeker (D.).
Twenty-ninth District—Chas. Clark (R.), James Nelson (R.), Howard Davis (D.).
Thirtieth District—John C. Monks (R.), George A. Goss (R.), George F. Felt (D.).
Thirty-first District—Miles A. Romney (R.), Alexander Thomas (R.), J. B. Tomlin (D.).
Thirty-second District—David A. Affleck (R.), E. H. Hardwell (R.), John D. Owen (D.).
Thirty-third District—F. H. Hyde (R.), L. H. Smyth (R.), M. L. Snow (D.).
Thirty-fourth District—S. W. Anderson (R.), F. C. Bush (R.), A. S. Higham (D.).
Thirty-fifth District—John James (R.), Marlow Cummings (R.), E. L. Sloan (D.).
Thirty-sixth District—Charles H. Wilson (R.), J. M. Goldstone (R.), Joshua I. Halliwell (D.).
Thirty-seventh District—P. B. Platt (R.), J. P. Lyon (R.), Martin S. Lindsay (D.).
Thirty-eighth District—Heber B. Aldous (D.).
Thirty-ninth District—George M. Barrows (R.), R. W. Salisbury (R.), S. F. Kershaw (R.).
Fortieth District—J. M. Hayes (R.), Peter Hansen (R.), Alexander McMas-tod (D.).
Forty-first District—J. M. Thomas (R.), J. M. Bowman (R.), Frank T. Luft (D.).

Every Movement Hurts.

When you have rheumatism, muscles feel stiff and sore and joints are painful. It does not pay to suffer long from this disease, when it may be cured so promptly and perfectly by Hood's Sarsaparilla. This medicine gets to the spot, neutralizes the acidity of the blood, which causes rheumatism, and puts an end to the pain and stiffness.

Biliousness is cured by Hood's Pills.

THE DEADLY HATPIN.

How Mrs. Hotchkiss Foiled Attempt Of a Bold Robber.

One evening this week, as Mrs. Kate Hotchkiss of 649 east Eighth South street, was returning home on a Calders' park car from a shopping tour down town, an attempt was made to steal her handbag. The car was crowded, and standing by the seat occupied by Mrs. Hotchkiss was a well dressed man, who somewhat leaned upon the back of the seat. Mrs. Hotchkiss had a number of parcels in her lap and underneath them was the handbag. She felt the latter object being quietly pulled away, but did not take much notice of the occurrence. A moment later the lady occupying the other part of the seat left the car and Mrs. Hotchkiss moved next to the window, and the man who had been standing took her vacant seat. His hand was placed inside and under his overcoat. Soon Mrs. Hotchkiss felt the handbag moving again, but her wrist was through the chain. She feigned ignorance of what was going on, and looked out of the window and at the same time took a hatpin from her hat. This she slid under the bundles in her lap, along side the handbag and gave a vigorous shake. The man sitting by her gave a suppressed exclamation, as the sharp pin pierced his hand. He turned several colors and recollected that he had reached his seat by the same means. He looked at the handbag, left in his lap. It would be well for ladies to look well to their purses, especially in crowded streets, as pickpockets and gruffers in general have by no means all left the city.

CAUTION!

Persons when traveling should exercise care in the use of drinking water. As a safeguard it is urged that every traveler secure Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy before leaving home, to be carried in the hand baggage. This most useful medicine relieves sickness and annoying delay. For sale by all druggists.

Seventy-fifth District—W. H. Silcock (R.), George H. Danse (R.), Ed. Ward (R.).
Seventy-sixth District—William Holt (R.), B. H. Beckstead (R.), Samuel H. Beckstead (D.).
Seventy-seventh District—John A. Sjalet (R.), William H. Gardner (R.), George Gardner (D.).
Seventy-eighth District—John Dunn (R.), John P. Pehrson (R.), A. H. Rock (D.).
Seventy-ninth District—George M. Spencer (D.).
Eightieth District—Tom Shannon (D.), William Coats (D.).
Eighty-first District—J. O. Dean (R.), V. E. Simms (R.), O. L. Countryman (D.).
Eighty-second District—W. S. Craine (D.).
Eighty-third District—Isaac Coon (D.).
Eighty-fourth District—William Lawson (R.), James C. Bortach (R.), Alfred A. Jones (D.).
Eighty-fifth District—David Mackay (R.), Charles J. Lambert (R.), Henry L. Bowden (D.).
Eighty-sixth District—Samuel C. Sudbury (D.).
Eighty-seventh District—William R. Smith (R.), David Wilcken (R.), John Campbell (D.).
Eighty-eighth District—S. J. Stark (R.), J. L. Stark (R.), Fred Barlow (R.).
Eighty-ninth District—J. P. Olson (R.), N. S. Pimpson (R.), John H. Evans (D.).
Ninetyth District—Horace E. Brevin (D.).
Ninety-first District—Joseph Hansen (R.), William Baldwin (R.), Orson Rudy (D.).
Ninety-second District—Lee Johnson (R.), J. L. Jones (R.), Lewis Peterson (D.).
Ninety-third District—Frank C. Howe (D.).
Ninety-fourth District—William Healy (D.).
Ninety-fifth District—Albert Shaw (D.).
Ninety-sixth District—S. B. Culley (R.), John Thomas (R.).

Demurrer of Defendants in Franchise Case Overruled.

The demurrer of defendants to the amended complaint filed by Thomas Homer against Salt Lake City, former Mayor Morris and eight members of the former city council, to enjoin them from granting a consolidation and extension of the life of the franchises owned by the Utah Light & Railway company, has been overruled by Judge Morse of the district court, and the defendants have been granted 20 days within which to answer. The decision of Judge Morse follows:

In the District Court of Salt Lake county, Utah, Thomas Homer, et al., plaintiffs; Salt Lake City et al., defendants. Decision. In the case of the State of Utah, at the relation of Thomas Homer, against Salt Lake City et al., a demurrer to the amended complaint has been argued and submitted. It is alleged in the complaint in this case that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is a voluntary association of individuals organized, among other things, for the purpose of carrying on commercial pursuits; that the defendants, R. S. Wells, W. J. Tuddenham, A. F. Barnes, J. H. Prece, F. S. Fernstrom, E. H. Davis, F. J. Heyward, et al., are members of the said Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and as such were co-partners with all the other members of said church, in the said association, which was engaged largely in commercial enterprises, and through Joseph F. Smith, as trustee-in-trust for the said association; that the said trustee had granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned in the complaint, consisted of 15 members; that on the fourth day of August, 1905, the said council granted to the defendants, the legal title to a part of the stock of the Utah Light & Railway company, which is held for the benefit of the members as co-partners of said church, including the defendants above named; that the city council of Salt Lake City, at the date mentioned