

a living in any way he might choose, so long as he did not interfere with others. He then alluded to the oppressive methods of religionists and began to speak of the disputes of Orangemen and Catholics in Ireland.

As it was ruled that he was not speaking to the question of the adoption of the resolutions, he was deprived of the privilege of proceeding, although Mr. Benner and others contended in his behalf, asserting that it would be a mistake to place it in the power of any person be able to say that he was not allowed to express his views in a meeting of this character.

MR. NICHOLSON

stated that he arose to elicit information. The call for this meeting appeared to be for an assembly of citizens to unite in a common cause affecting all classes of respectable people. It appeared, however, from the statements of some of the speakers, notably those of Mr. Thrall, and from those embodied in the resolutions, that it was a partizan or sectional movement. He had come there as a citizen, not in the capacity of a member of a political party. He was not a Liberal and never expected to become one. If, however, this meeting is a mere expression of respectable Liberals against the crime and vice with which our city is afflicted, it should be remembered that the members of the People's party were as emphatically opposed to the deplorable situation of public affairs as any other citizens could possibly be. If this was a sectional movement, no doubt the class to which he belonged would separately, if need be, give an unmistakable expression of their views and wishes on the subject in hand.

The applause which followed these remarks showed unmistakably that the vast audience did not want any narrow gauge sectionalism to enter into this movement.

Immediately Dr. Iliff arose and moved to amend the resolutions by striking out a clause which stated in effect that misrule had existed for 30 to 40 years prior to the Liberal rule. He made the motion on the ground that such an allusion was unnecessary. The motion to amend was put and carried with a great shout. When the nays were called for only one responded, Dr. McNeice, who shrieked "No" with such spasmodic effort as to convey the idea that the amendment had given him a sudden attack of the colic, from which we sincerely hope he has completely recovered, as we cannot afford to have a man of his caliber sick for any length of time.

Mr. Axton moved to amend by substituting "the cause of morality"—where the resolutions stated that the immoral situation would injure "the Liberal cause." A gentleman who made the impression on the writer that he was every inch a man, and of considerable force, moved a further amendment of the same nature as that of Mr. Axton, in order to remove any tinge of sectionalism from the proceedings. We did not learn the gentleman's name. Mr. Axton accepted of the

later amendment, which was carried.

Mr. Carr observed still another objectionable, because sectional, feature in the resolutions; that is where they say, "excited the apprehensions of many of the friends and supporters" of the present city government. He wished to amend by substituting "law-abiding citizens" for friends and supporters." By this time Dr. McNeice had partly recovered from the effect of Dr. Iliff's amendment, and was able to unfold himself and vociferate "I move the gentleman's amendment be tabled." The motion was immediately put to the house, and, apparently before the audience, which was really a good and generous one, had time to grasp the purport of it, it was carried.

The reason why the resolutions were not inserted in this report at the point where they were introduced as read, is because they were subsequently amended. They are as follows:

THE RESOLUTIONS.

F. E. Gregg then read the resolutions prepared, which, as finally adopted, were as follows:

We, citizens of Salt Lake City, in public meeting assembled to consider what can be done to restrain the lawlessness, vice and crime, which are disgracing our city, hereby declare:

First—That those who compose our present city government were elected to office with the explicit understanding that they would enforce the laws against vice and crime.

Second—That the present city government, while progressive in other things, has by its recent failure to enforce the laws against gambling, brothels, the sale of liquor to minors, and the opening of saloons on Sundays, excited the apprehensions of many of its friends and supporters, and is thereby imperiling the cause of morality in this city. In view of these facts—

(1) We hereby call upon our worthy Mayor and his associates to proceed at once to enforce promptly and thoroughly the laws above referred to, assuring them that in so doing they shall have the hearty support and co-operation of the moral and law-abiding citizens of this community.

(2) We hereby appeal to the City Council to refuse to grant the application for license now before it for a saloon in the vicinity of, or to be run in connection with, the variety theatre on Franklin Avenue.

JOHN T. LYNCH,

J. R. BOWDLE,

F. E. GREGG,

J. BRAINARD THRALL,

Committee.

The motion to adopt was carried and the meeting adjourned *sine die*.

THE IDAHO SENATORS.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 29. — The Senate met at noon and the Vice-President laid before the Senate a communication from the governor of Idaho, transmitting the credentials of the senators-elect from that State, George L. Shoup and Wm. J. McConnell.

The credentials having been read, Hoar asked that, if Shoup was present, the oath of office be administered to him. Vance remarked that the

new State of Idaho appeared to have elected more than its share of Senators, and he thought the credentials should be referred to the committee on privileges and elections. Hoar's motion having been agreed to, that Senator escorted Shoup to the clerk's desk, where he took the oath of office. Harris subsequently inquired what had become of Vance's motion and said that Shoup had simply sworn on his *prima facie* case.

Vance remarked that it was stated in the newspapers that three Senators had been elected in Idaho, and that the legislature had gone to the extent of assigning each of them a term for which he should serve. That was contrary, he said, to the rule of the Senate, and to the constitutional provision. He thought it proper, therefore, that the question be determined by the proper committee of the Senate.

Mitchell said that he had reliable information. So far as the election of three Senators was concerned, he held that regular and in order.

Hoar argued that the question was a very simple one. It was clear and unquestionable that one of the senators whose credentials had just been presented would go out on the 4th of March, 1891, and the legislature "being in session," had elected a senator for the term which would then begin beyond all question, there would be a vacancy at that time, because one of those two gentlemen would have to go out on the 4th of March, 1891.

Carlisle argued that the legislature of Idaho had no right to assume, in advance, the action by the Senate, that there would be a vacancy in the Senate from that State on the 4th of March, 1891. No election of a senator to fill such vacancy could take place, until it was legally known that a vacancy would occur. After it had been determined by the Senate in a constitutional way that there would be a vacancy, after that time, the next legislature of Idaho, if in session, might proceed at once to choose a Senator and, if the Legislature were not in session, appointment of a Senator should be made by the Governor of the State. He imagined there had never been a case in the history of the Country where a state Legislature had chosen three Senators at once.

Hawley—Is it not imperative under the constitution that there shall be a vacancy after the 4th of March next?

Carlisle—I think so.

Hawley—Then how can the legislature of Idaho be any more certain of that fact three months hence than it is today?

DUBLIN, Jan. 3. — Parnell left Dublin today for his country seat Avondale, where he is expected to remain until Monday next. Unless his plans be changed between now and Monday, Parnell leaves Avondale for Boulogne—*Sur-Mer* at an early hour, Monday, to take part in what is likely to be the final conference between the Irish leaders, so far as the leadership of the Irish party is concerned.