

THE SEMI-WEEKLY NEWS

The Great Country Paper of the West.

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

LOCAL BRIEFS.

High School Registration.—High school registry for the ensuing school year, is being held today and tomorrow.

T. B. Harrington Convalescent.—T. B. Harrington of Garfield is convalescent at St. Mark's hospital after a two weeks' siege of malarial fever.

Senator La Follette to Lecture.—U. S. Senator La Follette will lecture in the Salt Lake Theater, Sept. 19, under the state university lecture management, on "Purer Politics."

Frost in Bear Lake.—There was a heavy frost in the Bear Lake country and in Star valley, Wyo., on the night of the 18th inst. Considerable damage to late crops is reported.

Weather Man Located.—Asst. Observer V. H. Church of the local weather office, who came here recently from Cheyenne, has located with his family at 755 East 83rd South street.

Preparing for Work.—The Rio Grande Railroad company is anxious of men laying tracks in the vicinity of the new Gould passenger station, clearing away wires, grading and cleaning up the grounds.

Will Attend Congress.—Messrs. T. H. Fitzgerald, D. M. Landreth, W. D. Livingston, John Van Dyke, Van D. Spaulding, John W. Smith and others of the Abraham Land company will attend the Sacramento irrigation congress in a body.

Mailing Tax Notices.—County Treasurer Groeschel is now busy mailing tax notices to the property owners of the county notifying them of the amount of taxes they have to pay this year. The taxes become delinquent on Nov. 15 and if not paid by Dec. 1 the property will be advertised for sale to satisfy the tax.

Chaplain Brockman Leaves Tomorrow.—Chaplain Brockman of the Twenty-ninth Infantry, whose resignation was noted in the "News" some weeks ago, leaves the service tomorrow evening, and will engage in mining. His successor at Fort Douglas will be the chaplain of the Fifteenth Infantry. There will be no chaplain at the post until the arrival of the latter regiment.

New Pastor Here.—Rev. Louis S. Bowerman of Barry, Ill., is the new pastor of the East Side Baptist church, and will preach there next Sunday morning. He was pastor of the First Baptist church in Seattle for six years, also pastor of the Baptist church of Randolph, Mass., for the same time, and was afterward pastor of the Emmanuel church in St. Louis. Rev. S. A. Haworth, the late pastor of the East Side church, has accepted a call to Delta, Colo.

Zion's Savings Bank & Trust Co. Pays 4 per cent on deposits, safety deposit boxes for rent. JOSEPH F. SMITH, Pres. O. C. BEBE, Cashier.

Salt Lake Photo Supply Co. Kodaks, finishing, framing. 142 S. Main Street.

FREE MUSIC LESSONS

Madame Brodbeck will give one month's free lessons in Piano or Vocal to pupils, who wish to study at her studio, her superior methods which she acquired at the Royal Conservatory, Stuttgart, Germany, and under Manuel Garcia, London. Her studio is at 129 B street (between State and Second East, on Ninth South).

Win a cash prize at Saltair Labor Day.

NEW POWER SERVICE.

Prominent Eastern People Looking Over Salt Heating Plant.

Thomas Wagner, a prominent St. Louis attorney, and representing local banking and trust companies, will be in Salt Lake next week to look over the plant and prospects of the Salt Lake Public Service company. Manager Chambers of the company reports local conditions encouraging, as contracts enough have already been secured to give the enterprise a start. James M. Butler of Columbus, O., representing eastern investors, is now in Salt Lake looking over the plant and prospects. The company has secured water rights in the Cottonwood canyon sufficient to operate 5,000 horse power machinery, and there are already installed at Third West street, between First and Second South streets, boilers of a capacity of 1,600-horse power, a 30-foot stack 11 feet in diameter, foundations, water and sewer connections, structural steel and a side track for the automatic handling of coal and ashes.

Manager Chambers of the company has heating pipe on hand to reach to Second South and Main streets, where the main distribution station will be located. A tunnel five feet in diameter, concrete lined, will be laid to this point, and in this will be placed 14-inch and 16-inch heating mains, together with other lines of smaller pipe and the electric wires for the electric lighting and power service. Over \$100,000 has already been expended on the city plant, and the complete system contemplates the laying of eight miles of heating mains.

HAD AN AWFUL TIME

But Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy Cured Him.

It is with pleasure that I give you this unqualified testimony. About a year ago when I had a severe case of malaria I got caught out in a hard rain and the malarial fever which was not a new ailment, I had an awful time and had it not been for the use of Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy I could not have possibly lived but a few hours longer, but thanks to this remedy I am now strong and well. I have written the above through simple gratitude and I shall always speak a good word for this remedy.—Saml. H. Gwin, Concord, Ga. For sale by all druggists.

Ask your doctor to send you Royal Bread. It is made in a clean bakery and the crown label is on every loaf.

Registered Short Horns Cheap

Cows, heifers and bulls, for sale; over stocked and not of feed. Thomas W. Jennings, 173 First Street.

A delicious luncheon with prompt service at all hours at the Royal Cafe. A good place to eat.

The resort for you Labor Day is Saltair.

GROCCERS BLAME REAL ESTATE MEN

Decide They Don't Want to Come Into the Chamber of Commerce.

CALL MANY TALL NAMES.

Retail Dealers' Association Blames the Sensationalism of the Press for Existing Status.

By the adoption of a resolution calling large names at the Salt Lake association, the Butchers and Grocers' association last night closed its negotiations with the M. and M. association looking to an amalgamation of the working office forces of the two parties.

By this action the Butchers and Grocers made a hasty retreat from the spot light, and saved the M. and M. further embarrassment in retreating to a position into which the public considers it was placed inadvertently, and with no bad motive.

ASK FAIR PLAY.

The situation, as the Butchers and Grocers see it, was forecasted in the "News" last night, when it was stated that they blamed sensationalism on the part of the press, and the Real Estate association.

The situation as the Butchers and Grocers see it is set forth in the following resolutions, which were adopted last night with a generous whoop of applause:

Whereas, the Butchers and Grocers' association has been asked and urged by the Manufacturers and Merchants' association to occupy jointly with it its office room and meeting place for the sole purpose of reducing the running expense of the two organizations, and Whereas, the Butchers and Grocers' association was not aware that the Manufacturers and Merchants' association was by contract bound to other organizations, whose consent seems to have been necessary before the Manufacturers and Merchants' association could act;

Resolved, that the Real Estate association is a party to the lease of the premises known as the Chamber of Commerce, with the Manufacturers and Merchants' association.

Whereas, the Real Estate association without cause, proof or decency, saw fit to accuse the Butchers and Grocers' association of motives altogether at variance with the rights of others; Whereas, the Real Estate association claims that the Butchers and Grocers' association is organized solely for private interests, and that it is responsible for the present high living in Salt Lake City; be it

Resolved, that this association declines to share the blame made by the Manufacturers and Merchants' association; that this association resents most emphatically the gratuitous insult of the Real Estate association; that we know that the Real Estate association had any interest in the leasing or renting of the Chamber of Commerce premises it would not under any circumstances have considered any proposition of meeting under the same roof with it, as we deem it an organization of graft, misrepresentation and dishonesty; that it, and not the Butchers and Grocers' association, is detrimental to the best interests of Salt Lake City; that it willfully and maliciously lied when it accused the Butchers and Grocers' association as did; that our dealings throughout the United States have been upheld by all the higher courts; that we feel that its conduct and degrading influence would be detrimental and injurious to the morals of our members; that, man for man, we dare a comparison of the standing of the individual members of each association, not in dollars and cents, but in all that goes to make manhood, good citizenship and clean records; that it is an enemy to the interests of the city; its selfish broadcast slander and calumny on a class of decent and hard working merchants; and be it further

Resolved, that we prove them as such by demanding a thorough and rigid investigation from the proper authorities into our dealings and purposes, which are those of honest and thorough retailers of all kinds and descriptions all over the United States, thus establishing beyond dispute the absolute ignorance of the Real Estate association of all the cities' business methods, and proving it to be a congregation of loud-mouthed fakers trying to divert the odium of the public from their own misdeeds to ours.

That we ask the newspapers to give the Butchers and Grocers' association an equal chance, and not to constitute themselves at once accusers and judges; that we extend to any class of our citizens is an injury to all the city.

That we extend our sympathy and confidence to the Manufacturers and Merchants' association for their noble fortune of being obligated to such a conglomeration as the Real Estate association, and will endeavor to help them as soon as we can, by giving them office room with us.

We also recommend that an investigation be conducted into the dealings of the Real Estate association.

MARRIOTT HAS ENOUGH.

Would Stop the Investigation Into Local Trade Conditions.

J. M. Marriott, who in the Retail Merchant issued a "glad hand" address to the Salt Lake retailers, assuring them that the strength of uniting was never so well demonstrated as in the benefits to the organized coming of the formation of the Butchers and Grocers' association, now comes forward with a card, addressed to the press. It asks for a cessation of the present investigation and designates it a "controversy between the Real Estate association, and the Butchers and Grocers' association. His card follows:

"Of course considerable space has been devoted by the newspapers to a controversy between the Real Estate association on one hand and the Butchers and Grocers' and Manufacturers and Merchants' associations on the other. A great deal of hysterical talk has been indulged in on both sides to the harm of all consumers, and would that good, sound judgment be allowed to prevail and have these things settled as they should be by the proper and competent authorities. It seems to me that nothing constructive can be gained by acrimonious and heated debates, more especially if at all one-sided. Of one thing we are certain, much ill-advised discussion has gone on regarding the intended union of the Butchers and Grocers' and Manufacturers and Merchants' associations, which was not a consolidation of interests, but of the clerical or working force of the two and sharing of the rental and other expenses incident in the management of the two organizations."

A great deal more can be accomplished by and through calm and deliberate methods than the course now pursued by J. M. MARRIOTT.

Salt Lake City, Aug. 28, 1907.

TRADE MORE THAN DOUBLES.

U. S. Commerce With Latin-American Countries Shows Gratifying Increase.

Consular reports show that the trade of the United States with the Latin-American countries in the fiscal year just ended aggregated more than \$600,000,000, against \$284,000,000 in 1907. In 1906, against \$284,000,000 in 1907. In 1905, against \$284,000,000 in 1906. In 1904, against \$284,000,000 in 1905. In 1903, against \$284,000,000 in 1904. In 1902, against \$284,000,000 in 1903. In 1901, against \$284,000,000 in 1902. In 1900, against \$284,000,000 in 1901. In 1899, against \$284,000,000 in 1900. In 1898, against \$284,000,000 in 1899. In 1897, against \$284,000,000 in 1898. In 1896, against \$284,000,000 in 1897. In 1895, against \$284,000,000 in 1896. In 1894, against \$284,000,000 in 1895. In 1893, against \$284,000,000 in 1894. In 1892, against \$284,000,000 in 1893. In 1891, against \$284,000,000 in 1892. In 1890, against \$284,000,000 in 1891. In 1889, against \$284,000,000 in 1890. In 1888, against \$284,000,000 in 1889. In 1887, against \$284,000,000 in 1888. In 1886, against \$284,000,000 in 1887. In 1885, against \$284,000,000 in 1886. In 1884, against \$284,000,000 in 1885. In 1883, against \$284,000,000 in 1884. In 1882, against \$284,000,000 in 1883. In 1881, against \$284,000,000 in 1882. In 1880, against \$284,000,000 in 1881. In 1879, against \$284,000,000 in 1880. In 1878, against \$284,000,000 in 1879. In 1877, against \$284,000,000 in 1878. In 1876, against \$284,000,000 in 1877. In 1875, against \$284,000,000 in 1876. In 1874, against \$284,000,000 in 1875. In 1873, against \$284,000,000 in 1874. In 1872, against \$284,000,000 in 1873. In 1871, against \$284,000,000 in 1872. In 1870, against \$284,000,000 in 1871. In 1869, against \$284,000,000 in 1870. In 1868, against \$284,000,000 in 1869. In 1867, against \$284,000,000 in 1868. In 1866, against \$284,000,000 in 1867. In 1865, against \$284,000,000 in 1866. In 1864, against \$284,000,000 in 1865. In 1863, against \$284,000,000 in 1864. In 1862, against \$284,000,000 in 1863. In 1861, against \$284,000,000 in 1862. In 1860, against \$284,000,000 in 1861. In 1859, against \$284,000,000 in 1860. In 1858, against \$284,000,000 in 1859. In 1857, against \$284,000,000 in 1858. In 1856, against \$284,000,000 in 1857. In 1855, against \$284,000,000 in 1856. In 1854, against \$284,000,000 in 1855. In 1853, against \$284,000,000 in 1854. In 1852, against \$284,000,000 in 1853. In 1851, against \$284,000,000 in 1852. In 1850, against \$284,000,000 in 1851. In 1849, against \$284,000,000 in 1850. In 1848, against \$284,000,000 in 1849. In 1847, against \$284,000,000 in 1848. In 1846, against \$284,000,000 in 1847. In 1845, against \$284,000,000 in 1846. In 1844, against \$284,000,000 in 1845. In 1843, against \$284,000,000 in 1844. In 1842, against \$284,000,000 in 1843. In 1841, against \$284,000,000 in 1842. In 1840, against \$284,000,000 in 1841. In 1839, against \$284,000,000 in 1840. In 1838, against \$284,000,000 in 1839. In 1837, against \$284,000,000 in 1838. In 1836, against \$284,000,000 in 1837. In 1835, against \$284,000,000 in 1836. In 1834, against \$284,000,000 in 1835. In 1833, against \$284,000,000 in 1834. In 1832, against \$284,000,000 in 1833. In 1831, against \$284,000,000 in 1832. In 1830, against \$284,000,000 in 1831. In 1829, against \$284,000,000 in 1830. In 1828, against \$284,000,000 in 1829. In 1827, against \$284,000,000 in 1828. In 1826, against \$284,000,000 in 1827. In 1825, against \$284,000,000 in 1826. In 1824, against \$284,000,000 in 1825. In 1823, against \$284,000,000 in 1824. In 1822, against \$284,000,000 in 1823. In 1821, against \$284,000,000 in 1822. In 1820, against \$284,000,000 in 1821. In 1819, against \$284,000,000 in 1820. In 1818, against \$284,000,000 in 1819. In 1817, against \$284,000,000 in 1818. In 1816, against \$284,000,000 in 1817. In 1815, against \$284,000,000 in 1816. In 1814, against \$284,000,000 in 1815. In 1813, against \$284,000,000 in 1814. In 1812, against \$284,000,000 in 1813. In 1811, against \$284,000,000 in 1812. In 1810, against \$284,000,000 in 1811. In 1809, against \$284,000,000 in 1810. In 1808, against \$284,000,000 in 1809. In 1807, against \$284,000,000 in 1808. In 1806, against \$284,000,000 in 1807. In 1805, against \$284,000,000 in 1806. In 1804, against \$284,000,000 in 1805. In 1803, against \$284,000,000 in 1804. In 1802, against \$284,000,000 in 1803. In 1801, against \$284,000,000 in 1802. In 1800, against \$284,000,000 in 1801. In 1799, against \$284,000,000 in 1800. In 1798, against \$284,000,000 in 1799. In 1797, against \$284,000,000 in 1798. In 1796, against \$284,000,000 in 1797. In 1795, against \$284,000,000 in 1796. In 1794, against \$284,000,000 in 1795. In 1793, against \$284,000,000 in 1794. In 1792, against \$284,000,000 in 1793. In 1791, against \$284,000,000 in 1792. In 1790, against \$284,000,000 in 1791. In 1789, against \$284,000,000 in 1790. In 1788, against \$284,000,000 in 1789. In 1787, against \$284,000,000 in 1788. In 1786, against \$284,000,000 in 1787. In 1785, against \$284,000,000 in 1786. In 1784, against \$284,000,000 in 1785. In 1783, against \$284,000,000 in 1784. In 1782, against \$284,000,000 in 1783. In 1781, against \$284,000,000 in 1782. In 1780, against \$284,000,000 in 1781. In 1779, against \$284,000,000 in 1780. In 1778, against \$284,000,000 in 1779. In 1777, against \$284,000,000 in 1778. In 1776, against \$284,000,000 in 1777. In 1775, against \$284,000,000 in 1776. In 1774, against \$284,000,000 in 1775. In 1773, against \$284,000,000 in 1774. In 1772, against \$284,000,000 in 1773. In 1771, against \$284,000,000 in 1772. In 1770, against \$284,000,000 in 1771. In 1769, against \$284,000,000 in 1770. In 1768, against \$284,000,000 in 1769. In 1767, against \$284,000,000 in 1768. In 1766, against \$284,000,000 in 1767. In 1765, against \$284,000,000 in 1766. In 1764, against \$284,000,000 in 1765. In 1763, against \$284,000,000 in 1764. In 1762, against \$284,000,000 in 1763. In 1761, against \$284,000,000 in 1762. In 1760, against \$284,000,000 in 1761. In 1759, against \$284,000,000 in 1760. In 1758, against \$284,000,000 in 1759. In 1757, against \$284,000,000 in 1758. In 1756, against \$284,000,000 in 1757. In 1755, against \$284,000,000 in 1756. In 1754, against \$284,000,000 in 1755. In 1753, against \$284,000,000 in 1754. In 1752, against \$284,000,000 in 1753. In 1751, against \$284,000,000 in 1752. In 1750, against \$284,000,000 in 1751. In 1749, against \$284,000,000 in 1750. In 1748, against \$284,000,000 in 1749. In 1747, against \$284,000,000 in 1748. In 1746, against \$284,000,000 in 1747. In 1745, against \$284,000,000 in 1746. In 1744, against \$284,000,000 in 1745. In 1743, against \$284,000,000 in 1744. In 1742, against \$284,000,000 in 1743. In 1741, against \$284,000,000 in 1742. In 1740, against \$284,000,000 in 1741. In 1739, against \$284,000,000 in 1740. In 1738, against \$284,000,000 in 1739. In 1737, against \$284,000,000 in 1738. In 1736, against \$284,000,000 in 1737. In 1735, against \$284,000,000 in 1736. In 1734, against \$284,000,000 in 1735. In 1733, against \$284,000,000 in 1734. In 1732, against \$284,000,000 in 1733. In 1731, against \$284,000,000 in 1732. In 1730, against \$284,000,000 in 1731. In 1729, against \$284,000,000 in 1730. In 1728, against \$284,000,000 in 1729. In 1727, against \$284,000,000 in 1728. In 1726, against \$284,000,000 in 1727. In 1725, against \$284,000,000 in 1726. In 1724, against \$284,000,000 in 1725. In 1723, against \$284,000,000 in 1724. In 1722, against \$284,000,000 in 1723. In 1721, against \$284,000,000 in 1722. In 1720, against \$284,000,000 in 1721. In 1719, against \$284,000,000 in 1720. In 1718, against \$284,000,000 in 1719. In 1717, against \$284,000,000 in 1718. In 1716, against \$284,000,000 in 1717. In 1715, against \$284,000,000 in 1716. In 1714, against \$284,000,000 in 1715. In 1713, against \$284,000,000 in 1714. In 1712, against \$284,000,000 in 1713. In 1711, against \$284,000,000 in 1712. In 1710, against \$284,000,000 in 1711. In 1709, against \$284,000,000 in 1710. In 1708, against \$284,000,000 in 1709. In 1707, against \$284,000,000 in 1708. In 1706, against \$284,000,000 in 1707. In 1705, against \$284,000,000 in 1706. In 1704, against \$284,000,000 in 1705. In 1703, against \$284,000,000 in 1704. In 1702, against \$284,000,000 in 1703. In 1701, against \$284,000,000 in 1702. In 1700, against \$284,000,000 in 1701. In 1699, against \$284,000,000 in 1700. In 1698, against \$284,000,000 in 1699. In 1697, against \$284,000,000 in 1698. In 1696, against \$284,000,000 in 1697. In 1695, against \$284,000,000 in 1696. In 1694, against \$284,000,000 in 1695. In 1693, against \$284,000,000 in 1694. In 1692, against \$284,000,000 in 1693. In 1691, against \$284,000,000 in 1692. In 1690, against \$284,000,000 in 1691. In 1689, against \$284,000,000 in 1690. In 1688, against \$284,000,000 in 1689. In 1687, against \$284,000,000 in 1688. In 1686, against \$284,000,000 in 1687. In 1685, against \$284,000,000 in 1686. In 1684, against \$284,000,000 in 1685. In 1683, against \$284,000,000 in 1684. In 1682, against \$284,000,000 in 1683. In 1681, against \$284,000,000 in 1682. In 1680, against \$284,000,000 in 1681. In 1679, against \$284,000,000 in 1680. In 1678, against \$284,000,000 in 1679. In 1677, against \$284,000,000 in 1678. In 1676, against \$284,000,000 in 1677. In 1675, against \$284,000,000 in 1676. In 1674, against \$284,000,000 in 1675. In 1673, against \$284,000,000 in 1674. In 1672, against \$284,000,000 in 1673. In 1671, against \$284,000,000 in 1672. In 1670, against \$284,000,000 in 1671. In 1669, against \$284,000,000 in 1670. In 1668, against \$284,000,000 in 1669. In 1667, against \$284,000,000 in 1668. In 1666, against \$284,000,000 in 1667. In 1665, against \$284,000,000 in 1666. In 1664, against \$284,000,000 in 1665. In 1663, against \$284,000,000 in 1664. In 1662, against \$284,000,000 in 1663. In 1661, against \$284,000,000 in 1662. In 1660, against \$284,000,000 in 1661. In 1659, against \$284,000,000 in 1660. In 1658, against \$284,000,000 in 1659. In 1657, against \$284,000,000 in 1658. In 1656, against \$284,000,000 in 1657. In 1655, against \$284,000,000 in 1656. In 1654, against \$284,000,000 in 1655. In 1653, against \$284,000,000 in 1654. In 1652, against \$284,000,000 in 1653. In 1651, against \$284,000,000 in 1652. In 1650, against \$284,000,000 in 1651. In 1649, against \$284,000,000 in 1650. In 1648, against \$284,000,000 in 1649. In 1647, against \$284,000,000 in 1648. In 1646, against \$284,000,000 in 1647. In 1645, against \$284,000,000 in 1646. In 1644, against \$284,000,000 in 1645. In 1643, against \$284,000,000 in 1644. In 1642, against \$284,000,000 in 1643. In 1641, against \$284,000,000 in 1642. In 1640, against \$284,000,000 in 1641. In 1639, against \$284,000,000 in 1640. In 1638, against \$284,000,000 in 1639. In 1637, against \$284,000,000 in 1638. In 1636, against \$284,000,000 in 1637. In 1635, against \$284,000,000 in 1636. In 1634, against \$284,000,000 in 1635. In 1633, against \$284,000,000 in 1634. In 1632, against \$284,000,000 in 1633. In 1631, against \$284,000,000 in 1632. In 1630, against \$284,000,000 in 1631. In 1629, against \$284,000,000 in 1630. In 1628, against \$284,000,000 in 1629. In 1627, against \$284,000,000 in 1628. In 1626, against \$284,000,000 in 1627. In 1625, against \$284,000,000 in 1626. In 1624, against \$284,000,000 in 1625. In 1623, against \$284,000,000 in 1624. In 1622, against \$284,000,000 in 1623. In 1621, against \$284,000,000 in 1622. In 1620, against \$284,000,000 in 1621. In 1619, against \$284,000,000 in 1620. In 1618, against \$284,000,000 in 1619. In 1617, against \$284,000,000 in 1618. In 1616, against \$284,000,000 in 1617. In 1615, against \$284,000,000 in 1616. In 1614