

drawal was opposed by J. E. Booth, claimed that the resolution was now property of the Council, and evidently desired to see it voted down.

The chair ruled that the resolution could not be withdrawn without unanimous consent, and the question recurred on its adoption. It was lost on a strict party vote, and by this action the Council acquitted the prisoner.

There was considerable personal feeling shown by several members of the Council during the proceedings of the trial of H. E. Booth, and the discussion of questions connected with it.

On motion of J. E. Booth, Lund was brought before the bar of the Council on a charge of contempt. J. E. Booth moved that he be excused for his contempt. This was seconded by Taylor. Lund said that it was a matter of endurance and he had to succumb. Hart moved to fine Lund \$10. Eldredge moved to amend it by acquitting the offender, and spoke in support of the motion.

Seaman wanted to know if the Council had any dignity and if so why it was not maintained.

J. E. Booth moved that the Council adjourn. Thus, after some sparring on both sides, the Council adjourned until 2 p.m.

At that hour, the Council resumed. The motion to fine Councilor Lund was the pending question. The Councilor was excused.

The motion of Lund to adjourn was lost. A motion to take a recess was then made but withdrawn and Williams's motion to adjourn prevailed. This ended the business of the Council today.

The House committee on ways and means held a session yesterday and another this morning, in the effort to prepare a report in response to Varian's resolution calling for a statement of the financial condition of the Territory. It was at length decided to request the territorial auditor and treasurer to furnish, in recapitulated form, the information contained in their respective reports, for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. Stanford, chairman of the committee, stated to a News representative today that while the figures showing the exact financial status of the Territory had not been prepared, he believed they would make a very favorable showing. He spoke of an oversight of the last Legislature, in authorizing county collectors to receive Territorial warrants for taxes, but in failing to authorize the treasurer to receive the warrants from the collectors. Owing to this anomaly the collectors cannot settle with the treasurer, and for the purpose of removing it Mr. Stanford yesterday introduced a bill authorizing the treasurer to receive the warrants and settle with the collectors.

After this bill becomes law it will take two weeks or more to make this settlement, so that it will be late in the session before last year's business can be close up.

FRIDAY.

Towards the close of the third week of the session, the House is beginning to show definitely its disposition regarding the disposal of measures that are up for final action. That disposition is to dispose of them quickly. In about an hour yesterday afternoon the

House debated and passed three bills, and killed three more.

One of the bills passed, H. B. 42, was designed to correct an oversight in a law passed at the last session, which required county collectors to receive Territorial warrants for taxes, but did not authorize the Territorial treasurer to receive the warrants from the collectors. In consequence of this legislative blunder a number of county collectors cannot settle with the Territorial treasurer, until the relief afforded by this bill shall be extended to them. The House did itself credit by the careful investigation it made into the scope and effect of this bill, before passing it.

The next bill passed, H. B. 51, was also designed to correct an omission in the present law, by allowing city councils to elect a mayor pro tem from among their own number, during the absence or disability of the mayor.

The next bill passed was H. B. 53, extending the time of redeeming real property sold under mortgage or execution, to one year, the present term of redemption being six months. The bill also gives one year in which to redeem real estate sold under trust deeds. By its terms, however, it is made to apply only to mortgages, executions and trust deeds, given or issued in future, and does not affect existing obligations. In an able speech Sears opposed the bill, fearing that it would operate hurtfully rather than beneficially to the borrower. He argued that lenders would be unwilling to renew existing mortgages and trust deeds, because such renewed contracts would come within the operations of the law. He deprecated meddling with our present statutes upon such subjects, because frequent changes of such laws made capitalists shy, whereas if our Legislature would show a disposition to impart a stable character to them, the confidence of money lenders would be increased.

Varian replied, conceding weight to Sears' objections, and stating that the bill related to a question of policy which the Assembly must decide. The judiciary committee, which had drawn this bill as a substitute for others, had given a hearing to attorneys, financiers and others, and had reached the conclusion that the relief to the borrower which this bill would afford, should be given, and that the result would be more good than harm to the debtor class.

The bills lost were: H. B. 25, amending the chattel mortgage law; H. B. 36, regulating the practice of medicine, and H. B. 45, relating to the befouling of waters. The medical bill was a drastic dose which the House, by a unanimous vote, rejected. It peremptorily forbade any person to practice medicine or obstetrics without a diploma, except in districts where no physician with a diploma, resided. The House will not entertain any more such propositions as this, judging by its action yesterday.

It seems highly probably that the petition, having about 600 signatures, which asks for the creation of the new county of Carbon, with the county seat at Price, will be granted. The bill creating the new county was favorably reported by the House committee on counties yesterday, and no opposition to the measure seems to show itself.

While the contempt proceedings were pending in the Council yesterday, and especially after the case of H. E. Booth was disposed of, there was a cross-fire between Democrats and Republicans, which did not relate to any parliamentary question before the house, and was largely personal in character. In fact, considerable acrimony was developed, and it was a wise thing to adjourn, which the Council did for the day, after the contempt case of Mr. Lund was disposed of by his acquittal. No legislative business whatever was done in the Council yesterday.

In the debate on the wool memorial in the House this afternoon, Ivins led off in opposition to it. He claimed that the allegation in the memorial, that the development of the wool industry would have been impossible but for protective legislation, was untrue. He favored tariff for revenue, with incidental protection. He was of opinion that placing wool on the freelist would reduce its price but that the wool industry was so well established that it could take care of itself without protection. He did not think the price would go lower than it is now were the tariff removed, but it would be less than the average for several years past. He gave figures, compiled by himself, on the cost of caring for and profits on 3000 sheep in this Territory. He put the sheep at \$2 per head, or \$6,000 for the capital invested, the expenses at \$3,305, the product in wool and lambs at \$4,305, and the net profit of \$1,000. He claimed that the sheep industry was suffering now, not because it was not profitable, but because of the general financial distress, which makes all industries suffer. He held that the low price of wool had stimulated the manufacture of woollen goods in this Territory.

SATURDAY.

After the close of the News' report yesterday, Sears replied to Ivins' speech. He gave statistics to show the importance of the wool industry to this Territory, and the loss that would ensue to Utah as a consequence of a removal of the wool tariff. To show that the wool business was not as profitable as Ivins has represented, he cited the fact that Sanpete county shippers now had 50,000 pounds of wool stored in Boston, for which they had been offered by telegraph, a few days ago, 8 cents per pound, which meant about 4 cents per pound at the point of shipping. The expenses of insurance, storage, interest, on advances, etc., would consume the remaining 4 cents, and leave the growers of the wool nothing.

Tolton followed Sears. He claimed that many of the largest sheep owners in southern Utah were Democrats, who favored the policy of that party in respect to wool. He dwelt upon the damage done to the ranges by sheep, and held, with Ivins, that even with the present low price of wool the industry would be profitable.

Parsons said that all stock and sheep owners were trespassers on the public domain, and neither could make a point against the other on that ground. He claimed that much Utah wool this year had brought less than six cents. Sheep for mutton would not bring anything, not even the freight to an eastern market.

Hubbard said mutton was no lower