

HE DON'T WANT IT.

On request of Patrolman Oantion his appointment was not confirmed. Adopted.

CROSS WALKS.

The committee on streets recommended that cross walks be repaved on East South Temple streets, where said thoroughfare connects with North State, B, C, D, E, F and G streets. Adopted.

GAS COMPANY FRANCHISE.

The committee on municipal law submitted two reports on the request of the Indiana Natural Gas & Pipe company. The majority report signed by Messrs. Loofbourov, Horn and Heise, recommended that the franchise be granted. The minority report signed by Messrs. Hardy and Simondt, recommended that the franchise be denied until such time as the company had gas in commercial quantities. Both reports were laid on the table.

TO EMPLOY "LIBERAL" VOTERS.

The committee on streets recommended that sidewalks be constructed on both sides of East South Temple, First and Second South streets as far east as Twelfth. The estimates of the engineer accompanied the report. They were:

Brigham street—	\$6732 00
Abutters' proportion.....	516 00
City's proportion.....	
Total.....	\$7248 00
First South street—	\$6256 80
Abutters' proportion.....	412 80
City's proportion.....	
Total.....	\$6669 60
Second South street—	\$6256 80
Abutters' proportion.....	412 80
City's proportion.....	
Total.....	\$6669 60

Folland said he understood that property owners on East South Temple street were willing to have sidewalks constructed. But as to the First and Second South street that was simply a suggestion of the committee. It was an ominous move. He was not prepared to act favorably on the committee's recommendation.

Considerable discussion followed and that portion of the report referring to the first named street was adopted. The remainder was the cause of considerable discussion.

Wantland objected strenuously to the mutilation of his report. So did Lawson who said some people preferred to walk in the mud. It was more in harmony with their natures than cement sidewalks.

Horn also made a moonshine talk about the mud, dust, mossbackism, non-progression and a miscellaneous lot of synonymous questions.

Moran was not in sympathy with Wantland's scheme. The property owners should be consulted.

Folland raised the point that the unadopted portion of the report was out of order. On his motion the matter went over until miscellaneous business was reached.

SEWERAGE MATTERS.

The committee on sewerage reported as follows: That the Folland resolution relative to hoiler and engine was being carried out; that sewer improvements and repairs were going on on Fifth West street; that the Hardy resolution with reference to the purchase of pipe was being complied with. Adopted.

THE MAYOR "ROASTED."

The committee on waterworks sent in the following on the water pipe purchasing question, which has been a bone of contention between the committee and the Mayor:

SALT LAKE CITY, Sept. 13, 1892.

To the Honorable President and City Council, Salt Lake City:

Gentlemen—Your committee to whom was referred the communication of Superintendent Ryan relative to the purchase of 850 tons of 8-inch pipe for the extension of water mains, would report as follows:

Your committee had this matter before them some time in the latter part of July and fully investigated the same, saw the necessity of the purchase being made, and, to facilitate business, sent letters and telegrams to thirteen leading manufacturers and dealers in the United States, receiving bids from parties as follows:

D. Long.....	per ton \$39 50
Howard Harrison.....	" 37 50
Detroit Pipe Company.....	" 41 35
Addyston Pipe Company.....	" 38 00
Utah-Montana Machinery Co.....	" 38 50
Lake Shore.....	" 41 00
Rhodes Bros.....	" 36 50
George M. Scott.....	No bid

The above prices were to be, for 6 inch standard pipe, 33 to the foot, each and every piece placed under hydraulic pressure, guaranteed, F. O. B. cars, Salt Lake City. The above prices will show that Rhodes Brothers were \$850 lower in their bid than the next lowest bidder, and \$4049.75 lower than the highest bidder.

These bids with all communications from the above parties were pinned to your committee's report and placed before the Council for their action on August 9th.

Through some misunderstanding, either relative to the powers of this Council, or to the power placed in the hands of your committee, it was not acted upon until September 6th, when the said report was adopted and forwarded to the mayor for his approval and with authority to purchase the pipe from the lowest bidder, which he positively declined to do, stating that the committee had pursued unusual and unauthorized methods in procuring the said bids without first asking his authority, also declining to sign for those bids, as by so doing it would place his honor to perform a mere clerical act, he also stating that to a certain extent your committee had withheld from him his duty of inquiring into the validity or the reasonableness of the above contract.

We, your committee understand that all matters referred to the Mayor, either for his approval or rejection, gives him full power to inquire into, and investigate the validity and proper expenditure, not requiring any resolution or motion of this council for him to act upon in each individual transaction; we take it that as a salaried officer he is hired for this purpose, and not to stop the advancement of the departments by petty and frivolous excuses. The clerical act which his honor objects to, is what the law demands of him, after his proper and judicious judgment is used, for the welfare of the city government.

There certainly seems to be a misunderstanding in this matter as your committee believes that all business pertaining to the building up and the welfare of the city, first originates and emanates from this Council; to facilitate its workings, committees are formed to oversee the several departments of the city government, to see to its wants and requirements, for its successful operation, with powers to bring the matters to as near a consummation as possible, that it may then be referred to this council for its final action. This, your committee did, in connection with the requirements of the water department for the 850 tons of

6-inch pipe so that there would be no delay in the workings of the water department, knowing full well that the citizens who had petitioned for the extension of mains had already paid the amount into the hands of the assessor and collector for the purchase of said pipe.

To show you that we have not been misled as to the high prices placed on pipe, we herewith submit you report of pipe purchased in 1891 and 1892, showing, to you conclusively that we have done far better than was done heretofore:

May 18, 1891, Harrison & Howard, 6-inch pipe.....	\$39 00 per ton
June 17, 1891, Harrison & Howard, 4-inch pipe.....	37 75 "
June 16, 1891, Rhodes Bros., 12 & 6-inch pipe.....	37 85 "
September, 1891, Harrison & Howard, 6-inch pipe.....	37 75 "
October, 1891, Rhodes Bros., 12-inch pipe.....	36 40 "
November 9, 1891, Harrison & Howard, 4 & 6-inch pipe.....	41 81 "
December 18, 1891, Rhodes Bros., 6-inch pipe.....	42 25 "

In 1892 purchases were made as follows:

January, 1892, Harrison & Howard, 6-inch pipe.....	\$39 00 per ton
January, 1892, Harrison & Howard, 4-inch pipe.....	35 01 "
April 1, 1892, Colorado Coal & Iron company, 9-inch pipe.....	35 60 "
July 4, 1892, Rhodes Bros., 8-inch pipe.....	31 85 "

In the same month (July) 16 and 18-inch pipe was bought at \$2.17 per foot laid in the ground, or \$33.65 per ton F. O. B. cars, Salt Lake City.

We would wish to call your attention to the report of the executive of this city, in which he says: "In the former purchase of pipe which was made by myself, in conjunction with the water works committee, the prices paid to Rhodes Bros. was much lower than the bid upon which I am now required to purchase. For the 585 tons of 16-inch pipe purchased on May 30th from Rhodes Bros., their bid per ton was \$33.65, or \$2.17 per foot laid in the ground; this included digging, trenching, laying, back filling, and everything pertaining to that work."

As this price is much lower than any pipe has been heretofore purchased at, during the years of 1891 and 1892, we, your committee, wish to lay before you the reason why such low prices were obtained for the above pipe: Nearly the full amount of pipe that was purchased by this city at that time, was pipe that had been sold to the People's Water Works company of the city of Denver, who, we understood, had gone into bankruptcy and the pipe was in the hands of the receiver. The 18-inch pipe being a very unusual size and could not readily be disposed of in Denver, it was, figuratively speaking, a dead loss upon the hands of Rhodes Bros., the interest on the principal being a great item, the above firm did deliver this pipe in Salt Lake City at less than the original cost with freight added; also agreed that any pipe that would not pass the inspection of the superintendent of water works when it arrived here, should be cut off, thrown out, or culled and deducted. How many pieces were cut or thrown out, your committee is unable to state, but we believed that Rhodes Bros. allowed the full amount and the city was only to the extra expense of the extra joints, filling and tamping. The price of the pipe, if bought and ordered direct (instead of as above), would have been from \$38.00 to \$40.00 per ton.

Your committee would also respectfully submit that at all times manufacturers charge at least \$1.00 per ton more for small 6-inch pipe than the do for 16 or 18-inch, as the difference in the manufacturing of the article would amount to that much.

So far as the present bid was \$36.50, we have nothing to say, but that we used the