

taken up. It consists of seventeen pages of over 300 words each, and 35 sections. The chief clerk raised it from his desk and with a sigh over the magnitude of the task before him proceeded to read, the members occasionally interrupting with questions and otherwise.

The reading of the building and loan association bill continued till after 4 o'clock, when it was passed with several amendments.

A message from the Governor was read, stating that he had approved and filed H. J. R. 3, "A resolution authorizing the secretary to obtain 300 sets of the Compiled Laws of Utah, 1888; for the use of county and precinct officers," and H. F. 8, entitled "An act to amend section 2796 of the Compiled Laws of Utah Territory, 1888, relating to fees of mining recorders."

C. F. 37, a bill for an act to regulate the fees of attorneys, clerks of the district courts, commissioners and justices of the peace, was read the third time, amended and rejected.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27.

H. P. 77, from David Evans and fifty-six others, of Moab, endorsing the resolution of the Republican central committee of Utah County, in relation to the sugar bounty bill. A petition to refer was voted down, and,

On motion of J. D. Irvine, laid on the table.

The same committee reported on H. F. 89, to amend section 5443 Compiled Laws, relating to marshals' and sheriffs' fees, recommending its passage. Adopted.

The committee on claims and accounts reported on claim 19 of A. J. Burt for \$3978 for fees as sheriff, recommending that it be rejected and reported a bill for his relief. Adopted.

H. F. 97, to validate and make admissible in evidence certain conveyances affecting titles, etc., was read the third time and passed.

H. F. 102, to amend section 2010 Compiled Laws and section 2026 session laws relating to revenue, was read the third time and rejected.

H. F. 37 (substitute), to amend chapter 17, part 3, Compiled Laws, relating to branding cattle, etc., was read the third time and rejected.

H. F. 63, for an act relating to payment of costs, etc., before justices of the peace and commissioners, was read the third time and passed.

H. F. 93, to attach a part of Kane county to Garfield county, was read the third time and passed.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29.

Petition 81, by Lawrence, from J. S. Page and 71 others of Payson, asking for a bounty on sugar, was read.

Moritz moved to refer to the committee on manufactures and commerce.

J. D. Irvine moved an amendment, to table the petition. Seconded by Pike. The amendment prevailed, 13 to 8.

Petition 82, by Moritz, from J. A. Bringhurst and 82 others, of Springville, to the same effect as the foregoing, received the same treatment and went to the table flying.

The committee on judiciary reported on C. F. 68, for fees for attorneys at law, recommending its rejection. Adopted.

H. F. 50 came from the same committee with a recommendation that it

be rejected. It is for the protection of local stockholders in foreign building and loan associations, and the committee thought the ground sufficiently covered by previous legislation. Report adopted.

The committee on claims and public accounts reported on the claim of the commissioners to locate university lands for \$1000 each for services during the past two years. The committee thought half of that figure, or \$250 a year about right and so recommended. Report adopted and amounts ordered placed in the general appropriation bill.

H. F. 83, relating to the service of attachments in justices' courts by United States marshals, and H. F. 84, to amend section 4543, relating to gaming, were returned rejected.

The Council announced that the Governor had notified that body of his approval of C. J. M. 1, asking Congress to set aside sixty acres off the west side of the Fort Douglas reservation for the use of the university, and C. J. M. 4, asking for the transfer of the Industrial Home for the use of deaf mutes, and to revert to the public schools after five years.

H. F. 37 (substitute), by the committee on live stock, relating to the breeding, herding of cattle, etc., and requiring the county courts to designate the ranges for sheep and cattle, etc., was, on motion of Nebeker, reconsidered and passed by a vote of 14 to 6.

H. F. 90, for an act amending sections 3, 4, 6, 11 and 16 of an act to establish an agricultural college and experimental station in connection therewith, introduced by Wright, was put upon its passage, receiving 20 affirmative votes.

C. F. 66, prohibiting justices of the peace and commissioners of the Supreme Court from practicing law before any justice's or commissioner's courts in the county in which he resides, was passed; ayes 13, nays 8, absent 2.

J. G. BLAINE'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28.—Mr. Blaine furnishes the Associated Press the following under the caption, "A Personal Statement:" Since the separation of my son and his wife, three and a half years ago, my family have silently borne every misrepresentation, slanderous attack and newspaper interview it has pleased the now divorced wife to inspire. The person aimed at has been Mrs. Blaine. We perhaps have been at fault in allowing a horror of public discussion of private matters, together with a regard for the future of my grandson, to permit so much calumny to go unanswered. The last outrage of the kind, embodied in the decision of the judge at Deadwood, assumes an official character, which makes it impossible to longer remain silent. To do so would be to accept and perpetuate a great wrong to my wife, and a greater wrong to my grandson, than even a publication of the truth can inflict. A letter I addressed to Rev. Thomas I. Ducey, at the time of the marriage, gives important facts bearing upon that event.

BLAINE'S EXPLANATION.

AUGUSTA, Me., Sept. 13, 1886.
Rev. Thomas I. Ducey:
Last Wednesday morning my young-

est son, James G. Blaine, J., shocked me by the announcement that on the preceding Monday you had united him in marriage in your own rectory with Miss Mary Nevins; that my son and Miss Nevins were unaccompanied by friend or relative, two of your household servants being the sole witnesses. My son's announcement was the first knowledge that any member of the family had of even an attachment for Miss Nevins, whose character is not at all in question, and of whom, except for this rash marriage, I have never heard a breath of censure. My son is but 17. He has been living here under the daily care of a tutor, who was fitting him for college. In order to continue his studies he desired to remain here during the summer, while the rest of the family were at Bar Harbor. Monday, August 16th, Miss Nevins, her sister and father came to Augusta. Eighteen days afterwards my son, who had never heard of her until she came here, left his home, without permission or the knowledge of the family, and accompanied Miss Nevins to New York. The next day they presented themselves to you for marriage. While he misrepresented his age to you, he did not, according to your own statement, afterwards made, conceal from you the fact of his minority, or the fact that his family knew nothing of his intended marriage. You agreed not to inform his family. You took him to the archbishop in order to secure a dispensation, so that Miss Nevins, a Catholic, might marry my son, a Protestant. You knew I was within a moment's reach by telegraph, yet never gave the slightest intimation to me, the most interested and responsible party, of what was going on.

In defense of this conduct you allege the confidence reposed in you, as a priest, by my son. The confidence of a confessional is always respected; but, by your use of the confidence reposed in you outside of the confessional, even by those not of the Catholic communion, you perforce become an accomplice before the act of any crime or imprudence which you may hasten. You further allege that if you had not performed the ceremony, some one outside of your communion would have done it. This is a common defense of evil-doing, and is unworthy of a priest and a man.

A week ago my boy was under my protection, the most helpless, least responsible member of my family; erratic, but controllable through his strong affections, and an object of constant watchfulness to his parents and brothers and sisters; a source of constant anxiety, but not despair, because he is of good abilities; as readily influenced to right as wrong, and because the patience of love can never know weariness. Today, through your agency, this boy in years, in experience, in judgment, in practical capacity, leaves my home and care, burdened with the full responsibility of a man; with the welfare of a woman within his keeping I am powerless. I cannot question the legality of the marriage. I shall, at a distance, and at a disadvantage, try to guide my son. But, as a father, loving under the divine institution of the family, as a citizen, loving under the divine order of society, I protest against your act.