

last year, and he wanted the thing settled.

Mr. Kahler—I don't know where to find him; I have no power to subpoena him.

In reply to questions, Mr. Armstrong said he had had two wives; the second died in 1833; the first was still living; she was his only wife now. The objection was overruled.

John B. Almond was objected to on the ground of polygamy. He testified—I am a married man; took my first wife in 1853; she still lives with me; I married a second wife in 1861; she was divorced the fall of the same year; she died many years ago; my name was scratched off in February; I re-registered in June, and voted at the school election.

Mr. Kahler—You have never been convicted?

Mr. Almond—No, sir. Am I entitled to vote?

Mr. Kahler—I am inclined to think so; but you will receive notice.

No others presented themselves, and a recess was taken till this afternoon.

In the county precincts similar proceedings were in progress yesterday and today. In some places the challenge is on the ground that the party objected to "aids, abets, counsels and advices in the commission of crimes in violation of the act of Congress of March 3, 1887." Upon this point such questions as these were put:

"Do you pay tithing?"

"Have you contributed to the defense fund?"

And others of a similar nature. The challenges for "aiding and abetting" were numerous.

July 31 the Utah Commission took an important step to remedy a wrong which has been committed by the deputy registrars, and by which numbers of People's Party voters were excluded from the polls at the school election. The matter was brought up today by the appearance before the Commission of Fred. Kessler, deputy registrar for the Fourth precinct, who had stricken off names of those entitled to vote, and who applied to the Commission to sustain his action. This, however, was not done, as will be seen by the following, which took place at the commission rooms this morning:

Mr. Kessler said—There is a man in our precinct who wants his name replaced on the registration list. I made a very careful canvass. I went from house to house, and I don't think I missed one. Then I gave notice for the six days when parties could appear. This man did not come then, so I struck his name off. Now he wants it put back and claims that he has a right to have it done. I said I could not do it, as I could not find him and he did not report himself.

Col. Robertson—What is his name?

Mr. Kessler—I have forgotten. It is ——— I cannot remember it.

Gen. McClelland—Is it George Triplett?

Mr. Kessler—Yes, that is it, I believe.

Chairman Godfrey—Was he on the last county list?

Mr. Kessler—Yes sir; he has resided in the precinct for 20 years, he says.

Chairman Godfrey—And has never moved out of it, or gone into polygamy or anything of that kind?

Mr. Kessler—Oh no; he is all right that way. I struck his name off because I did not see him, nor did he call on me.

Col. Robertson—The names of those stricken off by mistake should be replaced.

Mr. Kessler—But it was no mistake.

Col. Robertson—I think it was a very grave mistake on the part of the registration officer. The law does not authorize you to strike off the name of a man simply because you fail to find him. It says the registration officer "shall visit every dwelling house in the precinct and make careful inquiry if any person whose name is on the list has died or removed from the precinct, or is otherwise disqualified as a voter of such precinct, and if so to erase the same therefrom."

Mr. Kessler seemed taken aback at this quotation, and looked as though he had never heard of it before.

Chairman Godfrey—You say the only reason for striking his name off was because you did not see him?

Mr. Kessler—Yes, sir.

Chairman Godfrey—Then it should be put back. There is no earthly reason why that man should not vote. The fault is not his. It is your fault that his name is not on the list. It it had been his fault through removing from one precinct to another, or some such cause, and it was his own neglect, his name could not be put there. But this is a mistake of the registration officer, and the voter must not suffer by it.

Mr. Kessler—Then I am authorized to put his name on the list?

Chairman Godfrey—You should never have left it off, and should now put it on.

Mr. Kessler—Shall I require him to take the oath again?

Chairman Godfrey—If you think he has gone into polygamy or anything of that kind.

Gen. McClelland—If you have good reason to believe he has.

Chairman Godfrey—Oh, yes, there must be ground to reasonably believe that he has, before you require him to take the oath again. You have no right to require it just for the sake of doing so.

This closed the conversation on that point, and Mr. Triplett, as well as the many others whose names have been stricken off in precisely the same way, should see to it that the deputy registrars do not fail to comply with the law, and that their names are replaced without delay where they belong, on the county registration list.

Shortly after the foregoing occurred the Commission formulated and promulgated the following:

OFFICE OF THE UTAH COMMISSION, July 31, 1890.

Whereas, sundry complaints have

been made to the Utah Commission by persons who claim that they are citizens of the Territory, and have been residents of their respective counties and precincts the requisite length of time to be registered voters, that they have been registered heretofore and have regularly voted in the annual elections for territorial and county officers; that their names, without any fault of theirs, have been stricken off and do not now appear upon the registration list for the ensuing August election, and that they are not disfranchised by any act of Congress.

Therefore, in the opinion of this Commission, whenever it appears that the name of a voter has thus been omitted from the registry list, without fault on the part of said voter, and such voter is not disfranchised by any act of Congress, that the name of such voter should of right be reinstated by the deputy registrar on the registration book of the proper precinct and he be permitted to vote at the ensuing election. But this does not apply to persons who have removed from one precinct to another since the first day of July last, not having complied with the statute regulating removals from one precinct to another.

G. L. GODFREY,  
Chairman.

The workmen's representatives were at work early this morning. They do not believe in leaving everything till late in the afternoon and then have it hurriedly passed over. They wanted the privilege of being represented at the polls on election day. The Utah Commission has made an order giving to each of the other two parties permission to have two challengers at the polls. But the workmen's organization was not provided for. The judges of election have been appointed, but this was done before the Workmen's party came into existence.

This morning N. R. Parks, chairman, L. M. Earl, secretary of the Workmen's central committee, accompanied by Attorney J. H. Hurd, presented themselves at the Utah Commission rooms and after a time were allowed a hearing. They wanted a judge, or inspector, or some one to represent them at the polls on election day, to witness the counting of ballots. They were informed that no new judges could be appointed, and that the law did not permit of an inspector.

Mr. Hurd said that what they really desired was to have two challengers, the same as was accorded to the other parties.

Col. Robertson said he did not see the use of allowing the Workmen any challenges. He saw no difference between their ticket and that of the People's Party.

Chairman Godfrey—Each party now has two challengers, and the Workmen can divide challengers with the People's Party.

Gen. McClelland—What harm is there in allowing the third party to have challengers and equal rights with the others?