

appear that the city had a one-fifth interest in said waters, and if the council voted away one-sixth of its interest, then the grantee would receive an actual one-thirtieth of the waters of the river. While he did not believe that anyone entered into the contract with the Hydraulic Canal Company dishonestly, he was unwilling to deed said company something when it was stated by councilors that the city received nothing. However, he believed the city could have maintained its right if it had officers who would maintain it; he was sure if he bought it he would do so. He did not think the report stated what it meant.

Councilor Young said Mr. Dooley's objection was merely a technical one and could be easily overcome.

Alderman Sharp was unable to understand the point raised by Mr. Dooley. The report stated the matter correctly. It recommended that the identical interest required by the city from the county be deeded back and left the City Attorney to give his opinion as to whether the deed should run to the county or the company. There was no member on the floor of the council who would pretend to claim that the transaction was not made in good faith by both sides at the time, and for one he thought at the time that the city was making a good purchase, and would obtain for its money one-sixth in the waters of the Jordan River. He thought so still. But the majority of the council having decided that the right obtained by the city could not be maintained except by expensive litigation, the committee had recommended that the identical interest, be it much or little, simply that no more and no less be re-conveyed to the source from which it came.

Mr. Dooley was satisfied if it was understood that the city simply relinquished what it acquired, but he insisted that the report did not say so, and would therefore vote against it unless amended.

Councilor Roberts was in favor of the city attorney giving a ruling as to whether the city could maintain its right. If it could, then the one-sixth interest in those waters was worth \$50,000 instead of \$10,000, but he apprehended that the city could never hold its right. The people out there would combine against the city, and if the matter got into the courts they would swear the city's interest all away. I opposed the proposition from the start because I foresaw that we would not be able to get what we purchased.

Mr. Dooley (*sotto voce*)—Then why did he sign the report in favor of it?

Alderman McCornick—I am no lawyer, but I apprehend if the city undertook to maintain its right to the water acquired from the Hydraulic Canal Company, there would be many difficulties thrown in the way by the people interested on both sides of the Jordan, and while a private individual might be able to defend it if he owned it, I don't think the city can, and hence I am in favor of relinquishing in favor of

the County Court from whence it came.

Councilor Clark said: We bought the grant that the County Court made to the Hydraulic Canal Company for one-sixth of the capacity of the Jordan dam. On the records of the County Court today it is recorded that when the company should incorporate they would receive a deed to the water right. When the proposition of the city to procure it was discussed, the question was considered as to whether it would be the better plan for the company to incorporate and the deed to be made to it, or whether it would be more advisable for the court to deed directly to the city. The latter plan being the more expeditious, it was agreed upon as a result of this understanding. The Hydraulic Canal Company petitioned the County Court to make the deed accordingly, and on that petition it was done.

Councilor Sowles thought the city got all the title that anybody could get. It was identically the same as the other canal companies got and as the city received in the first instance. He had never heard a legal opinion in regard to the matter. I voted for the proposition because it appeared to me it was a good buy. I am not convinced yet that it wasn't. If the city got what it bought we will be very foolish to relinquish it. If it didn't, let's have our money back.

Councilor Young—I have heard today that indictments have been made against several persons for alleged wrong-doing in selling this property to the city. I do not know what the charges are, but let us see about it. We should not be in too great a hurry. If it was a crime to sell it, it may be a crime to buy it. Let us take time to investigate the matter thoroughly.

On motion action was deferred to the next council meeting. A motion was also made that the city attorney investigate the question as to whom the deed should be made.

The city marshal asked to make a verbal report, and said that he had been arrested on the charge of misappropriating public funds. He asked that a committee investigate his affairs and if anything crooked was found, he was ready to retire from office. Deferred till the next meeting of the Council.

The mayor with the city attorney associated, to whom was referred the petition of Soren A. Olsen for a deed to part of lot 1, block 28, plat F, reported that several transfers of property had taken place but that no deed had been recorded and recommended that such deed issue to N. Norberg, the original owner, who was shown to be still living.

Recorder Wells, in behalf of G. M. Ottinger, chief of the fire department, offered the following suggestion: "In view of the fact that our fire alarm system will be in working order in a few days, I respectfully suggest that the City Council pass an ordinance, supplementary to the present ordinances, relating to the city fire department, making it a misdemeanor for any evil or mischievously disposed per-

son to mar or destroy or in any way interfere maliciously with the alarm boxes, wires or other appliance of the fire alarm. In all cities using the fire alarm the laws in this respect are very rigid."

Referred to the city attorney with instructions to prepare the required addition to the existing fire alarm ordinance.

Alderman McCornick said the plans for the joint city and county building had been opened by the city's committee, but the county officials were not present and no action was taken. The plans submitted were quite handsome, the architects, five in number, being W. Ward, W. E. Ware, T. O. Angell, C. R. Apponyi, all of Salt Lake, and A. Morris and C. B. Stuckert, of Denver.

The Council adjourned to meet on Friday evening. After adjournment the members spent some time in looking over the plans for the building.

UTAH COMMISSION DECISION.

December 19th the Utah Commission decided upon the following agreement in relation to the course of the deputy registrars, and the charges against them. The latter part particularly affords food for reflection, in view of the political situation here:

Heber M. Wells, vice chairman, R. W. Young, secretary municipal central committee of the People's Party of Salt Lake City, vs. H. S. McCallum, E. R. Clute, J. R. Morris, R. D. Winters and Louis Hyams, registrars for Salt Lake City.

Before the Utah Commission.

On the 30th day of November, 1889, an informal charge against said registration officers was telegraphed to G. L. Godfrey, chairman of the Commission, by the said complainants, whereupon he, by telegraph, called a special meeting of the Commission to be held at Salt Lake City on the 9th day of December, 1889. In response to said call a quorum of the Commission met at its office in Salt Lake City on said 9th day of December, and notified said complainants that the Commission was ready to receive and act upon any charges they might prefer against said registration officers.

On Wednesday, December 11, said complainants presented to the commission the following charges (published in the DESERT NEWS of that date) against said registration officers, whereupon the commission, deeming the said charges defective for want of certainty, on the same day caused the secretary of the commission to communicate to the complainants the following order (published in the News), and on Friday, the 13th day of December, at 9 o'clock, said complainants presented amended written charges (also published.)

And on Monday, the 16th day of December, 1889, said commission having met in pursuance of said order to hear said charges and the