In the evening a Priesthood meeting was held at which Elder Roberts defined the special duties of Seventies, and exhorted all to prepare for active missionary labor.

Four meetings in all were held, and a good spirit prevailed. It was truly a "little house well filled" as all could not get inside. Excellent music was furnished by the sweet singers of Price. Thanks are due the brass band of Castle Gate for coming down on Sunday and furnishing music between the meetings.

The health of the people is generally good.

A. E. WALL, Stake Clerk.

DECISION BY JUDGE ZANE.

Chief Justice Zane this morning rendered his decision in the case of the Salt Lake and Los Angeles Railway company vs the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railroad company and Salt Lake City, the hearing of which occupied the court's exclusive attention on Saturday and Monday last.

His honor said the plaintiffs had applied to the court for permission to extend their tracks from a point on South Temple street, between Sixth and Seventh West, to a connection with the Rio Grande Western on Sixth West, in order to reach the Rio Grande Western depot. The first question was whether there was a public necessity for the change demanded. It would appear that the plaintiffs obtained a franchise to lay its track on South Temple from Sixth West to the city limits, and a right of way from the point indicated to the Great Salt Lake, building their road at a cost of $210,000. It also appeared that improvements had been effected by them at the lake at an expenditure of some $320,000. The east end of the plaintiffs' track was now in the middle of South Temple, between Sixth and Seventh West streets. Of course if there was any necessity for this road at all there was a necessity for additional connections and accommodations for its freight and passenger traffic, and the middle of a street was certainly not a proper place for them. That the road was a public necessity was probably generally admitted. The Union Pacific had already a road to Garfield, and its chief business consisted in the conveying passengers to and from the Lake at that point. Competition, observed the court, regulated values and stimulated enterprise and progress. It might be said that there existed no necessity for the privilege now asked for—that plaintiffs might build their depot at the terminus of the line, or further west. In his opinion, however, that would not be as convenient for the public as a connection with the Rio Grande Western and to use that company's depot, which was centrally located. It was likewise reasonable to suppose that the plaintiffs obtained these privileges at a less outlay than they would have to make in building a new depot. This should benefit the public, and he inclined to the opinion that there was such a necessity for this connection. The further and more serious question was whether the court had authority to grant to plaintiffs the privileges sought. The statute provided for the public use of streets, but another provision of the statute set forth that railways should also be subject to the use of streets in common with each other where the same became necessary. It was also provided that the court should have power to determine the conditions and regulations as well as the manner and place of such crossings. By the plaintiffs crossing the Union Pacific track at the point named it would subject that portion of the street to common use. The further question was whether the court had the authority to give permission to plaintiff to construct its track across the street, as it proposed to do, in view of the fact that the city had refused, except under certain conditions, which had not been accepted. Reference had been made to section 2333 of vol. 2, compiled laws of Utah, 1884. This law provided that any railroad company might construct its road along, across or upon any street, avenue or highway, or across any railway which the route of its road should intersect. The proposed extension of this road from the connection between its own road on South Temple and Sixth West to the Rio Grande Western depot must be regarded as the line designated by the plaintiff company. His honor quoted the 31st subdivision of section 1755, 1st vol. compiled laws of Utah. This, he said, gave authority to prohibit the laying of a track on any street, alley, or public place; but no reference was made to the crossing. The law of 1888 also gave the city the right to prohibit the laying of tracks in streets, but did not give them the power to prohibit railroads from crossing a street where it was necessary to do so. He was disposed to construe these two laws together and to hold that where this latter law gave the absolute power to prohibit the laying of tracts on any street, while it gave the city the right to prohibit the laying, it was simply confined to this. In this case the plaintiffs had laid down their tracks, and were operating their road to the west line of Sixth West, and all they now asked was not to extend their track but to cross the south half of that street at the shortest distance practicable. Construing these two acts together, then, he had to view this matter in the light of reason and justice. It would certainly be unjust and unreasonable, when this road had been built to the point it had now reached on South Temple street, to say to the company that they should not go on to the other company's road, the R. G. W., and so get the benefit of its depot at once. A refusal to this extent would strike an impartial mind, at any rate, as being unjust and unreasonable, and he was not prepared to so hold. As to the conditions upon which the permission should be granted, the view he took was that the plaintiffs had the right to condemn so much of the Union Pacific's track as was necessary for the common use or would attain under the law of eminent domain. This would be but a few feet, and if a bond were required it could be given. In the meantime the right to occupy the required portion of the Union Pacific's track would be granted. Of course the city had the power and right to impose all reasonable and necessary conditions and subject these railroad companies to all reasonable requirements which the public good, safety and convenience demanded. It was here insisted that the city had offered to grant this right of way if the plaintiffs would take up a little over two squares—a quarter of a mile of its track, which was now on the north side of the Union Pacific, place it on the south side, and comply with other conditions as to putting the street in order, etc. The reason for this was claimed to be the securing of a safer crossing. The engineers called as witnesses, like all other experts, differed about this. It was also insisted that the court should require the plaintiffs, as a condition, to adopt what was termed the interlocking switch and distant signal system. But this, it appeared from the evidence, would cost a very considerable sum of money. Plaintiffs, however, proposed a system which was substantially the same thing, except that the distant signal was dispensed with, viz., the derailing switch; and the court was authorized to infer that it could be put in at much less cost. In his opinion there was hardly the necessity, for the present at least, for the larger expenditure. In fact, if the companies obeyed the law and stopped their trains before crossing any track there would probably be no danger of a collision. But engineers were only human after all, and would not always be careful and prudent. The law presumed, of course, that railroad companies would obey the law and stop their trains before reaching a crossing. The Saxby & Farmer system would, he held, be sufficient to meet the case.

His Honor therefore found for the plaintiffs on all the issues.

Attorney Williams (counsel for the Union Pacific Railroad company)—We will ask for a condemnation bond of $1500.

Hon. F. S. Richards (for the plaintiffs)—That will be satisfactory to us. To put in the signal system will require a little time.

Judge Zane—Commence as soon as you can conveniently.

Hon. F. S. Richards—We shall want the use of the crossing, of course, until we can do it.

Judge Zane—Build the other part of your road.

Judge Hoge—I wish to take an exception to the ruling of the court on the part of the city.

Judge Zane—Let the exception be noted.

LOGAN LETTER.

LOGAN, May 11.—Dr. Ormsby, with the assistance of Drs. L. W. and M. W. Snow, performed an operation on Mr. Ephraim Shaw, of Wellsville, for the removal of a large tumor that was growing on the side of his neck. The operation was critical, but unless it had been performed death was certain. The operation was entirely successful. The doctor performed a similar operation upon the person of Wm. Mendenhall; that also was successful.

The Rich Cache Mining company held a meeting on Monday afternoon. It was determined to resume work on their property and commence operations at an early date.