

action he has taken towards enforcing the ordinance requiring a license to be paid on dogs as requested by this Council some three months ago.

Adopted.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS.

The committee on improvements reported as follows:

"Your committee on improvements, to whom you referred back the attached papers and reports in regard to engaging an architect for the City and County Building, with request that we confer with the county authorities as to the propriety of having entirely new plans prepared, respectfully report that we have consulted with the committee representing the county in this matter, and at a joint meeting held December 27, it was voted to recommend to the City Council and County Court: First, that they proceed to erect the Joint City and County Building on the plans furnished by C. E. Apponyi. Second, that R. Kletting be employed as architect to superintend the construction of said building and to make such changes in the plans and specifications as may be required, provided a contract can be made with Mr. Kletting that will be satisfactory to both parties. After that action of the joint committee, the plans for the building were placed in the hands of Mr. Kletting for examination, with the request that he inform your committee, as soon as possible, as to the terms of a contract under which he would undertake to revise and perfect the plans and specifications, and superintend the construction of the building. He has notified your committee that after a careful examination of the plans he adheres to the main features of his proposition: first, \$2000 for revising and perfecting the plans and specifications; second, 1½ per cent of the cost of the building for superintending the construction of the same, he guaranteeing that it shall not cost over \$300,000. If desired, he will submit the revised plans to Prof. Ware of Columbia College, and obtain his approval of the same and pay \$250 toward the fee charged by Prof. Ware. As to the details of an agreement with him, he only asks that they be made clear and full, so as to bind both parties and leave as little chance as possible for misunderstanding, and thinks those details can be best arranged by the attorney in conference with him and the joint committee. If he is employed, he offers to furnish a bond for any reasonable amount, guaranteeing the city and county against loss from any defect in the plans and specifications, and providing that he shall faithfully and honestly perform his work as architect and superintendent of construction.

Respectfully submitted,
L. E. HALL,
W. P. LYNN."

The following resolutions adopted by the Architects' Association were read:

ARCHITECTS' RESOLUTIONS.

To the Honorable Mayor and City Council, and Selectmen of Salt Lake County:

Gentlemen.—We, the undersigned architects of Salt Lake City, have been informed by competent authority that the former resolutions adopted by us and presented to your committee on joint county and city building, have never been acted upon, and we respectfully request that this matter be considered and action taken there-

on. We believe that we are entitled to some consideration in this matter.

We further understood that preference for the work has been given to one architect, regardless of the rights of the resident architects and taxpayers of this city.

We still further understand direct from the chairman of the building committee that he is not in favor of any open competition in this affair, and states that he is in favor of a certain architect first last and all the time. We are opposed to this, on the ground that one man should not be omnipotent in this matter; again, the favored architect candidly declares that the council as a whole has nothing whatever to do with the matter.

This we consider a step in the wrong direction, as it is not only a great injustice to the architects of this city, but to all taxpayers as well. In a public building the best possible results are obtained by knowing what is wanted, and the only method of securing success in such work is by an open competition whereby many ideas are advanced which will be of benefit to all concerned, whereas if only one plan is taken the results are far from satisfactory.

We further respectfully request that your committee be instructed to confer with our committee and formulate rules, etc., for guidance in the competition for the Joint City and County Building. Therefore, we have adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the best structure possible, both in design and construction, is required for a joint city and county building.

Resolved, That the Joint City and County Committee leave the matter of designing plans to a free and open competition and select the best design with the assistance of experts on such matters.

Resolved, That we architects, citizens and taxpayers of Salt Lake City and county, are entitled to consideration in this matter, and deem it a great injustice if such consideration be not shown us.

Resolved, That we stand ready to appoint a committee of architects to confer with the building committee to formulate some plan for conducting an open competition if desired, and are willing to do this in such a manner that it will be no expense to the city and county.

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to present these resolutions to the honorable mayor, city council, and selectmen of Salt Lake County, Utah.

At the conclusion of the reading of the resolutions Councilman Hall rose to a question of privilege. He said: The imputation hurled at me, as chairman of the committee on public improvements, that I am in favor of Mr. Kletting, first, last and all the time is false. I never made any such statement, and I challenge any man or set of men to prove it.

Architects M. D. Kern and Fred Hale, at this juncture, sprang to their feet, exclaiming, "You made that statement to us."

Councilman Hall—I did not; you are mistaken. I again challenge you to prove it.

Mr. Hale—You made that statement to me.

Mr. Kern—And to me.

Councilman Hall (excitedly)—I deny it; I deny it. You are both mistaken. I never intended to exclude local architects from competition in the proposed new plans for

the joint city and county building, but remember this, Mr. Mayor and gentlemen of the Council, that in conferring with Mr. Kletting with a view to employing him to revise and perfect the Apponyi plans I was acting according to instructions contained in a resolution passed by this Council less than a month ago.

You must also remember that the Apponyi plans have never been rejected; they have been severely criticized, but that is all; until they are rejected, it is folly to throw the matter open to competition. The proposition of Mr. Kletting is a fair one and I see no reason for changing my mind. I have spoken warmly, but I do not wish to bear the entire burden of blame.

Councilman Parsons—In justice to Mr. Hall I will say that sometime since we met in joint session with the local architects and at that meeting it was decided to open up the matter for competition. Mr. Hall was not present.

Councilman Hall—Was it a secret meeting?

Councilman Parsons (warmly)—No, sir, it was not.

Councilman Hall—Was it a caucus?

Councilman Parsons—No, sir, it was not a caucus either; I repeat the local architects were present. I say right here emphatically and openly that Mr. Hall has no right to call this council to account for its action. I am surprised that he should do so. I move the rejection of the report.

Councilman James—I should like to ask Mr. Hall how the vote of the joint committee stood.

Councilman Hall—The vote stood four to one.

Councilman James—The rejection of this report will throw the matter back to where it was many months ago. Competition should have been allowed in the incipency of the matter; to allow it now means a total loss of the \$5500 already expended on the plans. This course, if pursued, will also, without doubt, result in a rupture between the city and county, and the joint building plan thus be defeated. I am in favor of the adoption of the report.

On motion of Councilman Pickard, further action in the matter was deferred until Friday evening next, when a special meeting will be held for further discussion of the subject.

"VARIETY" THEATER LIQUOR LICENSE.

Councilman Pembroke—With reference to the request of Perry & Company, who, at the last session of the council, made application for a liquor license, and were refused, I believe and say that the application was defeated by the city attorney, unwittingly misleading some of the members of the council—two at least—who would have voted in favor of granting the license had it not been that they drew the inference from Colonel Merritt's remarks that he was quoting from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I am now told