

that the amounts drawn on August 12th were to cover amounts due two other men whose names had been omitted on the payroll of July 29th. Affidavits were made showing where such work was done and offered as proof by the men who received the money. The watermaster was not informed of this transaction by his deputy until after this investigation was ordered.

In further examining the payrolls and interrogating the men we discovered two instances where men were on the payrolls in other than their own names and signed the rolls in such names.

One of these makes affidavit to having worked and was entitled to the amount overdrawn by another on August 12th. The same man has drawn his pay in July under another name.

The pay roll of July 29th shows full time of twelve days at \$2 per day for one man who makes affidavit that he did not work at all during that time, the amount, \$24, being paid to the deputy watermaster on an order purporting to be from the man whose name is signed to the pay roll by the deputy per himself.

All pay rolls are certified by the watermaster as correct.

We further learned that the deputy was not in the habit of using proper time books and could produce none of any kind before your committee, such names and amounts due being given the watermaster to make up his pay-roll from such memoranda as he alone can explain.

Your committee has spent much time and incurred considerable expense in prosecuting this investigation, and has held several meetings in order to get the necessary information, and which has prevented us from making this report earlier.

We have instructed the watermaster to dismiss the deputy and withhold all pay until the further order of the council.

In view of the foregoing facts your committee would recommend that any employee issuing an order on the paymaster for wages due shall be requested to satisfy the paymaster as to his identity before such order is paid.

We further submit the following resolution and recommend that it be adopted.

Resolved, That the finance committee be and they are hereby authorized to examine into the present system of keeping time in all the departments, and that they submit to the Council such recommendations as will in their judgment prevent the possibility of irregularities in making up payrolls, and to report to the Council what books, records, etc., should be required to be kept in the watermaster's office.

The minority report from Mr. Hardy reads:

I cannot fully agree with the majority report of the committee appointed to investigate the alleged dishonest conduct of Deputy Watermaster Hughes. The evidence obtained shows that Hughes induced workmen employed under him to obtain money from the city for work which was never done by them. The money thus obtained was handed over and pocketed by Hughes.

While there is much to palliate the conduct of the men used as tools by the said Hughes, this is not so in his case. He has committed a grave crime, and it is due to the people that he be prosecuted. If men who commit such offenses are allowed to escape the operation of the law it will encourage others to pursue a similar course.

I recommend that in the interests of law and official honesty an example be made of this case by the proper steps being taken for the prosecution of Hughes.

As to the watermaster's department and the manner of conducting the same, there is a lack of business shown in the loose manner of conducting the same. No

records are kept for water rights acquired by the city and the different rights citizens have against the city; also, the loose manner in which the different watermasters' payrolls are presented. The watermaster does not know how many men are hired in the different precincts, and is unable to tell until the payroll is presented at the end of every week or two weeks, as the case may be, and evidently does not know whether they are employees of the city or not, as the evidence in the Hughes case proves.

It was near midnight last night when the above reports were read by the recorder in the council meeting. The spectators who had relapsed into a somnambulist state were more than aroused from their drowsiness by the discussion that followed.

Karrick moved the adoption of the majority report.

Rich immediately afterwards took the floor and moved the adoption of the minority report.

Hardy spoke earnestly in favor of the adoption of his report. He declared that the loose and questionable way of doing business that characterized Mr. Harvey's office was a disgrace and a crime and should be stopped. Harvey, the alleged watermaster, excused himself on the ground that he didn't know of the irregularities which existed in his department, especially as to the actions of this man Hughes. That was the trouble. The city had a watermaster that didn't know anything—when he didn't want to and when it was not to his advantage. He was simply a slacker in office, and a very expensive one at that, and the sooner the city discovered that fact the better it would be off.

Karrick, in his quiet and unassuming way, took up the cudgel of defense for Mr. Harvey and declared that it was absolutely true that the watermaster knew nothing of the conduct of his deputies. "Why," he said, "Mr. Harvey was more surprised than any other man when it was learned that tricks and crooked work were being indulged in." The censure that had been given Mr. Harvey was premature and uncalled for. When Mr. Harvey had learned of the true nature of things he discharged Hughes.

Beardsley stated that he had signed the majority report, but that he also favored the minority report. The statements contained therein were correct. He believed that Mr. Harvey knew nothing of the dishonest work of Hughes, but there was no denying the fact that Mr. Harvey conducted the affairs of his office in a very careless manner.

Mr. Evans concurred with what Mr. Beardsley had said.

Rich asked Mr. Evans, chairman of the committee on Irrigation if it were not a fact that affidavits had been drawn up in Mr. Harvey's and City Attorney Hoge's handwriting exonerating Hughes; also if it were not true that Mr. Harvey kept no books or records in his office and that the only memoranda he kept of the many minute affairs of his office was what he carried under his hat.

Mr. Evans admitted that this deplorable state of affairs was correct.

Rich also wanted to know if it were not true that Mr. Harvey did not know who were employed in his office and the only way that he could tell was by referring to the city pay rolls.

A painful and ominous flash of silence intimated that this also was correct. As to the insulting letter recently sent into the Council by Watermaster Harvey, Rich declared he knew whereof he spoke when he stated Mr. Harvey had said that the councilmen were getting entirely too fresh and that he and other heads of departments would soon take occasion to call them down. Many things in that department were carried on in a strange manner. The deputy watermaster of the Third precinct had not been in the Territory long enough to register and vote without violating the law and running chances of prosecution. Two months ago the Council had passed a resolution authorizing the watermaster to clean out City Creek from Sixth to Eighth West streets. For four weeks the resolution was in the hands of the watermaster but he failed to act. It was then turned over to the street department, but Mr. Harvey showed his stubbornness by refusing to turn the water out of the creek so that the work could be done. That kind of business must be stopped. Rich concluded his remarks by saying that he could call the matter up at the next meeting of the Council.

Folland stated that Hughes was an all around rogue, entirely without the sense of honesty or manhood. He was not in favor of prosecution without just and sufficient cause, but here was a man that had proven himself a fraud and a forger and should be dealt with accordingly.

Lawson said there was every evidence that the wrongs of Hughes had been winked at by officials whose duty it was to ferret out crime and prevent its commission.

More discussion followed and the majority report was adopted.

#### THE AFFIDAVITS

referred to do not seem to be calculated by those who have them in possession to be made public. They were made by employees and ex-employees of the city before the committee on irrigation, and show that a general system of forgery has been carried on.

A News reporter asked to be allowed to see them today but was informed that Mr. Hardy had them. This rumor was incorrect as they seem to have been turned over to Mr. Evans. That gentleman when called upon stated that he had given them to the mayor and he did not see what good could be accomplished in making their contents public.

It is reported that a warrant will probably be issued for Hughes' arrest tomorrow and that he will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Said several councilmen today, "he is guilty beyond a shadow of doubt and must be dealt with."

A LONDON writer, who, it is fair to state in advance, was one of the staff of *Truth*, thus inventories the articles left on the sidewalk by a lady who lifted her train to avoid a puddle: Two cigar ends, nine cigarette ends, a portion of a pork pie, four toothpicks, two hairpins, one stem of a clay pipe, three fragments of orange peel, one slice of cat's meat, half the sole of a boot, one plug of tobacco (chewed), straw, mud, scraps of paper and miscellaneous street refuse ad lib.