but it can be shown and maintained only by professional skill and vigor, to secure which to the plaintiff pecuniary means are needed."

This statement of the rule fully meets my approval, and is supported by authorities.

It then affirms the evidence, the plaintiff has satisfied the court that she is acting in good faith in her claim of marriage, and that there is a fair probability of her being able to give the lie to the defendant's claim. Clearly, it is the duty of the court to direct that she have attorney and suit money. Before proceeding to consider the merits, it is necessary to determine what constitutes a marriage, and the evidence thereof, under the law of Utah. In 1887 Congress by law provided a very marriage ceremony to be certified by a certificate signed by the parties and the officer or person celebrating the marriage, and a record of the same thereof, which was declared (with the certificate) to be prima facie evidence thereof. It was also enacted that nothing in the act should be held to prevent the proof of marriages by any other evidence then legally admissible for the purpose. It is conceded this legislation is directory only, and therefore has no bearing upon the case in hand. In March, 1888, the Territorial Legislature passed a law regulating marriage. (L. L. Vol. 2, 253.) Marriage is prohibited and declared void, "when not so solemnized by an authorized person, except when solemnized by the very persons living and cohabiting as husband and wife." Section 2 simply designates the persons who may solemnize marriage, and if section 7 is only the section referred to in the exception above stated, the contention is meaningless and without point, since the Legislature is made to say, that a marriage is void when not solemnized by an authorized person, except when solemnized by the very persons living and being authorized. Section 8, however, is as follows:

"No marriage solemnized before any person professing to have authority therefor shall be invalid for want of such authority, if it is consummated with the belief of the parties, or either of them, that the person had authority, and that they have been lawfully married." The exception in paragraph 3 of section 2 quoted above, applies clearly to section 8, and the general 7 empt. yes in section 2 is manifestly intended for 8, and in the construction of the act must be so read.

It is contended by counsel for defendant that the exception previsioned for in section 8 includes cases, and those only, where the person assuming to celebrate marriage usually possess to have authority. In other words, that such person must say something indicating that he really is what he appears to be, in order to pretend to have authority. The application of this construction, if sustained, will hereafter appear. I do not so interpret the language of the statute. In enacting this section, the Legislature plainly intended to protect innocent persons against consequences resulting from the acts of persons who in fact were unauthorized, but who professed or pretended to have authority. A person deceived by the appearance of assurance of authority, manifested by act or conduct, and thus induced to believe the assumed authority existed, is clearly within the protection of the statute, as much so as if the belief was induced by oral statements.

Among the definitions of the verb "profess" is, "to set up a claim to," "to make pretense to," "to put on or present an appearance of." I think "professing" in the statute is equivalent to "pretending," and in fact it is quite immaterial how the profession or pretense is made, whether by word, act or conduct.

The plaintiff alleges a marriage with the defendant in this city and county on the 16th day of October, A. D. 1889. It appears from the evidence that the plaintiff's mother, Mrs. Berghout, a widow, came to this Territory from Sweden in 1879 or 1880, with the two daughters, the plaintiff and an older sister who had been married, but was at the time of the beginning of this history divorced or at least was living apart from her husband and with her mother. The family were in reduced circumstances, and the mother earned a livelihood as a dressmaker. In the fall of 1887, the defendant made the acquaintance of the plaintiff, then a young girl of fifteen years, and during the year following paid her some attention, taking her out to buggy riding and visiting her at her home.

The plaintiff testifies (corroborated by her mother) that during this time he gave her a diamond ring and a gold watch. This he denies, but admits giving her a seal skin cap and boa on Christmas, 1888, and also presents to her mother and sister. Plaintiff's mother testifies that the association and intimacy became so pronounced that in the fall of 1888 she questioned the defendant as to his intentions toward plaintiff, stating that her daughter was young, was not educated nor accustomed to housework, and in her judgment would not make a suitable wife for a man of defendant's means and position. Defendant's family, made up of age and engaged in real estate and brokerage business, Mrs. Berghout states that defendant told her that his intentions were good, and that he was fond of her daughter, that she was the only girl he liked, and if he married anyone, he would marry her. On or about the 16th of October, 1889, and before the alleged marriage of that date, defendant brought (or sent) some furniture to the house for the use of the family. Prior to this the Berghouts had moved into a house outlined and owned in part by defendant, and which he wished to furnish it completely, they occupied actually three or four rooms. Two rooms were left unfurnished and unoccupied, and defendant's furniture was placed in these rooms. Plaintiff testifies that she became much attached to the defendant, and that he proposed marriage to her in the summer of 1889. Her mother says that they appeared very much attached to each other, and that her daughter was very much, if not wholly, under the influence of defendant. That her apprehensions were allayed by the representations of defendant as above stated, and that, having confidence in him, she was no longer anxious concerning their intimacy. On the evening of October 16, 1889, the day before her fifteenth birthday, according to the plaintiff, about five o'clock in the afternoon, the parties went out driving, and upon returning went to a restaurant for supper. After supper they walked about a little, when the defendant renewed his proposal of marriage, suggesting that they be married at once. She assented, and they went to plaintiff's office, consisting of a front and back room, the latter being fitted with carpet, table, chairs and lounge. Defendant went out and soon returned with two men, unknown to plaintiff, but describes one to her as being one tall, light complexioned man, and one shorter, dark complexioned man, both fairly well dressed. Defendant had some conversation with these men, or one of them, relative to carrying the parties, but they seemed to hesitate, as plaintiff says, finally, however, consenting, when the ceremony was apparently performed.

Plaintiff and defendant stood up before one of these men and the Episcopal marriage service was read, and the defendant then and there promised to take the plaintiff as his wife, and the plaintiff then and there promised to take the defendant as her husband. The men then went away, and the marriage was then and there to that room consummated. Before the ceremony took, defendant had paid the men, who, as she thought then, was a justice of the peace, and she believed she was married to defendant.

All this testimony is fully contradicted by defendant, but he does not deny the occurrence as having taken place that afternoon and evening prior to his leaving his office and going away. Plaintiff states that after the marriage and its consummation defendant sent out for a carriage, and they proceeded to her mother's house about 10 o'clock, finding her in bed. The mother testifies to their coming about an hour or a half hour, to her daughter's coming into her bedroom, and to her being struck by a disappointed change in the plaintiff's appearance and demeanor. Plaintiff testifies that defendant induced her to consent to a secret marriage, and to the keeping of the same secret, by representing that he had been married, but was divorced, and had promised his mother, who was an aged woman in precarious health, that he would not remarry so soon. That after the 16th of October, 1889, she occupied rooms that had been furnished by defendant, and that he visited her in these rooms, sometimes staying with her as her husband, but never stayed all night. In two or three months, as stated by plaintiff and her mother, the mother ascertained from plaintiff that she was enceinte, and drew from plaintiff the story of the secret marriage and subsequent seduction. Thereupon the mother and plaintiff spoke to defendant about it, when he admitted the fact of the marriage, and excused the secrecy by stating that he had promised his mother not to marry again, and he was afraid if she knew of the marriage, she would not stay in the house, or would make it uncomfortable for him. After talk, according to the plaintiff and her mother, and until the family left for Denver in March or April of the next year, the defendant visited the house and associated with plaintiff as his wife within the limit, although not openly.

The evidence throughout substantially this testimony, but affirms that the association commenced in about September, 1888, in this way: Plaintiff was written to, has a note or notes making an appointment at the house of a mutual acquaintance, in one of which she could not recall, plaintiff was without him with an imperious business market. Thereupon defendant having offered the appointment went to plaintiff's house, and asked her what she meant. Plaintiff said they were poor, and she was tired of living in that way, and if she could find a good man she could take care of him, she would live with him. That she liked defendant, and if he wished her, would be his girl. Defendant asked her if she knew what it meant, and told her that he would not accept such a proposition from a virtuous girl, whereupon plaintiff told him she was no longer virtuous. Thereupon defendant had intercourse with plaintiff. He further states, that when the mother questioned him about his intentions, he states the facts (as related above) to her in the presence of her daughter, who assented to his version of their intimacy. In March, the family left, moves to Denver, the defendant giving them $600, and thereafter from time to time sent contributions until June or July, A. D. 1890, defendant supplied plaintiff with money, aggregating the sum of $5,000.

The foregoing is all the evidence bearing directly upon the sexual ceremony of marriage. The parties are in almost conflict as to this important fact. If the testimony of defendant be true, there was no marriage, and this motion, with the suit, must fail. If the testimony of the plaintiff be true, the question is whether the facts proven by her are sufficient to establish a marriage under our law. I am clearly of the opinion that they do. The marriage ceremony was performed by some person who professed (or pretended) to have authority to celebrate marriages. That this person did not actually possess the authority, failing to the plaintiff makes no difference here. He undertook to exercise it, and under the circumstances he was the ostensible professor and possessor of authority.

The alleged impotentiality of plaintiff's story was urged upon the court, and it seemed to be assumed that such a transaction as stated by her could not have taken place. But I am not prepared to accept this. Very many similar occurrences have taken place, we all know. The story of plaintiff does not strike me as being improbable as that of defendant. Either one that may be, upon this motion I am not called to decide this question finally. The effect of the evidence of defendant and one of the parties remains to be considered. As related by plaintiff and her witnesses, the seduction was continued until January, 1890. In May, 1890, defendant visited plaintiff at Denver, and August 6th the boy was born, and a few days later defendant was found in the rooms of plaintiff footing the bills and attentive to her. He was introduced to Dr. Ross as plaintiff's husband, and the birth of a child was made out in Mrs. L. E. Jay.

In July, 1890, plaintiff came to this city and remained some weeks, then went to Farmington, her home in Brigham, where they remained several days. He paid all her expenses, and they occupied privately two rooms in the house. In August, 1891, plaintiff, with her child and mother, went to Stockton, Utah, and took rooms with Lewis at the Stockton House, kept by a Mrs. Fitzgerald, who was a witness in this case. Defendant went there, was introduced and known as plaintiff's husband and remained in her rooms as a husband and head of a family usually does. He occupied the same rooms with plaintiff, who was known as Mrs. E. Taylor, with a husband at least in the Salt Lake City, he sat with the family at the table, and walked out in public with plaintiff and child.

Mrs. Fowers testifies that he spoke of taking his wife to Mrs. Kinney, referring to plaintiff, to Pinsburg at one party, Mrs. Fowers, Mrs. Kinney, Mrs. Fowers and her daughter, all testify positively that defendant passed as plaintiff's husband on example for friends, introduced the woman of apparently respectable people, ladies and gentlemen, who were at the hotel at the time and not those parties, are given with distinctness and candor, and he these alleged facts may be easily verified or disproved. Upon leaving Manton, defendant took plaintiff with him to Colorado Springs, and spent some hours there, going to Denver in the evening with plaintiff and her sister. He entertained the ladies at dinner at the Alsacy, and returned home to their home, but brought plaintiff back to the hotel, where she remained all night, he staying with her in her room, as she says.

It is unnecessary to pursue the details of the story further. In July or August, 1892, plaintiff was again in this city, with her registering as Mrs. Kinney, at the Walker House. Upon other occasions defendant visited her at Denver, each time staying with her as her husband—the place provided for her by defendant. Upon all occasions they bedded together as man and wife.

Defendant makes any sexual relations after March, 1893, when the family left Salt Lake City. It is not necessary for me to pass upon the credibility of his story. He also introduces a lot of evidence about alleged other intercourse claimed to have been written to him by plaintiff, and in some instances written or hinted at in his letters and at their meetings, and statements of their child. These letters are not admitted by plaintiff, but are insisted upon by defendant as having been received from plaintiff. The plaintiff testifies, however, that in 1893, just when, whether before or after the birth of the child she does not remember, the defendant in a moment of irritation told her she was not his wife. That for the twenty-six years she had been sacrificed, and she thought had no alienating effect upon him. That at times she was not responsible for what she said or did. In the above, she denies, or at least, qualifies, the statement. Afterwards she states, defendant informed her that he did not mean what he said, and that he would make her his wife.

These letters are not pieces of evidence to be considered and weighed with all other evidence, in the light of the circumstances. If the plaintiff's account is true, the statements in some of these letters, so sufficiently explained away by defendant's counsel, are satisfactorily explained. We may well imagine the effect upon a young and fleeting woman and mother of a claim made by the father of her child, that she was not his wife, when she had supposed herself to be lawfully married. If not his wife what would she be, but mistress, and the boy, illegitimate, and motherly instinct would impel her to implore the man she believed her betrayed her, to marry her. These statements are strongly corroborative of plaintiff's story, and are properly to be considered upon the final hearing.

In addition to the evidence referred to, there is an admission of the relationship claimed by the witness Hansen. Mr. Hansen, who is a reporter on a daily newspaper, testifies that about two years ago he informed the defendant for his paper, and asked him concerning a claim made by plaintiff that she was defendant's wife. He stated that he said, plaintiff was or had been his wife, but was not now. This is denied by the defendant who has witnesses to impeach, who is downright perjury, and perhaps by himself. The fact that there are other admissions of defendant testified to by apparently reputable witnesses which certainly tend to give credence to Mr. Hansen's story. He is moreover, so far as appears, quite disinterested, and to the best knowledge of the court, the reputation in this community for probity and credibility. Now what effect is to be given to all these admissions, whether they are supported by evidence apparently credible. It is suggested that they do not tend to prove a legal marriage, but a marriage in fact, and upon that and on the complaint, I do not concur with this. A marriage may be proved—even in criminal cases—by the admission of the party, and whether the admission of the fact of marriage is to be taken as an admission of lawful marriage in accordance with the laws of the country where solemnized, is to be determined by the jury or court which tries the fact.

U. S. vs. Miles, 103 U. S. 304.

But admissions I refer to the conduct and acts of defendant touching his apparent relations to plaintiff. These cannot prove a lawful marriage, and certainly are corroborative of plaintiff's testimony of the marriage. Admissions, verbal or by conduct, do not constitute marriage, but they are evidence of the fact, and sometimes, particularly if deliberately made and precisely identified, affect most salutary purposes. The court certainly cannot ignore this evidence.

Upon the whole I am of the opinion that the plaintiff has made out her case sufficiently for the purpose of this motion, and is entitled to allowance that the sum of $50 per month is necessary for the support of plaintiff and child, beginning with the 16th day of August, 1895, the return day of the order to show cause, that $75 is now necessary as suit money, and $200 is now necessary and reasonable as counsel fees.

The order of the court is that within twenty days from entry hereof, the defendant do pay to the clerk as suit money for the use of plaintiff, $75, also for the use of plaintiff's counsel, $200; that on the first day of October, and on the first day of each succeeding month, defendant pay to the clerk of the court as temporary alimony for plaintiff the sum of $50, and that defendant do within ten days, pay the further sum of $50, as alimony for September from the date of the return day of the order to show cause.

Let an order be drawn accordingly, with leave to plaintiff to make additional application if her necessities require it.

IN THE STOCK MARKETS.

Reports of Sheep and Cattle For the Past Week—General Comments

Last week's sheep report as issued by Abbot Pratt & Co., Chicago Live Stock and commission merchants, gives the following information:

Receipts of sheep so far this week, 78,000, some 4,000 less than last week. Market ruled steady on sheep. Receipts run largely to western lambs, which sold lower.

The course to the western lambs selling at eight lambs weighing 58 to 61 sold at $3 to $3.75.

Wethers sold sheep selling around $3. Bulk $2.75 to $3.15.

Prospect for next week fair receipts and steady prices, with a favorable market.

Ultimate Drovers' Journal: Receipts for the week so far now stand with last show a gain of 8,000 cattle, 8,000 hogs and a decrease of 2,000 sheep. As a period with a year ago there is a decrease of 10,000 cattle, a gain of 30,000 hogs and no change in sheep. The cattle market was "wild," lately leaves selling 25@30c lower than Monday. Hogs ro-- 5@10c higher.

The sheep market was generally steady.

The big corn crop alone won't make plenty of hogs.

Three-fourths of the sheep coming are on the "neutral and between" order.

The eastern states are taking an unusually small share of young cattle this fall being 1 to 40 percent. That will leave the most that should clear for western feeders.

Texas cattle feeders have gotten over their reverses, seem to get hold of cattle almost regardless of price, and the state will consequently have a great deal more feed than will be used.

This is the time of year when the western cattle move the light of way in the markets. They supply everything heaven sending cattle and the experience and canning new and fancy stayed before.

There is an unusual amount of sickness among young pigs in Illinois, Iowa and Missouri. For reasons not entirely accounted for, so many thousands of young pigs being put suddenly, not many more are being disposed of for fear of cholera, and those that are left are in state of affairs the summer packing season, having a decrease so far from the very light season last year, of 845,000 hogs. It is also true that the hog and provision bears were organizing entirely too hard for their own future welfare. There is no part of this country where there is an unusual number of hogs and there are large areas where the supply is far below the average.

It requires about 9,000 cattle, 20,000 calves and 25,000 sheep per week to supply the local trade of Paris. Not stock are slaughtered there for shipment except to environments like Rouen, St. Denis and Sevres. The French, like the English, are decidedly slow to take up with new improvements, especially if they originated in America, and so the refrigerator system can not yet be adopted, to admit the demand for immediate consumption regulates the condition of the market, for fresh meat can be kept only a few days at the longest. However, the French people as a rule are not averse to eating meat slightly tainted. They say it makes the meat tender, but Americans as a class are willing to accept their word for it.

Priesthood Meeting Postponed.

As the general semi-annual Conference of the Church will be in session next Saturday, the 5th inst., the Priesthood meeting of the Salt Lake Stake of Zion is postponed until Saturday, Nov. 2nd.

ANGUS M. CANNON,
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR,
CHARLES W. PENROSE,
Presidency of Salt Lake Stake of Zion.

SALT LAKE CITY, Sept. 30, 1895.

Notice to Tabernacle Choir.

The Denver chorus will come, arriving Wednesday. Tabernacle choir members will meet at Assembly Hall Tuesday night, at half-past eight, to rehearse and make arrangements to entertain the visitors; also to receive admission tickets.

EVAN STEPHENS.

Woman's Press Club.

The Woman's Press club will meet at the office of Dr. Ella R. Snipp, in East Temple street, at 8 o'clock this evening.

Samoan Sociable.

On Saturday, October 5th, a Samoan sociable will be given at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. W. O. Lee, at Hunter, Davis county. The train leaves the city at 8:30 p. m., returning leaves residence at 11:30 p. m. Neat invitations have been issued to Samoan acquaintances and their friends, the invitations being partly in the Samoan language. Those who attend are sure to have an enjoyable time.

Primary Officers.

The meeting of the Stake officers of the Primary Associations will be held at the residence of C. R. Felt, 155 north East Temple street, on Friday, immediately at the close of the afternoon session of Conference.

L. R. FELT, President.
MAY ANDERSON, Sec'y.

CANCER CURED
—AND A—
LIFE SAVED
By the Persistent Use of
Ayer's Sarsaparilla

"I was troubled for years with a sore on my knee, which several physicians, who treated me, called a cancer, assuring me that nothing could be done to save my life. As a last resort, I was induced to try Ayer's Sarsaparilla, and, after taking a number of bottles, the sore began to disappear and my general health improved. I persisted in the treatment, until the sore was entirely healed. Since then, I use Ayer's Sarsaparilla occasionally as a tonic and blood-purifier, and, indeed, it seems as though I could not keep house without it."—Mrs. S. A. Fretas, Bloomfield, Ia.

AYER'S
The Only World's Fair Sarsaparilla.
Ayer's Pills Regulate the Liver.

Tired Women
Find in the blood purifying, building-up qualities of Hood's Sarsaparilla just what they need. Mrs. Ira Griggs of Ennis, Texas, gives her experience below: "I suffered almost death with bad breaks, which developed into a very serious affliction and made a surgical operation necessary. I was completely broken down, had numerous boils, and when I commenced taking Hood's Sarsaparilla I weighed only 112 pounds. Now I weigh over 125 pounds and am in better health than for the past fifteen years. Formerly I was troubled with eruptions; now my skin is clear. I can truly say

Hood's Sarsaparilla
Has no equal for poor run-down women. Every one remarks about how well I am looking." Mrs. Ira Griggs.

Hood's Pills act harmoniously with Hood's Sarsaparilla. 25c.

Rev. John Hall, Jr., of Greenville, Miss., writes: "I have used Ayer's Cherry Pectoral in my family for years, and I do not hesitate to recommend it."

CATARRH
TRY'S CREAM BALM is a positive cure for Catarrh. Ease is instantaneous and a cure follows. Cream Balm is quickly absorbed and gives relief at once.
A possible is applied into each nostril and is agreeable. Price 50 cents at Druggists or by mail; samples, 10 cents. ELY BROTHERS, 56 Warren Street, New York.

OUR WORD FOR IT.
Our Fall Suits are all wool. There's no doubting that any more than there is the woolness of the sheep's fleece. We solicit a careful scrutiny of our stock. Our suits will stand examination or wear triumphantly. They are sight for sight and no mistake was made in the operation. We guarantee to give the best clothing made in the city. Money spent in our establishment is doubly well invested. Nothing pays better dividends than being well dressed, and you can't be well dressed anywhere else so cheaply as at our store.

Strictly One Price.

J. P. Gardner
136-138 MAIN STREET.

J.&P. COATS'
BEST
SIX-CORD
Spool Cotton

ESTABLISHED 1853.
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR.
PIONEER
UNDERTAKER
OF UTAH.
Manufacturer and dealer in all kinds of Metallic Wood and Cloth Covered Coffins and Caskets.
Full line of Coffin Furnishings kept constantly on hand.
Telephone and telegraph orders promptly filled.
Open Day and Night.
Factory and Warerooms No. 250 E. 1st South, 1½ blocks east of Theatre.

Deseret National Bank
U. S. DEPOSITORY
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.
CAPITAL $500,000. - SURPLUS $500,000.
Directors: L. S. Hills, Pres. Moses Thatcher, Vice-Pres. Wm. W. Riter, George Romney, Jas. T. Ellis, John R. Winder, James Sharp, Henry Dinwoodey, D. H. Peery, Frank W. Jennings, John R. Barnes, E. R. Eldredge.
S. P. YOUNG, Cashier.
SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES FOR RENT.

THE STATE BANK OF UTAH,
CORNER MAIN AND SO. TEMPLE Streets, Salt Lake City.
Capital, - - $500,000.
Surplus, - - $50,000.
Heber J. Grant, President.
Wm. S. Preston, Vice-Pres.
Heber M. Wells, Cashier.
DIRECTORS:
Heber J. Grant, Abraham H. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith, Heber M. Wells, Chas. S. Burton, Spencer Clawson, Wm. S. Preston, Thos. R. Farnsworth, Isaac Barton.
COMMERCIAL BANKING
In all its Branches.
Accounts Solicited—Large and Small.
SPECIAL ATTENTION GIVEN TO COUNTRY TRADE.

Wilford Woodruff, President. Geo. M. Cannon, Cashier.
CASH CAPITAL, - - $200,000
CASH SURPLUS, - - $200,000

Zion's Savings Bank & TRUST CO.
No. 1-3 East Temple Street.
Salt Lake City, Utah.
Established 1873. Incorporated 1889.
DIRECTORS:
Wilford Woodruff, President.
Geo. Q. Cannon, Vice-President.
Joseph F. Smith, George Reynolds, Angus M. Cannon, Heber J. Grant, James Jack, Lorenzo Snow, T. G. Webber, Francis M. Lyman, H. B. Clawson, L. John Nuttall, George M. Cannon.
Safety deposit boxes in our burglar proof vault for rent at very low rate.
Open for deposits Saturday night until 8 o'clock.

Wells, Fargo & Co.'s BANK,
SALT LAKE CITY, - UTAH.
Established, 1852.
Buys and sells Exchange, makes Telegraphic Transfers on the principal cities of the United States and Europe, and all points on the Pacific Coast. Issues Letters of Credit available in the principal cities of the world. Special attention given to the selling of Orts and Bullion. Advances made on consignments at lowest rates.
Particular attention given to collections throughout Utah, Nevada and adjoining territories. Accounts solicited.
J. S. DOLL, Cashier.

B. H. SCHETTLER,
WHO DOES A
GENERAL BANKING BUSINESS
At No. 22 Main Street, Opposite the Co-op
And Pays Interest on Deposits.
Desires your accounts.

COMMERCIAL NATIONAL BANK,
Of Salt Lake City.
CAPITAL, $500,000.
—INTEREST PAID ON TIME DEPOSITS—
DIRECTORS.—F. H. Jennings, John R. Park, O. J. Salisbury, Moses G. Tay, Thos. Marshall, W. H. Rowe, George M. Downey, John W. Dick-son, Newell Savage.
JOHN W. DONNELLAN, CASHIER.

WALKER BROS.
Bankers
SUCCESSORS TO THE
UNION NATIONAL BANK
Established 1869.
A GENERAL BANKING BUSINESS TRANSACTED.

T. R. JONES & CO.,
Bankers,
160 MAIN STREET.

THE
Great S. L. & Hot Springs Ry.
NOW OPEN TO FARMINGTON
Depot Third West and South Temple streets. "Mid Valley" to Salt Lake City.
Leave. As Follows. Arrive.
6.30 a.m. 7.00 a.m. 7.30 a.m.
8.30 " 9.00 " 9.30 "
10.30 " 11.00 " 11.30 "
1.30 p.m. 2.00 p.m. 2.30 p.m.
3.30 " 4.00 " 4.30 "
5.30 " 6.00 " 6.30 "
7.30 " 8.00 " 8.30 "
Trains—For Ogden, Hot Springs, Lake Salt Lake, 6.30, 10.30, 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Leave Ogden, 7.30, 9.30, 11.30 a.m., 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Commuters leave Hot Springs, Lake Salt Lake, 6.30, 10.30, 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Leave Ogden, 7.30, 9.30, 11.30 a.m., 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Commuters leave Hot Springs, Lake Salt Lake, 6.30, 10.30, 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Leave Ogden, 7.30, 9.30, 11.30 a.m., 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Trains—For Farmington, Hot Springs, Lake Salt Lake, 6.30, 10.30, 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Leave Ogden, 7.30, 9.30, 11.30 a.m., 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Commuters leave Hot Springs, Lake Salt Lake, 6.30, 10.30, 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Leave Ogden, 7.30, 9.30, 11.30 a.m., 1.30, 3.30, 5.30, 7.30 p.m.
Trains—For Ogden