

THE UTAH HOMICIDE.

Way Pardon Dods, killed Will...

Discharged.

The hearing of the charge of embezzlement against A. T. Carlson, took place before Commissioner Norrell yesterday, and resulted in the accused being discharged.

Pardoned.

Last evening Governor West granted a pardon to J. H. Riddle, who was sentenced last March to the penitentiary for stealing a horse. The pardon was recommended by Judge Boreman, before whom Mr. Riddle had been tried.

Third District Court.

Proceedings before Judge Sandford today.

At King vs. U. P. R. Co., 30 days time allowed defendant to file statement on motion for new trial.

James W. Carrigan vs. R. G. McNeill et al., defendants allowed 30 days to file statement on motion for new trial.

Charles Miller et al. vs. Frank Miller et al., judgment for plaintiff for \$300.

Wm. H. Coshell was admitted to citizenship.

David P. Cook vs. Margaret Vanderbeck trial before court; submitted and taken under advisement.

Echo & Park City R. R. Co. vs. W. L. Snyder, administrator, et al.; continued by consent.

Utah & Wyoming Implement Co. vs. Thomas Langtree; on trial before the court.

George Thacker vs. Emil Hase et al.; postponed to Jan. 6.

Ingenious Invention.

Recently Mr. Prubs, foreman of the Co-operative Furniture Company's shop, in this city, obtained a patent on a bed lounge of his invention. By all judges it is that has from the east who have examined the contrivance it is pronounced the most ingenious, useful and complete ever produced. It is made of a box, to which the back and seat are attached by strap hinges. When the place of furniture is needed a lounge the most restful in the box. When utilized as a bed the seat is swung out of its position and turned reverse side up. Then the back is turned from side down into the box, making a double spring mattress. Mr. Prubs has already been offered \$500 for the privilege of making the lounge in Chicago, but has declined. We are pleased to see the development of the inventive faculty in our community, and congratulate Mr. Prubs on his success.

The D. A. & M. Society.

The financial statement of the D. A. & M. Society in regard to the late Territorial Fair, is now ready to be submitted to the board of directors. It shows the gratifying result that the Fair receipts were sufficient to cover all of the expenses.

Most of the diplomas and medals have been distributed to the prize winners, though a few remain in the hands of Secretary Wells. The medals were engraved by John Held, and the work is very nicely done. They are enclosed in neat boxes made by Thomas Sligh.

The diplomas are of the same design as those used at the Fair in 1894, and made by W. C. Morris, only they have been reduced to a more convenient size. Of these, it is said by the lithographic house where they were printed, that they are the prettiest in design of any published in any part of the country, and the most careful art writer will admit that they are hard to beat.

The articles of incorporation for the St. Louis, Quincy, and Sioux City Railroad Company have been filed. The capital stock is \$1,000,000. The board of directors is as follows: J. H. Stearns, New York City; J. A. Scott, J. W. Harrison, J. C. Richardson, J. H. Holmes and John C. Smith, St. Louis, Mo.; J. M. Bishop, Quincy, Ill.; and J. B. Moore and James F. Heavey of Sioux City.

Railway Light.

Articles of incorporation for the St. Louis, Quincy, and Sioux City Railroad Company have been filed. The capital stock is \$1,000,000. The board of directors is as follows: J. H. Stearns, New York City; J. A. Scott, J. W. Harrison, J. C. Richardson, J. H. Holmes and John C. Smith, St. Louis, Mo.; J. M. Bishop, Quincy, Ill.; and J. B. Moore and James F. Heavey of Sioux City.

Ottawa, Ont., Nov. 20.—A conductor on the Canadian Pacific railway, named James Van Alstine, has fallen heir to an estate in Scotland valued at over \$1,000,000, through the death of a near relative. He leaves in a few days, accompanied by his wife and a family lawyer, for Scotland, to attend to his interests.

Leadville, Colo., Dec. 1.—Last night at Crystal Lake station, W. G. Watson, a brakeman on the Midland railroad, met with an unfortunate accident. He was making a flying switch, and as the wheels passed over his right foot, crushing it horribly.

A report is prevalent in railroad circles that the Santa Fe will put on a through train from Los Angeles to Los Angeles, Calif., as a rival to the Union Pacific "oriental limited." Negotiations are said to be in progress between the road and George M. Fullam for such a train, and it is to be the most elegant train of the Union Pacific. It will be steam heated and lighted by electricity.

George O'Connor of Leadville, Colorado had been on a protracted spree for the past week, and early on Thanksgiving morning he returned home intoxicated. When he reached his bedroom and was nicely tucked under the blankets, he awoke, his wife approaching, she ailing with a cold, and he was told to get up. He was so drunk that he was unable to do so, and he was carried to the hospital, where he died.

It is said that Vice President Holcomb, of the Union Pacific, has created a considerable stir among the officials and employees of that road at Omaha, and it is understood that Mr. Holcomb will "take the line" to the territory of retirement and reform and "go to it" several times. In fact it is stated that he is already preparing to leave the force at headquarters, as well as cutting down the salaries of those who remain. There are many other things have made him rather unpopular at Union Pacific headquarters.

Speaking of the new vestibule train of the Central and Union Pacific, which will be started December 15, the man, who made the arrangements for the new service, says that it is expected to make a trip between Omaha and San Francisco in sixty hours, although it has not been fully determined that this can be done. The construction of the train has, he says, been the subject of much thought. A few things which have not yet been mentioned will be the large water tanks below the floor, in which will be under air pressure, which will force it through the pipes supplying the lavatory and toilet rooms and also giving a sufficient head to throw by means of a hose a stream of water to extinguish any fire. By increasing the speed and decreasing the number of stops it is expected to save fully one day between New York and San Francisco.

The Anderson, Sign Writing Company are painting some very attractive holiday notices, in rich colors and disposing of them cheaply. Those who want anything of that kind cannot do better than get the home made article.

Proceedings Before Judge Henderson and Judge.

At PROVO.

The following cases came up before Judge Judge yesterday:

Anna Marks vs. W. H. Culmer et al.; motion for a new trial to be filed January 10; stay of proceedings ordered.

Anna Marks vs. John T. Sullivan; ten days stay of proceedings ordered.

Jane Richards vs. Isaac Hillman; order granting a decree of divorce.

Aan Harris vs. John Harris; leave to file an amended complaint granted.

Hans Olsen was admitted to citizenship.

The Co-operative Wagon and Machine Co. vs. E. P. Bean et al.; dismissed.

AT OGDEN.

In Judge Henderson's division of the court the following business was transacted:

Lorenz W. Ford and Andrew Louis were admitted to citizenship.

In the case of Ogden City vs. Julius Poppe, in which defendant was convicted of breaking the city ordinance against fast driving, he was given until December 10th to file and serve a bill of exceptions.

In the case of the United States vs. M. B. Wheelwright; unlawful cohabitation; a demurrer was filed and overruled. Defendant excepted.

The case of the United States vs. James Wray; unlawful cohabitation, was placed on file. At the close of the testimony the jury gave a verdict of not guilty, by instructions from the court.

The case of the People, ex. vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

FIRST DISTRICT COURT.

Proceedings Before Judge Henderson and Judge.

AT PROVO.

The following cases came up before Judge Judge yesterday:

Anna Marks vs. W. H. Culmer et al.; motion for a new trial to be filed January 10; stay of proceedings ordered.

Anna Marks vs. John T. Sullivan; ten days stay of proceedings ordered.

Jane Richards vs. Isaac Hillman; order granting a decree of divorce.

Aan Harris vs. John Harris; leave to file an amended complaint granted.

Hans Olsen was admitted to citizenship.

The Co-operative Wagon and Machine Co. vs. E. P. Bean et al.; dismissed.

AT OGDEN.

In Judge Henderson's division of the court the following business was transacted:

Lorenz W. Ford and Andrew Louis were admitted to citizenship.

In the case of Ogden City vs. Julius Poppe, in which defendant was convicted of breaking the city ordinance against fast driving, he was given until December 10th to file and serve a bill of exceptions.

In the case of the United States vs. M. B. Wheelwright; unlawful cohabitation; a demurrer was filed and overruled. Defendant excepted.

The case of the United States vs. James Wray; unlawful cohabitation, was placed on file. At the close of the testimony the jury gave a verdict of not guilty, by instructions from the court.

The case of the People, ex. vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

The case of the People vs. J. B. Carrington, was placed on trial. The defendant was accused of having made exorbitant charges in his official business as U. S. Commissioner. The evidence, however, proved that the charges were not excessive.

OBITUARY.

LEIGHMAN, John Leighman, sen., or as he was familiarly called, Father Leighman, departed this life at Whiting, Cache County, Utah, on Wednesday, November 21st, 1895, at 9:40 a. m., after six days' illness. Father Leighman was the oldest child of John Leighman and Jean Campbell; he was born at Salem, N. H., September 18, 1817, and therefore 78 years 2 months and 3 days old. When about 7 years of age his parents moved to Keosauqua, Iowa, eventually taking up their residence at Johnston, at which place he attained his manhood, and there married Jean Allan in the year 1838. His occupation was that of a cotton spinner, and being a natural mechanic he obtained employment in that line of business. From early childhood he was inclined to religious and was a devout and firm believer in the Holy Scriptures and in the divine mission of the Savior. His parents being Methodists, he was consequently what partial to that denomination, although never attaching himself to that body, nor to any other sect after his marriage, which he became a member of what is termed the United Church of Scotland, and in which he differed materially from the Presbyterian Church only in the matter of the selection of their ministers.

For about eight years he continued with the United Church, but becoming dissatisfied with its doctrines, began an examination of the doctrines of the more liberal churches, and in 1870 he was baptized