

Special Business Notices.

READ estray notice, Moroni District.

READ advertisement of meeting of trustees and stockholders of Castle Valley Coal and Mining Company.

THE Royal Illusionists at the Theatre for the last time this evening.

SAFELY and Certainly that great external remedy, Glenn's Sulphur Soap, removes cutaneous eruptions by opening the pores whose obstruction was the cause of the difficulty. Test and you will endorse it.

ACIDS IN BLACKINGS.—Recent chemical tests have shown Frank Miller's Improved French Blacking to be far ahead of all others for preserving and softening the leather and giving the richest and most durable lustre. Frank Miller, Son & Co's goods recently took the Grand Diploma at the Exhibition in Chili. Their "Crown" Dressing for ladies' and children's shoes, is the favorite in the Eastern States, and should be in every family here.

Fruit Jars and Jelly Tumblers at Little & Roundy's.

THE FAIR.
In honor of the memorable Fourth of July, 1876.

the glorious Birthday of our Nation, the Women's Centennial Territorial Fair will open on the Fourth of July.

1876.
at 12 m., in the "OLD CONSTITUTION" Building, a few doors South of C. R. Savage's Art Gallery.

It will probably continue four weeks, opening at 10 a. m., and closing at 8 p. m.

PRICES OF ADMISSION.

For adults, 25 cts.
Children under 12, 10 cts.

Except on Saturdays, when each admission will be 10 cents.

E. L. SHAW, Pres.

L. A. BERRY, Sec'y.

Water Coolers and Ice Cream Freezers at Little & Roundy's.

Magic of the Month.

Odoriferous SOZODONT renders the mouth enchanting, composed of rare, antiseptic herbs, it imparts whiteness to the teeth, a delicious flower-like aroma to the breath, and preserves intact, from youth to age, the teeth.

MOWING MACHINES.—All those who want to buy a first-class Mowing Machine should by all means call and see W. Anson Woods' improved, at Naylor Bros. These machines are of the lightest draft, are the strongest and cheapest in the market, and can be got on easy terms.

We have also the largest stock of seasoned wagon material in the Territory, as cheap as the cheapest.

ADVERT.—Brother John G. Coltrin is authorized agent for selling the work entitled *Correspondence of Palestine Tourists*, in all of the settlements South of Salt Lake County.

WHAT a beautiful lot of Baby Carriages and so very cheap at Dinwoadie's Furniture Store, 412 1/2.

STONEWARE, Crocks, Churns and Jugs at Little & Roundy's.

RED CANYON COAL.—Still he old reliable \$5.75 per ton at the yard, \$7.50 delivered. NO EXTRA CHARGE FOR DELIVERY in difficult places. Full weight and quality of coal guaranteed. A last and true friend for the rich and poor. Try it one and all. Orders always meet with promptness and care.

ROBERT SMITH, Agent, Office, 65 Main Street.

SILVER Plated Casters from two to twenty dollars at Little & Roundy's.

LYON'S KATHAIRON.—Lyon's Kathairon is an invigorating tonic vegetable preparation, positively free from any mineral or deleterious substances. It is the most delightful of all air dressing—cooling the head, allaying irritation, curing headache and throbbing temples, making the hair strong, fragrant, glossy and obedient to control, so clearly to use that it will not soil the finest fabric, causing the hair to grow luxuriantly and beautifully, removing dandruff and pimples. No man or woman can become bald who will use the Lyon's Kathairon properly.

CASTLE VALLEY COAL & MINING COMPANY.

THESE MI-ANNUAL MEETING OF THE Trustees of the "Castle Valley Coal and Mining Company" will be held in this City at the Deseret National Bank, on Monday, the 10th day of July, at 10 o'clock a. m.

And the Stockholders of said Company will hold their annual meeting at the same place on Wednesday, the 12th day of July, at 10 o'clock a. m.

JOHN TAYLOR, Vice President.

ESTRAY NOTICE.

I HAVE in my possession:

One dark red HEIFER CALF, 9 months old, no marks nor brands visible.

Which if not claimed will be sold at the district found in Moroni, Sanpete Co., July 13th, A. D. 1876, on Thursday, at 2 o'clock p. m.

Moroni City, July 3d.

District Foundkeeper.

Cheapest, Strongest, Best.

Barbed Spiral and Plain Spiral Wrought Iron Fencing. Twice the weight and size of any other. Guaranteed strong proof contract or return. Thoroughly tested, and approved by practical farmers.

Specimens can be seen by calling at this office.

PLANTER'S IRON FENCE CO., 209 N. Sixth Street, St. Louis.

EVENING NEWS.

Thursday, July 6, 1876.

PRICE OF GOLD.

Current daily by Deseret National Bank.

SALT LAKE CITY, July 6, 1876.

Trading at \$100.00; selling at \$100.25.

Local and Other Matters.

Thermometer 91 degrees F. in shade at 1 p. m. to-day. Fine, a few clouds, windy and dusty.

A GOOD MAN DEPARTED.

WE are exceedingly pained to have to announce the demise, at midnight last night, between July 5th and 6th, of Elder David Woolley Evans, photographic reporter for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and for the News, being a member of the editorial staff of this journal, and having occupied the latter position about nine years; previous to which he labored editorially and otherwise for some time on the Salt Lake Telegraph.

Notwithstanding that Brother Evans was one of the most unassuming men living, he was, on account of his office, a position, connected with the church, known to many thousands of people. Being personally very intimate with him, we know that those who knew him most loved him best.

In some directions he was a man of unusually active and powerful mentality, having had few if any living superiors as a photographer. He was also a good musician, having occupied a position as violinist for ten or eleven years in the Theatre orchestra. Among other accomplishments he could speak the French language with considerable fluency.

He was self-educated, having made himself proficient as a short-hand writer while working hard for a living as a hotel-closer, in which branch of business he was an excellent workman.

The difficulties which surrounded him during nearly the whole of his life would have been insurmountable to a man of ordinary force of character or will-power. When about nine years of age he was afflicted with a disease in his left leg, from which he suffered terribly for years from the time when he was first affected with it, and more or less intensely at times through his whole subsequent life, having become permanently lame from that cause.

The affliction which carried him off was Bright's disease of the kidneys. His illness continued over nine weeks, during which time he suffered greatly, and the last words he uttered were, after speaking tenderly to his wife, "God bless you all," which remark was addressed to his wife, his father-in-law, and Mrs. Saville, who surrounded his bed at the time. This was about four p. m. yesterday, after which time he was insensible to the time of his death.

He had long been troubled with indigestion, at various times. In the early part of the present year he was at home sick for a week or two, from which attack he never fully recovered, never subsequently attaining to his usual robustness.

He seemed aware of his approaching dissolution for several weeks previous to the event, and, under this impression, he said, addressing the writer, "I would like you to get pencil and paper and write," when he indicated as follows:—

"David W. Evans, born Jan. 6th, 1833, at Louth, Lincolnshire, England; embraced the gospel at Birmingham, England, August 8th, 1854, and emigrated to Utah in 1859."

He married Elizabeth Aldridge, daughter of Richard and Ann Aldridge, in this city, June 15, 1862.

He had many noble qualities of head and heart. He was most assiduous in his labors. He was an earnest, devoted, intelligent, persevering student, a hard, steady, faithful, and indefatigable worker. Whatever he undertook, he took pride in doing well. He was true in his integrity to the work of the Lord, and was generous almost to a fault. He was a very useful man, and in this regard his loss will be deeply felt; as well as on account of his sterling, honest, straightforward, outspoken qualities, which can be appreciated by those who are capable of understanding them.

He had a strong and abiding faith in the work of God, though he had but little faith in men. He was a kind, affectionate, indulgent husband, tender of home and family, and of those who were in any way connected with him. He was of a practical rather than of a speculative or sentimental turn of mind. He was a plain, blunt man. At times in uttering his convictions he appeared neither friend nor foe, particularly the latter. He was naturally impetuous in temper, swift and incisive and sometimes vehement in speech. He was of a quick, energetic, rugged character, yet without offense as tender as a child in his feelings. He was a true, staunch friend, a friend in need when he could render help, and when it was really needed.

Although recognizing the hand of the Lord in this and all other dispensations of his providences, we are pained to part from Brother Evans while he was yet in the prime of his usefulness, and in the zenith of his usefulness, and together with his other and numerous virtues, we deeply sympathize with his wife and four children.

The funeral services will be conducted at the 20th Ward School house, at half-past four p. m., tomorrow, July 7th.

Up From Provo.—Yesterday we were pleased to meet our friend, Prof. Karl G. Maeser, principal of the Brigham Young Academy, at Provo, who is visiting the city during the vacation. He is much pleased with his new position. We have heard from various sources that, under his able supervision, the Academy is being made an unqualified success.

THE REYNOLDS CASE—DECISION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY.

In the Supreme Court of Utah Territory, June Term, 1876.

The United States, Respondent, vs. George Reynolds, Appellant.

Appeal from the Third District Court.

Borenman, Justice, delivered the opinion of the Court:

The defendant was indicted for the crime of bigamy or polygamy, found guilty, and sentenced to imprisonment in the penitentiary and to pay a fine. He appeals to this Court.

The defendant filed his various pleas in abatement. The first plea raised the question of the proper venue to try the case, and it being contended by the defendant that it should have been composed of any number from six to twelve, and that the number of fifteen members. This question has been heretofore, at a former term, decided by this Court in the case of *Reynolds vs. United States*, and it is not necessary to repeat the reasons of this very recent decision.

It was upon the hearing of this case at that time in this Court that the defendant was found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of mandamus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of mandamus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of prohibition, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of prohibition, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of quo warranto, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of quo warranto, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of habeas corpus, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

The defendant then moved for a writ of certiorari, and it was upon the hearing of this motion that the Court decided that the defendant was entitled to a writ of certiorari, and that he should be released from imprisonment.

THE REYNOLDS CASE—DECISION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY.

In the Supreme Court of Utah Territory, June Term, 1876.

The United States, Respondent, vs. George Reynolds, Appellant.