

Choose You Between the Two.

A recent number of the Burlington Hawkeye contained an editorial appeal to the young men of the country, which greatly pleased many of our most highly esteemed contemporaries of the staid type, and which they have generally copied. "Young man," says the Hawkeye, "you may have heard that there is to be an election in this country pretty soon. It may be that you have never before voted for President. In that case, it is time for you to be making up your mind how you will vote next fall, and with which party you will work in the meantime. Which is it, Garfield or Hancock? Will you be radical or conservative? Choose you between the two. And if you choose to go with the Democracy and vote for Hancock, let us see what kind of company you will have on your way to the polls. The man who murdered General McCook will vote for Hancock. Every man who rejoiced at the assassination of Lincoln will vote for Hancock. Every man that ever put on a Kuklux mask and assisted in dragging an old negro out of his bed at midnight and hanging him, will vote for Hancock. General Butler, of South Carolina, the Hamburg butcher, will vote for Hancock. The man who shot General McPherson will vote for Hancock. Markedale, the Yazoo County murderer who killed Dixon because he wanted to run for the same office, has declared for Hancock. Currie, the Texas assassin, who shot an unarmed actor just because it was his day to kill somebody, has been acquitted by a Texas jury, and will vote for Hancock. Jeff Davis says if he had a vote he would cast it for Hancock. Boss Kelly will vote for Hancock. Every swindling scoundrel that is running a moonlight still and defrauding the Government and shooting the revenue officials in the mountains of Tennessee will vote for Hancock."

And now, young man, admitting that all the above-named persons will vote for Hancock excepting Mr. Jefferson Davis, and even admitting that he would if he could, this for the sake of obliging the Hawkeye, let us look to the other side of the house. "Which is it, Garfield or Hancock? Choose you between the two." Shall it be Garfield, who fell before the wrath of his own constituents, charged with bribery, conceit and perjury, or shall it be Hancock, who fell bleeding at Gettysburg? Shall it be Garfield, who was badly smirched by the Credit-Mobilier scandals, and who sold his influence as Chairman of a House Committee to a paving ring for \$5,000, or Hancock, whose record is stainless, whose character is above reproach? Yes, young man, choose you between the two. And if you choose to go with the Republicans and vote for Garfield, let us see what kind of company you will have on your way to the polls.

Mosby, the guerilla chieftain, the most bloodthirsty and heartless of the villains who hunted down Union soldiers, will vote for Garfield.

Eph Holland, the notorious jail-bird, thug and ballot-box stuffer, will vote for Garfield.

Boss McMane will vote for Garfield. Boss Shepherd will vote for Garfield. Joyce, the convicted whisky thief, will vote for Garfield.

Will Kernan, the blatherskite, drunkard and hired slanderer, will vote for Garfield.

"The" Allen will vote for Garfield. Secor Robeson will vote for Garfield. Every swindling scoundrel that was engaged in robbing the people of millions of money through the nest of ring frauds under Grant will vote for Garfield.

All of the Credit Mobilier-stained "statesmen," including Colfax and Patterson, long since driven from public life by an outraged people, will vote for Garfield.

Dick Harrington, the safe burglar, will vote for Garfield.

Chase, Hathaway, Pond, and their associates, now in the penitentiary at Concord, would vote for Garfield if they could.

Jake Rehm will vote for Garfield. Moses, the carpet-bag thief, will vote for Garfield.

Old Mad Wells and his gang of forgers and Returning-Board rascals will vote for Garfield.

The man who led on the rebel army, which tried to kill Hancock and capture Philadelphia, will vote for Garfield.

Beknap, who robbed Union soldiers' graves of their headstones, and fled from the Capital in disgrace, will vote for Garfield.

And last, but not least, the seven men, who, aided by Garfield, voted to legalize the most stupendous fraud on record, and stole the Presidency, will vote for Garfield. And so, young man, we might go on and fill column after column. But we have already given the names of several men, not saints, who will vote for Garfield. But we ask you to look further. Study the principles of the two great parties. Compare the records, both civil and military, of the two candidates. Turn your back upon the man who would rekindle the fires of sectional hate, and vote with that party and for that candidate whom you believe will know no sectional lines, but who will labor for a reunited country, for peace, happiness and prosperity, and a government in accordance with the Constitution.—Boston Post.

Three Epochs.

In the history of the Democratic party there have been two eras in which the bold and vigorous assertion of its distinctive principles has been the salvation of democratic republicanism in this country. Those two epochs are the proudest in our National annals.

No patriotic American can recall the names of Jefferson and Jackson, and the events of their Administrations without a glow of honest pride. And no American who is not at heart a monarchist, who is not in favor of such centralization as invariably tends to the one-man power, fails to pay the tribute of sincere respect to those illustrious Democrats and the great works which they made them.

Hated as they were in their times, visited with unstinted abuse, deluged with calumny to an extent unknown in the latter half of this century, they have nevertheless taken their rightful places in history and in the respect of their countrymen. No man now questions their ability, their integrity, their

patriotism; and there are very few who do not concede that the ideas to which they were devoted, the principles for whose maintenance they breasted the storm, were not essential to the maintenance of our institutions on the broad and enduring basis of "the utmost individual liberty consistent with the highest general welfare."

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic party, and the men allied with him, made a bold and successful fight against those monarchical principles, which, under another name, came too near molding our Government into a despotism. We get some idea of the influence of Old World institutions, customs and habits on the American mind a century ago, when we read that it was seriously proposed in "the Congress" to fasten on the President the awe-inspiring title of His High Mightiness.

And even in the Constitution of the United States, after the confederate system had proven a failure and been condemned, we still see too much of that settled distrust of the people which many of the fathers entertained. Ostensibly building the Government on the right of the majority to rule, they so constructed that a minority may lawfully prevent the majority from ruling for a series of years, as has more than once been demonstrated.

The veto power is another feature of the anti-democratic, or monarchical spirit. It is the one-man power in its most offensive shape, and if we are not prepared to admit that the majority ought not to rule, this prerogative should be so modified that a majority in Congress may make laws despite the Executive.

The provisions for electing a President and Vice-President of the United States still more forcibly illustrate the then prevailing fear that the people would wrong and destroy the Government if they had a chance. The people were to select a few very wise and very good men who were to decide, in their superior wisdom and virtue, who should fill the two highest offices in the Republic. It was not deemed prudent to trust the common people to select these officials. There was to be an intermediate authority to save the people from the danger of making a bad choice.

Not against the individual features of monarchy, or centralization—they are some thing in effect—but against its spirit, Jefferson and his party rose up to fight. They fought the good fight and kept the faith. They vindicated manhood. They set up the rights of the people. They struck down the growing danger of the hour. They gave the country a strong impetus in the right direction. They made splendid history.

When that sturdy patriot, Andrew Jackson, came to the front our Government was being run, as the Republican party has run it, in the interest of capital as against labor. There was corruption on every hand. The ruling power in Congress, in the Cabinet and in all the channels of Government was money. One great financial institution was the real controlling power.

Jackson, the bravest man of his age and as pure a patriot as ever wielded power, struck down the giant that had usurped authority. In all his acts he carried out the idea that this was a Government of the people, not of a corporation, not the tool of consolidated cash. He believed in the people, for he was one of them. His Administration is the pride of all men who are capable of appreciating genuine Democracy when inspired by the loftiest patriotism and nerved by the resolution of a hero.

The condition of the country to-day calls for another era like those which we have noticed. Centralization needs suppression if our institutions are not to be radically and permanently changed. If the right of the people to manage their local concerns is not to be lost, not to become as extinct as the dodo, the Democratic faith must be reasserted with Jefferson's directness and vigor.

And, if the country is not to be at the mercy of corporations and bondholders, if labor is to have any chance against the exactions of capital, if monopolists are not to fatten on the spoils of honest industry, we must have a reassertion of the faith, and a reproduction of the courage of Jackson.

And, with the honor the man has come. The Hancock era—the era to which this patriot soldier and statesman will give his historic name—is to be a fitting successor to those of the two illustrious Democrats whose Administrations were the most brilliant in our history. The election of Hancock will banish the infernal bane of sectional strife. It will unite the North and South in fraternal harmony. It will send to the rear those corrupt and corrupting influences which have dominated wherever the Radical spirit has had full sway. It will bring out new issues in which there can be no sectional line and no color line. It will be the one thing needed to give us freedom from all those bad influences that came as the result of the war. Peace and prosperity and a career of unexampled development and progress will be the conditions of that brighter and better epoch which will begin with the inauguration of President Hancock.—Washington Post.

General Garfield delivered an address at the reunion of the Forty-sixth O. V. I., at Ashland, Wednesday last. He had uttered but a few sentences when the platform on which he was standing broke down, and precipitated him to the ground. General Garfield shouldn't make a fuss about a little thing like that. He should regard the incident as a sort of informal rehearsal of the grand crash which is to come in October, and the earthquake which is to engulf him in November.—Cincinnati Enquirer.

If the Republican press can only stir up old Bob Toombs or General Wade Hampton to say something "to fire the Northern heart" how blissful it makes them. If they don't happen to say anything they proceed to say it for them, and with startling display type, place it at the head of the editorial page to dazzle the reader at his morning repast. It does not dazzle any more. The people have become used to that sort of humbuggery. Better stop it.—Indiana State Sentinel.

Getting at the Footings.

In reviewing the expenditures of the Government in recent years the Philadelphia Inquirer strains hard to prove that the Democrats are entitled to little or no credit for the reductions since 1875 when they had the first majority in the House. After comparing the expenditures the Inquirer says:

These figures, when carefully scanned, indicate that while the Democrats had the control of the National Appropriations they have taken off one year and added on the next, and so the real reduction in expenses is very small. They have by their acts shown that, if in full power, they would be apt to take in at the spigot and let out at the bung. Their idea of economy is not a whit better than that of the poor Indian who cut a piece off the top of his blanket and sewed it on the bottom to make it long enough to cover his feet.

This is probably very smart, but let us see how much truth there is in it. The total ordinary expenditures of the Government in the five years preceding the control of the finances on the part of a Democratic House are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. 1872: \$108,877,211 57; 1873: 181,025,793 04; 1874: 181,344,757 08; 1875: 171,291,697 91.

Total: \$890,570,754 44. The ordinary expenditures in the last five years under Democratic control of the Appropriations are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. 1877: \$154,300,943 33; 1878: 161,498,408 27; 1879: 161,300,037 17; 1880: 177,091,659 08.

Total: \$890,818,114 33. This shows a reduction of \$89,422,640.11 in the ordinary expenditures of the Government in five years since the Democrats obtained control of the Appropriations. The saving by Democrats amounts to four times the entire debt of Pennsylvania, or one and a half times the municipal debt of Philadelphia.

Yet the Philadelphia Inquirer wittily tells its readers, in the face of these great results of economy, that the Democratic idea of economy is not a whit better than that of the poor Indian. A saving of ninety millions in five years is probably a very small matter in the estimation of the Inquirer, but it is a great thing for the great body of the taxpayers, to whom it gives assurance of still further reductions of their burden.

Until the Democrats secured a majority in the House the expenditures of the Government were steadily rising in arithmetical progression, except in 1876, when in facing a Presidential election it was found necessary to make a slight reduction in order to save appearances. During the five years of Republican appropriations with which we have compared the five years of Democratic control, James A. Garfield was Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. Thus the responsibility for waste and extravagance rests not only on the Republican majority in Congress but is brought directly home to their candidate for President.

While making a reduction of nearly ninety million dollars in the space of five years the Democratic Representatives in Congress were just and liberal in their appropriations for the wounded and deceased soldiers of the Union, as the official records demonstrate. The total amount of appropriations for pensions in the five Republican years mentioned above are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. 1872: \$29,000,000; 1873: 30,480,000; 1874: 30,480,000; 1875: 24,000,000; 1876: 30,000,000.

Total: \$149,960,000. The appropriations for pensions in the five Democratic years are as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. 1877: \$20,331,500; 1878: 20,371,574; 1879: 50,233,330; 1880: 44,250,000.

Total: \$115,237,404. It is thus seen that the Democrats in Congress, while lessening the Government expenditures nearly ninety millions in five years, have in the same time increased the pension fund more than thirty-nine million dollars. The reduction of the lavish and wasteful expenditures created by the Republicans in Congress has enabled the Democrats to make this liberal endowment to the pensioners without increasing the burdens to the tax-payers but while greatly diminishing them.—Harriburg (Pa.) Patriot.

Republican Claims Examined.

The Republican Convention which nominated General Garfield as its candidate for President declared that it was content with the record of its party as a defender of the Constitution of the United States. General Garfield, as its candidate and the expositor of its creed, has, since his nomination, asserted the claim of his party upon the gratitude of the people for its services to the cause of Constitutional Government. Let us test the validity of this claim.

Not to go too far back, begin with the act of Congress of May 31, 1870, entitled "An act to enforce the right of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States of this Union, and for other purposes." It was a piece of Republican legislation. When it was enacted General Grant was President, Schuyler Colfax was Vice-President and James G. Blaine was Speaker of the House. The whole machinery of legislation was in the possession of the Republican party. Peace had long been restored, all the Constitutional amendments had been adopted, and nothing remained to be done except to give full effect to the Constitution as modified by the amendments.

Instead of performing this plain task, the Republican party, in order to secure its tenure of power, determined to retain power by any legislation, enacted under the color of these amendments, which might suffice to subordinate the State Governments to its political control. The act of May 31, 1870, was a contrivance invented to accomplish this purpose.

The statute in question began by repeating the substance of the Fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which had been shortly before formally declared to have been adopted. This prelude was plainly unnecessary for the purposes of the act. It was intended only to mask the changes made in our system of Government by the sections which followed. The second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh sections afforded the means of subordinating elections held in the States for State officers to the

control and discipline of Federal laws and Federal officials, and of bringing such elections under the direct and complete control of the Federal power. These sections were used for this purpose from the year 1870 to the year 1875 with signal success. A Republican President and a Republican Congress looked on and resisted any change in the system thus created, and subordinate Federal Courts and officers aided diligently in upholding and executing the obnoxious provisions. In 1875 an opportunity arose for testing the constitutionality of these innovations. The Supreme Court, notwithstanding the pronounced political opinions of the majority of its members, declared that Congress had no power to enact laws regulating State elections held for State officers. The conspiracy against the rights of the people, which had been safely managed for five years, came to an end. The gross outrages committed upon individual liberty under the color of these provisions, and the gross usurpation of unconstitutional powers, remain to be punished or atoned for.

The Republican party has shown no sense of the great wrong which it has done. It has left the unconstitutional provisions which it enacted standing on the statute book as a precedent for other laws of the same character, and as a public menace. That unhealed act is full of instruction. Its underlying principle is the true platform of the Republican party. It is a party which desires the complete subordination of elections in the States to Federal laws and Federal supervision. It is a party which hopes to reduce the States to mere territorial subdivisions, administered by governments municipal in their character and scope of powers. It is a party which aims at the concentration of a National and supreme sovereignty in the hands of Congress, provided Congress is Republican. That these bloody instructions have not already returned to plague the inventors, and that no attempt has been made to put them to that use, is proof that the knowledge of the Constitution and the respect for it which may be looked for in vain in the history of the Republican party may be confidently expected from the Democratic party.—N. Y. World.

The Role That Fits John Sherman.

According to Shakespeare, "one man in his time plays many parts" on the world-stage. Mr. John Sherman is hired and paid by the United States Government to act the part of Secretary of the Treasury. But Mr. John Sherman is possessed with a mania for acting, and insists on appearing in many characters besides the one in which he is cast, in spite of the civil service orders of the troupe to which he belongs. Last night he performed at Cincinnati, in Pike's Opera House, as Demagogue, and with remarkable success. The character fits him exactly. He had only to be himself all over and all the time to fill the bill. His performance was ostensibly a speech for Garfield; it was really an assault on a majority of the American people and the credit of the American Government, in the interests of the Republican party in general and Mr. John Sherman in particular. Mr. Sherman began by claiming that the present prosperity of the country is owing to resumption, which is owing to Republican legislation, carried into effect by his own amazing sagacity and administrative force, against the persistent opposition of the Democratic party at every stage; and also that if the Democratic party gets control of the Government it will undo all that has been done, confuse the finances, bankrupt the Treasury by paying bogus rebel claims, and paralyze industry and beggar everybody. Of course, Mr. John Sherman knows better. He knows that such representations insult the intelligence of the people to whom they are addressed. He knows that they are false. He knows, and every other intelligent American knows, that the present prosperity is not owing to Republican legislation, but to the industry, thrift, and enterprise of the American people, and the bounty of Heaven in unparalleled yields of cotton and corn and wheat, which have found a market in the famine-stricken countries of Europe and have turned the balance of trade in our favor. The Republican party is solely responsible for the commercial and financial crash of 1873, whose depressing effects lasted five years. That party passed the Resumption act in 1874, to satisfy the demands of the people, but had no faith that its terms could be complied with. Resumption could not have been reached at all but for the returning prosperity of the country in consequence of the extraordinary demand for our great products abroad, and the re-orientation of silver by a Democratic Congress over the veto of President Hayes. And so on to the end of the chapter. Mr. John Sherman's claim that he and the Republican party have created the prosperity of the country in opposition to the Democrats is only paralleled by the preposterous representation that the continuance of this prosperity depends upon keeping him and the Republican party in power.

According to his remarkable statement, the value of every bond depends on Garfield's election. As there is no likelihood of Garfield's election, what, then, are American securities worth? And what does Mr. John Sherman, Demagogue, expect that Mr. John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, will gain by such a stab at the credit of the Nation? It would be easy enough to follow him through the mazes of his harangue and expose the unscrupulous audacity of his misrepresentations. But it would be lost labor, as no one will believe what Mr. John Sherman, Demagogue, says.—N. Y. Express.

The heat in the south header of the Sutro tunnel, Nevada, is so great that no work can be done there. Air can be sent through to the face of the header, but it must pass through pipes such a great distance, surrounded by the hot air of the drift, that it is as hot as that in the drift when it reaches its destination. The rock itself at and near the face of the header is so hot that it can hardly be touched with the naked hand.

It is estimated that more than 200,000 deadheads are annually passed over the railroad lines in the United States.

POLITICAL ITEMS.

The Republicans who have jeered at Senator Davis for "sitting on the fence" will doubtless regard his change of posture as indefensible. But it places him on solid ground, and in an impregnable position. David Davis not the sort of a man to get into a moral quagmire.—Exchange.

In 1872 Carl Schurz went about the country saying that "in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the Republican party has shielded fraud and corruption." He doesn't say that this year. He should not be expected to. If the Republicans pay him they have a right to respectful treatment.

Despite the wonderful perfection to which lithography and similar processes for the reproduction in fac-simile of documents, the numerous lives of General Garfield that have thus far been inflicted on a credulous public have no copy of the General's \$5,000 opinion as to the merits of the De Golyer pavement.

Some Republican papers continue to make much ado over Hancock's lack of a civil record. They had better direct their complaints to Garfield's superabundance of record. The trouble with him is that he has entirely too much record, and all the fine promises for the future are vain beside the black record of his past.—St. Louis Republican.

McDonald's exposure of the doings and misdoings of the Whisky Ring, in which Babcock figured so extensively and Grant had a hand, has thrown a bombshell into the Republican camp. It has blown the cover from one of the worst scandals of the most corrupt administration this country has ever had, and no wonder the implicated parties squirm at the fix in which they find themselves.—N. Y. Express.

It is not believed that the Northern mind can be agitated, nor the Northern heart fired, by the grim specter of Southern claims, nor by a nightmare which takes the form of another rebellion. The rebel claims amount to nothing; that was taken out of politics four years ago. The Treasury is in danger from "loyal claims," and from thieves whom the Republican party dares not punish. The course of the "Solid South" during the Electoral count shows that if the North is not tired of bloodshed the South is. To suppose Indiana or New York can be imposed upon by the Republican press, even by the "independent" Republican press, is to impeach their intelligence and to cast a slur on their public school system.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

Why the South Makes Congressmen of Her Soldiers.

The list of "Confederate Brigadiers," that is, of prominent Southern men now in public life, but formerly more or less prominent in the Confederacy and its armies, is going the annual rounds of the Republican press. This prominence is taken for proof of something devilish in the conduct of the Southern people. But, as a matter of fact, the "Confederate Brigadiers" were and are their ablest men, and, just like any other community, without regard to the point of the compass they choose their ablest men to represent them. With the exception of Postmaster-General Maynard—the most prominent Republican from the Southern States are "Confederate Brigadiers," Key, Longstreet and Mosby; and the man from the South the Republicans are most apt to compliment for his fairness and moderation was once the Vice-President of the Confederacy. The reason is not hard to find. The same talents and force of character which made them prominent during the days of the Confederacy keep them so now. If the Republican party should, by wisdom and moderation, ever succeed in dividing the "Solid South" into voluntary and spontaneous party divisions, instead of into violent and factitious ones as at present, the prominent Republican leaders there would, if they had not by that time died out, be "Confederate Brigadiers." Otherwise, the party would be led, as of yore, by its "scallawags."

That there is nothing wrong, per se, in being a "Confederate Brigadier" is shown by the honor which the Republicans pay to those of that obnoxious brand who unite their fortunes with that party. If the "Confederate Brigadier," simply as a Brigadier, is an untrustworthy man, he must be untrustworthy, even though a Republican. If he is not in himself obnoxious, then the choice of him by the Southern people has no other significance than an indication of his talent and influence as a man. Hence, publishing lists of such as are elected to Congress is not an argument, but an appeal to passion, and an attempt to excite prejudice.

This is all the more evident, because no effort is made to cite any proofs of the present disloyal conduct of the "Confederate Brigadiers." They have voted all the Government supplies; they have increased the loyal pension list; they have admitted no "rebel claims"; they have done what the loyal majority failed to do—diminished the current expenses of the Government.

So that the publication of the statistics of the "Confederate Brigadiers" is simply a revival of the war spirit, an appeal to war memories, an irritation of ancient wounds, which, when indulged in by a "Confederate Brigadier," is considered proof of total depravity. Such is the power of self-deception, moreover, that in many instances those guilty of this inconsistency probably do not dream of it nor can they be persuaded that they are stultified; but, imagine, perhaps, that they are doing their country service by thus keeping wide open the gulf between the North and the South.—Detroit Free Press.

At Madrid, a prisoner recently sentenced by court-martial to be shot for participation in the attack on a train by brigands, before his execution made revelations incalculating several families of high position. He accused them of not only protecting brigandage, but of sharing in the proceeds.

A PROFESSOR stated recently before the New York Oyster Commission that 6,000,000 oyster eggs may be stowed away in the space occupied by a watch spring.

Advertisement for Dr. JACOBS' GREAT GERMAN REMEDY FOR RHEUMATISM, Neuralgia, Sciatica, Lumbago, Backache, Soreness of the Chest, Gout, Quinsy, Sore Throat, Swellings and Sprains, Burns and Scalds, General Bodily Pains, Tooth, Ear and Headache, Frosted Feet and Ears, and all other Pains and Aches. No Preparation on earth equals Dr. JACOBS' REMEDY, every rheumatism and other External Remedy. A trial entails but the comparatively trifling outlay of 50 cents, and every one suffering with rheumatism has clear and positive proof of its claims. Directions in Every Language. SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS AND DEALERS IN MEDICINE. A. VOGELER & CO., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Advertisement for HUNT'S REMEDY THE GREATEST KIDNEY AND LIVER MEDICINE EVER KNOWN. HUNT'S REMEDY has saved from lingering disease and death hundreds who have been given up by physicians to die. HUNT'S REMEDY cures all Diseases of the Kidneys, Bladder, Urinary Organs, Dropsy, Gravel, Diabetes, Rheumatism, Accumulation and Retention of Urine. HUNT'S REMEDY encourages sleep, creates an appetite, braces up the system, and renewed health is the result. HUNT'S REMEDY cures Pain in the Side, Back, or General Debility, Female Diseases, Disturbed Sleep, Loss of Appetite, Bright's Disease, and all Complaints of the Kidneys, Bladder, and Urinary Organs. HUNT'S REMEDY quickly induces the Liver to healthy action, removing the causes that produce Biliousness, Headaches, Typhoid, Sour Stomach, Constipation, Piles, &c. By the use of HUNT'S REMEDY the Blood and Bile will speedily regain their strength, and the Blood will be perfectly purified. HUNT'S REMEDY is purely vegetable, and needs a warm water before furnished to the public, and the utmost reliance may be placed in it. HUNT'S REMEDY is prepared expressly for the above diseases, and has never been known to fail. One trial will convince you. For Sale by all Druggists. For Pamphlet to W. M. E. CLARKE, Providence, R. I. Prices, 75 cents, and \$1.25 (large size).

Advertisement for THREE OF THE BEST BOOKS FOR SINGING CLASSES. THE TEMPLE. \$1, or 50 per dozen. By Dr. W. O. FORTIN. Such a full sized book as the above has this advantage over all others: After you have been through its excellent elementary course, you have sung its cheerful songs and glees, its spiritual songs, its Hymns, Tunes and Anthems, you have on hand a large collection which is just the thing for their practice, and also for Home singing. Dr. Fortin is his own master as one of our most skillful composers. THE VOICE OF WORSHIP. \$1, or 50 per dozen. By L. O. EMERSON. This book covers precisely the same ground as does the TEMPLE, and people will use one or the other as they fancy the music or the style of this or the other excellent composer. Mr. Emerson's books are known in every household and every school, and each new book is intended to be an advance over those that preceded it. JOHNSON'S METHOD FOR SINGING. \$1, or 50 per dozen. By A. N. JOHNSON. No writer excels this one in the perfect clearness and simplicity of his explanations and the thoroughness of his work. The teacher who uses this method needs to have in his hand the General Instruction Book (\$1.25), by the same author. The pages are compact, and the larger book gives directions for the use of the smaller.

Advertisement for D'BULL'S COUGH SYRUP. For the Cure of Coughs, Colds, Hoarseness, Asthma, Bronchitis, Whooping Cough, Sore Throat, and all other Affections of the Throat and Lungs. Price only 25 cents a bottle. WILSON'S FEVER AND AGUE TONIC FOR CHILLS AND FEVER AND ALL DISEASES CAUSED BY MALARIAL POISONING OF THE BLOOD. A Warranted Cure. Price, \$1.00. AGENTS! Are you awake or asleep? Or do you sleep? I know that the new, enlarged and fully illustrated edition of that same or the other as A FOOL'S ERRAND BY DR. J. J. WILSON is now the latest selling book in the world. It tells the fact that One thousand copies per day are now going out in wide-awake agents everywhere. It includes the author's new work, "The Inevitable Empire," the agent has sold over 5,000 copies. Such a change is offered but once in a lifetime. Act at once, and address STANDARD BOOK CO., 111 North La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. OPIUM. Morphine Habit Cured in 30 Days. No Pain. No Pay till Cured. Dr. J. J. WILSON, 111 North La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. \$66 A WEEK IN YOUR OWN TOWN. Terms and full particulars on application. Address: Dr. J. J. WILSON, 111 North La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.