

Kentucky Man Tells How Mayr Stomach Remedy Restored Wife

Mrs. W. H. Clarke is Relieved After Years of Digestive Disorders.

Mrs. W. H. Clarke, of Central City, Ky., for many years suffered from disorders of the stomach. She tried many treatments with little encouragement.

Mr. Clarke induced her to try Mayr's Wonderful Stomach Remedy. She got results right away. The he wrote:

"The medicine has done my wife a world of good, and I feel that it will cure her. I intend to keep on until she is completely cured, as you have been doing her more good than any one has ever done her, and she has been suffering with her stomach for years. I am glad I was told of the remedy."

Letters like that are written by users of Mayr's Wonderful Stomach

Remedy in all parts of the country. It proves its merit with the first dose—no long treatment.

Mayr's Wonderful Stomach Remedy clears the digestive tract of mucoid accretions and removes poisonous matter. It brings swift relief to sufferers from ailments of the stomach, liver and bowels. Many declare that it has saved them from dangerous operations and many are sure it has saved their lives.

Because of the remarkable success of this remedy there are many imitators, so be cautious. Be sure it's MAYR'S. Go to G. S. Varden & Son, drug store and ask about the wonderful results it has been accomplishing—or send to Geo. H. Mayr, Mfg., Chemist, 154-156 Whiting St., Chicago, Ill., for free book on stomach ailments and many grateful letters from people who have been restored. Any druggist can tell you its wonderful effects. (No. 3-F)

WALTER MARTIN

ERNEST MARTIN

NEW LIVERY STABLE!

New Carriages, Buggies, Runabouts Etc. Special Attention Given to Weddings, Funerals, Parties, Dances, Etc.

Horses Boarded By Day, Week or Month!

Hauling of Every Description Done. Transfer Business a Specialty.

Our stables on Eighth Street will continue under the management of Mr. Walter Martin and the Main Street place will be run by Mr. Ernest Martin.

MARTIN BROS.

Stables—Eighth St., Main St.

Both P Hones

ATTENTION, PEOPLE!

Do You Know We Handle the Celebrated

Detroit Jewell Gas Stoves & Ranges

Come and See. Our Prices Are Right.

Plumbing and Electrical Contractors.

Estimates Freely Given. Try Us.

SPICER & GILCHRIST

ELKS' BUILDING.

E. T. Phone 103 Home Phone 101

BLUE GRASS PARK!

Bathing and Boating.

Free-DANCING-Free

Afternoon and Evening.

Musicy Schemmel's Orchest

Professional Cards

J. S. Wallingford, M. D.

Office on Sixth Street,

Between Main and High,

Phones 31 PARKS, KY.

Dr. Wm. Kenney,

PARIS, KENTUCKY.

Office 514 Main Street.

Office Phones E. T. 136.

Home 136.

Residence E. T. 334.

Home 334.

DR. A. W. KELLER,

PRACTISING PHYSICIAN,

Offices, Rooms 4 and 5, Elk's Bldg

Paris Kentucky

J. J. WILLIAMS,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

Room 1 Elks Building.

If Adam was as jealous as the average man, I'll bet that his confidence in Eve didn't keep him from going out to the Apple Tree every now and then to frisk around and see if Eve and the Snake had left any cores.

There are a whole lot of women who get their ages and their bust measurements mixed.

CANCER CURED

I guarantee every case I undertake; 20 years practice; reference, any citizen of Paris.

DR. WM. R. SMITH,
Paris, Ky.

SILO BARN

ARE BEING BUILT BY ALL MODERN FARMERS.

WE INSURE THEM...

We Make a Specialty of Country Property

WE ISURE AGAINST FIRE TORNADO LIGHTNING

In Strong, Reliable, Prompt Paying Companies.

W. O. HINTON & SON,

THE NEW FIRM.

HOW'S THIS.

We offer One Hundred Dollars Reward for any case of Catarrh that cannot be cured by Hall's Catarrh Cure.

F. J. CHENEY & CO., Toledo, O.

We, the undersigned, have known

F. J. Cheney for the past 15 years,

and believe him perfectly honorable

in all business transactions and financially able to carry out any obligations made by his firm.

NATIONAL BANK OF COMMERCE,

Toledo, Ohio.

Hall's Catarrh Cure is taken internally,

acting directly upon the blood and mucus surfaces of the system.

Testimonials sent free. Price 75 cts. per bottle. Sold by all druggists.

Take Hall's Family Pills for constipation.

(adv-aug.)

Another cheerful liar is the man who tells his wife that he never looks at another woman.

NOT SO STRANGE AFTER ALL.

You may think it strange that so many people are cured of stomach trouble by Chamberlain's Tablets.

You would not, however, if you should give them a trial. They strengthen and invigorate the stomach and enable it to perform its functions naturally.

Mrs. Rosie Rish, Wabash, Ind., writes, "Nothing did me the least good until I began using Chamberlain's Tablets. It is decidedly the best medicine for stomach trouble I have ever used." For sale by all dealers.

(adv-aug.)

Most men are honest because they wouldn't steal less than \$100,000, and they are never where that amount is laying around loose.

INFECTION AND INSECT BITES DANGEROUS.

Mosquitoes, flies and other insects, which breed quickly in garbage pails, ponds or stagnant matter, barns, musty places, etc., are carriers of disease. Every time they bite you, they inject poison into your system from which some dread disease may result.

Get a bottle of Sloan's Liniment. It is antiseptic and a few drops will neutralize the infection caused by insect bites or rusty nails. Sloan's Liniment disinfects Cuts, Bruises and Sores. You cannot afford to be without it in your home. Money back if not satisfied. Only 25c, at your Druggist.

(adv-aug.)

The fellow who hollars murder if his wife asks him to carry an eight-ounce package home for her is the same lad who would cheerfully carry

PARIS INTERURBAN SCHEDULE CITY CAR ONLY.

| Lve. Court House. | Lve. Station 54 |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 7:10 a m | 7:15 a m |
| 7:45 a m | 8:00 a m |
| 8:15 a m | 8:30 a m |
| 8:45 a m | 9:00 a m |
| 9:15 a m | 9:30 a m |
| 9:45 a m | 10:00 a m |
| 10:15 a m | 10:30 a m |
| 10:45 a m | 11:00 a m |
| 11:15 a m | 11:30 a m |
| 11:45 a m | 11:55 a m |
| 12:05 p m | 12:15 p m |
| 12:45 p m | 1:00 p m |
| 1:15 p m | 1:30 p m |
| 1:45 p m | 2:00 p m |
| 2:15 p m | 2:30 p m |
| 2:45 p m | 3:00 p m |
| 3:15 p m | 3:30 p m |
| 3:45 p m | 4:00 p m |
| 4:15 p m | 4:30 p m |
| 4:45 p m | 5:00 p m |
| 5:15 p m | 5:30 p m |
| *5:40 p m | *5:50 p m |
| 6:05 p m | 6:15 p m |
| *6:30 p m | *6:40 p m |

*City Limits Only.

KENTUCKY TRACTION & TERMINAL COMPANY.

Interurban Schedule.

| Leave Lexington | Leave Paris |
|-----------------|---------------|
| For Paris | for Lexington |
| *6:00 a m | 6:45 a m |
| 7:20 a m | *7:30 a m |
| *8:00 a m | 8:15 a m |
| 8:50 a m | *9:00 a m |
| 10:20 a m | 9:45 a m |
| 11:50 a m | 11:15 a m |
| 1:20 p m | 12:45 p m |
| 2:50 q. m | 2:15 p m |
| 3:30 p m | 3:45 p m |
| 4:20 p m | 4:30 p m |
| 5:00 p m | 5:15 p m |
| 6:00 p m | 6:05 p m |
| 7:20 p m | 6:50 p m |
| 9:10 p m | 8:15 p m |
| 11:00 p m | 10:05 p m |

* Daily except Sunday

Cool mornings and evenings will soon be here. Prepare for them by installing Gas Heaters.

We handle

Taylor Grates,

Garland Ranges

and do all kinds of piping.

PARIS GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Incorporated.

able to divorce their argument from this Mohammedan text. This Mohammedan gospel runs through all prohibition sermons whether preached by Mohammedan priests or Christian ministers. It is the sum and substance, the heart and soul of their philosophy.

By the Koran I have established the fact that prohibition is Mohammedan in character; not Christian. With the Holy Bible I have clinched my affirmation that prohibition is wrong in principle and un-Christian in character. Take your choice between the Bible and the Koran, between Christ and Mahomet. Jesus drank wine and made it for others to drink. The Koran declares that "wine is an abomination of the works of Satan." Mahomet was a prohibitionist; Christ was not.

I have now shown by irrefutable logic, unanswerable reason, official records, and the sacred scriptures that the prohibition of the manufacture and use of intoxicating liquors is wrong in principle, un-Christian in character, and powerless as a remedy for intemperance. I have demonstrated that prohibition is:

Contrary to reason, opposed to nature, an insult to intelligence, destructive of human equality, a menace to manhood, based upon a false premise, an immoral proposition, a blow at the basis of all morality, inimical to true religion, powerless as a remedy for intemperance, antagonistic to the divine order, and that in principle temperance and prohibition are eternal opposites.

No man ever brought a more sweeping indictment against any cause than I have brought against prohibition tonight. My charges will stand because they are true. They cannot be overthrown.

When an argument is unanswerable your opponents may do one of three things. When unfair or dishonest, they resort to personalities. What they lack in logic they make up by personal abuse of the speaker. Unable to refute his argument they seek to injure his character or reputation, and end by saying that he made votes for their side.

When they are wise, they either assert that you said nothing worthy of consideration, or they ignore you entirely. But if they are "otherwise," they will expose the weakness of their cause by trying to demolish truth, a thing impossible. I shall call attention briefly to some of the arguments advanced by these people.

In reply to my charge that prohibition is contrary to reason, you will hear them say:

"Then why prohibit theft and murder?"

Because murder is wrong per se. You do not have to repeat the act of murder in order to become a murderer. Drinking becomes evil only by abuse. Besides, killing is everybody's business, but when you drink it is nobody's business but yours. A law that concerns everybody can be enforced, but you cannot enforce it when it is nobody's business but yours. That is the moral difference between taking a drink and committing murder.

These people appear to be unable to see the moral distinction between asking a man to have a friendly drink and cutting his throat.

I proved that prohibition is opposed to nature, and that the thing that makes prohibition a failure makes man a success, and some of the drys answer drunkenness is wrong. As I do not advocate drunkenness, nothing they can say on that proposition meets my argument.

I proved prohibition to be a menace to the development of true manhood. In reply you will be told that some people who drink are poor. They will not tell you why an equal number of people are poor who do not drink.

I denounce prohibition as an immoral proposition. For answer you will be told that Windle was formerly a prohibitionist. St. Paul was a Pharisee at one time in his life. Any man who opens his mouth before he opens his mind is liable to become a prohibitionist.

I proved that prohibition strikes a blow at the basis of all morality. Some of our opponents answer by charging that some liquor men are immoral. So are some preachers, but that is no argument against the church, nor is it a sane reason why any man should condemn good preachers.

I proved prohibition to be a menace to the church. Some of my opponents will attempt to ridicule our concern for the church, forgetting that there has never been a Prohibition Christian nation on this earth.

I proved by the records that prohibition has utterly failed to stop drunkenness, and in order to meet my argument, it will be necessary to show that more liquor we drink the less liable we are to become drunk. When they sustain this contention in the Court or Reason, I agree to prove by the same kind of logic that the less a man drinks the more drunken he becomes.

I proved by the Bible, the specific permission of God and the example of Christ that prohibition is not only un-Christian in character, but antagonistic to the divine order. In their futile effort to refute my contention my opponents will attempt to distort and twist certain Biblical quotations. But if you will stop to think you must realize that no passage rightly interpreted can be found in the Bible that would brand God as a monster by prohibiting a thing which he expressly permits, or that would convict Jesus of crime for drinking or making an intoxicant for others to drink. Plenty of things in the Bible favorable to temperance, but not a line for prohibition.

Where the Bible mentions wine, whether it commands its use or condemns its abuse, the Hebrew word is "yayin," the equivalent for the Greek word, "oinos," which according to the highest authorities on Biblical literature means the fermented juice of grapes.

The Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer by Rev. S. M. Jackson, D. D., LL. D., page 974 says:

"The Hebrew 'yayin' and its equivalent 'oinos' are general terms for all sorts of wine, that is, the fermented juice of grapes."

The New Schac-Herzog Encyclopaedia

WINDLE'S SPEECH.

(Continued from Page 6)

cating it is necessary to learn what kind of wine the guests wanted. Unless He perpetrated a fraud Jesus supplied the kind they wanted, and not some substitute.

In the ninth verse we read:

"When the ruler of the feast tasted the water that made wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants that drew the water knew), the governor of the feast called the bridegroom."

From this we learn that the ruler of the feast was not aware that a miracle had been performed. He thought the supply had been secured from a regular dealer around the corner. His testimony was, therefore, free from prejudice or bias. Now, why did he call the bridegroom? Something out of the ordinary had happened.

In verse 10 we are told that he said to the bridegroom:

"Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now."

Now we know what kind of wine the guests had at the beginning. It was good wine. This good wine gave out, and, of course, they wanted more of the same kind. The good wine was the old intoxicating wine.

This is shown in the next sentence uttered by the ruler of the feast. After stating that it was customary to set forth good wine at the beginning of the feast he said:

"When men have well drunk, then that which is worse, but thou hast kept the good wine until now."

From this we learn that the good wine always set forth at the beginning of feasts would make men drunk. Otherwise it would not be necessary, in order to prevent a debauch, to switch to the wine "which is worse," or weak. Besides the expression "have well drunk" in the original reads "becomes thoroughly intoxicated." In the German Bible it is translated "drunk through and through." If the good wine set before guests at the beginning of feasts would intoxicate when drunk to excess, so would the wine Jesus made, for the ruler of the feast said: "Thou hast kept the good wine until now." I challenge any man living to show that the good wine was not old wine—the intoxicating kind. I defy him to prove that the guests wanted grape juice.

This is the plain, simple meaning of the text. I have made no effort to twist, distort or wrest any term from its manifest import. As Jesus used wine and made it for others to drink, prohibition can never be Christian in character.

I do not say that He debauched the wedding feast. I do not claim that the guests got drunk on the good wine. The ruler of the feast suggested the possibility, but does not aver that such happened on this occasion. I give you the record as it is.

I deny that Jesus supplied a demand for intoxicating liquor to make men drunk. I deny that when we vote to supply the demand for intoxicating liquors that we vote to make men drunkards. There is a vast difference between drinking and getting drunk—the same difference as there is between eating and becoming a glutton; between buying a gun and committing murder.

Having settled forever by the example of Christ the true Christian attitude on the liquor question, I defy any man on earth to show how it can ever become Christian to prohibit anything that Jesus practiced.

In Deuteronomy, 14th chapter, 26th verse, God says:

"And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink."

It will be seen in this instance that God became specific. He knew the controversy that would arise, the strife this issue would engender. Hence in taking His position in favor of personal liberty on the drink question God made His meaning perfectly clear. If God permits us to spend our money for strong drink, who has the right to forbid?

If God would permit His people to spend their money for strong drink, and then damn them for doing it, He would be a monster.

I deny that God is a monster and in His defense brand prohibition as a political, legal, religious and moral monstrosity.

Prohibitionists have assumed a position on the drink question that indicts God as a monster and Christ as a criminal. I stand ready to defend Christ and God against their indictment and for this they denounce me as a blasphemer. I would rather discredit the opinion of every prohibitionist on this earth than to brand God as a monster and Christ as a criminal—the one for permitting His people to spend their money for strong drink, the other for performing a miracle to supply the demand for intoxicating liquor.

You cannot find within the lids of the Bible a single passage rightly interpreted that supports the principle of prohibition. If you could find a passage showing that it was wrong to spend your money for strong drink—morally wrong to use liquor—criminal to supply the demand, you would absolutely destroy the respect of mankind for God, for the Bible and for Christ.

The Christian Bible is emphatically, and eternally opposed to prohibition as a principle. But I have here another Bible, held to be sacred by hundreds of millions of people. On page 129 of this book we read:

"O true believers, surely wine is an abomination of the works of Satan."

This is the Mohammedan Bible—the Koran. Mahomet was a prohibitionist. Prohibition is a cardinal doctrine of the Mohammedan religion. Notwithstanding this fact the Turks are the most criminal, poverty-ridden nation on this earth. The quotation from the Koran sounds like a prohibition speech. Drys will find it impos-

ible to divorce their argument from this Mohammedan text. This Mohammedan gospel runs through all prohibition sermons whether preached by Mohammedan priests or Christian ministers. It is the sum and substance, the heart and soul of their philosophy.

By the Koran I have established the fact that prohibition is Mohammedan in character; not Christian. With the Holy Bible I have clinched my affirmation that prohibition is wrong in principle and un-Christian in character. Take your choice between the Bible and the Koran, between Christ and Mahomet. Jesus drank wine and made it for others to drink. The Koran declares that "wine is an abomination of the works of Satan." Mahomet was a prohibitionist; Christ was not.

I have now shown by irrefutable logic, unanswerable reason, official records, and the sacred scriptures that the prohibition of the manufacture and use of intoxicating liquors is wrong in principle, un-Christian in character, and powerless as a remedy for intemperance. I have demonstrated that prohibition is:

Contrary to reason, opposed to nature, an insult to intelligence, destructive of human equality, a menace to manhood, based upon a false premise, an immoral proposition, a blow at the basis of all morality, inimical to true religion, powerless as a remedy for intemperance, antagonistic to the divine order, and that in principle temperance and prohibition are eternal opposites.

No man ever brought a more sweeping indictment against any cause than I have brought against prohibition tonight. My charges will stand because they are true. They cannot be overthrown.

When an argument is unanswerable your opponents may do one of three things. When unfair or dishonest, they resort to personalities. What they lack in logic they make up by personal abuse of the speaker. Unable to refute his argument they seek to injure his character or reputation, and end by saying that he made votes for their side.

When they are wise, they either assert that you said nothing worthy of consideration, or they ignore you entirely. But if they are "otherwise," they will expose the weakness of their cause by trying to demolish truth, a thing impossible. I shall call attention briefly to some of the arguments advanced by these people.

In reply to my charge that prohibition is contrary to reason, you will hear them say:

"Then why prohibit theft and murder?"

Because murder is wrong per se. You do not have to repeat the act of murder in order to become a murderer. Drinking becomes evil only by abuse. Besides, killing is everybody's business, but when you drink it is nobody's business but yours. A law that concerns everybody can be enforced, but you cannot enforce it when it is nobody's business but yours. That is the moral difference between taking a drink and committing murder.

These people appear to be unable to see the moral distinction between asking a man to have a friendly drink and cutting his throat.

I proved that prohibition is opposed to nature, and that the thing that makes prohibition a failure makes man a success, and some of the drys answer drunkenness is wrong. As I do not advocate drunkenness, nothing they can say on that proposition meets my argument.

I proved prohibition to be a menace to the development of true manhood. In reply you will be told that some people who drink are poor. They will not tell you why an equal number of people are poor who do not drink.

I denounce prohibition as an immoral proposition. For answer you will be told that Windle was formerly a prohibitionist. St. Paul was a Pharisee at one time in his life. Any man who opens his mouth before he opens his mind is liable to become a prohibitionist.

I proved that prohibition strikes a blow at the basis of all morality. Some of our opponents answer by charging that some liquor men are immoral. So are some preachers, but that is no argument against the church, nor is it a sane reason why any man should condemn good preachers.

I proved prohibition to be a menace to the church. Some of my opponents will attempt to ridicule our concern for the church, forgetting that there has never been a Prohibition Christian nation on this earth.

I proved by the records that prohibition has utterly failed to stop drunkenness, and in order to meet my argument, it will be necessary to show that more liquor we drink the less liable we are to become drunk. When they sustain this contention in the Court or Reason, I agree to prove by the same kind of logic that the less a man drinks the more drunken he becomes.

I proved by the Bible, the specific permission of God and the example of Christ that prohibition is not only un-Christian in character, but antagonistic to the divine order. In their futile effort to refute my contention my opponents will attempt to distort and twist certain Biblical quotations. But if you will stop to think you must realize that no passage rightly interpreted can be found in the Bible that would brand God as a monster by prohibiting a thing which he expressly permits, or that would convict Jesus of crime for drinking or making an intoxicant for others to drink. Plenty of things in the Bible favorable to temperance, but not a line for prohibition.

Where the Bible mentions wine, whether it commands its use or condemns its abuse, the Hebrew word is "yayin," the equivalent for the Greek word, "oinos," which according to the highest authorities on Biblical literature means the fermented juice of grapes.

The Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer by Rev. S. M. Jackson, D. D., LL. D., page 974 says: