A STRONG PLEA FOR LIBERTY.

Letter from a Non-"Mormon" to the New York Journal,

ON THE PRESENT CRUSADE.

If Who Would Take the Mote Out of His Brother's Eye Should First Remove Beam from His Own.

The subjoined communication on the anti-"Mormon" agitation, written by a non-"Mormon," a resident of Colorado, was sent to the New York Journal, and also to the World, but so far it has not been published in those papers, although both have manifested much interest in the subject. A copy was also sent to the "News" for publication.—ED.]

To the Editor of the New York Sunday Journal:

Dear Sir—I see in the Journal that you have commenced an agitation against Brigham H. Roberts, of Utah, being his seat in the Congress of the United States, and that you are taking the lead, and, of course, the demand is equally. This is a very high and strong position to take. It is sound ground, if it be true, that the Journal is very strong for sound morality, and that on public men possessing that virtue as a qualification for holding such high offices. I hope, too, that the Journal will always be found treading down all hypocrisy, injustice, bribery and prostitution, wherever found, in high or low degree, and that it will always set its face steadfastly in favor of right, as against wrong, and consistently uphold the principles upon which the United States was founded, and upon the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence.

If I have read the Constitution aright, if I understand aright the principles of democracy, and the basis of this country, it is that the United States stands before the world, to represent and maintain, so far as in it lies, (1) Self-government by the people, (2) Protection and security of property and possessions, legitimately obtained and created by the builder, or his ancestors' labor, (3) The right of free speech, and (4) The right of freedom of religious opinion.

Now, sir, taking those as the principles, (they being correctly stated), how does your agitation pan out, tried by those tests? And be it remembered, that every American stands pledged to these principles by the very fact that he, or she, is an American. This country was founded by our Puritan forefathers, to vindicate their right to freedom of religious opinion, and they or their descendants have the love and devotion of their successors for having achieved that glorious charter of human liberty. Then, if that freedom of religious opinion is the sacred birthright of every American, it is patent that the "Mormons," or Latter-day Saints, as they call themselves, have that same right, and it cannot be taken from them justly, or under the Constitution, let their religious opinions be as cranky as they may, either in fact or in the opinion of us, who are out of them. And, perhaps, it would be well, right here, and prevent any misconception, if I state distinctly that I am not a "Mormon," nor do I belong to any "Mormon" organization, society, firm, or any institution of any kind whatever connected with "Mormons," or "Mormonism." I was twice in Salt Lake or Utah except once and that was for the length of time it took the Northern Pacific or Central Pacific, or connecting railroads to run through the place or state.

I presume it will be granted that the "Mormons" do possess this right. If they do we have, then, no right to object to them on those grounds, that is clear. Do we do so? If yes, then we, not they, are in the wrong. We, too, are indebted to our predecessors, and to our principles, and the principles of our government and nation. Do we object to their religion? I think not. Do we object to their freedom of religious opinion? Again we are compelled, if honest, to plead "guilty." We object to that part of their religion that permits, or, rather, or recommends, a man having more than one wife. As a matter of fact, I really do not know whether plurality of wives is a tenet of their creed, or a matter of discretion. I know, however, that we "Gentiles," as they style us, so regard it. And it is to this we object, or profess to do so. Now, our religious ideas, or opinions, is founded upon and declares that "the Bible is the Word of God." Does or does not the Bible declare that "godly Christian people" practiced polygamy? Is it not a fact that it does? Also, is not the clear inference that the "Christian institution" was sanctioned? Now the thing, polygamy, is either right or wrong, in itself. If it is wrong, then we are not with the Mormons that it was sanctioned in the time of the Hebrews, and if saturally, if it was regarded as right. If it was right then, how is it wrong now? If, on the other hand it was, in itself, right, then we are wrong. That is clear. Now which is it? The Mormons is there, and it is for the believers in the plural marriage institution of the time to explain it. The Mormons are not responsible for it, they did not create it, and the Mormons will believe in it, or practice it, or teaching, or whatever it is, while others have relinquished it, and, if they have observed that custom, are they to be condemned for that? If yes, is it not a little cranky, to say the least, to go and pass to root and rock, are we so dead sure that we have left off the practice of polygamy, because we, forsooth, have done so? Or is it that while we may have but one wife we may have several mistresses? And if not, do we? Is it not a fact, Sir, that our morality, in this respect, is somewhat like the law, allowed to have been, Mahomet, we have in Cuba, in that it needs similitude? If this be so, and who, excepting with society, dares to, what right have we to throw any stones at the Mormons? Which is more moral, to preach and practice the same thing, or to preach one thing and practice another (morally) opposite?

In this regard I would submit, respectfully of course, that it might not be inferred to the contrary, as we do not, it might seem, to make it a condition that every member of Congress, who votes against the Mormon, should have the nerve to vote to prevent him taking the seat to which he has been elected, shall be a necessary preliminary, make—statement on his oath, that he has never been unfaithful to his wife, and that any member who votes against Roberts, shall neither vote nor retain his own seat, as a change for the good, is sure to be the result. Jesus Christ, I think, rebuked the wisdom of taking the mote out of one's own eye, before we undertook the task of plucking it out of the eye of another. And that reminds me, it is a common thing, how one thing reminds you of another, that Jesus also made some remark to the effect, that those who looked upon a woman to lust, after her had thereby committed adultery in his heart. That is it was his will that was wanting, but only the opportunity. And again, if this be so, are not most of us a precious lot of humbugs? And this is proven, too, by the fact that neither you or any member of Congress, will take this proposition, to make an oath as to faithfulness, seriously, but will think that an oath merely getting off a funny little "saw" at them. They will take it in a "What-are-you-driving-at" spirit, and pass it off as not being seriously meant. And anything I can say would not convince them in a way in which is a very convenient, and comfortable method of ignoring an embarrassing position. Notwithstanding, I am confident, or sanguine, I would dare them to the test. At the same I have no hope they will take it. I offer it, or not alone, they, to be consistent, ought not to vitiate disability Mr. Roberts for being honest and avoiding his predecessors, or more than one woman, a declaration they shrink from denying under oath.

I see it is alleged by some that while Congress has not the right to prevent Mr. Roberts from taking his seat, it can, after he has taken it, expel him. I doubt whether it has any such right really, but it may have all the sense, I'm greatly inclined to, however, that, morally, it has no such right. And if it has, the advantage of a mere legal right to do something, which it has no moral right to do, then Congress and its sometime uncertainty, is in right place and dignity. Experience is said to make people wise. The attempt to keep Mr. Roberts from taking his seat in the house of Commons should be a lesson to the legislators on this side of the Atlantic, of the folly of such acts of the persecutions. The sterling, good, honest, common sense of the people, always seems to be near the right, though aloof, and the people have neither hypocrisy nor hypocrites. And I will venture the prediction that the time will come when the hypocrisy of this persecution of Roberts will be seen plainly, if it is not already, as I am inclined to believe.

But suppose Mr. Roberts is a "Mormon," and admit he has three wives, what of it? He has broken the law of the land, it is replied. If this is the reason why he should be excluded, well and good. If the same rule is applied to every lawbreaker. At the same time it would appear to be somewhat of a "Mormon" idea, for Mr. Roberts broke the law of the land openly, which is something a little unusual, and is testimony that he did not marry three times merely to break the law, but that it was a matter of conscience set him. When a man commits bigamy, he usually tries to keep the thing quiet, Roberts does not appear to have so acted. As one of a jury, with the circumstances before me, I would not convict him of bigamy, neither do I believe any man with common sense would.

Much is made about Mr. Roberts being immoral—because he has married three wives. Is this so? If yes, then, what shall we say of those who have lived with, and visited for immoral purposes, women whom they have not married? When those men are charged out of, or not permitted to enter the American Congress, then it will be time to have a season of virtue relative to Mr. Roberts. Apply the rule all round if you apply it at all. Consistency is indeed a jewel. Let us be consistent in the prosecution of Mr. Roberts. I am holding no brief for the man; I do not know that even an American stands pledged to these principles by the very fact that he, or she, is an American. This country was founded by our Puritan forefathers, to vindicate their right to freedom of religious opinion, and they or their descendants have the love and devotion of their successors for having achieved that glorious charter of human liberty. Then, if that freedom of religious opinion is the sacred birthright of every American, it is patent that the "Mormons," or Latter-day Saints, as they call themselves, have that same right, and it cannot be taken from them justly, or under the Constitution, let their religious opinions be as cranky as they may, either in fact or in the opinion of us, who are out of them. And, perhaps, it would be well, right here, and prevent any misconception, if I state distinctly that I am not a "Mormon," nor do I belong to any "Mormon" organization, society, firm, or any institution of any kind whatever connected with "Mormons," or "Mormonism." I was twice in Salt Lake or Utah except once and that was for the length of time it took the Northern Pacific or Central Pacific, or connecting railroads to run through the place or state.

I presume it will be granted that the "Mormons" do possess this right. If they do we have, then, no right to object to them on those grounds, that is clear. Do we do so? If yes, then we, not they, are in the wrong. We, too, are indebted to our predecessors, and to our principles, and the principles of our government and nation. Do we object to their religion? I think not. Do we object to their freedom of religious opinion? Again we are compelled, if honest, to plead "guilty." We object to that part of their religion that permits, or, rather, or recommends, a man having more than one wife. As a matter of fact, I really do not know whether plurality of wives is a tenet of their creed, or a matter of discretion. I know, however, that we "Gentiles," as they style us, so regard it. And it is to this we object, or profess to do so. Now, our religious ideas, or opinions, is founded upon and declares that "the Bible is the Word of God." Does or does not the Bible declare that "godly Christian people" practiced polygamy? Is it not a fact that it does? Also, is not the clear inference that the "Christian institution" was sanctioned? Now the thing, polygamy, is either right or wrong, in itself. If it is wrong, then we are not with the Mormons that it was sanctioned in the time of the Hebrews, and if saturally, if it was regarded as right. If it was right then, how is it wrong now? If, on the other hand it was, in itself, right, then we are wrong. That is clear. Now which is it? The Mormons is there, and it is for the believers in the plural marriage institution of the time to explain it. The Mormons are not responsible for it, they did not create it, and the Mormons will believe in it, or practice it, or teaching, or whatever it is, while others have relinquished it, and, if they have observed that custom, are they to be condemned for that? If yes, is it not a little cranky, to say the least, to go and pass to root and rock, are we so dead sure that we have left off the practice of polygamy, because we, forsooth, have done so? Or is it that while we may have but one wife we may have several mistresses? And if not, do we? Is it not a fact, Sir, that our morality, in this respect, is somewhat like the law, allowed to have been, Mahomet we have in Cuba, in that it needs similitude? If this be so, and who, excepting with society, dares to, what right have we to throw any stones at the Mormons? Which is more moral, to preach and practice the same thing, or to preach one thing and practice another (morally) opposite?

In this regard I would submit, respectfully of course, that it might not be inferred to the contrary, as we do not, it might seem, to make it a condition that every member of Congress, who votes against the Mormon, should have the nerve to vote to prevent him taking the seat to which he has been elected, shall be a necessary preliminary, make—statement on his oath, that he has never been unfaithful to his wife, and that any member who votes against Roberts, shall neither vote nor retain his own seat, as a change for the good is sure to be the result. Jesus Christ, I think, rebuked the wisdom of taking the mote out of one's own eye, before we undertook the task of plucking it out of the eye of another. And that reminds me, it is a common thing, how one thing reminds you of another, that Jesus also made some remark to the effect, that those who looked upon a woman to lust, after her had thereby committed adultery in his heart. That is it was his will that was wanting, but only where the trouble has its roots. When Utah was to come into the Union, it did not now it has been made a rich state, by the Mormons, it was become worth having, and immediately seems to be coveting Naboth's vineyard. Its mines, its revenues, its resources, its climate are desirable, and I think there is an attempt being made to play the carbon trick on us, and oust the Mormons from the government of their own home and affairs.

In my opinion the whole thing is a political "fake," a political plot, a piece of political intrigue right through, and eradicate to none of those engaged in it. It is utterly unworthy of the Journal, and whether you have seen it or unconsciously, as I am inclined to give you the credit of supposing, or partly, without thinking the subject out, I do not know, but I am convinced you are helping to do a great injustice to a people, and this I do not think was or is the object of the Journal's being founded. I suppose the Journal, like everybody else, is in doubt, and I decidedly think you have erred, and are erring in this crusade against Roberts. As this back is up, I think it is a waste to take it will come to nothing, but if it be of God you can't down it, and I say this should serve a warning to the "Mormons" are increasing rapidly, too. Why be so scared at a few people in Utah? Why be so afraid of Mr. Roberts?

As I have already said, in my opinion, this opposition is a political game throughout, and neither morality nor decency enter into the matter at all. And it is an unfair game, for the politicians are in the hands of the opponents of the "Mormons," and, to be fair, equal, it is a big man against a little one, and the agitation is to discredit a people who have done, and, as far as they have been united, if one or two things I have heard about them are true, if no more than a fraction of the agitation is for the purpose of turning the "Mormons" out of the control of their own government, to secure control of the offices and the spoils of Utah, and to get hold of as much of the revenue as possible, the thing begins to wear an aspect, that while quite in accordance with the manner in which American politics are conducted, yet nevertheless it is not creditable to any of the parties engaged in it. It is this very thing that makes American politics a byeword and a reproach, and causes them to stink in the nostrils of other nations. Looking at it in this light I am very sorry to see the Journal so early and so soon in support to any such thing, and I trust you will give the matter a more searching enquiry and refuse any longer to support what to say the least looks like an unfair fight.

In conclusion, I hope you will not your way to print this letter; you have printed the other side to fair and print this, if you think it, and I am under dog in the fight, the mass of the people are against them, but the Journal is worth of its reputation and more that they shall have a fair show. There is neither chivalry nor manliness in crushing out the weaker battalions," but there is both in taking an unpopular side, at least to the extent of allowing the side of unpopular side have fair play. Truth is mighty and if the "Mormons" are to be crushed, they are not going to hurt anybody, at least we can allow to be a fair show to them. At least they are entitled to all their rights under the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, and there cannot then be the right of anti-government, the right of free speech, the right of freedom of religious worship, and the right of being secured in their lives, their liberties, and their possessions.

Jesus Christ's definition of morality and of religion was: "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." Love your neighbor as yourself. I say unto you, love one another."

John Stuart Mill's definition of morality is: "The greatest good to the greatest number, with the least possible injury to any; that is, that the reverse is immoral."

FAIR PLAY.

LAWLESS PHILIPPINES.

Pirates and Brigands Infesting the Group of Islands.

[Scientific American.]

The brigands and pirates which infest the islands of the Philippines and the adjacent waters have been for an immemorial, been regarded as among the most desperate freebooters to be found in any part of the world. The inhabitants of these islands are composed of many, different, different, mixed races. The races or tribes are somewhat different on all the larger islands, and in every one of these there are tribes that never have the rule of any people, on these islands there are no less than seventeen pagan and half a dozen Mohammedan tribes. Luzon, Mindanao, Cebu, Mindoro, and a dozen other islands all have their tribes of freebooters, the remnant of some native tribe.

To get a correct idea of the great bands of lawless natives who infest these islands, it is necessary to go back to a date much earlier than the beginning of Spanish rule in these islands. Prior to the coming of Magellan, these islands had already suffered several foreign invasions. But these were peaceful ones. As far back in time as the Chinese or Japanese, sought these islands in great numbers, and their coming proved of much good to the islands. They had industrious ways and soon imparted those again these islands. Laoco in particular, had the influx of Tagal invasion occurred, and these, like the Chinese, were soon absorbed in the population of these islands. Thus were made up the three early races in these islands, to which all tribes can be traced. These are Negrito, Ingrote and Tagal. The Negrito was the aboriginal race, and in many of the tribes of the Negrito still be found. In nearly all cases the pirates and brigands are made up of these three tribes. The Tagal is today regarded as the real native of the Philippines. This due to the only one of the early races which, at this day, can be considered a factor in the islands.

Until a comparatively recent day these islands have been the centre of piracy. For more than three centuries Spain has been fighting to get rid of the pirates and subdue the native brigands, but without success; for many whole islands have resisted, always been independent of Spanish rule, while many tribes on the larger islands were also independent of Spanish rule. Moros, Negros, Pinay, Zelos, Leyte, Bohol, Samar and Mindoro there are as many different tribes, as there are islands.

In the earlier years of Spanish rule, the Tagals and Visayas gave the enthusiasm as end of trouble, and no sooner had these tribes been subdued than the Moros, in the south, began to use operations. From early times to this they have carried on their ambuscades, and have never been subdued. The Chinese pirates, in earlier days, also gave the Spanish much trouble. They captured a number of smaller towns along the coast, and even made an attempt to capture Manila during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the island of Bohol, Mindanao, Samar, the Spanish rule is not so complete, and it is particularly strong, and the sultans of the islands have, from time to time, given the Spanish rulers much trouble, but some years ago their power was broken. During the sixteenth century, the Mohammedan tribes were a terrible strong on the islands of Mindanao, Palawan, Tawi Tawi and Jolulan. But the pirates of Mindanao have always been the most troublesome. The Moros are the most warlike, and are entirely independent of any outside rule.

The Moros are a peculiar tribe, which originally came from the surrounding islands and mixed with the native tribes of Mindanao. The Moros are the most warlike people of the islands and are a powerful race. They expect all foreigners are their enemies. This is probably due to the bad treatment they have received at the hands of the Spaniards. Most of the Moros are well armed and well equipped. The barong is a terrible weapon, and with it an expert swordsman can cut a man in half at a single blow.

The peculiar native crafts, so common on the islands, are particularly adapted to the use of the pirates. They are long, narrow, and very swift. The boats used by the native are very skillful in handling them. They carry large sails and have outriggers to prevent their being upset. Before the days of steam navigation these crafts were easily able to avoid pursuing parties.

The brigands of these islands are no less notorious than the pirates, and, if anything, are more feared. They are roaming along the coast, the former are carrying on their system of plunder on the interior. Every island has its lawless tribe which never knew Spanish rule. These native brigands were in many cases driven to the charm land, who, even to this day, are found among the mountains.

Probably the most noted brigands of the islands are the Macabebes, who are found mostly in Luzon, the largest of the islands. The Macabebes know no law save their own. They have no connection, or, at least, no ties, between them and natives and Spanish also fail to face this murderous gang. The Chinese are the principal victims of the Macabebes, and scarcely a night passes but what some Chinaman is killed. Already one hundred and fifty have been killed in breaking up the Macabebes, and quite a number of the gang now in Manila have been executed. This will be the beginning of the trouble with the wild tribes and the lawless bands of the Philippines.

ARISTOCRATIC EGGS.

All, However, Subject to the Changes of Age.

[Cleveland Plain Dealer.]

When you rise to the highest type of exclusive taste there is no doubt that a certain New York woman can justly claim the blue ribbon. It is asserted that in her extreme fastidiousness she has every egg that she eats her breakfast heard carefully registered the moment it is laid at her country home. And each egg, as it is laid, is placed in a box with the seal of the owner stamped upon it, and is then covered in a thousand wrappers to the fastidious dame's Fifth avenue mansion. Of course here that by these favored eggs are all of true aristocratic lineage, with souls that would scorn to pass with the common, plebeian company. Its intelligent, in social intercourse, they become that the outward hopes to time to come, and the seal of the lady's crest and carefully stamped with her personal ball mark. It must be added, that the eggs are always the able examples of aristocratic culture are a good deal more like perveiais than the ordinary egg. Not only do their contents exhibit that quiet preference for richly neutral tone that marks the best and most refined society, but the shell of these gems of the cuisine are not to be lightly fingered by the hands of world domestics. The chef alone is permitted to prepare them for the epicurean feast. The distilled water, the imported mayonnaise, the jewel salts, the inlaid scrambler, the dissecting of Asaby's spicy chutney—nothing is too good for the delicate of the gods. And yet the dreadful thought will not down that when these aristocratic palate delighters have passed the period of youth, when they have taken on the ripeness of age, they are, we the unfailing hints of age, they will be no more lauded than the commonest egg of the plebeian, and even against a stump orator, or caressed on a bad artist.

AFTER INGERSOLL.

A Clergyman Challenges the Agnostic and Asks Him Some Questions.

Rev. George F. Hall, pastor of the Tabernacle Christian church, Decatur, has challenged Colonel Ingersoll to a public debate in throwing down the gauntlet he says in part:

1. Is it not true that you have never seen the hour when, by a fair examination you could have obtained a third-grade certificate to teach in the common schools of Illinois? Did not the Hon. John Warner, then mayor of Peoria, and Colonel Ingersoll's adherents, in the column of the Star, Madison, Indiana, in December, 1861, admit that such was the case?

2. Is it not a notorious truth, well known to the Illinois bar, that you are not a well-read lawyer? Did you ever make a speech to clear the carbon from your brain? Is your ability to make sophistry, spread eagle speeches before a jury? And are not your political harangues and much boomed lectures of the same type?

3. Is it not true that your lectures, no matter under what guise they may be delivered, are, in reality, but a mere rehashing of the charges on about a dozen stereotyped assaults upon the Bible and Christianity? And do you not palm off the same old blasphemous "chestnuts" in each and every lecture year after year?

4. Is it not true that you are one of the most shameless and unblushing plagiarists on the rostrum today? To illustrate, if you did not really purchase the lectures of Robert Dale Owen, you allow a temperance speech purloined from one Dr. Gunn, Family Physician, to be sent to press in your name without any other whatever for commission, trusting to the reading world with more persuasiveness than the lecturer would have dared exercise in a public hall, and, finally, all the world of the Britishers composition in question gave you?

5. Did not a Philadelphia paper publish, in parallel columns, a beautiful selection of blank verse written by an English poet and, only one day later, appear in a society issue over the dead body of a child, thus exposing your plagiarism?

6. Did not Professor Otto Kellinsky, of Cape Girardeau, Mo., be the St. Louis Republic, on Sept. 16, 1894, state that your "Mistakes of Moses," as published in the fall of 1879, in the Chicago Times, Inter-Ocean, Tribune, and the Truth Seeker, of New York, was characterized from a rare work entitled "Celsus Against Christianity," which was published in London in the seventeenth years before—by James Hittell?

7. Are not large portions of your celebrated lectures, "Ingersoll on Liberty," by Holbach, "The Rules of Reason," by Volney, Voltaire's "Dictyonnaire," and Volney's "System of Nature," by Dr. Alcobert?

8. Honestly, now, is not every scrap of most arguments you have used in lectures practically stolen from better minds, the hoodoo, says, "quoke."

Drunkenness Cured

It is Now Within the Reach of Every Woman to Save the Drunkard.

A TRIAL PACKAGE FREE.

The Remedy Can be Given in Tea, Coffee or Food, thus Absolutely and Secretly Curing the Patient in a Short Time Without His Knowledge.

This cure for Drunkenness has shed a radiance into thousands of hitherto desolate firesides. It does its work so silently and surely that a wife, devoted wife, sister or daughter looks on, the drunkard is reclaimed even

MRS. JOHN M. HATTON.

against his will and without his knowledge or suspicion. The discoverer of this grand remedy, Dr. Hatton, will send a sample of the remedy free to all who will write for it. Enough of the remedy is mailed free to show how it is tasteless, odorless and easy to give that it will cure the dreaded habit quietly and permanently. Send your name and address to Dr. M. W. Hatton, 162 Green Building, Cincinnati, O., and he will mail a free sample of the remedy to you, together with a plain wrapper, also full directions how to use it, books and testimonials from hundreds who have used it with success. Send everything needed to aid you in saving those near and dear to you from a life of degradation and ultimate poverty and disgrace.

Mrs. John M. Hatton, of Lebanon, Ohio, writes: "I saw the age cured her husband with Golden Specific, who had been a hard drinker for years, now writes on behalf that she cured a near and dear relative and makes a most earnest appeal to all other women to save the drunkard.

Send for a free trial trial today. It will brighten the rest of your life.

HOSTETTER'S STOMACH BITTERS

The liver gets lazy and sluggish sometimes and then you have biliousness and bad rum leer in.

LIVER

HOSTETTER'S BITTERS wakes up the liver, clears up the complexion and makes you well again.

Cold Weather Brings Catarrh.

The Severity of this Disease Increases Each Winter.

Though the disagreeable effects of Catarrh are felt all the year round, cold and unpleasant weather aggravates the disease and it is during the winter season that its ravages seem to fall fiercest, succeeding year upon year in spreading the disease, so that it gradually gets its hold upon the sufferer with a grasp that becomes firmer each winter.

Catarrh often appears as only a cold at first, and is hardly noticed. But gradually the cold returns, and it is more difficult to cure, and stays longer each time. These symptoms seem to mislead, they mark the insidious approach of a disease that will develop in severity and stubbornness, and that it is impossible to cure with the usual treatment of sprays, washes, and douche applications. Being a disease of the blood, only a blood remedy can give the slightest effect upon it. S.S.S. (Swift's Specific) is the only cure for Catarrh, because it is the same of the blood, and S.S.S. is the only remedy which reaches and eradicates blood diseases; it cures Catarrh, Rheumatism, Cancer, Contagious Blood Poison, Eczema, Scrofula, and every other disease of the blood. It is guaranteed

S. S. S. (Swift's Specific) will prove all assertions made that it is the only cure for Catarrh, because it is the cause of the trouble—the blood—and, follows out all traces of the disease.

Swift's Specific is the only remedy which reaches and eradicates blood diseases; it cures Catarrh, Rheumatism, Cancer, Contagious Blood Poison, Eczema, Scrofula, and every other disease of the blood. It is guaranteed

Purely Vegetable

and is the only blood remedy containing no potash, mercury or other mineral.

Books mailed free to the same of the trouble—the blood—and follows out all traces of the disease by the Swift Specific Co., Atlanta, Ga.

The Word "BARGAIN."

It has been so overused, so abused and frayed out, and bored about that it has almost lost its identity—nobody pays any attention to it—no matter how big or black the letters are that make it. It's a good word—too good for such treatment. We don't use it much ourselves, but we do use it in our ads—of whatever and enterprises, until now it's hopelessly bankrupt of meaning, and has become obsolete. We are sorry, certainly sorry, because we stood by it as long as we possibly could, were it regular one, never were abused it. We could right now tell of a bargain—but nobody would understand us if we used the old plain word—and so we simply say that you should look in our window and see displayed there our line of cosmopolitan shirts—sold everywhere at $1.50; our price

85 Cents;

AND THEY ARE THIS SEASON'S EFFECTS.

Siegel Clothing Co.

Geo. Q. Cannon & Sons Co.

Valentines!

Valentines!

IN FANCY LACE, CELLULOID AND CARD NOVELTIES AND NEW COMICS

Wholesale and Retail.

SPECIAL TERMS TO SCHOOLS AND PARTIES.

Cannon's New Book Store

11 AND 13 MAIN STREET.

A FAIR PROPOSITION:

Standard SQUARE INCH TAILOR SYSTEM

$500 IN CASH

Will be paid by agents and will bring a system that will make a fit on the STANDARD SQUARE INCH TAILOR SYSTEM. All on the following points of merit:

Simplicity, Accuracy, Quickness, Durability, Range of Style and Fashion, Preference of Fit on Every Form.

Agents are making from $5 to $10 per day selling this system. Its revolutionary features of the old and extensive system of measures and agents are one of success. We have several different styles and branches with all.

A FATAL LESSON will be given free to everyone who writes to us, showing every point of merit, and an insight into every book published. Address

THE HAZARD POWDER CO.,
Hazardville, Conn.
Represented in Utah by
Salt Lake Hardware Company.

Combination Fence

Agents wanted. Exclusive territory. Liberal terms.

TELEPHONE 1194

Geo. F. Felt & Co.

Cor. 4th South and Main.

Yard and Factory Depot.

Wire and ornamental iron work. G. F. Felt & Co.

GUNPOWDER.

Low rate over road who every shot to Ogden, who always shot your shot 10 HAZARDS "Dead-Shot Rifles" HAZARDS "Fine Shooting" HAZARDS "Duck Shooting" HAZARDS "Sporting and Blasting" HAZARDS "Best of all" Ask your dealer for the powder.

THE HAZARD POWDER CO.,
Hazardville, Conn.
Represented in Utah by
Salt Lake Hardware Company.

Academy, 328 S. MAIN ST.