

R. J. HENNINGER, Manager.
T. T. GIER, Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

One year in advance \$1.00
Six months in advance .50
Three months in advance .25
Single copy 10 cents

The "Who's Who in America" has been established for nearly fifty years, and it has become a standard work for all who have read it. It is a book that is not only a source of information, but a source of inspiration. It is a book that is not only a source of information, but a source of inspiration. It is a book that is not only a source of information, but a source of inspiration.

CIRCULATION (SWORN) OVER 4000



A TROUBLESOME BOGEY MAN.

The fear of militarism is not a product of American soil. Our history contains no example of the army in any way encroaching upon or usurping the rights of the civil authorities or becoming an instrument of tyranny in the hands of a despotic leader. On the contrary no page of our history is brighter or has been viewed with greater wonder by the nations of the world than that which relates the closing scenes of the civil war and the disbanding of the largest army ever marshaled by a republic. When this government exhausted by four years of civil strife disbanded within six months more than 800,000 soldiers who retired quietly to private life without causing a ripple on the surface of a peaceful and law-abiding society. At the beginning of 1866 the army had been reduced to less than 50,000 men and in 1876 it contained but little more than 25,000, hardly enough to care for the ordinance the nation felt its duty to keep on hand for an emergency. At the beginning of the Spanish-American war the unprepared condition of the army can hardly be realized. So unfit was it for service that General Miles then in command, urged in the strongest terms that no aggressive measures be taken for several months until the regiments were recruited and the volunteers were drilled thoroughly. While the country would not permit such delay at that time, had we been going to war with a strong nation it would have been necessary to have adopted General Miles' plan. It was humiliating to the American soldier, when he reached the Philippines to find the native rebels in bare feet and a breech cloth better armed than he was, and when he was fortunate enough to capture a native his own gun was thrown away and the savage's appropriated with the knowledge that the Mauer rifle would shoot three times as far as the old Springfield he had abandoned. The war was half over before the American soldiers had modern arms. This should have been a good lesson for the country and it did have the effect of Congress authorizing the United States to support a regular army of 100,000 men when on a war footing, but in time of peace to be reduced to less than 60,000 men. This is the condition of our army today that causes all this talk about militarism and its threatening dangers. The Democratic party pretends to see calamity ahead for the nation from this source; it "views with alarm" this most awful specter and demands "the reduction of the army to that point historically demonstrated to be safe and sufficient." As a matter of fact, the army is smaller today than it ever was before in proportion to the population. According to figures compiled by the Army and Navy Journal, a non-partisan publication, in 1800, the days of Jefferson and Monroe, there were ninety-six men to each 100,000 population. In 1829, the proportion was 103 and today there are only seventy-five to each 100,000 people.

When it is remembered that these 60,000 men are engaged in policing 1000 islands in the Philippines, and scattered in small detachments from Alaska to Florida in this country, it does not

seem possible that a party which claims to have recently regained its sanity could become frightened by such a shadow as "militarism." Even Judge Parker, "that profound jurist and statesman," who as the *Courier-Journal* intimates, has power to cause the rain to cease, the clouds to disappear and the sun to shine, also sees danger in a great military display, he argues that we are not a military nation, bent on conquest. Of course we are not, and if we were inclined that way, 60,000 soldiers would make a very poor beginning for a conquering nation. The talk about militarism is the worst kind of rot indulged in by demagogues for political effect. No one can really be so ignorant as to fear 60,000 American soldiers who love their country as dearly and serve it more faithfully than those who are constantly abusing them. Any one with ordinary intelligence ought to be able to see that it would be impossible for these widely scattered troops to get together even if they all became traitors at once and if they did, they could make little headway against a nation the strength of ours. A sheriff in many counties would be able to disperse them with a posse he could summon in a few hours.

But why is this ghost of militarism paraded before an intelligent citizenship? It will not frighten any one unless it be those new arrivals from countries where the large army is a burden upon the people. All this bluster is made to catch a few uninformed citizens who have not yet become familiar with the history of our country and the temper of our people. This nonsense is not addressed to the intelligent voter. It will not appeal to him; it is intended for the ignorant.

"WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA?"

From the current volume of the very interesting book under the above title, a copy of which is on our desk, we gather several items of information, that are essentially out of the ordinary. The book contains the names of 14,443 people who have attained more or less eminence in their different vocations,—13,204 men and 1,239 women.

Of these 13,204 men who willingly furnished all the details of their careers for publication, 316 refuse or neglect to give their ages, while of the 1329 women, 305 refuse or neglect to disclose the dates of their birth.

In other words, as the author says, "reticence on this subject is largely a feminine characteristic, for while 2.35 per cent of the men do not give the date of their birth, the proportion of women who do not is over 29.45 per cent."

The average age of the 874 women who give the dates of their birth is 50.57 years, and of the 13,888 men is 53.56 years.

Of the 13,172 who give their ages only 40.41 per cent are under and 59.59 per cent over 50.

The author says married women are as averse to giving their ages as are "bachelor maids."

More of the men were born in 1865 than in any other year, while more than one-half of them were born between 1840 and 1860. Of the women more of them were born in 1860 than in any other year while more than one-half of them were born between 1840 and 1865.

Of those who gave any statement at all as to whether they were married, 9883 men are so blessed, while 1,235 women are similarly situated, 815 men distinctly acknowledged they were unmarried and 410 women admitted the same state of facts.

Of the 14,443 persons whose biographical sketches are in this volume, scattered all over the United States, only one of every thirty of the men is a bachelor, while one of every three of the women is a spinster.

From this it is fair to conclude that most of the prominent men are married while most of the prominent women are not, going to show, does it not, that wives are a positive assistance to their husbands, while husbands, it would seem, constitute an insufferable handicap to their wives.

"Who's Who in America" is a very valuable book even though some of the conclusions drawn from its statistics are more interesting than flattering—in some directions.

THE PORTAGE ROAD.

The earnest and effective assistance given the state board of canal commissioners by leading citizens of Portland in the matter of building the Cillo portage road is not only creditable to that city but augurs well for the first important step in the tangible development of Eastern Oregon. This enterprising move on the part of Portland furnishes ground for general congratulation.

It means not only that the farmers of that section now in business will reap the benefit of cheaper transportation while they need it, that is, while they are yet living, but it will furnish, as nothing else will, a stimulus to an earlier completion of the canal.

With the passage of the act appropriating money with which to secure the right of way for the canal, the state board was placed in a very embarrassing position, since it followed the appropriation for the building of the portage road before the latter project could be commenced; and since one of these undertakings is but temporary while the other is to be for all time and much more effective in the accomplishment of the object in view, it

necessarily brought matters to a halt.

Many conditions arise confronting public officers where responsibility cannot be avoided, but where duty lies along one of two or more paths, thus increasing the embarrassment without solving the difficulty.

The portage road is one of such difficulties. There are many farmers in that section of Eastern Oregon which is to be particularly benefited by its construction who do not expect to live long enough to see the canal completed, and these men see the money which has been appropriated for their immediate relief lying idle in the state treasury. Naturally, they want to see it expended in the building of the portage road.

The man who needs relief today from an annoying condition does not get much consolation from the assurance that assistance will come within a short period after his death—especially, if the assurance comes from the very source that has been empowered and directed to furnish the relief at once.

The farmers of Eastern Oregon are more interested in having the benefits of reduced freight rates come to themselves than to their successors. And this is all natural enough. The portage road should be built if possible, and at once. The Statesman believes the state board has wished to do the best thing under the circumstances all along, and this enterprising movement by the citizens of Portland, if unaccompanied by any legal entanglements, will no doubt be promptly accepted. It will mean the beginning of the great work that will eventually give us the realization of that alluring dream of our fathers, an open river to the sea.

THE "LEGAL" POWER OF THE LEGISLATURE.

In regard to the communication by Judge Boise, printed in this issue it is only necessary to refer to that part which deals with the constitutionality of the law enlarging the boundaries of Salem. As to the desirability of the enlargement of the territory of the city, the Legislature in such cases is influenced by the delegation most concerned and its power to act is never questioned.

All of Judge Boise's letter that bears directly upon the suit against the city is contained in the following sentence: "You do not seem to comprehend that there is a difference between the 'Power of the Legislature' to amend the charter, and the legal exercise of that power."

But this is indeed a hair splitting distinction that strongly suggests the absence of any difference at all. To concede that the Legislature has the power to do a thing is to say that it has the legal power to do it, of course. That body has no illegal power to do anything. All its powers are legal and to admit that it has the power to extend the boundaries of a city is to admit that it has the legal power to do so. We certainly do not "comprehend the difference" between two things that are precisely alike.

And we are very much inclined to differ from the eminent jurist in his implied statement that the Legislature has the power to appropriate money in an unconstitutional manner. That body has not the "power" to do any invalid thing, and when, in speaking of the Legislature, we concede it has "the power" to pass a certain act, of course, if we intend to be candid, we refer only to those acts it can pass legally. To admit it has the power to do a thing that we feel certain the courts would decide to be invalid would be an uncandid statement on our part as well as unfair to those depending upon us for advice. If we say the Legislature has the power to do a certain thing, and it does it, and the court afterwards says it had no such power, the action of the court only shows that we were wrong in our first statement.

Judge Boise hints at a technicality upon which the suit against the validity of the act extending the city boundaries will be based, although he does not actually give it his sanction. Of this it may be said, however, that no city ever grows or reaches its best possibilities when such a spirit is permitted to dominate its government.

AS TO CERTAIN FEATURES OF BOSSISM.

It is given out to the public—the public enjoys to have these matters settled by those who think they are specially commissioned by each other to settle important matters for the public—that Brownell has withdrawn from the contest for the Presidency of the Senate next winter and that Kuykendall's "triumph is assured."

There are 500,000 people in the state of Oregon, and thirty state senators, but four men met in Portland last week and fixed the entire matter for the twenty-eight senators who were at home and having nothing whatever to say in the matter. This system of managing politics simplifies matters and renders the duties of the disinterested senators less irksome.

Two United States and the two aspiring candidates meet, talk the matter over, make compromises, trade future positions,—trade some men in and others out, men who were not there, of course—and the important matter is a "closed incident," and is so given out to the public! Here is the way it is reported:

"Mr. Brownell declares positively and in unmistakable terms that he is not a candidate for re-election to that

honor, but is first, last and all the time for Senator Kuykendall for the place."

But it occurs to some people that this is the second time Brownell has "declared himself first, last and all the time for Kuykendall for the position." At that memorable meeting just after his election to the presidency of the senate two years ago, Senator Fulton and Senator Howe were present when, in order to get Kuykendall out of the way as a promised aspirant for the chairmanship of the ways and means committee, Brownell promised to support Kuykendall "first, last and all the time" at the next session!

How does it come, then, that here he is in the race for that position, asking it necessary to call a meeting of those who manage these important matters for the people? Since the affair was settled at that meeting two years ago, why has it been necessary to settle it again? And what assurance is there that it will not bob up again before next January requiring a still larger "concession" to appease the distinguished gentleman "whose services to the Republican party in Oregon have been so vast as to defy the power of proper computation?"

And where do the people come in on these programs based upon such a lovely plane of political manipulation. Likewise, where does Julius Moreland find himself domiciled in the political arena? And is John Hall to be finally immolated on the altar of the second Brownell promise to support Kuykendall, "first, last and all the time"? And doesn't any other aspirant for the presidency of the senate dare breathe a political hope because two United States Senators and two aspirants for that position meet and trade and compromise and settle the matter?

Really, it might turn out that there are others, though the thought seems not to have occurred to the Big Four.

THE STATESBORO DISGRACE.

All the leading newspapers of the South are outspoken in their denunciation of the atrocious burning at the stake of negroes already convicted of murder according to law. This is creditable to those papers, for there is nothing else to be said.

The Atlanta Constitution says that "in its unreasoning desire to inflict summary punishment upon the two principals the mob defeated the ends of justice," when the murdered negroes were alone able to give testimony that would lead to the apprehension of others connected with them in the murder of the Hodges family.

The Memphis Commercial-Appeal says the burning was the result of "pure blood-thirstiness," and says it was "an atrocity that is calculated to shake faith in popular government."

And the Charleston News and Courier says that "in the presence of such a spirit of lawless violence every good citizen must be appalled." And the last paper quoted gets at the kernel of the whole difficulty by asking the following question:

"And now what will the Governor and the peace officer and the law and order loving people of Georgia do about it? It is not to be believed that the murderers of Reed and Cato are not known. Shall they escape without punishment for their terrible crime?"

But nothing is more certain than that nothing whatever will be done in the matter. To do so would be contrary to Southern sentiment on the proposition. The leading papers can do nothing but loudly denounce the barbarous murders, but the proceeding is but the natural outcome of the methods employed for the suppression of the negro vote in the Southern states, for which every Democratic paper in that section stands an open sponsor.

In spite of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the federal constitution, the negroes of the South do not vote. As a rule, they know better than to go to the polls. The admitted free use of the shotgun has done it. Senator Tillman has frequently boasted of these murders while addressing the United States Senate. And yet, while not permitted to vote, they are used to swell the Democratic representation in Congress and in the electoral college.

A large per cent of the electoral votes which will be given to Judge Parker will come from the Southern states based upon the citizenship of hundreds of thousands of negroes who have no share whatever in the choosing of presidential electors. The rank injustice of this cannot be defended from any point of consideration.

But while all good men deeply deplore this Statesboro outrage, it is the natural outcome of that generally tolerated policy in the South of resorting to violence, if necessary, to trample under foot the constitution of the United States, and from whence comes the loudest cry that "the constitution should follow the flag"—a sentiment which holds, for partisan purposes, that the constitution should follow the flag into the Philippines, but not into the South without the express permission of those who reserve the right to govern a large part of the citizens there without their consent!

CONSISTENCY VERSUS PROGRESS.

As a sort of supplementary indictment against President Roosevelt as an unsafe man in his exalted position, the Democratic papers are discovering that in one of his books printed several years ago sentiments can be found that



From the Office Window

An Undoubted Case for Federal Intervention.

Passing from a consideration of the exchange of compliments between the strikers of Colorado and the polygamists from Utah, as they showed their teeth in the Miners' Congress in Portland, it is interesting to ponder over a case now making trouble in Washington City.

This difficulty originated in the incessant playing of a piano by a Mr. Southard on Yale street, and so intolerable a nuisance has he become to all his neighbors that a petition, signed by fifteen of his nearest victims has been presented to the police commissioners, but without avail. The next effort at relief was made through the district attorney, but that officer pretends to find himself powerless to interfere with the vested rights of the persistent disciple of the Mozart-Paderewski school of public disturbers.

The district attorney has decided that the proper source of relief can come only from the grand jury, and to that body the petitioners have appealed. In their complaint the following state of facts is set forth:

"He takes a portion of a bar of music and repeats the same sometimes for two hours," says the petitioners; "then he will change to a combination of notes, and we can be sure of those for an hour, if not longer. The loud pedal is used and he pounds as hard as it is possible to pound. Sunday is no exception, and far from being a day of rest, it is one of the worst we have. Pardon our going into detail so strongly, as we wish to impress upon you the fact that this is not the ordinary piano nuisance, but the most unheard of, as well as unexcused, of its kind."

"Now we ask, gentlemen, that you will give your earliest and closest attention to this petition, allowing us the privilege of using our homes for rest between the hours of 2 and 4 in the afternoon, and our lawns after the hour of 8 in the evening."

One of the tenement houses in the neighborhood has already been vacated and the tenants of two others have served notice that unless the nuisance is speedily abated, they will move out.

And all this, let it be borne in mind, is in Washington City, right under the nose of President Roosevelt, and the latest news intimates no disposition on his part to bring to bear the powerful

are entrusted into a direct contradiction of some other sentiments to which he has given utterance more recently.

Whole columns are thus devoted in some of the more prominent papers East, sometimes developing into the horrible display that finds its most effective expression in the deadly parallel column, clearly proving that twenty years ago, or, still more recently, Roosevelt believed something that he doesn't apparently believe now!

Hence, his unfitness for the Presidency.

When one of America's greatest thinkers said that he "would have the courage to do what he believed today though it might give the lie to all he said yesterday," he was evidently in a mood not altogether understood by these pert critics of the President.

And suppose Judge Parker were to be brought face to face with this sort of a test as to his reliability or "safety?" Four and eight years ago he voted for the free and unlimited coinage of silver without waiting for the consent of any other nation on earth, against which, at this time might be quoted a certain telegram announcing that the gold standard is "irrevocably established."

Paul, the greatest of the apostles, was at one time an industrious persecutor of the saints. One of the things that could be said of President Roosevelt is that he is big enough to change his mind when deemed necessary. It is one of the best things yet to come to the surface in Judge Parker's political career, that he could and has changed his mind.

In fact one of the most creditable things to be said of the Democratic party is that it could and has changed its stand upon great public questions about as often as it has had occasion to give them utterance.

For many years the Democratic party has made an heroic fight for an income tax law but its last national convention voted it out of the platform, and with Mr. Bryan's consent, for the reason plainly stated by Senator Hill, that with such a plank in the platform, the Democrats could not carry New York. And Mr. Bryan, seeing the point, withdrew his amendment and abandoned the fight for a "principle."

Oh, yes, really bright men frequently change their mind. Roosevelt no doubt frequently has. And there are others.

Editorial Sidelights and Observations on Various People and Things, Picked Up and Scribbled Down at Odd Times.

influences of Presidential interference. No doubt the matter will be brought into the pending campaign as an instance of the rapidly waning strenuousness of the Rooseveltian backbone and as vividly illustrating the necessity for a Democratic triumph in November.

Sprucing Up.

Did you ever look at the sea of unsightly telephone and telegraph poles that line either side of the principal streets of Salem and one side of nearly every other? The next time you are on the street close your eyes as far as possible to every thing else but those poles—you know it can be done—and get a realizing sense of the unsightliness that impresses itself upon every new comer who finds himself within our gates.

The laws of the city require all poles to be painted with two coats of good white paint. It is a plain requirement, specific and easily understood. But if there is one pole within the city limits that has or ever had a coat of any kind of paint, its location has never been discovered.

The question is, why? This ordinance was passed eleven years ago for the purpose of adding to the beauty of our streets. Our business men spend thousands of dollars in embellishing the fronts of their buildings that do not add one cent to the amount of their business, unless in the matter of increased attractiveness. Most of the prettiest homes in the city keep their lawns neatly cut and watered, solely as an appeal to the beautiful as accepted by the eye. There is no money in it and none is expected.

The court house and state house grounds are kept green and beautiful at the expense of many thousands of dollars each year. Why? There is no income from it. These things are all done because of the difference between us, or what is generally supposed to be, and the self-satisfied redmen who owned this country when we found it.

This was the reason for the passage of the city law eleven years ago requiring the painting of every pole thereafter erected upon which wires were to be strung. Why was the first pole and every succeeding one not painted? It is not a case where it is necessary to appoint a committee to investigate the financial condition of the city to ascertain whether the expense can be afforded. It will not cost the city a dollar. It is merely one of those easy cases where to say the word is to secure the result.

And yet, we are free to admit, that the custom of not enforcing any ordi-

nary law to which some man may object has become so common, that when an officer starts the world by announcing that he intends to enforce the laws—for which purpose, only, he was elected,—the usual outcome is the institution of a suit by the aggrieved victim to determine if the courts will not in some way knock out the law.

But we believe the companies owning the poles that line our streets everywhere, would raise no objection to the enforcement of this law. Certainly, they would not. But this very admirable law should be enforced anyway, and the best time to do the work is now, before the fall rains set in. Will the council move in the matter, and if not, why not?

Our sister city of Albany, that sleepy, old-fashioned, out-of-date burg up the river has a similar ordinance, and every pole in the city, on the main streets and in the suburbs, is painted white from the top to within eight feet of the ground, the remainder being painted black. The beautiful effect upon the streets is noticeable the moment you enter them, and a visitor looking for a home would at once count it an added attraction.

The next time you are on any of our streets look at our magnificent array of unpainted poles and get a free panoramic reproduction of one of the huge "deadendings" to be found in the neighborhood of Silver Creek Falls—a remaining relic of the great fire in the Cascade Mountains in the fall of '48.

But the question is, who will be the first councilman to raise this sleeping ordinance from the sacred precincts of the dead, that we may tighten the belt around our municipal carcass and move up into the Albany class?

A Slip and a Scratch.

Charley Simms of St. Johns, went home Wednesday night and found his wife had gone to a dance. It made him mad, and he started for the dance hall but found the spouse on pleasure bent—or about to be bent—on the road, and, proceeding to tell her a few things to his surprise she talked back. This made him mad again and a fight began during which he slapped her and she pulled his hair and scratched him.

The case is now in the local courts, and serves to recall the fact that two weeks ago a woman in Chicago applied for and secured a divorce from her husband because he invariably let her have her own way. Really, what intolerable and inexplicable extremes we do "meet up with" in this beautiful old world!

CORRESPONDENCE.

Another "Friendly Suggestion," Accompanied by a Cited Precedent.

Editor Statesman:

As to that "Friendly Suggestion" to the Salem saloon keepers we would wish to remark it is wasted effort in the direction of securing a strict observance of the law under which they are permitted to do business. The fact is the average saloon keeper seems to presume that a license to sell liquor under certain restrictions, is a license to ignore all restraints whatever, and then forthwith proceeds to persistently act upon said presumption, regardless of the fact that the highest court in the land has repeatedly decided that the liquor traffic is not a legitimate business only to the extent it is made so by special statute.

Another feature of the business is that the few who do observe the letter of the law are ever ready to defend those who persistently and systematically violate its every provision. In the states of Texas and Kansas this matter has been fought to finish in all its phases and the saloon has universal—both state and national. In the former state Prohibition by statute prevails in more than one hundred counties and the number is increasing from year to year, notwithstanding the aid given the local saloons by all the breweries and distilleries in the country from Milwaukee, St. Louis and Chicago in fighting the law on its constitutional ground.

At last the brewers' association of that state have come to the conclusion that it is useless to "kick against the pricks" and now notify the authorities that they stand ready and willing to prosecute and secure the conviction of all men guilty of a violation of the license law. Had they, and the better class of saloon keepers, done this from the start, there would not have been a tithe of the Prohibition sentiment in the country there is today. If they had demonstrated the fact that license regulated the traffic, which it does not and never did further than to give a few the monopoly of the trade, the "disenfranchisement" would not find "Jordan such a hard road to travel" as they are now finding. Verily the old adage, "first make mad" finds a fitting application to the saloon keepers.

"Legal" Power of the Legislature.

Editor Statesman:

In the Statesman of the 21st instant in your criticism of a communication by Wm. Spayd you quote me as having said that the Legislature had the power to amend the charter of the city of Salem, so as to embrace new territory,

and seem to infer from that statement that I admitted that the present charter was legally enacted and is valid.

You do not seem to comprehend that there is a difference between the "Power of the Legislature" to amend the charter, and the "legal exercise of that power."

For example the Legislature has the power to pass laws for the appropriation of money for various purposes, but for such laws to be valid they must comply in manner and form with the requirements of the State Constitution; one of which requirements is found in Section 20, Article IV of the Constitution. "Every act shall embrace but one subject and matters properly connected therewith which subject shall be expressed in the title."

I have expressed no opinion as to whether or not this new charter was passed by the Legislature in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution. That is an open question to be decided by the proper court. Whatever opinion I have expressed is in favor of the enactment of the charter when I presented at a public meeting a remonstrance of over 90 per cent of the people of this new territory, and when I did not apprehend that the Legislature would disregard the wishes of the people in the new territory, and violate the rights of the people which the Constitution is made to protect.

The matters referred to by me in my former communication were as to the right of the Legislature to ignore the remonstrance of over 90 per cent of the voters of the new territory.

Before the enactment of a statute for the creation and extension of any municipal corporation by submitting the same to the voters of the district to be embraced within the boundaries of such corporation, the people of a district desiring to form a city petitioned the Legislature for a Charter, fixing its boundaries, and defining its powers and duties. And no such city was ever created when the majority of the people in the district remonstrated against it, nor has the boundaries of any city in this state except Salem been extended to embrace a large number of people, without the consent of the majority of the voters in such new territory. Such a proceeding was without precedent, and unjust. The people in the new district were receiving no benefits from the city government, and will receive none in the future. The new territory is most of it too remote and sparsely settled to be properly lighted, or have a sufficient supply of water to make its engines of any use in case of fire. The new territory is to get from the enlarged city some burdens in the way of taxes for the benefit of the old city, but no benefits, with many annoyances in the management of their lands and general business.

R. P. BOISE.

Gray Hair

"I have used Ayer's Hair Vigor for over thirty years. It has kept my scalp free from dandruff and has prevented my hair from turning gray."—Mrs. F. A. Soule, Billings, Mont.

There is this peculiar thing about Ayer's Hair Vigor—it is a hair food, not a dye. Your hair does not suddenly turn black, look dead and lifeless. But gradually the old color comes back,—all the rich, dark color it used to have. The hair stops falling, too.

31.00 a bottle. All druggists.

"If your druggist cannot supply you, send us one dollar and we will express you a bottle. Be sure and give the name of your nearest express office. Address, J. C. A. & Co., Lowell, Mass."

Free! A Trial Bottle of Jayne's Carminative Balsam

—The Standard Remedy for Summer Complaint, Cramps, Colic, Griping Pains, Sour Stomach, and Vomiting, also for Dysentery, Diarrhea or Looseness, Asiatic Cholera, Cholera Morbus, and Cholera Infantum. JAYNE'S CARMINATIVE BALSAM has been used with great success for 73 years. We will send Free to any person who part payment for the mailing, a trial size bottle of JAYNE'S CARMINATIVE BALSAM. Write your Name, Town and State plainly to insure your getting the same.

Please mention this paper when answering advertisement.

Address: DR. D. JAYNE & SON, Philadelphia.