

# ROYAL BAKING POWDER

Absolutely Pure.

This powder is more concentrated than the ordinary article, and contains weight of pure powder, per ounce. Royal Baking Powder Co., 109 Wall Street, N.Y.

## Reputed in the Name of Orangeism.

The conduct of those young rowdies, who on Monday evening last paraded the streets of the city with hand-painted signs, the purpose of which was to surround the public places, simply disgruntled the public, and gave name of Toronto, and some action should certainly be taken by the authorities to prevent the recurrence of such scenes. We suppose while these young toughs confine their exercises to making rough-hands, and the like, it is no how to prevent their parading; but when they begin to fire stones and smash windows they clearly commit a breach of the peace, and should be summarily dealt with.

In the name of Orangeism we repeat all connection with those young rowdies. They are a disgrace to the Protestantism they profess; they are a disgrace to their parents and the city of Toronto.

## Woman Suffrage Defeated.

### New York Standard.

Women's rights in England have received, according to a tale from Southport, a blow from an unexpected quarter. The Society for the Protection of Animals, who are the repository of a large number of Southperts, are going on very well when a noise came out of a hole and sat down on the middle of the floor. That produced complete silence, during which the woman were cautiously getting up the stairs. Nobody had enough presence of mind to call the police, and after getting a full stomach. Thus connected with the fact that a man inured to being a common drunkard has his leg trying to get into jail after having climbed out to get a smoke, and the fact that a woman wanted to be a tramp, and having been found here or there, she had run up the curtain. A demand for the reform of men's conduct, an unpopular and abandoned meeting took place, and the meeting broke up in a mud for the door.

## Prohibition vs. License.

### New York Standard.

In a recent letter to the Lewiston (Me.) Journal, Gen. Neal Dow, the father of Prohibition, declares that after that law is enacted in the State, "the greatest temptation will be to make it impossible." This is a fact, and then leaves its administration to an official, while it is a fact that trade with foreign countries, where the Prohibition strength was equal to ours, was wholly disappointing.

## HONESTY AND INTELLIGENCE.

It pays to be honest, you say. Granted.

But how many are dishonest though ignorant, expedient, or intentionally. One can be dishonest and yet say nothing.

A clerk who lets a customer buy a damaged piece of goods, a witness who holds back the truth with clear conscience, a medical practitioner who takes his patient's money when he knows he is doing him no good—all are culpably dishonest.

It is generally known that dishonesty is committed by codes, regulations, and custom, not to mention advertising.

Now there is a medicine on the market which for the past ten years has accomplished a marvelous amount of good in the cure of Kidney and Liver diseases, and diseases arising from the derangement of these great organs—namely, Safecure.

Safecure is the merit of the doctors of this country know from actual evidence that it will cure Advan's Kidney Disease, which is but another name for Bright's Disease.

The medical profession admit that there are physicians dishonest enough to procure Warner's Safe Cure, put the same into plain, four-ounce vials, and charge their patients \$2.00 per vial, when a sixteen-ounce bottle of the remedy, in its original package, can be had for any drug store in the world for \$1.00—Times.

The doctor argues that the majority of the patients of this country know from actual evidence that it will cure Advan's Kidney Disease, which is but another name for Bright's Disease.

The medical profession admit that there are physicians dishonest enough to procure Warner's Safe Cure, put the same into plain, four-ounce vials, and charge their patients \$2.00 per vial, when a sixteen-ounce bottle of the remedy, in its original package, can be had for any drug store in the world for \$1.00—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.

One of those unreasonable men who take a newspaper for a year or two and then sell it back marked "read" or "not wanted," was sued by a Godly publisher in \$7,000. Ten years ago he would have commanded from \$12,000 to \$13,000—Times.