


# Bedford Inquirer.



BEDEFORD, PA., FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1867.

## BUSINESS NOTICE.

Mr. Alex. R. Aiken is the authorized agent for the INQUIRER, to receive subscriptions, advertisements, collect accounts and receipts for the same. Mr. Aiken will call upon all those who are indebted to us and present our accounts. He will also give those whose advance subscriptions expire on the 1st of April a chance to pay up for the next year.

**DIRECTORY.**—The following is a directory of the Officers of Bedford County and the Borough of Bedford, of the Ministers of Bedford, and the time of meeting of the different associations:

**BEDEFORD COUNTY OFFICERS.**  
President Judge—Hon. Alex. King.  
Associates—Wm. G. Eichelhof and Geo. W. Gamp.  
County Recorder and Recorder, &c.—O. E. Shannon.  
District Attorney—E. F. Kerr.  
Treasurer—George Marford.  
Sheriff—Robert Stockman.  
Deputy Sheriff—Philip Hertzler.  
Deputy Surveyor—Samuel Ketterman.  
Commissioner—Michael Wertz, Michael S. Riebel and David Hower.  
Clerk—John G. Fisher, Counsel—John W. Dickerson.  
Directors of Poor—Samuel Beckley, D. R. Anderson and John H. Heckerman.  
Deputy Poor—E. F. Kerr, Clerk—T. R. Giddens.  
Physicians—William Bowles, Physician—Dr. F. C. Reamer.  
Justices—David Evans, James Mattingly and John D. Lucas.

**BOROUGH OFFICERS.**  
Borough—O. E. Shannon.  
Assistant Burgess—Philip Hertzler.  
Council—Thomas H. Lyons, John Boor, A. W. Mower, J. M. Shoemaker, Hiram Lentz and T. R. Giddens.  
Clerk—H. Nicodemus.  
Treasurer—John H. Hosh.

**Conservable—Samuel Waters.**  
School Directors—J. Mann, S. L. Russell, T. R. Giddens, Jacob Rees, H. Heckerman and H. Nicodemus.  
Secretary—J. W. Lingenfelter.  
Trustees—T. R. Gettys.

**MINISTERS.**  
Episcopalian—Rev. Alfred J. Barrow.  
Presbyterian—Rev. A. V. Schenck.  
Lutheran—Rev. J. Q. McArthur.  
Methodist—Rev. B. G. W. Reed.  
German Reformed—Rev. H. Heckerman.  
Roman Catholic—Rev. Thomas Hayden.

**ASSOCIATIONS.**  
Bedford Lodge, No. 220, A. Y. M., meets on the first Wednesday on or before full moon, in the Bedford Hall, on the corner of Pitt and Richard streets.  
First Branch Encampment, No. 111, I. O. O. F., meets on the first and third Wednesday evening of each month in the Bedford Hall.  
Bedford Lodge, No. 222, I. O. O. F., meets every Friday evening, in the Bedford Hall.  
Bedford Lodge, No. 145, I. O. O. F., meets in the Court House, on Monday evening of each week.

**MAGNOLIA WATER.**—A delightful toilet article—superior to Cologne and at half the price.—2c.

**A NEW GROVER & BAKER 555 Sewing Machine for sale.**—One-half cash and the balance in a reasonable time. Apply to Box 61, Bedford, Pa.

**HON. SIMON CAMERON** is on his annual visit to the Springs. The friends of the General in this county will be pleased to meet him again. Long may he live to repeat his visits.

**ANY person** desiring a Scholarship of the Quaker City College, Philadelphia, one of the best Business Colleges in the United States, can be supplied, on reasonable terms, by applying to us.—1c.

**GUM ROLLER GRAIN DRILLS.**—About 300 now in use in Bedford county. Everybody pleased with them. Always in order and ready. Hartley & Metzger have sold about 50 already this year. All well-informed farmers will buy none but Willoughby's Gum Roller and Gum Spring Drills.

We would call the attention of gentlemen to the notion department in the store of Berkstresser & Co. There will be found the best assortment of the best Hosiery, Gloves, Neckties, Collars, (paper and linen), and Cuffs to be found in Bedford. Do not overlook their Hats and Clothing, but look over them.

**KICKED BY A HORSE.**—Matthias Reichard, a young man in the employ of Levi Smith, at the Aradale House, was kicked and dangerously injured by a horse, on Monday evening. He was engaged in taking off the gears at the time, and was struck with such force in the stomach by the beast, that he was knocked entirely out of the stable.

**RATIONS COMMUTED.**—Heirs of deceased prisoners entitled to Commutation of Rations.—The heirs of prisoners who died in any of the Southern prisons are entitled to recovery of the Commutation for Rations provided by Act of Congress approved March 2, 1867. Widows, children and parents who are entitled to Ration money can procure it by applying to Durbin & Lutz.—1c.

**JOHN W. SNOWDEN,** late private of Company E, 2nd Regiment of Pennsylvania Cavalry volunteers, is represented to have died in one of the Southern prisons during the rebellion. Any person acquainted with the circumstances and date of his death will confer a great favor upon his parents by communicating the facts to the editors of the INQUIRER.—1c.

**Fit Up.**—As harvest is about over everybody is supposed to have worn out their shoes, and we would remind our friends and the public generally that Irvine & Stetler claim to have the most extensive and best stock of town. Any one in want of cheap Oxfords, Notions, Groceries, &c., will also find their stock complete and up with the times in price. Call at No. 2 Anderson's Row.

**BOAT CAPTIVED.**—Narrow Escape of Three Persons from Downy.—One day last week, a party of three young men named Kriebbaum, Smith and Lingenfelter, were crossing the dam near Woodberry in a small boat or skiff, the vessel capstived and precipitated them into the water. Mr. Kriebbaum being somewhat of a leader, struck out vigorously for the shore, but the other two being less fortunate, floundered around for a while at the imminent risk of drowning, but were finally rescued from their perilous position by Mr. Holsinger, who came to their assistance in another boat. We congratulate our friends on their fortunate escape, and would advise them to "trim ship" in future voyages in a life vessel.

**ROOMS OF THE COMMITTEE on the Treatment of Prisoners of War and Union Citizens held by the Confederate authorities during the late rebellion.**  
WASHINGTON, D. C., July 17, 1867.

In pursuance of a series of resolutions passed by the House of Representatives, July 10, 1867, the undersigned were appointed a committee to investigate the "Treatment of Prisoners of War and Union Citizens held by the Confederate authorities during the late rebellion."

All persons in possession of important information upon either of these subjects are earnestly requested to address the Committee, as directed below, stating:

First, The name, age, and post office address of the writer.

Second, If a soldier or seaman, his rank or position, and with what command he served.

Third, A full statement of all facts known to the writer touching his own imprisonment or treatment, and that of others, either soldier or citizen, giving, as far as possible, names, places, and dates, with names of Confederate officers in charge.

Correspondents from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Texas, and the States and Territories lying west of the Rocky Mountains, will please address JOHN P. C. SHANKS, M. C., Washington D. C.

Correspondents from Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, and the Territories east of the Rocky Mountains, will address WILLIAM A. PILE, M. C., St. Louis, Mo.

Correspondents from Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota will address ALEX. C. HARDING, M. C., Monmouth, Ill.

Correspondents from the New England States will address AARON F. STEVENS, M. C., Nashua, N. H.

Correspondents from Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, and Tennessee will address WILLIAM MUNKEN, M. C., Findlay, Ohio.

Communications addressed to the members of the Committee will be free of postage.

It is the intention of the Committee to collect all the facts necessary to make a thorough official history of this subject.

The various newspapers throughout the country are requested to give this Circular a gratuitous insertion, together with such notice as they may deem proper.

**JOHN P. C. SHANKS,**  
WILLIAM A. PILE,  
ALEX. C. HARDING,  
AARON F. STEVENS,  
WILLIAM MUNKEN,  
Committee.

**REV. D. LARABEE,**  
Clerk.

**RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE.**—At a regular stated meeting of Cove Lodge No. 268, I. O. O. F., held on Saturday evening, August 10, 1867, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:

WHEREAS, It has pleased Almighty God, in His dispensation of His all-wise providence, to remove from among us the wife of our brother, Thomas M. Snowden; and, whereas, This sad event is very painful to our mourning brother, being the heretofore trial which he has ever experienced—the loss of one most dear to him, and, whereas, The character, life and virtues of the deceased were of such purity, and her kindness and affection toward our beloved brother such that the loss of his life companion brings him great affliction and trouble, and condolence and sympathy being much needed, therefore be it

Resolved, That we hereby tender to our sadly bereaved brother our heartfelt sympathy in this the hour of his affliction, and we commend him to our Heavenly Father, who doth not afflict willingly, for that comfort which charity brings cannot give: The Lord gave and the Lord taketh away.

Resolved, That we condole with the relatives of our brother, who, by her death, have been deprived of an affectionate sister and friend.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to our afflicted brother, and copies be sent to the Bedford Inquirer and Bedford Gazette, with a request that they be published.

**SAM'L B. SWARTZ,**  
**JAS. A. SHADE,**  
**JOS. E. NOBLE,**  
Committee.

**Portrait of THADDEUS STEVENS.**—Thaddeus Stevens has been photographed by Weberman and the likeness engraved by Sartain. This picture is sold by subscription only, and Mr. JACOB Z. OYER is now canvassing this county for subscribers. The artists have succeeded in producing not only a perfect likeness of the "great Commoner" but a work of the highest merit. Intellectually Mr. Stevens has no superior, if an equal in this country, and his great and manifold public services have familiarized his name to the entire nation. When years have toned the acronimies of the present day, impartial history will accord him the meed due his vast talents and patriotic labors. The Common school system of Pennsylvania will ever stand an enduring monument to his fame, and future generations will lead the name of him through whose intelligent labor education was made as free as the waters of life. The portrait of Mr. Stevens should have a place in every household in this State, and the life like picture of him now offered the public will be surpassed if equalled. A copy can be seen at our office.

**THE SPRINGS.**—In a letter to the editor of the Harrisburg Telegraph, a correspondent speaks of the Springs as follows:—"Here may be found health, recreation, rational enjoyment and agreeable leisure, with the desirable accompaniment of neat and well ventilated sleeping apartments, and a table excellent alike in quality and variety. The guests at the Springs hotel number about two hundred. There are, perhaps, as many more at neighboring boarding houses and places of accommodation. Probably double the number would be here if the Broad Top railroad extended to the Springs, or even to the town of Bedford. Referring to the hotel at this place, we are reminded of a disparaging remark not long since made in our hearing concerning it, which have not been verified in our experience. Whatever may have been the case heretofore, it is certainly now contained in a style which should preclude complaint. The landlord (Mr. Anderson) is courteous and obliging, the waiters polite and attentive, the table liberally supplied with best cooked and palatable dishes, and the general appointments of the house characterized by judgment and an accommodating spirit."

**WITH FOUR METALLIC QUALIFICATIONS** a man may be pretty sure of earthly success. These are: Gold in his pocket, Silver in his tongue, Brass in his face, and Iron in his heart.

But for a tonic appetizer, and as a gentle stimulant, there is reliable virtue in PLANTAIN BITTERS. No article has ever been so duplicitated in a style which should preclude complaint. The landlord (Mr. Anderson) is courteous and obliging, the waiters polite and attentive, the table liberally supplied with best cooked and palatable dishes, and the general appointments of the house characterized by judgment and an accommodating spirit."

**BOURBON TOWN FEMALE COLLEGE.**  
BOURBON TOWN, N. J.  
An institution for the careful and thorough instruction of Young Ladies in all the branches of a complete education. Board and tuition in the Preparatory and Collegiate departments, \$208 per year. Working, Academic, and Musical Departments, and ornamental branches, extra. Winter Session opens September 19th. For Catalogues, address Rev. JOHN H. BRACKLEY, A. M., August 16th.

**LIST OF LAUSES** put down for trial at Sep. 4th term 1867, 1867, 24th.

John Cassa, Esq., vs. Thos. Murray et al.  
Thos. Well & Co. et al. vs. Saml Steiner.  
W. S. Rietken vs. Kensing & Fleck.  
Mary Ann Yarnall vs. Wm. Marshall.  
Wm. Firmstone et al. vs. Jas. Fink et al.  
Ann E. Dalk vs. John Weyand.

John Kemp vs. Hildesheim Coal and Iron Co.  
David Heiler vs. H. & B. T. Rail Road Co.  
Robert Adams et al. vs. Francis Hayman et al.  
Ridderbeck & I. Co. vs. Broadway & I. Co.  
Marg. W. Blackburn vs. Geo. Blackburn.  
Geo. W. Meyers vs. Michl Feithey et al.  
John H. Karns vs. David Rietken et al.  
Jeremiah Knouff vs. John H. Wertz et al.  
Thos. R. Evans vs. Shaler & Marshall.  
John Black et al. vs. Catherine Tricker.  
Samuel Crisman et al. vs. John Ake's adm'r.  
Thos. Ritchey vs. Jacob Lingenfelter, et al.

Seized and taken in execution as the property of Samuel J. Galt, a lot of ground in the Borough of Bedford, being No. 140 in the general plan of the Borough, now occupied by defendant on West street, and containing a brick house and other buildings thereon erected; said lot being 25 feet or more in front on Pitt street and extending back 240 feet to 20 feet alley, adjoining lot of Job Mann on the West and Hiram Lentz and wife on the East.

Seized and taken in execution as the property of Mrs. Sophia D. Gibson, a lot of ground in the Borough of Bedford, being No. 140 in the general plan of the Borough, now occupied by defendant on West street, and containing a brick house and other buildings thereon erected; said lot being 25 feet or more in front on Pitt street and extending back 240 feet to 20 feet alley, adjoining lot of Job Mann on the West and Hiram Lentz and wife on the East.

Seized and taken in execution as the property of Mrs. Sophia D. Gibson, a lot of ground in the Borough of Bedford, being No. 140 in the general plan of the Borough, now occupied by defendant on West street, and containing a brick house and other buildings thereon erected; said lot being 25 feet or more in front on Pitt street and extending back 240 feet to 20 feet alley, adjoining lot of Job Mann on the West and Hiram Lentz and wife on the East.

Seized and taken in execution as the property of Mrs. Sophia D. Gibson, a lot of ground in the Borough of Bedford, being No. 140 in the general plan of the Borough, now occupied by defendant on West street, and containing a brick house and other buildings thereon erected; said lot being 25 feet or more in front on Pitt street and extending back 240 feet to 20 feet alley, adjoining lot of Job Mann on the West and Hiram Lentz and wife on the East.

Seized and taken in execution as the property of Mrs. Sophia D. Gibson, a lot of ground in the Borough of Bedford, being No. 140 in the general plan of the Borough, now occupied by defendant on West street, and containing a brick house and other buildings thereon erected; said lot being 25 feet or more in front on Pitt street and extending back 240 feet to 20 feet alley, adjoining lot of Job Mann on the West and Hiram Lentz and wife on the East.

## FACTS FOR THE PUBLIC.

Easily verified by examination, which we respectfully invite.

1. We have the largest establishment for the manufacture and sale of Clothing in Philadelphia, extending through from 518 Market street to 511 Minor street, and occupied exclusively by ourselves.

2. Our building, having been constructed by us for our own exclusive occupancy, and for the business to which it is entirely devoted, unites all the conveniences and appliances which have been found necessary or desirable.

3. We have an ample cash capital, enabling us to make all purchases for cash and giving us a selection, at the most favorable prices, from the markets of the entire world. IN THIS PARTICULAR we have ADVANTAGES SHARED BY NO OTHER HOUSE IN THE TRADE. This fact is well known to the entire Philadelphia community.

4. We sell goods for cash only, which, though it restricts our business to those prepared to purchase in that way, enables us to give them such advantages as no house doing a different business can possibly offer.

5. A business experience of a quarter of a century has informed us fully of the wants of the public and of the best way to meet them.

6. We employ the best and most experienced Cutters and Workmen in making up the style, fit and make of which are unsurpassed.

7. All persons, whatever may be their physical peculiarities (unless deformed), can be accurately fitted at once from our stock, in most cases better than by goods made to order, and at prices 25 to 50 per cent. lower.

8. Our business is large and constantly increasing, enabling us to keep the largest, best assorted and most complete stock of Men's, Youth's and Boys' Clothing in Philadelphia, which, together with all our goods, are made of fresh goods, replacing their old.

9. For seasons already enumerated, we can and do sell at prices guaranteed in all cases lower than the lowest elsewhere, or the sale cancelled and money refunded.

10. All goods when offered for sale are represented to be exactly what they are.

11. When buyers are, for any reason, dissatisfied with a purchase made, if reported, and if reasonable terms, we pledge ourselves, by a full satisfaction in every case, and request that all such may be reported to us for adjustment.

**HALF WAY BETWEEN BERRYET & CO. TOWER HALL, 518 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA.**  
AND 606 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.  
May 17-3m.

## Spread the Truth!

Some medical men insist that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, however valuable it may be. Querer reasoning this. It is like saying that an article which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it is ungratified to advertise a remedy, but it is ungratified to advertise a remedy which the world needs should be hidden away—that benefits and blessings may be too widely diffused—that the means of protecting and restoring health should be a close monopoly, and not accessible to all. The argument is bad. It is reasonable to say that it