

SCIENCE'S LATEST VALUABLE VICTORY

The Problem of Getting Nearly Full Power from Coal.

IT HAS BEEN SOLVED AT LAST

Dr. Jacques's New Process Likely to Reduce the First Cost of Electric Light Plants to a Quarter of What It Is--What the Invention Will Accomplish.

From the Buffalo Express.

No announcement in practical science of recent years has been calculated to excite so much interest as that made on one day that the problem of the direct conversion of coal into electricity had been solved. The announcement came almost simultaneously in this country and in Germany--in Germany from an eminent chemist that the thing could be done, and characteristically, in this country from an electrician of high standing that it had been done. Dr. Coehn, a German chemist of note, has been experimenting at the problem for some time, and as a result of his researches announced a short time ago his belief that it would be possible to transform coal into electricity directly. The same month Dr. William W. Jacques, an electrician of the Bell Telephone company, filed letters of patent upon a process accomplishing exactly this result.

Just what all this means was best put in a lecture by Professor Ostwald two years ago, when he said: "Had we a cell in which electrical energy was produced by the direct oxidation of carbon, with an output approaching the theoretical, we should be on the brink of an industrial revolution, a revolution in which the invention of the steam engine sinks into insignificance."

This is putting the case strongly, but it is nevertheless in a large measure true. As almost everyone at all acquainted with the subject knows, the highest efficiency known at the present time, only secures about 14 per cent. of the theoretical efficiency of burning coal. An ordinary steam engine does not realize over 6 or 7 per cent. The remaining 90 or more per cent. is absolutely lost--wasted.

Furthermore, in order to get the potential energy of coal into a form where it is easily utilized commercially, involves still further loss and waste. All the power that is consumed in running the dynamo is so much energy thrown away. A table recently prepared, showing the highest efficiency known at the present time, only secures about 14 per cent. of the theoretical efficiency of burning coal. An ordinary steam engine does not realize over 6 or 7 per cent. The remaining 90 or more per cent. is absolutely lost--wasted.

THE PROBLEM STATED.

Now if a way could be found to approximately reverse these proportions it is easy to see what an industrial revolution would result. In fact, the inventor of Boston, believes that he has done about this. He has devised a process of singular simplicity, generating an electric current direct from coal or rather from coke, and in a series of tests was able to secure in one instance as high as 87 per cent. efficiency of efficiency of the coal used. This, of course, was exceptional, but Dr. Jacques believes that he will be very shortly able to produce electricity commercially for somewhere between one fifth and one tenth its present cost.

But in the very simplest way, Dr. Jacques's process is this: Taking a quantity of coke he reduces this to a powder, adds a little water, jams it into a cylinder and makes a big round stick of carbon that looks a good deal like a giant firecracker or a stick of carbon for an electric arc light. All told, it is a simple process, and the inventor believes that he will be very shortly able to produce electricity commercially for somewhere between one fifth and one tenth its present cost.

To obtain the necessary voltage or electrical pressure, a hundred or more of these iron pots are put together, their rims connected by a wire. The whole plant--it can hardly be called a battery--is enclosed in an oven in order to keep the solution at a uniform temperature of about 400 degrees centigrade. Practically, that is all there is to this epoch-making invention. With the exception of a pump to drive the air through the solution of soda there is no "machinery" at all. Compared with this marvellously simple affair, a steam engine and dynamo are as "Prof. Jacques observes, "hopelessly complex." There are no boilers, no engine, no dynamo, no ashes to be removed, no water to be paid for, no endless quantity of supplies to be provided.

Roughly speaking, Dr. Jacques estimates that the first cost of an electric light plant, per horse power, will be something like a fourth or a fifth of the present cost. The expense of maintenance, or, rather, of attendance, is reduced almost to a minimum. The carbon cylinders last for 150 hours or more, the enclosing oven has a self-feeding attachment. Practically this generator requires little more attention than an ordinary small steam heating house plant.

From a series of tests extending over many months Dr. Jacques estimates that already he is able to generate electricity for a fifth or a sixth that of the best plant in the United States and for one tenth that of the smaller plants. In other words, a pound of coal is made to produce five or ten times as much power as at the present time.

THE INVENTION'S VALUE.

Perhaps this does not bring to your mind any very clear or vivid idea of the immense value of this invention. Take it another way. The other day Dr. Jacques and Edward Atkinson, the statistician, sat down and undertook a little speculation in figures. Supposing that by Dr. Jacques's process all the electric and power plants in the United States could be reproduced for, say one fourth of their present value, and next that they could be run for one-fifth their present cost. In the United States there are upwards of \$1,000,000,000 invested in steam engines alone. This, of course, includes locomotives and the like. In the matter of first cost Doctor Jacques's invention would therefore represent a saving of upwards of three quarters of a billion of dollars. Again, steam power in this country represents an annual expenditure of

about \$450,000,000 a year. That is practically the annual cost of running the national government, including all the improvements and expenditures on public work which the government undertakes. Were Dr. Jacques's process to be introduced, even with its present efficiency, the bill for power would be reduced to less than a hundred million, it would save the people of this country annually more than two and a half times the amount that is collected from our everlasting tariff fees. It would save five or six times as much as all the silver that would be offered for coinage if Mr. Bryan and his followers had between get the reins of government and enact a free-coinage measure.

Now consider all the steam engines and all the coal used in all the rest of the world beside, and it will begin to dawn upon you what a wonderful thing this modest and neglected Boston electrician has accomplished in doing. It is a thing which, for two of the foremost physicists of this country, Professor Charles R. Cross Thayer, professor of physics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Henry A. Rowland occupying the chair of physics in Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, have made reports on Dr. Jacques's process and have not hesitated to declare their belief in its practical value or to give Dr. Jacques sole credit for his great invention.

You will better understand the full measure of this Boston electrician's experiment when you recall that he has done the thing which the foremost inventors and scientific minds of the last quarter of the century have sought in vain. Edison tried for it, tried for years, and curiously enough along something of the same line taken by Dr. Jacques. But he failed flatly, just as all the others have done. Indeed, so general is the belief that the direct conversion of coal into electricity is impossible that when the news of Dr. Jacques's discovery was reported in England, the Electrician of London printed a long and laborious demonstration of why it could not be done. Inferentially it labeled the news as a humbug. Dr. Jacques smiles as he reads the article in the Electrician by the light of a lamp whose current was generated by the new process directly from the coke.

THE INVENTOR HIMSELF.

The Boston inventor is a little past 40, a brisk, wide-awake, handsome man, who has very little of the air of a typical inventive genius. You would take him for an active, go-ahead business man sooner than for anything else. For all that he is a man of science, as well as a practical electrician, and he is as well as an electrician. Originally a Johns Hopkins man, he pursued his studies in Germany, and then entered the employ of the Bell Telephone company as its electrician. He has, indeed, been with them from the beginning.

His discovery represents a labor of not less than ten years. It is two years or more, even, since Dr. Jacques became certain that he had solved the problem, although his patents were not taken out until this spring. Just how he worked it out would be a long story. The conditions were that he should find a way by which carbon could be oxidized in the process, not by combustion as in fire, but at a low temperature, converting the energy of the carbon into electricity instead of heat. It was necessary that this oxidation should be easily regulated and that the fluid in which the carbon was immersed, the electrolyte, should not suffer deterioration in the process.

Dr. Jacques conceived the idea, and this is the very kernel of his great discovery that the oxygen of the air might be made to combine with carbon, not directly, but through the aid of an intervening electrolyte, which would carry the air and present it to the carbon. In order to do this he tried for a long time to use the electrolyte, believing the latter would take up a part of the air and present it to the carbon, and that he latter would immediately accept it, and by combining with the oxygen which forms a part of the air, insure true and perfect oxidation.

He succeeded, and, further, he found that the stick of carbon and the electrolyte were connected by wire, a current of phenomenal volume flows through it. All that remained thereafter was patiently to work out and overcome all the minor difficulties that lay between the laboratory experiment and successful commercial application. It need not be said that it was easy. It took months of patient investigation and experiment. Things which could be done on a small scale would yield nothing like the same results when done on a large scale. But one after another the difficulties gave way, results multiplied, and the problem was solved so definitely and so definitely that even a capitalist could see that it was done.

It may be two years before the new invention will be put into practical use on a large scale and begin to make its influence felt. But when this time arrives it is not easy to calculate what a change it will bring to the production of electricity. It is likely to produce, if only a part of the expectations of Dr. Jacques are realized the invention is still likely to equal in value that of any other discoverer of the century.

BALLAD OF BOSTON TOWN.

Miss Jane Penelope Brewster, of lineage running back To ancient Plymouth's founders, with never a flaw nor crack, Supposedly daff and Browning, Emerson and Thoreau. Very select, correctly odd and all that stuff, you know; Never appearing in public without a chaperon. Loaded with B. C. wisdom, but to modern larks unkind, Sudden came the Boston mind to totter and quake and reel By riding out through the Back Bay Pines mounted upon a wheel! Gay and snickered, cultured society wept. Still on her awful downward course Miss J. P. Brewster kept; Her long skirts soon gave way to short bloomers succeeded those. What did they say on Beacon street? 'Twas too much, to suppose, Headings and solid argument, ridicule, cats and scow! Fell for her lot, but still she went reeling "centuries" off. Soon she was winning prizes; her intimates, her fell of pain, Finally her peddler; and she had "wheeled on the brain."

But after a while what happened? Jenny shook off her shell, Got acquainted with real folks, grew to be plump and well; Found out something about the world that's whisking along, didn't despise the play; When the season was over the girls of her ancient set Found she'd married the very man they all had hoped to get; Instead of the brain, the facts in the case reveal That when Miss Brewster rode there was a massive brain on the wheel!

THE INVENTOR'S VALUE.

Perhaps this does not bring to your mind any very clear or vivid idea of the immense value of this invention. Take it another way. The other day Dr. Jacques and Edward Atkinson, the statistician, sat down and undertook a little speculation in figures. Supposing that by Dr. Jacques's process all the electric and power plants in the United States could be reproduced for, say one fourth of their present value, and next that they could be run for one-fifth their present cost. In the United States there are upwards of \$1,000,000,000 invested in steam engines alone. This, of course, includes locomotives and the like. In the matter of first cost Doctor Jacques's invention would therefore represent a saving of upwards of three quarters of a billion of dollars. Again, steam power in this country represents an annual expenditure of

THE RELATION OF PRICES TO WAGES

Convincing Reply to the Recent Speech of Candidate Bryan.

FREE SILVER CRAZE CUT TO PIECES

Text of an Address Last Tuesday Evening at Dolgeville, N. Y., by Professor George Gantou of New York, Editor of Gantou's Magazine and Recognized Master of Economics--Don't Fail to Read It.

Some of our Democratic friends have made themselves believe that the free coinage of silver is the want of the moment. They are wrong. The want of the moment is the rich. And the more clearly they can make it appear that the free coinage of silver is the want of the moment, the more clearly they can make it appear that the free coinage of silver is the want of the moment. To "spoil the Egyptians" seems to them the acme of success. They appear to have worked themselves into the belief that the free coinage of silver is the want of the moment. To "spoil the Egyptians" seems to them the acme of success. They appear to have worked themselves into the belief that the free coinage of silver is the want of the moment.

Second, that this was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism, which they insist necessitates the free coinage of silver at a ratio which is a doublet and creates general prosperity. Third, that restoring the free coinage of silver would re-establish the monetary and industrial conditions of 1873 and create general prosperity. Fourth, that the free coinage of silver would re-establish the monetary and industrial conditions of 1873 and create general prosperity.

Justification of their policy they affirm: "That the act of 1873 demonetizing silver 'struck down half our primary money, and consequently cut prices in two' to the great injury of the farmers and other producers."

Second, that this was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism, which they insist necessitates the free coinage of silver at a ratio which is a doublet and creates general prosperity. Third, that restoring the free coinage of silver would re-establish the monetary and industrial conditions of 1873 and create general prosperity.

Fourth, that the free coinage of silver would re-establish the monetary and industrial conditions of 1873 and create general prosperity. Fifth, that the free coinage of silver would re-establish the monetary and industrial conditions of 1873 and create general prosperity.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RATIO. So much has been said about 16 to 1 that there seems almost to have been created a feeling that there is some occult influence associated with that particular ratio. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Let us now consider the second proposition, that the demonetization of silver was a departure from the principle of bimetallicism. It is not so. It is a ratio which means what it means by 16 to 1, and why that particular ratio is preferred is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled? Who will get more wealth for a day's work through prices being doubled?

AN UNPARALLELED

Cured in a Manner that will Interest any Person who is Nervous.

Another Case, a Court Stenographer in Cleveland, Run Down from Overwork, Helped by the Same Means.

From the World, Cleveland, Ohio. Mrs. Adeline Bentel, of Hudson, Ohio, arrived here yesterday on a visit to her daughter, Mrs. O. W. Chapman. She intends to remain for some weeks.

When the above little item of news was published a few days ago, it caused no little surprise as well as some incredulity among the people of Marietta, Ohio, where Mrs. Bentel lives when she is at home. Not but what the lady in question has a perfect right to travel and to go to see her